THURSDAY, 23 JULY 2026

ESTIMATES—STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE—HOUSING AND PUBLIC WORKS; YOUTH

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Jon Krause, Scenic Rim)

Mr Speaker (Hon. Pat Weir, Condamine)

Committee Members

Mr JJ McDonald MP—Chair

Ms JM Bush MP

Ms W Bourne MP

Mr TA James MP

Mr D Kempton MP

Mr SR King MP

Members in Attendance

Dr CAC Rowan MP

Hon. MAJ Scanlon MP

Mr MC Berkman MP

Hon. MC de Brenni MP

Ms C Mullen MP

Hon. LM Linard MP

Hon. GJ Butcher MP

Hon. G Grace MP

Mr BJ Mellish MP

In Attendance

Hon. ST O'Connor, Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth

Mr Matthew Adams, Chief of Staff

Mr Christien Duffey, Principal Adviser

Ms Caet Young, Principal Adviser

Department of Housing and Public Works

Mr Mark Cridland, Director-General

Ms Danielle McAllister, Deputy Director-General, Policy Performance and First Nations

Ms Anastasia Tritchler, Acting Executive Director, Office of the Director-General

Mr Matthew Nye, Deputy Director-General, Housing and Homelessness Services

Ms Ainslie Barron, Assistant Director-General, Public Works

Queensland Building and Construction Commission

Mr Angelo Lambrinos, Chief Executive Officer and Commissioner

---

The committee met at 8.30 am.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I declare this hearing of estimates for the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee open. I acknowledge the Aboriginal people and the Torres Strait Islander people of this state and their elders past, present and emerging. I acknowledge the former members of this parliament who have participated in our democratic institutions and all Australians who serve and have served our nation to protect our democracy. Finally, I acknowledge all Queenslanders, whether they have been born here or have chosen to make this state their home, whom we represent to make laws for the peace, welfare and good government of this state.

I am Jon Krause, the member for Scenic Rim and Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Under the provisions of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, I will preside over today's hearing. The members of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee are: Mr Jim McDonald, the member for Lockyer and chair; Ms Jonty Bush, the member for Cooper and deputy chair; Ms Wendy Bourne, the member for Ipswich West; Mr Terry James, the member for Mulgrave; Mr David Kempton, the member for Cook; and Mr Shane King, the member for Kurwongbah. I assume we will have some substitutions throughout the day as well as members who have been granted leave to appear. I welcome those members as well.

I remind everyone present that any person may be excluded from these proceedings at my discretion or by order of the committee. Please note that the first three rows of the gallery are reserved for departmental and ministerial staff supporting the minister. Members and others who are attending to observe are welcome to sit in the remaining rows or in the gallery.

The committee has authorised its proceedings to be broadcast live, televised and photographed. Copies of the committee's conditions for broadcasters of proceedings are available from the secretariat. Staff who are assisting our witnesses here today are permitted to use personal electronic devices in the chamber. I ask all present to ensure phones and other electronic devices are switched to silent mode or turned off if not in use. I specifically remind all members in relation to this matter. I remind everyone that food and drink is not permitted in this chamber.

Before we commence, I remind members of the statement made by myself and Mr Speaker at the commencement of estimates hearings on Monday and Tuesday in relation to statements, points of order, the tabling of documents, authentication, the taking of questions on notice, motions and other associated matters. Whilst I will not read that statement again in full, if necessary I will be able to refer to it. I want to remind members of those principles set forth by myself and the Speaker at the beginning of this estimates week.

The House has determined the program for the committee's estimates hearing today. Today the committee will examine the proposed expenditure contained in the Appropriation Bill 2026 for the portfolios of the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth; the Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games; and the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. I remind honourable members that matters relating to these portfolio areas can only be raised during the time specified for the area, as was agreed by the House. I refer members to the program set by the House which is available throughout the chamber and on the committee's webpage. The sessions today will examine the proposed expenditure for the housing, public works and youth portfolio areas until 12.15 pm; the sport, racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games portfolio areas between 1 pm and 4.45 pm; and the transport and main roads portfolio area between 5.15 pm and 9.30 pm.

I remind everyone that these proceedings are subject to the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly. In respect of government owned corporations and statutory authorities, standing order 180(2) provides that a member may ask any question that the committee determines will assist it in its examination of the relevant appropriation bill or otherwise assist the committee to determine whether public funds are being efficiently spent or appropriate public guarantees are being provided.

On behalf of the committee, I welcome the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth, the director-general, officials and departmental officers and also members of the public. For the benefit of Hansard, I ask officials to identify themselves the first time they answer a question referred to them by the minister or director-general. Please remember to press your microphones on when you want to speak and off when you are finished speaking.

I now declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio areas of housing, public works and youth open for examination. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

Minister, if you wish, you may make an opening statement regarding the housing portfolio area of up to five minutes.

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you, Deputy Speaker and committee, for this opportunity to appear. Every Queenslander deserves a safe and affordable place to call home and this budget invests more than any government has before to deliver that. After a decade when housing supply went nowhere near keeping pace with population growth and when just 509 social homes were added on average each year, that has been out of reach for far too many Queenslanders. The Crisafulli government is responding with the scale, certainty and reform needed to turn that around as we deliver our comprehensive 20-year housing plan, A Place to Call Home. Our 2026-27 budget invests a record $5.725 billion over four years to build more social and community housing right across Queensland. Since being elected, we have contracted 5,544 social and affordable homes for delivery and we currently have over 6,900 social and affordable homes underway across Queensland.

We said we would empower the community housing sector and they are now delivering around 70 per cent of that pipeline. Our 'always open' Queensland Community Housing Investment Pipeline, or Q-CHIP, has already locked in 77 community homes since opening last September and we are also delivering eight new youth foyers, more homes for women and children escaping domestic and family violence, and supported housing for Queenslanders who need more than simply a roof over their heads because we recognise that homelessness is not fixed by just putting someone in a taxpayer funded motel and thinking the job is done.

Despite the scare campaigns we have seen from the member for Gaven saying that homelessness support has been reduced, our second budget provides an additional $450 million over four years for homelessness services and crisis responses, building on the significant investment of nearly $600 million in new funding we made in our first budget. We have delivered on our commitment to give specialist homelessness services certainty, ending Labor's year-by-year arrangements by renewing funding for a further three years, with a 20 per cent uplift all the way through to June 2029.

The Immediate Housing Response program will continue as a crisis safety net because temporary hotel and motel accommodation cannot be baked in as a long-term housing solution. When we came to government, families and individuals were stuck in motels for months and sometimes years on end without a clear pathway into stable housing. Since last September alone, we have helped more than 1,400 households transition from hotel and motel accommodation into longer term housing. What we are doing is working. I can reveal today that the social housing register has reduced month on month since last October. As of yesterday, there are 3,682 fewer Queenslanders on the register than the number we inherited from the member for Gaven.

Our budget also includes new long-term funding for Emmanuel City Mission's Night Sanctuary in South Brisbane, founded by the incredible Roby Curtis. We are supporting the refurbishment of the old Ozcare building and providing ongoing operational funding so that the service can expand from a small one-night-a-week trial to something that operates seven nights a week with capacity to support up to 110 people, to give them a safe place to rest, a warm meal and connections to the services they need. ECM is an important first step in delivering a positive housing and homelessness legacy ahead of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

We are also restoring fairness and integrity to the social housing system. The former government did not conduct routine rent and tenancy reviews in over five years, meaning we had no idea whether almost half of our tenants were even eligible or paying the right rent. We, in fact, have found over 3,700 households that the member for Gaven was charging too much in rent. We fixed that. Our strengthened Antisocial Behaviour policy is supporting our frontline housing officers to take action with the small number of tenants who repeatedly make life hell for their neighbours while continuing to support the vast majority of our residents to do the right thing.

We are also backing Queensland renters and property owners by restoring the Residential Tenancies Authority to a sustainable funding footing. The former Labor government put the interest earned on Queenslanders' rental bonds into Treasury, leaving the independent regulator underfunded and facing structural financial pressures. Our budget provides an additional $18.5 million to support the RTA and ensure it can continue delivering the services relied upon particularly by renters across our state.

We inherited a housing crisis created over many years. It cannot be fixed overnight, but, after years of announcements without action, Queensland now has a government with more social and affordable homes underway than ever before and which is investing record funding in frontline services. I thank the committee and look forward to your questions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. We will start with non-government questions today.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, funding for the Immediate Housing Response fund in this budget is around $42 million less than last year. That reduction is correct; is it not?

Mr Cridland: Good morning to the committee and good morning to the Housing and Public Works staff that might be watching today online. The budget in 2026-27 for IHR is $100 million. This compares to the commencing budgets for IHR in 2025-26 of $85.86 million and the commencing budget in 2024-25 of $98.8 million. The $100 million in 2026-27 reflects that there are currently 1,237 households in IHR. This is down from 2,150 households in March 2025. Overall, our specialist homelessness services have been able to transition 3,252 households into a housing solution from IHR. The most common outcomes were to public housing, to private housing, to community housing and to supported accommodation.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, the member for Cooper will table leaked information from the department noting a funding reduction for the Salvation Army of about $1.6 million. It says on there that the DDG should call because it is 'high political sensitivity'. Director-General, can you confirm a DDG called this organisation and advised that their IHR funding would be reduced?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause for a moment while we see the documents. All committee members and everybody across the table are to have one if they can, or at least the director-general.

Mr Cridland: Thank you for providing these documents, member. I really cannot verify what these documents are. They are a screenshot. Leaving those documents aside, in 2025-26 there was a single-year, time limited top-up. That was to deal with the high demand that had been in place before the policies around the use of IHR had been put in place and also to allow time to transition households out of IHR. As I mentioned, 3,252 households have been found a housing solution now but, as I said before, the base funding for IHR in 2026-27 is greater than the original funding in 2025-26 and 2024-25.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: could I seek assurances from the member for Gaven authenticating the source of this particular document? To me it appears to be a screenshot of a computer screen. I want to authenticate the basis of the actual document itself given it is a screenshot of what appears to be—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. One moment. Leader of the House, to your point of order, it may appear to be a screenshot. In terms of seeking authentication, the member has made a statement to the committee to the effect that it is a leaked document. In that sense, the member has asserted certain matters in relation to the document. If, through whatever means, that is asserted not to be the case, or it is asserted not to be a genuine document, there is a process for taking action or making complaints about the member's statements. In the absence of that, the member has asserted the nature of the document and, in any event, the director-general has already answered the question as well. We will move on to a further question.

Ms SCANLON: The member for Cooper will table a further leaked document from the department noting a funding reduction for Uniting Care of over $3.5 million. It, too, says the DDG to call and 'high political sensitivity.' Director-General, can you confirm that a DDG also called Uniting Care to advise that their IHR funding had also been reduced?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause, Director-General. We will look at that document as well, everybody.

Dr ROWAN: To a further point of order: I understand that the member for Gaven has indicated this is a leaked document. Again I seek your guidance in relation to the member for Gaven being able to authenticate that this is actually valid. I understand that she has asserted it is a leaked document, but authenticating its veracity I think is important for the committee, if she is able to provide any basis and indicate authentication to the words that this was leaked but it is also an authentic document, given that they are screenshots of a computer screen, as I look at them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Moggill, for your point of order. I will seek some further advice in relation to that, bearing in mind the matters I referred to previously.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: the Speaker in the parliament has taken the word of members of parliament, including LNP members in opposition, regarding authentication, so I ask that these documents be considered by the committee.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Gaven, for your point of order. I was just seeking some advice on those very points.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: further to this matter of authentication, the director-general made a good point that he cannot verify these documents. I wonder if it would help the committee if these documents were able to be related to the budget papers themselves because at the moment they are a random screenshot that does not relate to the budget.

Ms SCANLON: Deputy Speaker: these are specific documents that show funding cuts to organisations that are funded through the budget. You could not be more connected to the budget.

Mr McDONALD: That could be completely fabricated, though.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, thank you for your point of order. I am going to make a couple of points. Firstly, having taken advice from the clerk, these questions could be asked in the absence of the documents that are being tabled, which would enable things to move a lot more quickly. I give that guidance to the member.

Secondly, however, I will seek a direct assurance from you, member for Gaven, that the documents you are tabling have been directly provided to you by a party, that they are genuine leaked documents. Can I seek that assurance?

Ms SCANLON: These are documents that the opposition has obtained, correct.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The third point I will make is that the committee can determine whether or not to have these documents published in due course, regardless of whether they have been tabled or not. I go back to the first point, though. It seems to me these questions could be asked in the absence of any documents, and that would enable the matters to progress a lot more quickly.

I take the points of order from government members as well in relation to these documents. I have sought a direct assurance from the member. Also, I will go back to my previous comments. If documents are tabled and it is asserted that they are of a particular nature and it is then determined it is a different matter, that is a very serious matter for the member involved. I am going to ask the member for Gaven to proceed, in light of all of those rulings and advice. Do you have another question?

Ms SCANLON: Yes, Deputy Speaker.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I did not hear the member for Gaven answer your request to genuinely authenticate the documents. I did not hear that go into the record.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, did you give that assurance in response to my question?

Ms SCANLON: I did.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understood that she did, member for Lockyer. Perhaps you have spent too much time near tractors. Member for Gaven, please continue.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, how many other service providers received calls about funding cuts?

Mr Cridland: I will make a couple of points and repeat some I made earlier. The IHR hotel and motel program, which is provided by our specialist homelessness services, which do a fantastic job, has reduced from 2,150 households in March 2025 to 1,237 households as at 30 June. The IHR program has always been a demand-driven program. Prior to this financial year, there were no dollars assigned to 2026-27 for IHR and this budget has provided $100 million to continue that program to meet that demand.

I think the success that the SHSs have had working with our Housing Outreach Mobile Engagement teams is quite stunning. They have been able to transition 3,252 households out of hotels and motels into housing solutions. Last year alone, they provided over 400,000 nights of accommodation to people when they really needed it. The sector SHSs agree with us that the IHR is not an ideal long-term solution. The better outcome is long-term housing solutions.

Micah, in fact, commissioned a report with the University of Queensland which concluded that motels were not designed to be nor do they function as suitable long-term accommodation options for families. We are seeing the good work of the SHSs and our Housing and Outreach Mobile Engagement teams drastically reducing the demand on the IHR—the hotels and motels which are not suitable for long-term accommodation. We believe that, working with our SHSs, the $100 million of new money provided in 2026-27 will be sufficient to meet that demand.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, the member for Cooper will table a leaked spreadsheet, noting at least 25 organisations with $42 million in reduced IHR funding. Many of them have advised the department that they would have to reduce service outputs. Director-General, do you stand by your earlier statement?

Mr Cridland: I am not personally familiar with this document. I am not questioning the veracity of it; I am just not personally familiar with that document. I will look into it after this session. As I mentioned in my earlier answer, which I stand by, there was single-year, top-up funding to deal with demand at that time that had carried over from 2024-25 during a different time in this program. That single-year, top-up funding was always just that. The base funding last year was 85.86 and the base funding this year at the start of the budget is $100 million.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I refer you to that spreadsheet again. Can you confirm that 37 potential FTE jobs could be lost as a result of this funding reduction?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: again, given the response by the director-general to the previous question, in which he indicated he was not aware of the document, I want to seek further assurances. I know that you have given guidance to the member about not necessarily having to table the document. Again, they are screenshots. I want to have authentication for this third document.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: the Leader of the House has sought to raise the same point of order on three occasions. It is repetitive. You have ruled consistently on all of those occasions. I submit to you that those points of order are becoming disorderly.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order, Leader of the House?

Dr ROWAN: This is a third tabled document and is separate to the previous ones. Also, guidance was given to the member for Gaven in relation to the tabling of the previous documents that it was not necessary in order for a further question to be asked.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not for me to direct how people ask questions. It was guidance only. To your point of order, I will seek the same assurance form the member for Gaven in relation to the nature of the document.

Ms SCANLON: Yes, these have been obtained by the opposition.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: this separate point of order is with regard to imputation. Given the answer the director-general gave to the last question, the assertion that there will be a reduction in FTEs is not correct.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your assurance, member for Gaven. I was going to ask you to rephrase that question in any case because it is a hypothetical question and it contains an argument. Could you rephrase that last question?

Ms SCANLON: I can. Director-General, can you confirm that 37 potential FTE jobs could be lost as a result of a reduction in funding?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, that is still a hypothetical question.

Ms SCANLON: Sorry. Director-General, can you confirm that 37 FTE jobs will be cut as a result of a reduction in funding?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: that is worse. There is an imputation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, if you want to make a point of order, you must seek the call. Could you please do that appropriately rather than just speaking out of turn?

Mr McDONALD: Sorry, Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, could you repeat the last question you asked, please?

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I am referring to the column in the spreadsheet. Will 37 FTE jobs be cut?

Mr Cridland: The staff supporting the IHR are employed by non-government organisations, by SHSs. Those organisations have just received three years of funding. As the minister mentioned, some $429 million will go directly to SHSs on top of previous funding. Many are large and complex organisations. I do not think it is appropriate for me to comment—I know that I would not like it if someone else were sitting in a forum like this commenting on uncertainty for my employees—when I am not in charge of those organisations.

I am not going to speculate in this forum on what SHSs, the employers of these people, might do. If anyone watching out there is concerned, that is a matter they should discuss with their employer. If the employer has concerns, we will work with them to try to determine how we can assist. I am not going to speculate on the jobs of people who are not in my organisation.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, when asked about IHR funding reduction the minister said, 'Growing demand meant these programs have previously been underfunded, leaving frontline services without funding certainty.' Director-General, does a $42 million reduction recognise the quote 'growing demand'?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, I think there is an inference in that question in the sense that you are surmising that there is a $42 million reduction. Could you rephrase the question, please?

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I refer again to the column in the tabled spreadsheet that outlines a $42 million reduction. Does that recognise the 'growing demand'?

Mr Cridland: I will attempt to answer it. I am not sure I completely understand the question, but I will do my best. The IHR funding commenced in 2022-23. Base funding in that year was $27.95 million. Base funding in 2023-24 grew to $60.59 million. In 2024-25, base funding grew again to $98.8 million. Then what had to happen over that time in 2024-25 and in 2025-26—based on the base budgets, the government had to provide supplementary funding to the IHR program while we stabilised and transitioned households out of IHR. I mentioned 3,252 households transitioned out. It is fair to say that there was growing demand. As I have pointed out, as at March 2025, having stabilised and having worked with our SHS providers and our HOME team to transition folk, there are now 1,237 households in IHR.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will go to government questions.

Mr McDONALD: My question is to the minister. Will the minister clarify the facts regarding claims from the member for Gaven about IHR eligibility, the sale of social housing, funding the specialist homelessness services and First Nations housing staff members?

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you very much, member for Lockyer. I almost want the member for Gaven to keep going with some of those questions. I do thank you for that question. It is a great question, because the member for Gaven continuously peddles misinformation on social media about—

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I take personal offence and ask the minister to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, will you withdraw?

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. Since we were elected by the people of Queensland in October 2024, the Crisafulli government has been working hard to fix Labor's housing failures. The Labor Party—in particular, the member for Gaven—have refused to take responsibility for their appalling record and have instead spread fear and mistruths—

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I take personal offence again and I ask the minister to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was listening. I did not hear the member for Gaven specifically referred to.

Ms SCANLON: He did.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If that is the case—

Mr O'CONNOR: I am happy to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, thank you for withdrawing.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will touch upon a few of those scare campaigns, because it is important to put the record straight about the falsehoods that were spread by the member for Gaven and this line of questioning—

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I again take personal offence at the comments made by the Minister for Housing and ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, would you withdraw, please?

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. Maybe something I will not have to withdraw on is the member for Gaven's budget. The member for Gaven's line of questions goes to a reduction in a demand-driven program. In the member for Gaven's own budgeted figures, the amount that was allocated for the IHR

program in 2024-25 was, as the director-general just outlined, $98.8 million. In the member for Gaven's own figures, that dropped in 2025-26 to $85.86 million. In fact, over the Labor Party's period, the total funding for the IHR program that they put in place was $285 million compared to the current government, who has funded this program to the tune of $361 million. The director-general ran through the reasons for that reduction. It is because we are getting people into houses and out of hotels, and that is a good thing. We build; Labor go to Booking.com. We are spending less on motels because we have more people in houses.

With that eligibility issue with the IHR program that the member for Gaven continuously talks about, the changes that we made since we came to office were to standardise the rules that those specialist homelessness services already had in place. We have standardised those statewide. We brought in that policy in March or April last year by working with that sector. It included ensuring that those staying in hotels and motels on a temporary basis are our most vulnerable and that these Queenslanders are on a proper pathway to a housing outcome. The director-general ran through some of those numbers. They are very good numbers in terms of housing outcomes—to have over 1,400 since last September alone moved into long-term housing.

We also set fair and proper expectations of behaviour and asked the residents of that program to pay a co-contribution, just like they would pay for rent in social housing. That is important, to get them used to doing that again for when they get on that long-term housing pathway. The behaviour policy was also important, to make sure we were not seeing those hotels and motels getting trashed. With the program that we inherited, we saw so many operators of that program pulling out because their hotels and motels were getting trashed and they could no longer continue running that program.

Under the former Labor government, it was 'no questions asked'. There was not even a requirement for someone to prove that they were actually experiencing homelessness to get a taxpayer-funded motel. Our policy is around making sure more vulnerable Queenslanders have the help they need to access temporary accommodation while they get on to a longer term housing pathway. Claims that vulnerable Queenslanders are being denied access and that we are turning people away without legitimate reason are simply untrue.

Not even remotely in the ballpark of being true is a scare campaign being peddled by senior Labor frontbenchers that we are undertaking some kind of sales campaign with social housing. Under the government that the member for Gaven was a minister in and the member for Springwood—I welcome him to the table as well—they sold nearly 2,000 social homes over their decade in power. How many have we sold since we were elected? Twenty-six, and almost all of those homes have been sold to our existing tenants or to other state government departments for infrastructure projects. The Labor Party know this. We have given them that information in answers to questions on notice, but they continue to peddle that line to everyone who will listen despite the fact that they themselves sold nearly 2,000 social homes.

The member for Gaven also tried to spread fear by saying that funding for specialist homelessness services had been cut. Not only have we delivered record funding to these services and a 20 per cent uplift that was due to expire under the member for Gaven's last budget for those services across our state; we have locked in certainty with funding for every single program except the temporary-by-nature IHR, which we have run through at length, all the way through to June 2029. There is not a skerrick of truth to the member for Gaven's claim. All of those specialist homelessness services have received their funding letters by my department outlining their funding uplifts and their extensions to—

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just pause for a moment, please, Minister. What is your point of order, member for Gaven?

Ms SCANLON: I again take personal offence at the comments made and ask the minister to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did hear that one, Minister. Could you withdraw, please?

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw—just the facts of the member for Gaven's last budget.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Deputy Speaker. That withdrawal was not unreserved and did not meet that standard.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, could you please withdraw in an unqualified manner and then carry on with a further statement?

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. The former Labor government's budget locked in specialist homelessness services funding on a year-by-year basis. There was no certainty for these services. Every year these workers had to wait for a state budget to be delivered to know whether they would have jobs in the new financial year.

Not satisfied with all of that, the member for Gaven stated publicly that we have reduced staff in our First Nations housing team. In fact, in her contribution to the budget in the House she said that. Again that was not based on any facts, just 'vibes' she got from supposed leaks. There was no question on notice; there was no document to refer to. It was like a TikTok influencer spruiking a protein shake. Let me lay it out here for the committee. When the member for Gaven was in my role, the Labor government had 136 staff in the First Nations division of the housing department. The Crisafulli LNP government today has 138 staff in that division.

In terms of the final part of the member for Lockyer's question around supposed cuts to social and affordable housing, the truth could not be further from the repeated claims we have seen from the Labor opposition. No Queensland government has invested more into delivering social and affordable housing than the Crisafulli government. Labor averaged 509 homes a year over their decade of decline. We are on track to deliver four times that many by the end of our first term alone, and we have contracted 5,544 social and affordable homes since we were elected in October 2024.

My message to the member for Gaven and the Labor Party more broadly is a simple one: stop the scare campaigns. This is not university politics. These are vulnerable people's lives that you are playing with. Stop claiming help is not available. Hotels and motels are being funded—

Ms SCANLON: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: I take personal offence to the comments made and I ask the minister to withdraw.

Mr McDONALD: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: I do not believe the minister referred to the member at all.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, I was listening. Whilst the minister directed some comments towards the member for Gaven and the Labor Party, I do not think there was any personal reflection on the member for Gaven. Minister, it would aid the committee if you would withdraw.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. Hotels and motels are being funded, but they are not the only support we offer. Imagine if a vulnerable Queenslander refuses to even reach out for services because they listened to the opposition and believe there is nothing there to help them. We expect robust debate in the chamber. We expect valid criticism and differences in policy approaches, but these deceitful scare campaigns and playing politics with vulnerable Queenslanders is irresponsible. These issues were corrected, particularly with the IHR, by the director-general at last year's hearing. That should have been the end of the misinformation. Today those scare campaigns must stop completely.

Mr KEMPTON: My question is to the minister. How is the minister's department working with specialist homelessness services to get families and households out of IHR hotel and motel accommodation and into longer term housing?

Mr O'CONNOR: As I outlined previously, a hotel is not a home. It is completely inappropriate accommodation for people to live in long term. Some of those long-term stays went well into years under the former government and that is not acceptable. It is not an appropriate environment for a family to raise children, a person to recover from trauma, or for anyone to establish the stability they need to rebuild their life.

That is why we have refocused the Immediate Housing Response program towards helping households move beyond emergency accommodation and into safer, more suitable longer term housing. This also aligns with our build program, which delivered over 1,700 social homes in the last financial year alone. Under the former government, families, individuals and couples were placed in hotels and motels without a clear or active pathway out. The system was focused on securing another night of accommodation rather than resolving the household's underlying crisis.

We have changed that approach. I commend in particular our Housing Outreach and Mobile Engagement team under Matt Nye's division of the department, led in particular by Kirby Cook, who has done a great job with our specialist homelessness service providers to get people out of hotels and motels and into longer term housing. Our team has been working with those providers since last September to identify the barriers keeping households in temporary accommodation and develop practical pathways into longer term homes. That focus is delivering results.

As the DG outlined, the number of households being accommodated in IHR funded hotels and motels has declined from 2,150 in March 2025 to 1,237 as of 30 June 2026. That reduction is because since September last year we have supported 1,427 households to transition into longer term housing outcomes. Those outcomes are not only overwhelmingly getting them into social and community homes but also into private rental market homes, supported accommodation, temporary supported accommodation and other housing that is appropriate to the needs of the individual household.

Unlike the former Labor government, we are not just moving people from one form of crisis accommodation to another. We are understanding each household's individual circumstances and identifying the right housing response most likely to provide them with the stability they need. Some of those households may be ready to accept a social housing allocation; some may be able to secure and sustain a private rental market home with assistance through our many products such as RentConnect, our bond loans and rental grants, or our rental security subsidy. People with more complex needs may require supported housing or ongoing case management to help them sustain their tenancy.

Our department is proud to now be taking a more active and coordinated approach to identify those pathways instead of allowing households to remain indefinitely in temporary inappropriate accommodation. The persistence, compassion and practical focus of our teams has been critical to supporting these households achieve the housing outcomes we need to see. I take this opportunity to pay a special tribute to James O'Brien, who has since retired from our department after decades of service. He was pivotal to the foundation of that team in the department and developing the outcomes focused approach we implemented last year.

It is also important that the government listens directly to the people who are experiencing the Immediate Housing Response system. Last year I attended a forum with Micah Projects to hear from families living in hotels and motels about the difficulties they face, the disgusting circumstances many of them were living in for months and years on end. I will attend that forum again this year to listen to those families. Their feedback reinforces why emergency accommodation must remain temporary and why households need active support to navigate the barriers between crisis and achieving a permanent housing outcome.

We recognise that securing a tenancy is not always the end of the journey. Many households need ongoing support relating to health, disability, domestic and family violence, trauma, education, employment or tenancy sustainment. That is why we are investing record funding not only in more homes but also into stronger outreach, supportive housing and frontline homelessness services. As we outlined earlier, that was nearly $600 million in our first budget and an additional nearly $450 million in our second budget.

The reduction of households in IHR and people moving into actual homes shows that this approach is making a difference. There is more work to do, but the outcomes we are achieving are clear. Emergency accommodation will continue to be available for Queenslanders in acute crisis while our priority remains helping every household move towards the safety, dignity and stability of a proper place to call home.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, we will return to non-government questions given the time that has elapsed.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, my question is for you. The minister said at an event to homeless organisations in June—

You shouldn't be in a position where your staff are waiting for today to see whether you've got certainty whether you will have a job in just a couple of weeks.

Director-General, can you advise as at 23 June 2026 exactly how many services had been advised of the exact funding allocation they were to be provided with for the Immediate Housing Response fund?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Director-General, do you need a moment to find any detail around that?

Mr Cridland: Yes, I would not mind the member repeating the last part of that question, please.

Ms SCANLON: Certainly. Director-General, can you advise as of 23 June 2026 exactly how many services had been advised of the exact funding allocation they were to be provided with for the Immediate Housing Response fund?

Mr Cridland: I thank the member for the question. I am going to have to check. It is a very specific date so I will need to check that.

Ms SCANLON: I am happy for you to come back to the committee if you do not have that information at hand.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Director-General, thank you for that answer. Minister, it is up to you as to whether the director-general tries to come back with that detail.

Mr O'CONNOR: We will endeavour to get it by the end of the session.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you. Minister, why didn't you pick up the phone to organisations which had their funding cut and have had to reduce services and let staff go, according to the tabled documents?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: in relation to the question as asked by the member for Gaven, there are a number of imputations or inferences contained within it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I agree.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I have tabled a spreadsheet that shows a $42 million reduction in funding. The director-general has recognised that the top-up funding for demand has been discontinued. The minister surely could answer this question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, notwithstanding the documents that have been tabled, the standing orders in relation to the asking of questions in estimates still provide that they should not contain inferences or imputations or be argumentative or have excessively long preambles. I would ask you to restate the question, please, without it being argumentative or having inferences about particular funding levels.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Minister, did you pick up the phone to organisations which had their funding reduced under the Immediate Housing Response fund?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will give the call to the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth.

Mr O'CONNOR: You have to move with the information you are getting, member for Gaven. It is reduced because people are in houses, not in hotels. That is a good thing.

Ms SCANLON: They are on the street.

Mr O'CONNOR: They are in houses, not hotels.

Ms SCANLON: They are on the street.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Gaven. The minister is answering your question.

Mr O'CONNOR: The only cut that would have occurred is if the member for Gaven had continued in this role, like I outlined.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order: I take personal offence to that comment and ask the minister to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, I am going to ask you to withdraw that comment, please.

Mr O'CONNOR: Okay. I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carry on with your answer.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Gaven funded specialist homelessness services year by year. Do you want to ask me to withdraw that, or do you know it is true? It is correct.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr O'CONNOR: There was no offence to that because it is the facts, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, please address your comments through the chair and respond to the question.

Mr O'CONNOR: Until we were elected, homelessness services were funded year by year. Their funding dropped off a cliff. That is why we put in nearly $600 million in additional funding last year to lock in that 20 per cent uplift that was again going to drop off a cliff under the member for Gaven. We locked that in all the way to June 2029, and this year we finished the job, except for the Immediate Housing Response program, which I think we have covered at length today. The numbers are reducing there because people are in houses, not hotels. That is a good thing. I would have thought that is what we are all trying to achieve here. Again, the only cut that would have occurred is if the member for Gaven remained in this role.

Ms SCANLON: Deputy Speaker, point of order: I take personal offence and ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, would you withdraw that comment, please?

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. The member for Gaven funded specialist homelessness services year by year. We have provided them certainty for three years, all the way through to June 2029, while we work to fix the system. I want to commend the work of Matt Nye's division again and Dr Mackie in particular, who is working under our programs reimagined space to fix the back end and make sure the system is easier for these homelessness services.

These services were funded year by year by the member for Gaven. The fact that she is not taking offence shows that she knows it is true. It was in her last budget. They were funded year by year. They had no ongoing funding certainty until this government was elected. We made a clear commitment to those services to fund them over multiple years to give those workers the certainty they deserve.

In terms of the event that the member for Gaven is talking about, the comments that I made are accurate. They are exactly the comments I have made today. The Crisis Accommodation Program will still consider to be funded year by year because we do not want to bake in hotels and motels as housing outcomes. We have funded that at the levels that the demand is projected to be, based on the number of people we are getting into actual homes. We are very proud of that. It is a completely inappropriate environment for families, in particular, to be in hotels and motels for months on end. It is completely inappropriate.

In terms of the additional funding we have provided in this budget for specialist homelessness services, I thank the member for giving me the opportunity to outline this. In 2026-27, $429.5 million has been budgeted for homelessness responses across Queensland. That is $260.5 million to continue general homelessness responses—

Ms SCANLON: Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just pause for a moment, Minister. What is your point of order?

Ms SCANLON: The minister has attempted to answer the question. I am happy to move on to my next question.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: the minister is being very complete in his answer. He is giving context in answering the question directly.

Ms SCANLON: With respect, it is not relevant.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, I take your point of order. I understand that the minister is continuing to respond directly to the question, which I think made some reference to a reduction in funding. The minister is responding directly on that point.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order: I asked specifically if the minister had picked up the phone to communicate that reduction in funding. The minister has not answered that question so I am happy to move on to my next question.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order—

Mr O'CONNOR: No, it was about funding. I am disputing the claim.

Ms SCANLON: So you are disputing that there is a $42 million cut?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, you have made your point of order. This is not an argument back across the table. Do you have a point of order, Leader of the House?

Dr ROWAN: I do. The minister is addressing all of the information contained within the question. There are many elements to it and he is outlining specifically the elements in response to the member for Gaven. He should be permitted to respond. Under the standing orders, there is not a time limit applied to his response when he is providing information that is responsive to the question as asked.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. I have heard all of your points of order. Minister, I have been listening and I consider you have been relevant in terms of dealing with the issue regarding reduction in funding. There was another element to the question. Perhaps you could finish up on the reduction element and also address the other element to the question, if you intend to.

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes. In terms of the Immediate Housing Response, I am happy to outline again the figures. These are direct from the department. Under the former Labor government, in the last budget delivered by my predecessor, the member for Gaven, the Immediate Housing Response was funded at a total level, and in the prior years that the member was minister—

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: relevance.

Mr O'CONNOR: You cannot run from your record, member.

Ms SCANLON: The member for Bonney has just said that he will repeat this for the committee, so he has already said this. He has not answered the other part of the question. If he is not able to, I would like to move on.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order on relevance, member for Gaven. As I just stated, I have heard the minister responding to one of the elements of the question. I do not know if the minister has finished responding to that point or not. However, there was another section as well. Minister, perhaps you could round out your answer in relation to that second point and address the first point if you intend to.

Mr O'CONNOR: Just on the Immediate Housing Response, the amount budgeted by the former housing minister, who is the member for Gaven, was $285.16 million over those years that she was the minister. The amount budgeted by me is $361.23 million. I dispute the claim of a reduction because 361 is a bigger number than 285, member for Gaven.

In terms of the discussions I have with specialist homelessness services, I speak to them all the time. I am very thankful for the work they do. I visit as many of them as I possibly can. I am very proud to be the first minister to give them the funding certainty that they deserve, to give them that funding all the way through to June 2029. It was incredibly disappointing that they did not get that prior to us coming to government.

Ms SCANLON: Deputy Speaker, I am happy to move to the next question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the minister has concluded that answer.

Ms SCANLON: My question is to the director-general. The income limit for a single person with no children applying for social housing is $609 a week. From 1 July the full-time minimum wage is now $1,004.90 a week. Can you confirm that a single Queenslander working full time on the minimum wage earns too much to qualify for social housing?

Mr Cridland: As the member is aware, the department uses eligibility settings to ensure Queenslanders have reasonable and fair access to social housing assistance and to identify the most vulnerable people in the highest need. Anyone who is seeking social housing assistance has their eligibility and housing needs assessed through a consistent assessment process. At times it may be appropriate to look at factors other than income to determine need where there are wellbeing factors like customers with complex medical needs or exceptional circumstances in terms of care of the state or natural disasters. Those who are ineligible are able to seek assistance from the department for other housing products if required. The social housing limit for a single person has remained unchanged for many years. It sits at $609 per week.

Ms SCANLON: My next question is to the director-general. At last year's estimates you confirmed the department paid $63,448 for the SGS Economics & Planning review of the income limits. What advice have you provided to the minister about the outcomes of this report and recommended next steps to increase the income limit?

Mr Cridland: The minister has stated this very publicly and it is, therefore, the position of the department that while there remain over 20,000 approved applications on the social housing register who meet the existing social housing eligibility criteria including income limits, there will be no change to those income limits.

Ms SCANLON: I have a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, on relevance. While I appreciate that answer, my question was: what advice have you provided to the minister about the outcomes of the report? I understand that is the minister's position.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: the director-general was being directly relevant to the question and giving context to it and even spoke directly about the minister's public comments. He was being directly relevant to the question, although the member for Gaven may not like the answer.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Director-General, do you have further comments to add in that respect?

Mr Cridland: No, thank you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, do you have a further question?

Ms SCANLON: Yes. Director-General, what methodology did the SGS review recommend and why was it not considered appropriate for Queensland?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two questions in that question, so take them one at a time.

Mr Cridland: My understanding is that SGS Economics & Planning submitted their final report in August 2024 and it did not recommend a specific methodology for Queensland.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, how much of the $5.72 billion of the department's capital program is beyond the forward estimates?

Mr Cridland: Someone will tell me if I am wrong, but the $5.725 billion is all within the forward estimates.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is the four years.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, can you advise how much of that funding had already been allocated by the former Labor government and how much is genuinely new money that has been funded by the Crisafulli government?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: in relation to the question with the term 'genuinely', I submit to you that question probably contains an imputation with that particular word in there. The question may need to be rephrased depending on your advice.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thanks, Leader of the House. It is arguable that that does contain an imputation. However, I will allow the question. If the director-general needs time to find that level of detail, you can have that.

Mr Cridland: I believe I have it to hand now, thank you. Across the last two budgets the current government has committed an additional $3.491 billion. That is within the forward estimates. Then they have also committed an additional $500 million baseline each and every year from 2029-30.

Ms BUSH: My question is to the director-general, Mr Cridland. In relation to the eight new youth foyers did the department at any point recommend to the government Mackay or Mount Isa as locations for one of the eight youth foyers?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: is this question relevant to this section of the estimates?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will seek that clarification from the minister. Do youth foyers come under the department of housing?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, despite the 'youth' in the title, it is not in the youth section of the department. This is well and truly in the housing space.

Ms BUSH: It would be nice to see a member across his brief.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Cooper.

Mr Cridland: Can you give me one moment to consult with my colleagues? Thank you for your patience while I sought the information. I am advised that in January 2025 the department updated the site selection methodology used to determine the locations for the youth foyers. The changes included incorporating updated data from 2023-24, disregarding data from the youth foyer working group, promoting readiness and updated information from the region. Once this updated methodology was applied it resulted in Mackay dropping off to ninth position on the list.

Ms BUSH: I may have missed it. Mackay was recommended but fell into ninth position and Mount Isa then was not recommended?

Mr Cridland: Yes, the longstanding commitment has been to eight youth foyers to be delivered initially by 2046 and now by 2044. The minister has made public commitments to have all eight youth foyers commenced by 2028, which the department is on track to do. We updated the data as not all sites at that point had been identified publicly. They were known to the department but were not known publicly. Before we publicly released the new locations, I am advised the department updated the data used to determine the priority locations and that resulted in Mackay dropping to ninth and Rockhampton moving up to eighth.

Ms BUSH: May I ask a follow-up question? Could the director-general table the methodology used by the department for site selection?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment, Director-General. Of course members can ask for documents to be tabled, but the committee cannot order documents to be tabled. Director-General, the question is directed towards you.

Mr Cridland: That would be at the discretion of the minister as to whether we provide any further information.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your answer. We will go to government questions for a section.

Mr JAMES: Can the minister advise the committee of the total capital spend to deliver social and community housing within the Crisafulli government's second budget and provide an update on how this compares to prior approaches?

Mr O'CONNOR: We have to stop swapping questions with the opposition! That is what we just got from the opposition. The Crisafulli government, of course, inherited a housing system where supply was nowhere near keeping pace with our state's growing population. That meant that over the former Labor government's decade in power under ministers like the member for Gaven and the member for Springwood an average of just 509 social homes were added to the system each year. That is at a time when our population grew by over 16 per cent and the social housing stock only grew by about six per cent. It has meant that the register grew by over 80 per cent on Labor's watch and we are still playing catch-up to deliver the homes that vulnerable Queenslanders deserve.

Our A Place to Call Home 20-year housing plan established a clear target of 53,500 new social and community homes to be delivered by 2044 and our budgets have backed that with record funding and long-term investment. Member, in your electorate of Mulgrave, you are absolutely delivering. We have 555 social and affordable homes underway on top of the 66 that we have delivered since you were elected in October 2024.

As the director-general just outlined, in our first two budgets alone the Crisafulli government has committed an additional $3.491 billion to building more homes. That is something we are very proud of and it contributes to our four-year capital program of $5.725 billion to build more social and community homes across our state. As the director-general mentioned as well, we are the first government to lock in long-term perpetual baseline funding for the delivery of social and community homes to maintain a continuous pipeline well beyond the forward estimates. On top of that additional funding that we have put in of $3.49 billion just to construct new homes, if you take that $500 million figure all the way out to the end of our target period that is an additional $10.991 billion that through our budget decisions we have already committed to, and that $500 million resets every budget cycle as our baseline.

It stands in stark contrast to the former Labor government's stop-start approach where they were obsessed with media releases and glossy brochures where housing announcements were always put ahead of housing delivery. Our Crisafulli government understands that Queensland's housing pressures require a sustained social and community housing pipeline backed by real long-term funding, strong partnerships with the community housing sector and a relentless focus on getting more homes built. Member for Mulgrave, I am very proud to let you know as well that in the last financial year we delivered 2,244 social, community and affordable homes for particularly our most vulnerable Queenslanders and we now have 6,925 homes under construction or under contract to be delivered—the largest pipeline of social, community and affordable housing our state has ever had, so thank you for the question.

Mr McDONALD: Great answer!

Mr KEMPTON: My question is to the minister, following on from that last response. I note the minister has just stated that more than 6,900 social and affordable homes are now underway. How does this compare to the former government's pipeline and how many homes have been contracted for delivery since the change of government?

Mr McDONALD: Great question!

Mr O'CONNOR: Very good question, member for Cook, and I thank you for that. As at 30 June 2026 we have—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment, Minister. What is your point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: My point of order is that the standing orders require a question to pertain to one issue. My understanding of the question is that it contained two questions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thanks for your point of order, Manager of Opposition Business. I am going to allow the question given that there have been a number of questions asked by members on both sides of this table this morning that have contained more than one issue. The minister is able to answer each of them in turn. Yes, I take your point of order. However, given what has already gone on—and I think across the last few days that has gone on as well—I will allow the question, but thank you for your point of order.

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. As at 30 June 2026, 6,925 social and affordable homes were either under construction or contracted for delivery. That is 4,828 social homes and 2,097 affordable homes. Member, in your electorate of Cook this includes 213 social and affordable homes underway on top of the 122 we have already delivered since your election in October 2024. Of the total statewide pipeline, 4,926 homes—that is about 71 per cent—are being delivered in partnership with registered community housing providers, more than twice the proportion of the pipeline that we inherited. Since the change of government we have contracted over 5½ thousand additional homes, substantially growing the pipeline we inherited and creating the foundations our state needs to lift the annual delivery numbers that we need to see.

In 2025-26, as I outlined, 2,244 social and affordable homes were delivered by the Crisafulli government, including 1,711 social and community homes alone. We have also replaced the former government's stop-start funding rounds with the Queensland Community Housing Investment Pipeline. This is our nation's only always-open procurement pathway for the community housing sector which allows them to bring forward suitable projects throughout the year rather than waiting for a government funding round or a clunky grant process. I want to particularly acknowledge Sarah Amos and her division and, within that division, Sam Betros and Kelly Mangan for their work with Q-CHIP. Since its launch, Q-CHIP has received more than 145 presubmissions, offering thousands of potential social and affordable homes across our state. Member, this is a deliberate shift in approach. It is about giving those CHPs greater certainty, unlocking more projects and making it easier for government to assess and contract good proposals as they become ready.

I was asked about comparisons. One of the most stark comparisons of the member for Gaven is the Housing Investment Fund. This was a program that was underway for about 3½ years by the time the Labor Party were kicked out of office. In that period—in that 3½ years—not a single newly built home was delivered by the member for Gaven from the Housing Investment Fund—not a single one. In terms of alternative approaches, we have seen one pretty recently in the United Kingdom, member, where one of the candidates in the Clacton by-election, Count Binface, has committed that, if elected, he will build at least one affordable home—at least one. So the member for Gaven could not even outdeliver Count Binface in terms of homes from the Housing Investment Fund.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause please, Minister. Do you have a point of order, member for Gaven?

Ms SCANLON: Yes, I take personal offence. He knows the facts behind this fund.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you for your point of order.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Minister, would you withdraw that comment, please.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. Do we have a further question from a government member? Member for Lockyer?

Mr McDONALD: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Will the minister advise the committee about the social housing register and outline how the Crisafulli government is managing the register to ensure it remains an accurate reflection of current housing needs for eligible applicants?

Mr O'CONNOR: On the most recent data I have from the department, which was yesterday, there were 23,954 active applications on the social housing register. That represents an 18.6 per cent reduction over the last 12 months. It is important to understand that this register is a point-in-time record. These numbers fluctuate as new households apply, as existing applicants are housed, as people's circumstances change, as applications move between active and inactive statuses or as applicants no longer require social housing. The important thing to note, member for Lockyer, is that there has been no change to the social housing register policy or eligibility requirements since we were elected. It is the same framework the member for Gaven presided over as housing minister. Despite that, member for Lockyer, the member for Gaven has sought to run a scare campaign suggesting that vulnerable—

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just pause for a moment, please, Minister. What is your point of order?

Ms SCANLON: Again I take personal offence to the comments made and ask the minister to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, would you withdraw that comment, please?

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. Please continue.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Gaven has suggested vulnerable Queenslanders are being arbitrarily removed from the register. That claim is false. Our department applies the same routine administrative processes that operated under the former Labor government to ensure the social housing register is as accurate as it possibly can be. In fact, when the member for Gaven was housing minister she oversaw the removal of 9,705 people from the social housing register in 2023-24 through the cancellation of 5,022 housing applications. On my watch as housing minister, in my first full financial year there were fewer applications cancelled—8,224. Of these, 2,419 applicants were uncontactable, 4,481 were no longer eligible or did not provide evidence of eligibility, 1,016 were appropriately housed or no longer required social housing, and 237 were cancelled for other reasons. In terms of the very clear, simple administrative process that the member for Gaven oversaw, she now seeks to portray that as something sinister even though it is exactly the same.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes?

Ms SCANLON: Again I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Gaven. Minister, would you withdraw that comment?

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. The difference is that this government is being transparent about the data and ensuring the register is a reliable measure of genuine current housing need. We have made the register's data easier to access and easier to interpret and we are publishing it more frequently.

Under the former government this information was only released quarterly for the prior quarter. Applications are reviewed annually or when an applicant advises the department that their circumstances have changed. This may include securing employment, moving interstate, a change in household composition, obtaining suitable housing or no longer requiring social housing—all reasons Queenslanders would expect applicants to no longer be on the register. Maintaining an accurate register is not about denying assistance to Queenslanders in need; it is about ensuring social housing is prioritised for eligible Queenslanders with a genuine and ongoing need, while supporting other households into suitable alternatives such as private market rental support where appropriate.

After inheriting a register that increased by over 80 per cent under the former government, we are now seeing the early signs that demand is stabilising and reducing. The register has reduced month on month since peaking in October 2025, with 23,954 applications as of 22 July. It is now below the levels that we inherited from the member for Gaven where it sat at 24,704 active applications. I want to particularly thank our Deputy Director-General for Housing and Homelessness Services Matt Nye and his team for their work. We are not complacent. That is why we are investing a record $5.725 billion over the next four years alone to deliver more social and community housing. The lasting solution is not a political scare campaign; it is building more homes and helping more vulnerable Queenslanders into safe and secure housing.

Dr ROWAN: Minister, I note that you recently announced the expansion of Emmanuel City Mission to deliver a new 110-bed, seven-day-a-week night shelter for Brisbane. What has been the driver for this project, and when can we expect the expansion to be completed?

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you for your concern for the most vulnerable in our state's capital. The expansion of Emmanuel City Mission's Night Sanctuary is about providing a safe and dignified place for people who otherwise would be sleeping rough on Brisbane's streets. Emmanuel City Mission currently operates a day shelter in Peel Street, South Brisbane supporting 250 to 300 vulnerable people every day. Recently they started their night sanctuary, operating as a small philanthropic trial one night a week which generally supports about 30 guests with a meal, a safe place to sleep and care throughout the night. I acknowledge—as I did in my introduction—Roby Curtis, who is the founder of that incredible organisation and his many supporters, in particular Brook Monahan and the Mosaic Foundation, who not only support Emmanuel City Mission financially but also go there and volunteer on a regular basis.

Our budget this year provides long-term government funding for the very first time to transform Emmanuel City Mission's trial into a seven-night-a-week service, with capacity for up to 110 beds each night. That funding will support the refurbishment of Emmanuel City Mission's existing Peel Street premises, an old Ozcare building which has good bones and can easily be renovated. The proposed

model will include dormitory and flexible sleeping arrangements. There will be a separated section for females to sleep in, there will be some individual rooms and there will be onsite support. This is a response to the issues we have seen, particularly in the Brisbane CBD, but we also recognise that long-term housing is the only sustainable solution for many of these individuals. We need to do more to ensure those individuals have a place to sleep and somewhere safe to go. That is why this service forms part of our additional $450 million investment in specialist homelessness services and crisis support, taking total homelessness service funding to more than $1 billion over four years.

It is important to note that this is part of our commitment to deliver a positive housing and homelessness legacy ahead of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, one where those experiencing homelessness are supported, instead of being displaced or pushed out of site. I want to acknowledge the director-general, in particular, for his passion for ensuring the games do not result in what we have seen in other cities across the world; that we show we are a compassion state and that we care for our most vulnerable.

We are working with ECM on that refurbishment. Mosaic, through Brook, will be undertaking that, and we are working with them on what that expanded operating model will look like. I want to acknowledge their staff and volunteers. Roby told me about half of them have actually experienced homelessness themselves. They have created an incredible culture there. It is beautiful to see the way they care for our most vulnerable. They have sustained this service through many years with just philanthropic donations. They recently received some Brisbane City Council funding which we absolutely welcome. I want to thank the Lord Mayor, Councillor Howard and everyone who was involved in securing that funding. The other part of this partnership, of course, is the Catholic Church. I thank them for the long-term lease that was able to be secured to give us the confidence to invest in this service as well.

Roby is a proud member of our Homelessness Ministerial Advisory Council. His experience and practical insights help inform our broader homelessness response. Each partner I outlined brings different strengths to the table, but they all share the same objective of ensuring more vulnerable people in Brisbane have somewhere safe to sleep, access to care and a clearer pathway out of homelessness. This is a practical example of what can be achieved when government, the community sector, philanthropy and local institutions work together, rather than operating in isolation. This partnership will allow a proven model of compassion and practical support to operate each and every night. We cannot wait to see it up and running.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will now move to questions from non-government members.

Ms BUSH: I have a question for the Director-General, Mr Cridland. Is it correct that no operational funding was budgeted in 2025-26 for the youth foyers in Rockhampton or Toowoomba?

Mr Cridland: As with all our facilities that require operational funding, we will usually seek funding the year before those facilities need to commence operations so that we can have service providers engaged as the facility progresses to practical completion. For those ones that you mentioned, there is no need to have operational funding secured at this time.

Mr O'CONNOR: They are not built.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, the question was not directed towards you.

Ms BOURNE: My question is to the Director-General. The volume of walk-ins, social housing applications and requests for rental assistance has increased this year according to my electorate office. Can you tell me if an analysis has been undertaken to determine workforce demand in your department?

Mr Cridland: In our department we have been very fortunate that our FTE cap remains similar to last year at 4,592 positions. According to the recently released State of the Sector report our FTE grew as a department by 383 positions between March 2025 and March 2026. In the last financial year alone it grew by 203 FTE, in terms of both permanent staff and temporary staff. We are constantly looking at where demand is and where best to direct our approved FTE cap. That is a never-ending job for us in a department with nearly 4,600 FTE, so, yes, it is fair to say that we do regularly look at our workforce requirements.

Ms BOURNE: I understand it has been undertaken and recommendations made. Director-General, can you advise how many additional FTEs were recommended to keep up with demand this coming financial year?

Mr Cridland: As I mentioned, our approved FTE cap for 2026-27 is 4,592. That is consistent with what we put forward in the budget.

Ms BOURNE: Could I ask if that was what was recommended, Director-General?

Mr Cridland: My recollection—someone will correct me if I am wrong—is that we sought eight additional FTE for regulatory services in this budget and that was provided.

Mr KING: My question is to the director-general. The opposition has received a number of complaints about maintenance delays. Is it correct the department does not provide a timeframe of when non-urgent maintenance will be carried out?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: authentication.

Mr KING: Through my electorate office—and, I am sure, the electorate office of everyone else at this desk—we are getting a lot of complaints about maintenance delays. I hope that substantiates it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your assurance around that, member for Kurwongbah. I think the question can be put even without the opening statement. Director-General, could you respond to that question around timeframes?

Mr Cridland: The 2026-27 budget for the social housing maintenance program is $355.9 million. This includes $75.3 million for social housing in First Nations local government areas and $280.6 for social housing across the state. This amount is higher than previous years of the maintenance commencing budget. In fact, it is an increase of $30.7 million, or 9.5 per cent, over the 2025-26 initial allocation. As in prior years, as the department understands more about the level of maintenance requirements the department can seek additional support throughout the year as we respond to urgent, unavoidable maintenance.

In terms of directly answering your question, member, we do actually track maintenance requests. We prioritise them into four categories. The first category is 'immediate', and the typical response time aims for a one-hour response as the fault could lead to death, injury or serious damage to the property. Examples include gas leaks, fire, exposed live electrical wires, burst water pipes. The second category we treat is 'urgent'. The typical response time is aimed to be four hours as the fault could endanger health or cause extensive damage to property. Examples include loss of power, serious storm damage, burst water pipes outside the building, blocked sewerage, smoke alarm not working or major structural damage. The third category we respond to is called 'priority'. The typical response time for this is 24 hours as the fault causes serious impact on the customer. Examples include a blocked drain, a toilet not working or overflowing, broken windows or door locks. Then we have 'non-urgent' maintenance, the fourth and final category. We do not have published response times for those, but we do try to address those as quickly as we can.

Mr KING: I appreciate that. That was the question answered. I have a follow-up. Is it correct that a hot-water system not heating properly or a stove or oven not working properly is classified as non-urgent?

Mr Cridland: I thank the member for the question. It is very technical. It is probably best I stay out of technical matters in my non-engineering capacity. We have in our maintenance response centres, which are located across the state, and in Queensland Shared Services, where they also take 24/7 calls, people who are much more proficiently trained in this than I am and they all know how to categorise all of these responses. To give you an example that I have been aware of, if you have had a four-burner electric stove and one element is not working but the other three are, that might be classified as non-urgent. That is my understanding.

Mr KING: I am happy for you to get back to me about those items. They are electrical ones. I do not want to go into my background.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, I do not know if you want to try to seek any further detail about that particular question before the end of session or if you just want to leave the answer where it is.

Mr O'CONNOR: If there are cases the member wants to provide, we can look into that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you wish to move on to another question, members of the opposition?

Mr KING: I am wondering if the minister is not going to take that on notice—if stoves and hot-water systems not working are classified as non-urgent, not parts of a stove. If the whole stove is not working or the hot-water system is not working, is that non-urgent?

Mr O'CONNOR: By the end of the session?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, by 10.30.

Mr O'CONNOR: Okay. We will endeavour to get what we can by 10.30.

Mr BERKMAN: Minister, we have seen recent polling that shows a growing majority of Australians say that house prices could fall so that more people can afford to buy one. Is it this government's policy that house prices should go down or they should continue to rise?

Mr O'CONNOR: It is very broad, but I am happy to take it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Maiwar, for that question. I will not ask you to authenticate the polling because I think the question stands regardless.

Mr O'CONNOR: This government's policy is to increase supply of all types. You were in the session yesterday with the Deputy Premier on private market supply. We are very proud of the numbers we are achieving there through the Residential Activation Fund. That is over 100,000 lots unlocked now, including in my community on the Gold Coast which has 18,900 we unlocked with the council. We have the Land Activation Program, which is activating state land that in many cases has had more spent on it for mowing contractors than building on it.

It is all about increasing supply. In my space—in the session we are in I will stick to what is relevant to this session, and that is social and community housing—we are very proud of how big that pipeline is: to have contracted alone 5,544 homes since we were elected. That is without even including the homes that began construction on our watch or were under construction on our watch. We have that pipeline at over 6,900 and are investing more money—not just in this budget, but we beat our own record of the last budget—than any other government has before. That is the only thing that will move the needle.

It has to be supply of all types. The private market is more relevant to your question, but the more vulnerable people you get out of the private market the better. That is what social and community housing is for. We are delivering at a scale that this state has not seen before. We are very proud of the investments we are making and the actions we are taking. In the next session there will be quite a bit we can talk about in terms of building policy and in terms of things like the Queensland Housing Code and the regulation of the Queensland Building and Construction Commission.

Mr BERKMAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr BERKMAN: It is simply on relevance. If the minister is disinclined to answer specifically about house prices and policy then I would take that answer as given.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, what is your point of order?

Mr McDONALD: My point of order is that the point of order the member for Maiwar just made contained imputations. The minister is being directly relevant to the question and giving a complete answer. It is a very broad question, as you outlined in allowing the question in the first place.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the House?

Dr ROWAN: My point of order is that there was a bit of latitude allowed in the question given that it cuts across different portfolio areas. There are elements of the question that were put that could have been put to the Deputy Premier yesterday. There are other elements that the housing minister is being responsive to which pertain to his portfolio area. Given the broad nature of the question, the minister is being responsive to those elements which directly related to his portfolio; however, other elements of the question, as I stated, related to the Deputy Premier's portfolio area and could have been put to him yesterday.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, I have been listening to the minister. He is being responsive in terms of his portfolio area in relation to the supply of social and affordable housing, which does relate to the issue of policy and policy in relation to what you have asked about. Minister, did you have further comments to add in relation to your portfolio?

Mr O'CONNOR: I will leave for the next session BPIC and the impact that had on housing delivery. On supply there is a lot we are doing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Was there a further question, member for Maiwar?

Mr BERKMAN: Yes. It is again to the minister, and I am mindful of time so I am not looking for a super longwinded answer here. In this budget the government has capped land rent increases for farmers; meanwhile, regional Queensland has become the most unaffordable region in the country to rent a home, with no limits on how much landlords can increase rents further. If this government can cap rents for businesses or farmers, can it cap them for tenants?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order under standing order 115: it is a lengthy preamble. A number of elements of the question relate to portfolio areas not under the responsibility of the minister who is currently before our estimates hearing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, please.

Mr BERKMAN: On that point of order, Deputy Speaker: I am happy to rephrase the question if it would satisfy the government members.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, the legislation relating to the limits on increasing rent once per year, or whatever it is, is in your portfolio, is it not?

Mr O'CONNOR: Tenancy laws are, yes. I can make comment on tenancy laws.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Moggill, I take your point of order. The member for Maiwar was providing some context around where he got to with his question, which is within the portfolio so I will not rule the question out of order on any grounds. Minister, can you answer in relation to rent tenancy laws?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes. Our priority is on stability and certainty in the tenancy legislation in Queensland. That is the No. 1 thing we can do to help with housing supply, to have stability. It is the right thing to do for renters and it is the right thing to do for property owners and investors. Stability is our No. 1 driver and that is a message that I will give to tenant advocates as well as to the real estate industry. We have to have certainty after years of often kneejerk changes that had to be, embarrassingly, corrected by the member for Gaven. We are not doing that. We are delivering stability and certainty in the market because that is the best thing we can do for housing investors and it is the best thing we can do for Queensland renters. In the interests of time, I will leave it there.

Ms SCANLON: My question is to the director-general. Can you advise the average number of months to allocation for social housing and the average number of months to process an application for social housing?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you need a moment to get that detail, Director-General, you may take it.

Mr Cridland: Yes, it would be helpful if I have a moment, thank you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you need the question restated?

Mr Cridland: That would be helpful, thank you.

Ms SCANLON: What is the average number of months to allocation for social housing and the average number of months to process an application for social housing?

Mr Cridland: I will start with the second part of the question. Our KPI for assessing social housing applications is 28 days. I am advised that, as at 30 June, for the year, there were two applications that exceeded that, out of many thousands. I will see if I can source the other bit of information.

Ms SCANLON: I am happy for you to come back if you do not have it to hand so we can move on to the next question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Director-General, if you do not have it immediately to hand then we can come back before the end of session, if the minister agrees.

Mr Cridland: I do now have it to hand.

Ms SCANLON: To be clear, I am asking for the average, not a KPI.

Mr Cridland: The average wait time for the allocation of a household on the housing register, as at 30 June, was 31.7 months.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, how many property inspections have not been completed this financial year?

Mr Cridland: I will ask the Deputy Director-General of Housing and Homelessness Services to come to the table, please, to answer that question.

Ms SCANLON: Again, if that information is not to hand then I am happy to move on.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been referred. Mr Nye, did you hear the question?

Mr Nye: Can I please ask the member to repeat the question?

Ms SCANLON: Certainly. How many property inspections have not been completed this financial year?

Mr Nye: I do have that information available. I will see if I can get it to hand, thank you.

Ms SCANLON: While the deputy director-general is looking for that information, I am happy to move to the next question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Director-General, do you think you will have that in the next 20 seconds?

Mr Nye: With the minister's permission, can I come back at the end of the session? Thank you.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, is the 31.7 months that you just referred to an increase compared to previous years?

Mr Cridland: We are currently running an incredibly low vacancy rate due to high demand and people not transitioning at the moment. Compared to the private market, we are below that in terms of a vacancy rate. Compared to 30 June 2025, it was at 21.22 months.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, how many people on the social housing register have a disability flag applied and, separately, how many have an older person flag without a disability applied?

Mr Cridland: With the minister's permission, we will come back to you with those two data points.

Ms SCANLON: Can I ask a follow-up question to that?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can you ask the follow-up question without the answer?

Ms SCANLON: I can. Director-General, has the department undertaken any work to change the accessibility targets, specifically, the gold SDS target?

Mr Cridland: That is a matter of policy but I would point to our SDS, which shows that we have far exceeded the 50 per cent target for gold or platinum housing in our social housing stock. I think it is over 60 per cent, but the other question is a matter of policy.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I understand there is $19.6 million in the budget for tenancy sustainment. Can you tell me how that compares with the 2024-25 financial year?

Mr Cridland: With the minister's permission, I will have to come back to you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is another to come back to. The list is growing.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, the member for Cooper will table a copy of question on notice 756 of 2024 where I as the minister provided the total cost and cost per home of an MMC project and provided QBuild's cost to build the MMC home range. Given that information has previously been provided, my question is this: can you please advise of the nine state delivered social housing projects outlined in prehearing question on notice 7 what is the cumulative increase and can you provide this same information for non-government community homes?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That was a fairly long preamble, member for Gaven. We have not seen the tabled paper yet. Can we get the tabled paper to each member and across the table, please?

Mr Cridland: I have accessed QoN No. 7.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Director-General, have a look at the tabled paper. If you need the member to restate the pointy end of the question, that is okay.

Mr Cridland: I would simply refer the member back to the answer provided in QoN No. 7, that any cost escalation or cost assumptions that have gone into purchasing any of our housing products, whether they are modular or traditional, is commercial-in-confidence because we are in the market for thousands of homes. We would not seek to prejudice value-for-money procurement or tender outcomes by promoting what prices we may have paid for certain developments in certain situations.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker, on relevance: to be clear, I am not asking for individual amounts for each project. I am asking for the cumulative increase. As outlined, that has previously been provided by the former Labor government.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take your point of order, member for Gaven. My view is that the director-general has answered in a relevant way. It is up to the director-general how he answers the question. Do you have a further question?

Ms SCANLON: I do. My question is to the director-general. Are you aware of the member for Clayfield advocating against the originally planned athletes village in Hamilton and has the project ever been considered for the inclusion of an application for funding through the Housing Australia Future Fund?

Mr Cridland: The athletes villages are in the portfolio of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. I would not seek to answer on their behalf.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: social housing is the direct responsibility of the minister and the director-general. My question was about the Housing Australia Future Fund. The minister just took credit for a range of projects funded, both social and affordable, so I would think this is a question the department can answer.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hear your point of order.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: in relation to the question as put by the member for Gaven, as I heard it, there were two elements to the question, one of which related to the portfolio area here, but there was a separate element that related to another portfolio area as well.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. Member for Gaven, the director-general has answered in a relevant way and I think has concluded the answer.

Ms SCANLON: With respect, Deputy Speaker, the director-general has not answered the question and he said he cannot answer the question because it is another portfolio. I am happy to rephrase specifically.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member, you have asked the question. The director-general can answer, under standing orders, provided the answer is relevant—and the answer provided was relevant—and the director-general has concluded his response. We will move to government members' questions.

Mr JAMES: Minister, last year you announced a strengthened tenancy management framework which included a new Antisocial Behaviour policy for public housing tenants. Can you outline how this has improved our public housing system?

Mr O'CONNOR: As you are well aware, the overwhelming majority of our public housing tenants are good neighbours who respect their homes, their communities and those living around them. They deserve to feel safe in their homes. However, for too long, under the former Labor government, a small number of tenants were able to make life miserable for entire neighbourhoods, while victims and responsible tenants had little confidence that meaningful action would be taken. The former government's so-called Fair Expectations of Behaviour policy did not provide the strong and consistent response that Queenslanders or our own housing officers needed. That changed when we brought in our new Antisocial Behaviour policy last year. That policy is about reinforcing the responsibilities of our tenants and it makes clear that those responsibilities also extend to household members, to visitors and to other people the tenant permits to be at their property. The usual framework involves two warnings with action to end the tenancy following a third substantiated incident, but where that behaviour is dangerous or severe the department can take immediate action. Member, that distinction is important. This is not a policy aimed at minor disagreements between neighbours. It is directed at serious, repeated, dangerous or illegal conduct that affects the safety of our other tenants, our broader community or our frontline staff.

In the first 12 months of our strengthened policy, 122 households were evicted through the QCAT process because of antisocial behaviour. That compares with just 45 evictions in 2024-25 under Labor's previous policy. The increase demonstrates that serious complaints are being acted on and that consequences will now follow where tenants repeatedly or severely breach their responsibilities. Importantly, those 122 evictions represent only around 0.2 per cent of all of the public tenancies we manage. That reinforces the fact that the overwhelming majority of tenants are good neighbours and do the right thing, but for the small minority who engage in dangerous or persistent antisocial behaviour the message is clear: government subsidised housing does not mean there are no consequences.

I have a few case studies to share with you, member. In the first one, a person was struck in the head with an axe, resulting in a fractured skull. The perpetrator was taken into custody and charged with grievous bodily harm, so a notice to leave was issued to the tenant to terminate the tenancy. In another one, during a house visit of our housing officers alongside the Queensland police force, an unknown male threatened our staff with a syringe, demanding they leave the property. Upon entering the premises, staff observed various weapons including swords, machetes and knives. Following an investigation, a first and final notice to leave was issued. QCAT supported and issued a decision to

terminate the tenancy. In a third one, during a home visit at a neighbouring property, the tenant exited their residence and confronted a staff member, ultimately striking our staff member, who activated their duress alarm. Following reports made to the QPS, a first and final notice to leave was issued. QCAT supported that and issued a decision to terminate the tenancy. I have some examples as well to table, member, that show some of the conditions of these properties. With your indulgence, I will table those for the benefit of the committee.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You need to seek leave.

Mr O'CONNOR: I seek leave to table some of these examples.

Mr McDONALD: I move that leave be granted.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you. They are important examples from areas like South Gladstone, Kingston, your own community in Cairns, member, and Bundaberg and they show the condition that some of these properties are in once these notices are issued.

If a tenant is issued with a notice for antisocial behaviour and they refuse to leave, the department must apply to QCAT, present the evidence and obtain a termination order from the tribunal. That shows this is a firm but fair approach. Our policy is about empowering our housing officers, giving them the tools they need to protect the safety and wellbeing of all of our tenants. We are replacing a system that left frontline staff hamstrung and unable to take timely action. I want to conclude my contribution by thanking all of our housing officers. I get exceptional feedback from them on the new policy wherever I go. All the HSCs across the state do a great job, and I want to commend them for the work they do serving Queenslanders.

Mr McDONALD: Minister, the 2026-27 budget included $730,000 for the Palm Island Rent-to-Buy Home Ownership Scheme, including an interest-free loan component. After applications opened to this scheme, the member for Gaven claimed that she announced the policy in August 2024. Can the minister clarify whose policy this is?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, that is a lengthy preamble. I will allow the question, but I note that for all members in relation to questions asked. Minister, I give you the call, bearing in mind the time and the need to respond to some questions where you were to come back to the committee. Keep that in mind.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will be a couple of minutes, Deputy Speaker. From the outset I want to say that this is not the member for Gaven's home ownership scheme. This is Palm Island's home ownership scheme. It was developed in partnership with the Palm Island Aboriginal Shire Council, and I want to in particular commend the mayor, Alf Lacey, who has been a long-term advocate for this. I was very proud to join him to see those applications open just a couple of weeks ago. He said he never thought he would see this happen in his lifetime and it was all about making sure his community had the opportunity to do what every other Queenslander has the opportunity to do, so I in particular commend the mayor. I do want to say that it is disappointing but unsurprising that the member for Gaven would seek to make this historic milestone for the Palm Island community all about herself. I note that the member has claimed it was her announcement—

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I take personal offence at the comments made and ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, would you withdraw, please?

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. The member has claimed this was her announcement. Credit where credit is due: the member is very good at making housing announcements—

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I fail to see how that withdrawal was unqualified.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought it was unqualified. There was a further statement made afterwards which a member could, if it was a personal reflection, have taken offence to; however, I did hear the unqualified withdrawal and the minister carried on.

Mr de BRENNI: My point of order, Deputy Speaker, was that the statement made immediately after the withdrawal was identical to the one made before. That would make it qualified.

Mr O'CONNOR: I just said the member is good at announcements. It is a statement of fact.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, there is no need for that. Minister, I considered you did make an unqualified withdrawal and you then made a further statement.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am happy to withdraw again if it offends the minister.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, don't do it. Minister, that is a qualified withdrawal.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. Please continue.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member's claim is not even supported by her own words at the time. The rent-to-buy scheme was not in existence. 'Rent-to-buy' did not appear anywhere in the member's statement at the time. The former government did not open the scheme. They did not fund the payment pathways for Palm Island residents. It did not exist. It is rent-to-buy because we worked with the council. They had literally just announced Palm Island home ownership with no detail. We are very proud to be delivering that. We are very proud to be providing a practical opportunity for Palm Island residents. It is what practical self-determination looks like. I encourage anyone who aspires to home ownership on Palm Island to make an application.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, you were to come back to the committee with some answers to questions that we were seeking more details on.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will let the director-general run through the things we have compiled.

Mr Cridland: On the maintenance issue, a full stove not working—as opposed to just one element—and a hot-water system not working is classified as 'priority', which is a 24-hour response except in very remote communities, where it will be the next business day.

Member for Ipswich West, I undersold our ask. We sought and received funding for 34 FTEs. I remembered eight—apologies.

With regard to the IHR, going back very early in the piece, on 27/28 April, base funding was confirmed to the SHSs. On the 18th—

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, can the director-general please finish his response?

Ms SCANLON: I am mindful of time and that does not answer my question. If the question is not answered, I would like it taken on notice.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, I am mindful of time, too. I take your point of order. It is up to the minister as to whether any questions are taken on notice formally.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am confident the director-general is answering it and he should be given the opportunity to do so.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 10.30 am and the time for examination of these housing estimates has expired. Members, the committee will now take a break until 10.45 am, at which point we will resume and examine a different portfolio area. The committee hearing is suspended.

Proceedings suspended from 10.30 am to 10.45 am.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Welcome back to the LCC. Minister, we will now consider the portfolio area of public works. Minister, you may make an opening statement for this portfolio area of up to five minutes.

Mr O'CONNOR: The public works portfolio is central to delivering the buildings, homes and infrastructure Queenslanders rely on, while also regulating and supporting our building and construction industry, which is worth around $69 billion annually. QBuild sits at the heart of that work. With a workforce of more than 1,900 Queenslanders—over 400 workers more than when we were elected—QBuild builds, maintains and repairs government assets across the state, and our QBuild tradies are among the first to respond after natural disasters, helping communities get back on their feet.

Since we were elected, as I mentioned, we have continued to grow their workforce. We are continuing to strengthen their regional capability and invest in the next generation of Queensland tradies through our apprentice program. Our Cairns housing factory, as the member for Mulgrave knows because he was there, is being expanded to grow modular housing construction capability in Far North Queensland, closer to the communities these homes are being built for and to provide further practical training opportunities for our apprentices. In recent months our other facility in Brisbane reverted to its original role as a QBuild depot, supporting QBuild's core construction asset management and disaster response functions.

We are also delivering more housing for our frontline workers in regional and remote Queensland. Teachers, police officers, nurses, park rangers and our other public servants need access to safe and appropriate housing if we expect them to live and work in the communities that need them most. We are developing a new government employee housing program to ensure future investment is better planned, more responsive to workforce needs and targeted to communities where housing shortages are making it difficult to attract and retain frontline workers.

We are also reducing emissions across our vehicle fleet through our QFleet Vehicle Emissions Reduction Strategy 2025-2030, which gives our public servants more choice to drive what best suits their needs. By June 2026 QFleet had achieved a 4.16 per cent reduction in fleet emissions. After just over a year of our new strategy the fleet is more than 40 per cent of the way towards our 2030 target.

The public works portfolio also plays a vital role in restoring productivity across Queensland's building and construction sector. The Crisafulli government inherited an industry weighed down by declining productivity, with procurement policy literally written by the CFMEU. The Queensland Productivity Commission found construction productivity had declined by around nine per cent since 2018. That meant Queensland needed more workers to produce the same level of construction output, contributing to higher costs, longer delays and fewer homes getting out of the ground. The commission estimated that if productivity had remained at 2018 levels Queensland could have delivered an extra 77,000 homes. That is why our government has permanently ended Labor's Best Practice Industry Conditions, also known as the CFMEU tax, which increased costs and restricted competition without delivering any demonstrated material improvement in safety outcomes.

We replaced the former government's complicated overlapping procurement framework, which was spread across 700 pages, with a clear and practical Queensland Procurement Policy of just 52 pages. It is about creating genuine opportunities for small and family businesses, First Nations businesses, social enterprises and veteran owned businesses while prioritising value for taxpayers. It is also about ensuring more Queensland businesses can get government work.

We are also progressing our Building Reg Reno to cut red tape and make it easier for builders, tradies and home owners. Builders and home owners currently face a patchwork of different design and siting requirements across local government areas unchanged for over 15 years. Our modern and consistent Queensland Housing Code will provide greater certainty, reduce unnecessary delays and help get more homes approved sooner.

We are investing in a better Queensland Building and Construction Commission for home owners and tradies across our state, under the leadership of Commissioner Angelo Lambrinos. The 2026-27 budget delivers $56.2 million to support the QBCC's functions on top of the $15.2 million provided in last year's budget to support the QBCC's continued digital transformation to reduce paperwork, save time and make it easier for tradies with innovations like digital licences. We are improving dispute resolution with a pilot process, resolving around 70 per cent of disputes in an average of just 32 days. We have gone from just seven per cent of issues being resolved on the first contact with QBCC to well over 30 per cent.

Finally, for almost 165 years Public Works has helped build Queensland. We are proud to be continuing that legacy. I thank the committee and look forward to your questions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister, for your opening statement. We will move to non-government questions.

Ms MULLEN: Director-General, to quote the government's own response to the Queensland Productivity Commission report, the Queensland Housing Code is a 'key initiative' to 'boost productivity, reduce regulatory burden and make it easier to build in Queensland'. Consultation on the draft Queensland Housing Code closed almost 12 months ago. Why has a final housing code not been delivered?

Mr Cridland: I invite Assistant Director-General Ainslie Barron to the table to respond.

Ms Barron: The Queensland Housing Code is a matter we have continued to consult on since formal consultation closed last year. That has involved significant consultation, particularly with local governments as they are responsible for implementing the code. We are in the process of finalising the technical detail as well as the implementation pathway and are looking for the minister to take the material to Governor in Council in the near future.

Ms MULLEN: Minister, the Housing Industry Association has concluded that the absence of a mandated statewide housing code is at least $150 million to $200 million each year in direct costs as well as additional indirect costs. I ask the member for Cooper to table that HIA report. Given the current housing affordability crisis, why is the government not using the policy lever of a mandated housing code to reduce costs and increase productivity in the housing sector?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, would you like to see the tabled document prior to answering?

Mr O'CONNOR: I will have a look at it. What particular section are you referring to, member?

Ms MULLEN: The last page.

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the member for the self-reflection on the Labor Party from the very outset. Like I mentioned in my intro, this is something that has been unchanged for 15 years. I think 2009 was the last time this was updated—maybe it was 2010. Regardless, it has been 15 years, the last 10 of which I think you will find the Labor Party were in government.

We have been getting on with the job of doing this. As Ainslie just outlined, it will be progressing for Governor in Council consideration. This is something that has been well consulted on. We are doing it in partnership with local governments. We are not railroading local governments. That is the key difference between our approach and the Labor Party's approach. I made the commitment to housing stakeholders, to building stakeholders and to local governments that we are going to work with them to make sure that this suits their needs and that this is something they want to implement themselves and that they have an easy pathway to implement. We have identified that pathway and we are working through that. This is something we are doing with local government, not against local government, not on top of local government. We do not railroad councils in this government. We respect them. They are equal partners. We want to work with them.

This is a really important reform that has taken far too long to get to this point. There are different homes being delivered in different parts of Queensland. That is why it is really important to get the views of local governments, front and centre, in that consultation. I have directly consulted with a number of local governments over that time. The most recent one was my own council on the Gold Coast. We had a great meeting a couple of months ago with the deputy mayor, who is the head of planning, to run through that. We have had really great feedback from local governments across the state. We have taken that on board over the last 12 months.

This will be a landmark piece of work. It will be very easy for local governments to implement when it has gone through Governor in Council. It is something that was, as you have identified, committed to in our response that we released in January this year to the Productivity Commission report. We are getting on with the job of delivering it after a decade where it was not on the agenda and it was not progressed. We are very proud of our work. We are very proud to be a state government that partners with local governments.

The QHC, of course, will include a consistent and streamlined approach to design and siting requirements. It is ridiculous that three-quarters of councils across our state, because the state government had not updated those standards, have different design and siting rules for detached dwellings. There are some very small matters that they can carve out and have individual qualities put on those homes, and that is a good thing. It will, of course, simplify planning and building processes. It will make approvals faster. It will make them more cost-effective, as the HIA report that you have tabled outlines. It will reduce complexity in planning approvals by minimising the need for additional development applications and siting variation assessments, thereby lowering costs and workloads.

We are working through that. We will have a transition period. We will have all the support available through the department to help councils adopt that as easily as we possibly can. Again, this is all about us working with local governments. We are very proud to be partnering with local governments. In fact, a couple of members on our side of the committee here have served in local government previously, and I thank them for that. That very much informs our approach to how we deal with communities across our state. We do not railroad them. We do not come in over the top of them. We work with them to get an outcome that we can all be happy with.

We will be providing as well, through Ainslie's team, practical support measures through that transition period to get implementation assistance and to have a streamlined planning scheme amendment process. We have identified a very easy pathway for local governments. I have made the direct commitment to housing stakeholders that if there is a local government that does not join the Housing Code and does not take that on board with our very easy pathway that we will have in place

then I will directly advocate to them to talk about the benefits of that. I will get them on board to make sure we can have that consistency statewide that has not been there certainly over the last decade but not for the last 15 years.

Ms MULLEN: Director-General, the deadline is looming for all Queensland homes to have interconnected photoelectric smoke alarms installed by 1 January 2027. How much funding has been allocated in the 2026-27 state budget for the smoke alarm installation program, which provides a subsidy for those eligible Queenslanders over 60 or who have a disability to support them with installing new smoke alarms or upgrading noncompliant ones?

Mr Cridland: Can I seek some advice on that program?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, of course.

Mr Cridland: I think that program is Queensland Fire Department funded.

Ms MULLEN: No. I understand it is under the Home Assist Secure program.

Mr Cridland: I will seek some further clarification.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Director-General, would you like to come back to that?

Mr Cridland: Perhaps that is best.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, is it okay if we come back to that question?

Mr O'CONNOR: Home Assist Secure is in the housing part of this portfolio, I believe.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let's clarify that.

Mr Cridland: If it is in Home Assist Secure, it is in the housing portfolio.

Mr O'CONNOR: We will confirm that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will put that on notice one way or another until the end of this session.

Ms MULLEN: Director-General, I refer to the minister's media release of 27 May 2026 which states—

The expansion of QBuild's Portsmith manufacturing facility aims to increase annual production—

of modular homes—

by 40 per cent from 1 July 2026 ...

How many actual houses does that amount to?

Mr Cridland: Would you mind repeating the detail in that, please?

Ms MULLEN: I refer to the minister's media release of 27 May. I have a copy if you need me to table that for you.

Mr Cridland: That would be helpful, thank you.

Ms MULLEN: The member for Cooper will table that. How many actual houses does that amount to? It says it will increase the production of modular homes by 40 per cent.

Mr Cridland: My understanding is that the productivity increase the minister referred to, which is facilitated by our acquisition of some EDQ land next door to the existing RAAC, will allow us to produce 36 modules per financial year from 1 July 2026. Member, I cannot tell you how many houses that means because it could be a one-bedroom home, which is one module, or a four-bedroom home, which could be five modules, so I cannot tell you. It has the capacity to do 36 modules per year.

Ms MULLEN: What is the timeline from 1 July 2026 for these modules to reach manufactured completion?

Mr Cridland: The production timeframes will be dependent on the particular customer demand and the type of product they have requested and where we have to deliver it, so at this point I do not think I can answer you specifically. I could seek some general information on the typical construction timeframe for a module, but for specific ones that is client dependent.

Mr O'CONNOR: We would be able to get the average timeframe for a module to go through the factory.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think they are asking if they can come back when they have more details.

Ms MULLEN: Yes, if you can come back on that it would be helpful. Director-General, based on the minister's opening statement, has the government closed the Brisbane rapid accommodation apprenticeship centre as an ongoing manufacturing facility?

Mr Cridland: Since QBuild commenced manufacturing in South-East Queensland the MMC industry has transitioned from infancy to a proven construction methodology, with a significant number of MMC suppliers having established large-scale manufacturing facilities in the south-east corner. These suppliers have the capacity to deliver a significant pipeline of projects at scale in purpose-designed facilities, achieving considerable cost efficiency and manufacturing outputs when compared to QBuild's rebadged factory at the former Eagle Farm depot. Commercial suppliers have the capability and are manufacturing two- to three-storey modular homes in response to emerging private market demands. They are doing this in large, purpose-built facilities.

The QBuild SEQ RAAC has encountered a number of challenges since it commenced operations, including structural columns limiting the ability to manufacture concurrently, roller doors not being sufficiently high to allow for modules to be easily transported, and the lack of hard stand for large-scale storage. I can advise that, during our most recent expression of interest process to identify the capacity of the MMC industry, 97 suppliers expressed interest, 83 of them based in Queensland, and 67 manufacturers are within SEQ. The last module accordingly out of the SEQ RAAC was completed in May 2026 as we now have ourselves, let alone the private market, 18 suitable suppliers that can provide those at a significant cost differential, I have to say. The cost differential is around 20 per cent, so it means that trying to compete with now very established, very high-capacity private manufacturers is not the best use of resources.

Ms MULLEN: Director-General, given that it was also an apprenticeship centre, how many apprentices will now no longer be working at the Brisbane RAAC?

Mr Cridland: There will be no reduction in QBuild apprentices as a result of the RAAC component ceasing. The facility will still operate as the primary SEQ QBuild depot and our apprentices, as they are now, will continue to be rotated through programs of work and they will continue to achieve above industry average completion rates, I am very confident of that.

Ms MULLEN: Director-General, just to be clear, the Queensland government has determined they will be privatising the manufacture of housing—or modules, as you call them—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Jordan, I have a point of order. Could you rephrase that question, please, as it contains an inference. It could also be deemed to be argumentative.

Ms MULLEN: That is fine; I will move on. Minister, many state governments are investing heavily to support modern methods of construction themselves. How much funding has the Crisafulli LNP government included in the 2026-27 budget for measures to support MMC?

Mr O'CONNOR: Can I just clarify, member: is this about our build program in terms of how many homes are modular?

Ms MULLEN: Yes, government build.

Mr O'CONNOR: I think that would probably again be within the housing component of this session. I can get some advice from the DG. Manufacturing is another portfolio entirely under Minister Last. In terms of the pipeline that we have, that was in the housing component of this session. I will provide some more information on the rapid accommodation and apprenticeship centres soon. In terms of the pipeline, that was probably better suited to the housing component. I will make some general comments about it if it helps the committee. We are delivering an agnostic approach in terms of the houses that we are delivering. Value for money is the No. 1 driver in our housing program to get as many homes for the $5.725 billion we are investing in this four-year period alone in social and community housing—

Ms MULLEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: I am specifically speaking to housing produced through modern methods of construction that the government itself is producing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point of order is relevance?

Ms MULLEN: Yes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, you indicated that you had some issue with whether that was in the public works or housing section.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member did not clearly say it was about the QBuild facility. She talked about MMC generally. According to the latest numbers it was 18 per cent a couple of months ago, but it is 16 per cent more expensive than a traditional build. As the director-general outlined, the modules that were coming out of that facility in the south-east—which I think was a stonemason depot originally that the former government just slapped a label on and said it was a housing factory—were 20 per cent different to the private market. You can do the maths on what that adds up to in total. Was the member looking for the modules produced out of our RAACs?

Ms MULLEN: Yes, please.

Mr O'CONNOR: Is there any particular timeframe, member?

Ms MULLEN: I was asking how much has been allocated in the 2026-27 state budget for MMC in the RAACs.

Mr O'CONNOR: It depends on where the houses are going, member, and whether it is government employee housing, which is in this session, or social and community housing, which is—

Ms MULLEN: Government employee housing—

Mr O'CONNOR: I cannot write your questions for you.

Ms MULLEN:—that is produced at the RAACs. How much has been allocated in the 2026-27 budget?

Mr O'CONNOR: Just government employee housing?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will give you both some guidance. There seems to be some conjecture about what should be in this session and what should have been in the previous session. To the extent that it is relevant to this session, Minister, please answer.

Mr O'CONNOR: In terms of the SEQ RAAC, I have three modules for the Queensland Ambulance Service in Oakey, three modules for the Queensland Ambulance Service in Proston, three modules for the Queensland Ambulance Service in Tara, three modules for the Queensland Ambulance Service in Charters Towers, three modules for the Queensland Ambulance Service in Barcaldine and four modules for Queensland Health in Dirranbandi. In Cairns, the only outputs of the RAAC were for the social housing program, not the government employee housing program.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will move to government questions now with the member for Mulgrave.

Mr JAMES: Further to questions asked by the opposition, can the minister update the committee on QBuild's modular housing factories in Eagle Farm and Cairns and how they are supporting the pipeline of housing projects?

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the member for Mulgrave for the question. It was wonderful to join the member for Mulgrave a couple of months ago to announce that we are increasing the output of the RAAC that is just outside his community in Far North Queensland to nearly 40 per cent. That is going to be a great thing for our QBuild tradies up there, who do a fantastic job in a well-located housing factory.

We do support as a government modern methods of construction where it can deliver quality homes efficiently, strengthen our construction workforce and provide value for taxpayers. As has been outlined by the director-general, QBuild established a rapid accommodation and apprenticeship centre at Eagle Farm, there was the holding yard at Zillmere, and there is one in Cairns to support modular construction and apprentice training. The Eagle Farm facility did play a role in the early development of Queensland's Modern Methods of Construction industry. It helped QBuild test new construction approaches, it supported the delivery of housing and it provided valuable practical experience for the QBuild apprentices there. I want to acknowledge all of our QBuild tradies and apprentices who contributed to that work.

The housing market has changed considerably since then. As the director-general outlined at length, a growing number of private modular suppliers have now established large-scale, purpose-built manufacturing facilities in South-East Queensland. These businesses can manufacture at greater scale and achieve cost and production efficiencies that QBuild's repurposed Eagle Farm depot cannot match. The Eagle Farm facility was not designed as a large-scale modular housing factory. In fact, it was not properly set up as a factory at all. In the previous Labor government's panicked rush to look like they were doing something to address their own housing crisis, they directed QBuild to try to turn one of their depots into a fake factory. Its layout and infrastructure constrained efficient production, and homes manufactured there have cost significantly more than comparable private market alternatives. As a

result, a sustainable future pipeline of manufacturing work could not be secured because it was too expensive compared to the private market. We simply were getting no-one putting in orders for the houses being produced there because they were far too expensive.

With the completion of the current pipeline, the Eagle Farm site will revert to its original role as QBuild's Eagle Farm depot and will also be home to QBuild's South-East Queensland apprentice hub. The Zillmere site—which has been primarily used as a holding yard for those modules manufactured at Eagle Farm, because, again, it was completely unsuitable—will continue to store the small number of remaining modules, materials and equipment as required. It is important to get this on the record before we see a scare campaign from the opposition: this change will not reduce QBuild's workforce. Staff based at Eagle Farm will continue to be deployed across QBuild's construction and maintenance programs as they have been during the many months where there has not been a sufficient modular pipeline.

The future of the QBuild RAAC in Cairns, though, is very different. QBuild have an extensive presence across regional and remote Queensland—something they rightly should be proud of—where private supplier markets, particularly for factory built homes, remain far more limited, if existent at all. The Cairns facility is well placed to respond to the housing and infrastructure needs we have across Far North Queensland, and in particular in the remote communities we serve. For that reason, the Cairns RAAC will continue operating, and its target is an increase of around 40 per cent in manufacturing output from 1 July 2026. An independent quantity surveyor has also been engaged to examine how this facility can continue delivering more high-quality homes while improving value for taxpayers. I have given them the message that this is a floor, not a ceiling; I want to get as many homes out of that facility as we possibly can because it is a practical, location-specific approach to delivering housing.

In South-East Queensland, where there is now a more mature and competitive modular market, the government should make use of capable industry suppliers rather than duplicate their capacity at a higher cost to Queensland taxpayers. In Cairns, where the private market capability is more limited and QBuild's regional footprint remains critical, we are strengthening our government manufacturing capability. That outcome is a more efficient QBuild, continued employment and training for our workforce, an expanded role for Cairns and better value for Queensland taxpayers.

Mr McDONALD: My question is to the minister. We have seen concerning reports through the CFMEU inquiry. Is the minister aware of any tactics the CFMEU has deployed in its engagement with your department and the QBCC under the former government, and what expectations have you set to change the culture?

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the member for Lockyer. You are right: the evidence emerging from the CFMEU commission of inquiry is deeply confronting. The inquiry's work is ongoing and the allegations must be properly tested, but the evidence already heard raises serious questions about how far the CFMEU influence reached into the former Labor government, into taxpayer-funded procurement and into Queensland's supposedly independent regulators.

The most distressing evidence has come from former Master Builders Queensland chief executive Grant Galvin. Mr Galvin told the inquiry that he was subjected to a sustained campaign of intimidation, including thousands of union members marching on his workplace and a coffin being placed in a tree outside his office. He said the campaign contributed to a severe mental health crisis and an attempt to take his own life. That testimony should be a moment of reckoning for the Queensland Labor opposition. While industry representatives say they were being intimidated and targeted, Labor continued accepting the CFMEU's political support and embedded union-backed conditions into government procurement.

The inquiry has also heard evidence about the CFMEU's influence over Labor ministers and in senior government decision-making. Former Transport and Main Roads director-general Neil Scales alleged that CFMEU leaders routinely invoked their access to then premier Annastacia Palaszczuk and then transport minister Mark Bailey while attacking his opposition to Best Practice Industry Conditions. The inquiry was shown police body worn footage of CFMEU members storming a government building, knocking over a security guard and searching room by room for Mr Scales. Public servants were repeatedly traumatised and some lodged workers compensation claims about their experience.

When Mr Scales raised the incident with then minister Bailey, he alleges the then minister dismissed it simply as 'unions being unions'. That response tells Queenslanders everything they need to know about Labor's attitude: a union allegedly storming a government workplace, a security guard

being knocked over and staff left distressed, and the responsible Labor minister shrugs it off as just 'unions being unions'. That is not leadership; it is indulging a powerful political ally that for many years contributed to the coffers of the Labor Party.

The evidence involving the Queensland Building and Construction Commission is equally serious. Former QBCC licensing manager Graham Easterby told the inquiry that CFMEU figure and former QBCC board member Jade Ingham pressured the regulator to investigate and take action against contractors where, in Mr Easterby's view, there were no valid grounds to do so. He also told the inquiry that the then QBCC commissioner said he was under pressure from former Labor public works minister Mick de Brenni, the member for Springwood, along with a member of the board to consider licensing action against contractor Watpac.

I concur with Mr Easterby. This level of ministerial involvement in an operational regulatory matter is incredibly unusual and inconsistent with the independence expected of this important regulator. To have a senior CFMEU figure around the board table of that regulator, while the inquiry has now heard allegations that he was also pressuring that regulator to pursue particular contractors, is incredibly concerning. At the same time, the member for Springwood was allegedly intervening in operational matters and Labor was imposing CFMEU-backed procurement conditions across major government projects. That is not an appropriate separation between a political party, a union and an independent regulator.

The inquiry also heard that officials and industry repeatedly warned Labor about the Best Practice Industry Conditions and those concerns were ignored while the Labor government continued meeting frequently with the CFMEU. Contractor evidence described BPIC as driving up construction costs, reducing productivity and making major projects increasingly difficult to deliver. The financial consequences have been substantial, and you will have an opportunity to hear about some of those, I am sure, in the transport portfolio later this afternoon.

The Crisafulli government has established this commission of inquiry because Queenslanders deserve answers. They deserve to know why former Labor ministers continued empowering the CFMEU despite the mounting evidence they were repeatedly provided. The Crisafulli government is exposing that culture, dismantling the systems that enabled it and restoring integrity to Queensland's construction industry.

Mr KEMPTON: My question is to the minister. You have stated that you had paused the Best Practice Industry Conditions, BPICs, and you have now stopped them permanently. What benefits has your department seen across government projects as a result of these changes?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, pausing Labor's Best Practice Industry Conditions, or the CFMEU tax, was one of the first decisions of the Crisafulli government. We acted quickly because BPICs were doing real and substantial damage. They drove up costs, they reduced competition and they virtually locked out the entire construction industry from bidding for major government projects, particularly small contractors and contractors in regional communities. Labor created a construction system that worked for the CFMEU, not for Queenslanders. Only around 0.12 per cent of building industry participants were able to bid for major government projects under those arrangements. The evidence emerging through the CFMEU commission of inquiry has reinforced why this change was necessary. Queenslanders saw that through the project delays they were experiencing and the cost blowouts. The Cross River Rail, for example, has blown out to more than $19 billion and is now expected to take years longer to deliver.

The Queensland Productivity Commission also found that had BPICs remained in place until 2029-30, they could have imposed a net cost of up to $20.6 billion on the Queensland community, project costs would have been up to 25 per cent higher than they otherwise would have been and rents would have increased by 8.3 per cent because up to 26½ thousand fewer homes would have been able to be built. That is the real cost of Labor's arrangement with the CFMEU: higher costs for taxpayers, fewer homes for Queenslanders and value being less for every dollar spent by government.

That is why we paused BPICs immediately and we went further with the Queensland Procurement Policy 2026, which permanently removed BPICs from future Queensland government procurement. Future projects will be assessed on their value for money, on the capability of the contractor, on safety, on competition and, above all, on the ability to deliver—not on ideological conditions drafted by a militant, misogynistic union, but value for taxpayers. That is our No. 1 driver. This is not about reducing wages or compromising safety in any way. Workers deserve fair pay, safe workplaces and lawful conditions. There was no justification for a procurement regime that locked out almost the entire industry, inflated costs and failed to produce material improvements in safety outcomes.

Labor and the CFMEU made Queensland more expensive and less productive. We paused their destructive BPIC regime as one of our first decisions and through the QPP 2026 we have now abolished it permanently. That means more competition, better value and more capability to build the homes and infrastructure that Queenslanders deserve.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will go to non-government questions.

Ms MULLEN: I have some questions for the QBCC commissioner. Commissioner, the QBCC has been notifying Queensland home owners making claims under the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme that they can expect to wait up to 15 weeks for their case to be allocated to a QBCC building inspector before progressing. I will ask the member for Cooper to table an email from the QBCC. Is this the average wait time for a case to be allocated to an inspector?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Cooper is tabling some documents which we will all have a look at. Please send it to the commissioner as well.

Mr Lambrinos: The average wait time for inspections as of 30 June is 12 weeks. That number has come down significantly since the peak of 20 weeks, which was back in June 2023. We have seen a 40 per cent reduction in the inspection wait time over that period. We have been on a very concerted effort over that period to reduce the inspection wait time and we have done that through a number of different initiatives which have included increasing our building inspectorate by 24 FTEs over that period. We have supplemented the building inspectorate with the Capacity Uplift Program, which is providing us with the flexibility to scale up, particularly in short-term peak periods, to cater to the demand. We have also implemented a statewide operating model which is allowing us to reallocate our building inspectors to areas across the state where the demand is the greatest. We have also implemented a number of process improvements over the last 12 months in particular. We have introduced a number of digital tools and technologies for our building inspectors to modernise the way they operate and to optimise the way they conduct their field inspections to drive further efficiencies and productivity within the inspectorates.

More generally though, we have been on a very aggressive recruitment campaign over the last 12 months across the organisation, reducing our vacancy rates from 13 per cent to under five per cent. In that time we have also reduced our turnover rate to just on eight per cent. Not only have we increased the capacity of our workforce, but we have also stabilised our workforce. As part of those vacancies, we also took the opportunity to reassess where those vacancies are most important and, where appropriate, we reallocated them to higher priority frontline staff. In that regard, we have gone from 64 FTEs in the building inspectorate in FY25 to a new establishment of 74; and 61 of those 74 are currently filled, so we are actively in the market recruiting for the remaining vacancies. We are clearly in a very competitive market. We are drawing our talent from the same pool that the rest of the building and construction industry is recruiting from, so it is very competitive. In that regard, we have also implemented a new employee value proposition and a recruitment optimisation program so not only can we attract the right talent in the building inspectorate, but we can recruit them more efficiently and lock them in before they take on other opportunities across the industry.

Ms MULLEN: Commissioner, I note the last QBCC regulatory report that actually referenced inspection times, which was January to June 2025, stated inspection wait times have remained stable at nine weeks. You are now saying it is 12 weeks. Can you explain why the industry and consumers are being advised of those additional waiting times, please?

Mr Lambrinos: The reality is that year on year we do get fluctuations in the wait times and we also get fluctuations across the nine regions that we operate in across the state. In the last 12 months I have gone from talking about a $59 billion industry which is now $69 billion. I have gone from talking about 122,000 licensees to just under 130,000 licensees. I have gone from talking about issuing 150,000 policies every year to issuing just under 200,000 policies a year. The industry is absolutely growing year on year and as a result we are seeing a proportionate increase in the services we need to provide. That includes the need to inspect defects, where we have a seen a 20 per cent increase on the number of defect works year on year as well.

Ms MULLEN: Can I confirm the vacancy numbers for building inspectors? I think a pre-estimates question indicated you had six vacancies at this time; is that correct?

Mr Lambrinos: Out of the 74 established roles we have six permanent vacancies that we are looking to fill. The remaining vacancies in that establishment are as a result of building inspectors who are taking on other development opportunities within the organisation. They are either on secondment or operating as technical advisers in our internal review unit or in our Mediation and Conciliation Service which we operationalised this year.

Ms MULLEN: So given the wait times have increased, did you as commissioner at any point seek additional funding or raise the need for additional building inspectors with the minister?

Mr Lambrinos: I have come on board with the QBCC to reform it and transform it. That includes looking to simplify and optimise and streamline the way the QBCC operates rather than just throwing more resources at it. In that regard, I am absolutely challenging our teams to look at how we can optimise the way we work and strip out any unnecessary complexity in the way we work and leverage the amazing digital technologies that are available to them at the moment and, therefore, as I said, optimise and demonstrate productivity within the team before we throw additional resources at it. We still have on our absolute numbers 13 vacancies to fill, so I do not think it would be appropriate for me to ask for additional resources until, firstly, I can fill those 13 and, secondly, we can demonstrate that we have optimised the way the team operates.

Ms MULLEN: Thank you, Mr Lambrinos. Director-General, I refer to the Budget Capital Statement 2026-27 on page 46, which indicates $168.55 million for government employee housing for the financial year. How much of that $168.55 million is new funding and how much is continued funding through the previous Labor government's 2022-2027 government employee housing program?

Mr Cridland: The funding in 2026-27 is the largest single year of funding towards the 2022-2027 program to deliver 439 government employee housing. It will see us complete the program and spend approximately $168.6 million for the remaining 85 homes.

Ms MULLEN: Sorry, so just to confirm: it is all continued funding through the previous Labor government's program?

Mr Cridland: It is to complete the delivery of the 2022-2027 government employee housing program.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you have a further question, member for Jordan?

Ms MULLEN: Yes; thank you. How much of this new funding is for the maintenance of government employee housing?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Director-General, do you need a moment or do you have that level of detail?

Mr Cridland: Can I just have the question asked again, just to make sure I have heard that right?

Ms MULLEN: Of that $168.55 million, how much of this funding is for maintenance of government employee housing, or is that a separate line item?

Mr Cridland: Yes. This one does new homes, renewals or replacements or upgrades as opposed to general maintenance, yes.

Ms MULLEN: Director-General, I refer to the minister's response in the 2025-26 estimates hearing in relation to modelling demand for future investment in government employee housing. Can you advise if this work had been completed and, if so, how much funding has been allocated for government employee hosting post the 2026-27 financial year?

Mr Cridland: As is a longstanding practice, we go out to agencies in December of each year and ask them to specify their forward demand for government employee housing. This year we are focused on completing the 2022-2027 program. We will go out in December this year to agencies to ask for their forward demand and then we will engage with the executive government through the budget process to determine the forward program for 2027-28 onwards.

Ms MULLEN: Okay, so the minister's response in 2025-26—and I am happy to read it but I also have a copy of the transcript that I am happy to table, if needed—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the member for Cooper could table that document, that would be good.

Ms BUSH: Yes; just confirming that I will be tabling that. Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Could I see it, and the director-general, too, please?

Ms MULLEN: Thank you. I will just read the words of the minister. It says, and this is from 2025-26—

> ... we are undertaking work that has never been undertaken before to model that demand across government and to inform our future decisions around future investments into the government employee housing program.

He went on to say—

> We want this work to be completed as part of the next budget process.

So can I just confirm: this work has not been completed as part of this budget process in 2026-27?

Mr Cridland: I am just looking at the transcript. The minister is very clear that this goes through to 2027—the end of the financial year 2027, which is 30 June next year—and we will go back as part of the forward budgets with the outcomes of the work that we do with agencies and the consultation that we will conduct with them over the December through to February period.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Last question, member for Jordan.

Ms MULLEN: So just to confirm that you do not have any understanding at this time of how many government employee homes will be required by agencies beyond the 2026-27 financial year?

Mr Cridland: We will need that figure to inform our forward budgets, so we will need that information to feed into the 2027-28 budget. In terms of the numbers that we will need as part of that process—and I understand that this has been an ongoing process—we write to agencies in December. We get a return from those agencies signed by their chief executive or delegate which testifies to their actual forward demand so that we can be confident when we compile that, and that is what we do. We do not ask the chief executives of those agencies whether or not that is right; we assume that the chief executives of those agencies have signed off on their responsibilities under the relevant legislation. We compile those numbers and we take that to government as part of the budget process, and we will do that for next year once this current program is completed.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the chair of the committee, the member for Lockyer.

Mr McDONALD: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Minister, I understand a QFleet pilot was commenced under the former government which involved the leasing of hydrogen powered vehicles. Is this pilot now completed and what were the outcomes?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, that is correct. In August 2021 the former Labor government launched five leased Hyundai Nexo hydrogen vehicles with great fanfare. The then minister, the member for Springwood—it is his day—declared that the trial would help make Queensland a hydrogen superpower and accelerate the uptake of hydrogen powered transport. Member for Lockyer, five years later the reality is very different. The pilot confirmed that hydrogen may have a future potential as a low-emissions fuel, particularly in some heavy transport applications, but it also exposed the enormous practical and financial barriers to using hydrogen for passenger vehicles.

Because the lease costs were so high, the former government provided $747,000 to funding the heavily subsidised leased rates so agencies could afford to participate in the trial. QFleet then spent a further $730,000 over two financial years establishing and maintaining a temporary hydrogen refuelling solution at QUT's Cleveland facility. Member for Lockyer, that is more than $1.47 million in government funding for a pilot involving just five leased passenger vehicles. That is—I have done the maths for you, member for Lockyer—$294,000 per passenger vehicle, even before you account for the time spent transporting the vehicles to and from the temporary refuelling site, which was not in a convenient location.

It is another example of the former Labor government disrespecting Queensland taxpayers' money. I know it will shock the committee, but Labor announced the headline before properly working through the cost, the infrastructure requirements or whether the technology was even commercially viable. The member for Springwood promised a hydrogen revolution. Queenslanders received five extremely expensive leased vehicles dependent on a costly and limited refuelling arrangement. The evidence is clear that hydrogen passenger vehicles are not currently a financially or operationally viable option for QFleet. There is insufficient refuelling infrastructure, the hydrogen and fuel industries have shown little appetite to expand the passenger vehicle refuelling network and Hyundai does not appear likely to introduce its next-generation hydrogen passenger vehicle into Australia, with the market increasingly focused on potential heavy transport applications, although Hyundai, member for Lockyer—I will confirm—did at least get those five vehicles back. Queensland taxpayers did not even get to keep those. They were leased for five years by the member for Springwood. We therefore ended that pilot.

We will not continue spending taxpayers' money on lease passenger vehicles that cost around four times more than their conventional equivalents when the necessary infrastructure and market support does not exist. Instead, we are focused on reducing emissions across QFleet's fleet of around 11,500 vehicles. That is why early last year we replaced Labor's narrow technology-driven approach with the QFleet Vehicle Emissions Reduction Strategy 2025-2030. This gives our public servants the flexibility to choose lower-emission, fit-for-purpose and value-for-money vehicles for any circumstance across our state. Of all the changes we have brought in, member for Lockyer, this is the one that attracts

the most praise from public servants. They are very happy to have the choice back in respect of their vehicles—instead of the binding mandates on one particular type of technology that we saw under the former government.

Our new strategy does include battery electric vehicles, it does include plug-in hybrids and it does include conventional hybrids and efficient petrol or diesel vehicles, depending on the tasks that our public servants need to complete. That practical approach is already delivering a 4.16 per cent reduction in our whole-of-fleet emissions, which is well and truly on track to achieving our 2030 targets while giving more choice to public servants within our government.

Mr JAMES: Minister, at the start of this year the new Queensland Procurement Policy 2026 commenced. Can you please provide an update on the progress of its implementation, including feedback from industry?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, you have two minutes so that there is time for coming back on a couple of questions.

Mr O'CONNOR: Absolutely. Thank you, member for Mulgrave. Across our agencies, government owned corporations and all the other arms of government, we spend about $35 billion a year. That buying power should create opportunities for Queensland businesses, strengthen local communities and deliver genuine value for taxpayers. Our 52-page consolidated Queensland Procurement Policy is built around five practical pillars: value for Queensland; local opportunities; making it easier to do business; being open to new ideas; and practical economic, environmental and social impacts. As I touched on before, it has permanently removed BPIC—the CFMEU tax—and it has replaced the former government's local benefits test with a strengthened purposeful public procurement evaluation criteria. That gives agencies and GOCs the opportunity and choice to consider the wider economic and social benefits of major procurements to suit where those tenders are going to. That could be utilising Queensland workers and suppliers, creating apprenticeships and training opportunities, increasing expenditure with small and family businesses, supporting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander businesses, delivering benefits for regional communities and supporting social enterprises.

We are very proud to say we have the only procurement policy in the nation that expressly recognises veteran owned businesses and suppliers that employs veterans and helps them transition into civilian employment. That is important in Queensland because we have the largest population of veterans of any state. Between 1 January and 26 June 2026, approximately 82 per cent of significant procurements released to market included at least one of those purposeful public procurement evaluation criteria. That is a total of 520 outcomes applied. The most frequently applied outcome was the use of local workers and local suppliers. The other commonly applied outcomes were increased expenditure with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander businesses, commitments to apprenticeships, investments in small-, family- and medium-sized businesses and benefits for regional communities.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, there were two matters to come back on: one was in relation to smoke alarm program; and the second was general information about the construction timeline for a modular home. I call the director-general.

Mr Cridland: The average time to complete a module is seven weeks. Smoke alarms are within the housing portfolio, but I can confirm that Home Assist Secure can be used for smoke alarms.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Director-General, for that information. We have one minute to go. Would someone from the government side like to ask a question?

Mr McDONALD: Minister, following the completion of the Queensland Productivity Commission's inquiry into the construction industry and the handing down of the government's response earlier this year, how is the minister's department and the QBCC progressing with implementation?

Mr O'CONNOR: We are central in the work of making Queensland the building capital of the nation. Of the inquiry's 64 recommendations, the government agreed or agreed in principle to 51 which is about 80 per cent. We noted a further eight and did not agree to five. Importantly, we did not wait for that report to act. We are getting on with the job of turning around our building and construction industry.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It being 11.45, the time for examination of the public works portfolio has expired. We are dealing next with the youth portfolio. If there is a changeover of officials to occur, could it please happen quickly and efficiently so that we can get underway with the youth portfolio. I note there were no questions taken on notice in the public works section.

The committee will now examine the estimates for the youth portfolio area. Minister, if you wish, you may make an opening statement regarding the youth portfolio of up to five minutes.

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. It remains a great privilege to be Queensland's Minister for Youth as our state's youngest cabinet minister. The Crisafulli government re-established a dedicated Minister for Youth because our next generation deserve a direct voice in government and a genuine role in shaping our state's future. Young Queenslanders are not only our future leaders, they are already leading in their schools, workplaces, communities, sporting clubs, cultural organisations and own families. We are investing in leadership pathways, listening to their ideas and ensuring young people are actively involved in developing solutions to the challenges Queensland faces.

The 2026-27 budget delivers more than $1.9 million over two years to partner with YMCA Queensland to deliver the Queensland Youth Parliament, and separately to deliver the Queensland Indigenous Youth Leadership Program. The Queensland Youth Parliament is now in its 31st year and remains one of the most important youth leadership opportunities in our state. I want to thank all members for their engagement with their youth member. This year we had 467 young Queenslanders nominate to take part, with at least one nomination received from every electorate in our parliament. That tells us that young Queenslanders want a seat at the table to understand how this place works and to advocate for their communities.

The Queensland Indigenous Youth Leadership Program is now in its 22nd year and has supported more than 780 young First Nation Queenslanders in that time. Its strength is not only in the opportunity it provides to participants but also in its sustainable model of leadership, with former participants returning as mentors and facilitators to pass on the knowledge they have gained. Participants also take place in the Eric Deeral Indigenous Youth Parliament, giving them practical experience of parliamentary and legislative processes run in the name of our nation's first indigenous state parliamentarian.

Queensland Youth Week is another important opportunity to celebrate the achievements and contributions of young people across our state. In 2026, a record 123 events were delivered across Queensland, from festivals and sporting competitions to workshops, camps, movie nights and community activities. In November, our Safer Schoolies Response will once again support thousands of schoolies celebrating on the Gold Coast and in Airlie Beach. The Gold Coast response will include a dedicated schoolies hub, services like police and health and around 1,000 volunteers, including our iconic red frogs. We recognise the way young people celebrate the end of school has significantly changed over time, however, so planning is well underway for this year. We are working closely with commercial operators and local stakeholders to deliver a positive experience for school leavers while supporting local businesses and maintaining a safe and respectful environment for Gold Coasters.

Finally, our Night-Life Economy Commissioner John 'JC' Collins has completed extensive engagement across the state to understand the challenges facing venues, artists, hospitality businesses, councils and local communities. Over the past year JC has engaged with 82 stakeholders, held 32 meetings with ministers and departmental representatives, participated in 20 forums and workshops, delivered 15 speeches, visited seven local government areas and chaired four Night-Life Economy Advisory Panel meetings.

The Crisafulli government will very soon release our state's first night-life action plan in response to JC's landmark report which will include commitments to support local artists and venues and to address outdated regulatory barriers while ensuring safety remains central to the night-life experience in every corner of our state. A recent example of our approach was our trial of extended trading hours for pubs and clubs during the Socceroos matches in the FIFA World Cup which provided greater flexibility for venues and fans while maintaining appropriate safety settings.

We cannot wait until 2031 to make Queensland's night-life more vibrant; that work must start now. Across this portfolio our purpose is clear: to give young Queenslanders a stronger voice, create genuine opportunities for leadership, support them through important milestones and build a night-life economy that is safe, vibrant and ready for the future. I thank the committee and look forward to your questions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your opening. We will go to non-government questions and the member for Nudgee.

Ms LINARD: My first question is to the director-general. With reference to the night-life economy report that was completed in February, when will the report's recommendations be released, please?

Mr Cridland: The timing of the release of the report is a matter for executive government. We have received the report. We have been working across the 62 recommendations with agencies. It is not for me to comment on the timing.

Ms LINARD: What advice, then, have you provided on the report and, if any, on its public release?

Mr Cridland: If we have provided advice to the minister and government it is to inform consideration by executive government, so it would not be appropriate for me to comment until they have considered that fully.

Ms LINARD: I imagine you will provide the same answer, but when can live music and hospitality venues expect that the government's response to those recommendations and report will be released?

Mr Cridland: Yes, it would be the same answer.

Ms LINARD: With reference to the 16-member Nightlife Economy Advisory Panel, how many members of that panel directly represent under-25 workers or youth arts organisations, ensuring the primary consumer and labour demographic of the sector has a seat at the table, please?

Mr Cridland: I will ask the Deputy Director-General of Policy, Performance and First Nations to come to the table to talk about the panel.

Ms McAllister: Could I ask the member to repeat the question for me, please?

Ms LINARD: The question was with reference to the 16-member Nightlife Economy Advisory Panel. How many members of that panel directly represent under-25 workers or youth arts organisations, ensuring the primary consumer and labour demographic of the sector has a seat at the table?

Ms McAllister: While there is no specific member that represents that cohort, we have had a youth member, accessed through the Office for Youth, who has come to one of the panel meetings to provide direct input.

Ms LINARD: Is that member aged 25 or under and therefore representative of that demographic?

Ms McAllister: Yes, definitely. I do not have the exact age, but they were certainly a young person.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Nudgee, if you could direct your questions to the director-general for each one to be referred, please.

Ms LINARD: Director-General, has that demographic been directly consulted with regard to the report or the recommendations or, indeed, in informing the government with regard to the government's response?

Mr Cridland: I thank the member for the question. I will refer to the Deputy Director-General of Policy, Performance and First Nations, thank you.

Ms McAllister: There was a specific survey which was distributed through the Office for Youth towards the end of last year which then informed the commissioner's independent report and so has fed into having a direct youth voice impacted and informed through that report.

Ms LINARD: Minister, young Queenslanders identify mental health, cost of living, youth justice and climate action as their issues of greatest concern. How many times have you advocated on their behalf with your cabinet colleagues with regard to these issues?

Mr O'CONNOR: Member, that is from the Young Queenslanders Sentiment Report?

Ms LINARD: That is correct, and also the Mission Australia report with respect to Queensland results.

Mr O'CONNOR: Constantly. You can ask any of my cabinet colleagues. I make robust contributions, which I will not go into, but I am constantly advocating on behalf of young Queenslanders. I like to say I have grown old in the youth portfolio. I have had this portfolio since I was first elected, at the end of 2017. I had a lot less grey hairs. I will look like the member for Lockyer by the time I am finished with this, I think! I am very privileged to be the youth minister of this state and to be able to go in to bat on those issues. When I was your shadow minister you were well aware of my advocacy on one of those issues you raised: climate action. I am very proud of that advocacy. That advocacy is baked into our Energy Roadmap. That is a good thing. In terms of the other issues you raised, as these matters come up I go in to advocate for young Queenslanders.

I advocate for young Queenslanders every day in the broader part of my portfolio of housing. There is no greater example of that than our delivery plan for eight new youth foyers. We are very committed to that to make sure young Queenslanders who are experiencing some of those issues you have outlined are able to have a safe and secure place to call home, to get them onto a long-term housing pathway. As the director-general outlined earlier, the former government also had a plan for

eight foyers but those eight foyers were by 2046. Our eight foyers will all be underway, if not completed, by 2028. That is a good thing. They cannot come soon enough. We saw only two youth foyers delivered in the last three terms of the former Labor government. We have eight underway right now. That is a fantastic thing for hundreds of young Queenslanders. That will help thousands of young Queenslanders, particularly with the issues you raise. Not the climate action one but in terms of the other issues you raise, that is the most practical support within my portfolio that we can provide for young Queenslanders in need.

Ms LINARD: As a follow-on from that question, with respect to mental health, cost of living and youth justice specifically, what, if any, tangible outcomes have arisen as a result of your constant advocacy that you referred to?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can take that point of order, Leader of the House.

Dr ROWAN: My point of order is in relation to key performance indicators and outcomes. They are the responsibility of other portfolio areas and there will be an opportunity to ask other ministers in other portfolio sections with respect to outcomes in those policy areas under the direct control of other ministers.

Ms LINARD: Deputy Speaker?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take your point of order on that point of order.

Ms LINARD: It is directly relevant to his responsibilities as they are clearly articulated in his charter letter from the Premier.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Which ones are you referring to, member for Nudgee?

Ms LINARD: It reads: 'Investigate and activate opportunities to better allow for young Queenslanders to be consulted and informed on work undertaken by the Queensland Government', but also to make sure he is allowing young Queenslanders to contribute to the ongoing prosperity of the state. I would argue that young people would expect he is an advocate on the issues that matter most to them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you both for your points of order. The minister answered your first question in relation to his advocacy work. I think your question goes more to the specifics of other portfolio areas and what changes or reforms are being made there. Questions of that nature need to be put in different sessions. Could you restate the question so that we can be clear about what you are asking in relation to the Minister for Youth.

Ms LINARD: Of course. What I am asking about is whether the minister's advocacy—which he commented, I believe, was constant—is actually effective on behalf of young Queenslanders. That was the core of the question, not to ask for detailed responses on behalf of portfolio matters.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will go to cost of living first. I am very proud to be delivering a record housing budget, beating our own record of last year. That is probably the greatest impact on the cost of living for not just young Queenslanders but all Queenslanders—although particularly young Queenslanders. We are delivering more housing supply. We are seeing more commencements, more completions and a construction industry that is not beholden to the CFMEU. We are delivering more opportunities for home ownership, particularly for young Queenslanders. Again, that was another session but we are delivering.

In terms of the specifics you mentioned with the charter letter and in terms of the opportunities that I create for young Queenslanders to advocate, there is the Youth Parliament, which hopefully we do get a chance to run into. We found a situation where the former Labor government had allowed that to run at a deficit and had the YMCA covering the deficit of that program. Even the Youth Parliament was not properly funded by the former Labor government and the $1.9 million in additional funding that we have included in this budget will resolve that. For the first time we will give the Queensland Indigenous Youth Leadership Program a sustainable funding model so that program can be run for First Nations young Queenslanders. We are achieving results.

In my main portfolio area of housing, I am very proud of the numbers that we are getting and the supply we are getting out of the ground and of the opportunities that is creating for young Queenslanders, particularly the opportunity for home ownership. In the session the other day, the Treasurer, in his capacity as home ownership minister, outlined how we have gone from last in the nation in home ownership and we are moving up that ladder. We have a clear target to go from last to first in 10 years. That is only going to happen with supply and with initiatives like Boost to Buy, which

we are very proud is the most generous shared equity scheme in the nation in terms of its eligibility criteria. That is a good thing. Young Queenslanders are accessing that scheme to achieve their dream and their aspirations of home ownership.

We are doing all we can for young Queenslanders, particularly in my role as minister for housing but more broadly in my advocacy. I am very happy to stand on my record whatever part of the government it is.

Ms LINARD: Minister, if I come to the topic of the cost of living that you chose, in respect to the Mission Australia Youth Survey 2025 Queensland report, given that cost-of-living concerns among young Queenslanders have nearly doubled from 2023 data and you have said that your government and, indeed, you as the minister have been listening to young Queenslanders on the cost of living, why do so many young Queenslanders feel their financial situation is getting worse under your government's watch?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: there is an imputation or inference contained within the question. I think the question is also bordering on seeking an opinion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is definitely seeking an opinion. Member for Nudgee, is there a way that you can rephrase the question?

Ms LINARD: Yes. With respect to imputation, the report results shows a declining confidence of young people. It is a statement of fact.

Dr ROWAN: A further point of order: in the second part of the question as asked by the member for Nudgee, she was linking that directly to the government so that was the imputation reference there. As I said, it was also seeking an opinion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us deal with the issue of seeking an opinion. Member for Nudgee, if you are able to, rephrase. Member for Moggill and Leader of the House, I know you like to have all of your points of order dealt with. I am not sure that there is an imputation in that question, but it is definitely seeking an opinion. Can you rephrase the question so that it is not seeking an opinion please, member for Nudgee?

Ms LINARD: Certainly, Deputy Speaker. Minister, in the Mission Australia Youth Survey, on cost of living young people have said they feel that the situation is worsening for young Queenslanders in the state. What has your government done, given your previous reference to the significant things that you have done for young people, other than housing, to make the situation better for young Queenslanders?

Mr O'CONNOR: Young Queenslanders have a voice in the cabinet. The youth ministry was abolished by the government you were a member of. It was taken away as a portfolio. Thank goodness we re-established it because it puts it front and centre. I will very happily stand on our record in terms of the value of concessions provided by the government to Queenslanders. It is now at $9.285 billion. I outlined the supply that we are delivering. That is the No. 1 determinant of cost-of-living pressures. As I outlined extensively in the housing session, that has not just happened overnight. We had a decade when supply went nowhere near keeping pace with demand and young Queenslanders gave up on the dream of home ownership because it became too hard. Everything that the former Labor government did made that harder. It made housing harder. It locked young people out of the market, whether that was a rental or purchasing their own home.

We are very proud of the work that we are doing, the supply that we are delivering and the changes that we are driving to get more homes out of the ground and to give more opportunities to young Queenslanders in particular. We are very proud to have re-established a youth ministry after it was abolished by the former Labor government. This session did not exist for a couple of years. There was no youth portfolio. You were not able to have a particular member of cabinet—or I was not able to as the shadow minister. There was no youth minister in the former government. That is how important young Queenslanders were to them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, address your comments through the chair.

Mr O'CONNOR: The former government did not even properly fund the Queensland Youth Parliament. It is an appalling record. We are very proud of what we are delivering, including in this budget with $1.9 million in additional funding for those key youth programs that were not funded by the former Labor government.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will go to the member for Cook,

Mr KEMPTON: My question relates to jobs for young people. Can the minister please outline how the Queensland government is supporting young people to access housing support, jobs in the department and a construction career in QBuild?

Mr O'CONNOR: I will not go on about youth foyers again, although I am very passionate about those. I am very proud to have the Gold Coast Youth Foyer in my electorate and to have seen the change that that has created for so many young people. We cannot wait to see our eight new foyers come out of the ground across the length and breadth of our state. They are going to make a tangible difference for young people who are earning and learning.

Another part of the department that I will touch on, because it is something that I am directly responsible for, is QBuild. QBuild is a really important pathway into employment for young people. Apprentices are the future of that organisation. They are not just the future of QBuild; they are the future of Queensland. They maintain our homes, our schools, our hospitals, our police stations and our essential public infrastructure. We are very proud, in 2025-26, to have added 79 apprentices to QBuild, which is the largest intake in many years.

As of 26 June 2026, my most recent data, I can update the member that QBuild employed the equivalent of 196.46 full-time apprentices, which is an increase of more than 60 per cent from July 2024. Those apprentices, who are overwhelmingly young Queenslanders, are working across our state. I have been very pleased to meet them in my travels across the state. They are chippies, sparkies and plumbers. They are working in painting and refrigeration mechanics. They are cabinet-makers. In fact, they work as stonemasons in the depot that we talked about in the previous session. I can update the member that we are very proud to say that a quarter of those apprentices are female, which helps to create a more diverse construction workforce in our state, particularly with our government builder.

Our apprentice completion rate for QBuild in 2025-26 was 77.42 per cent, which is more than 20 percentage points above the broader industry completion rate. It means that we are not just conducting training for training's sake; we are creating a genuine pathway into a trade, into a secure job and into a long-term career serving Queenslanders. After many years in which the former Labor government allowed workforce and construction productivity challenges to get worse, we are investing in the young Queenslanders who will help build our state's future. Whether it is a young Queenslander needing help to find a safe place to call home, an opportunity to enter our Public Service or a practical pathway into a trade, we want government to open doors rather than place barriers in the way.

Mr JAMES: Minister, the 2026-27 budget includes additional funding of $1.9 million over two years for the continuation of the Queensland youth leadership programs. How is this additional funding supporting the programs?

Mr O'CONNOR: As I outlined earlier, our budget includes more than $1.9 million over two years to continue the Queensland Youth Parliament and the Queensland Indigenous Youth Leadership Program. That funding of $750,000 over two years will support the YMCA Queensland to deliver the Youth Parliament in 2027 and 2028, and that is on top of existing funding that was already committed for the program but which I outlined was unfortunately inadequate. That additional investment will address the program's financial pressures. It will provide travel scholarships so that regional and remote young people, particularly from your community and the member for Cook's community, can participate in the program. It will strengthen reporting and training, it will support compliance with new child safety requirements and it will keep the Queensland Youth Parliament accessible and inclusive.

The QYP is now in its 31st year and it is really one of our state's most important youth leadership programs. The huge number of applications we get, as I outlined earlier, sends a very clear message that young Queenslanders want to see how this place works, they want to have a seat at the table and they want to speak on behalf of their communities here, and we absolutely welcome that.

In 2025-26, 99 per cent of participants in youth leadership programs reported that their leadership capabilities had improved, exceeding our own target. The QYP gives participants practical experience in policy development and in parliamentary debate, it gives them opportunities to speak publicly, often for the very first time, and it shows them how they can advocate for their corner of Queensland. It also ensures that voices heard in this place are not confined just to Brisbane or the south-east more generally but do include young people from right across Queensland.

As I outlined, Labor failed to provide the longer term certainty that this program needed, which was incredibly disappointing. They left the Queensland Youth Parliament underfunded and expected the YMCA Queensland to absorb the shortfall, as—I found out when I came into this role—they had done for several years. That was not sustainable. It placed the future accessibility and quality of this program at risk. We have stepped in with a practical investment to secure the program for 2027 and

2028 to make participation more accessible to young Queenslanders, regardless of where they live or their family's financial circumstances. Instead of expecting not-for-profit organisations to keep picking up the tab, we are providing the certainty and stability needed to secure the QYP. It is an investment in confidence, capability and civic participation and just another example of how we are backing young Queenslanders not to just observe decisions made about them by government but to help shape them from the inside.

Dr ROWAN: Minister, I know that you referenced this in your opening remarks and also throughout the session, but the Night-Life Economy Commissioner has provided you his report with recommendations to enhance the vibrancy and safety of Queensland's night-life. Obviously, it is an exciting time leading up to 2032. When you said earlier 'very soon' we will know about what is going to happen, can you provide any additional information as to the government's response to the commissioner's report and the timing of that?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is a long preamble, Leader of the House, but I will give the call to the minister to answer.

Mr O'CONNOR: He is very excited about this, Deputy Speaker. The Kenmore tavern absolutely goes off on a Saturday night and that is what the member for Moggill is thinking about right now through these long days at estimates.

Mr KING: Doing karaoke.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am not taking that interjection!

Dr ROWAN: And the Bellbowrie Tavern.

Mr O'CONNOR: And the Bellbowrie Tavern! I will get that on the record for you, member for Moggill. Our night-life economy is central to the cultural, social and economic life of our state. It includes more than 22,000 businesses employing over 238,000 Queenslanders, with a turnover expected to reach $47.7 billion by 2030.

For too long, Queensland lacked a coordinated vision for its night-life economy. Under the former Labor government, venues, artists, hospo workers and local communities were all forced to navigate a patchwork of outdated rules, overlapping responsibilities and inconsistent decision-making. Labor spent years regulating the night-life economy without developing a genuine plan to grow it. We have taken a very different approach. We have established the Nightlife Economy Advisory Panel and we have asked JC, our commissioner, to engage directly with the people who understand the sector.

I outlined the many meetings he has had in the last year, including 32 with ministers and departmental representatives, mostly to discuss his report, which is called *Moonside*. It is based around three pillars: vibrancy, safety and how we make things more business friendly. It contains short-, medium- and long-term recommendations to reduce unnecessary complexity, modernise regulation, support businesses and respond to changing consumer expectations. We have carefully considered those recommendations across government, and very soon we will be releasing Queensland's first night-life action plan. We wanted this to be a practical pathway to get our state to where we need to be, particularly as we welcome the world in 2032.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, the time is nearly complete—

Mr O'CONNOR: With your indulgence, Deputy Speaker, can I thank a few people?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Very quickly, until 12.15.

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank everyone from the Office of the Director-General: Rebecca, Emma, Ben, Anna, Liana and Leisha. I particularly thank our Director-General, Mark Cridland, who loves this time of year, and our deputy directors-general, Matt Nye, Danielle McAllister, Sarah Amos, Graham Atkins, Andrew Bennett and Tanya Brady. I thank our Commissioner at the QBCC, Angelo Lambrinos; our RTA CEO, Steve Davidson; Ainslie Barron, our Building Policy Assistant Director-General; Terry Green, our Chief Regulator; and Melissa Lynch, our CFO, for all of their efforts in putting together a fantastic budget and preparing for these hearings.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. Thank you to everyone involved in this hearing this morning. We have now reached the end of the time allocated for consideration of the proposed expenditure of the youth portfolio area. We note for the record there are no questions taken on notice. Thank you, Minister, officials and departmental officers.

The committee will now adjourn for a break and resume at 1 pm with the examination of estimates for the portfolio areas of sport, racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games at which Mr Speaker will be the presiding chair.

Proceedings suspended from 12.15 pm to 1.00 pm.

ESTIMATES—STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE—SPORT, RACING AND OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

In Attendance

Hon. TL Mander, Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

Ms Kristin McGill, Chief of Staff

Department of Sport, Racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games

Mr Andrew Hopper, Director-General

Ms Amy Murdoch, Executive Director

Stadiums Queensland

Mr Todd Harris, Chief Executive Officer

Queensland Academy of Sport

Mr Troy Ayres, Chief Executive Officer

Queensland Racing Integrity Commission

Ms Catherine Clark, Commissioner

Racing Queensland

Mr Lachlan Murray, Acting Chief Executive Officer

Mr SPEAKER: Good afternoon. For the benefit of those who have just joined us, I am Pat Weir, member for Condamine and Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Under the provisions of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, I will preside over this hearing. The members of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee are: Mr Jim McDonald, member for Lockyer, who is the chair; Ms Jonty Bush, member for Cooper and deputy chair; Ms Wendy Bourne, member for Ipswich West; Mr Terry James, member for Mulgrave; Mr David Kempton, member for Cook; and Mr Shane King, member for Kurwongbah. We are also joined by the member for Gladstone and the member for Springwood. The committee is joined by other members who have been granted leave to attend and ask questions at the hearing today.

I remind everyone present that any person may be excluded from the proceedings at my discretion or by order of the committee. The committee has authorised its hearing to be broadcast live, televised and photographed. Copies of the committee's conditions for broadcast of proceedings are available from the secretariat. Staff who are assisting our witnesses here today are permitted to use personal electronic devices in the chamber. I ask all present to ensure phones and other electronic devices are switched to silent mode or turned off if not in use. I also remind everyone that food and drink is not permitted in this chamber.

The committee will now examine the proposed expenditure in the Appropriation Bill 2026 for the sport, racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games portfolio areas until 4.45 pm. We will then adjourn for a break until 5.15 pm before examining the portfolio areas of transport and main roads until 9.30 pm. I remind honourable members that matters relating to these portfolio areas can only be raised during the times specified for the area, as was agreed by the House. I refer members to the program set by the House, available throughout the chamber and on the committee's webpage.

I also remind everyone that these proceedings are subject to the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly. In respect of government owned corporations and statutory authorities, standing order 180(2) provides that a member may ask any question that the committee determines will assist it in its examination of the relevant appropriation bill or otherwise assist the committee to determine whether public funds are being efficiently spent or appropriate public guarantees are being provided.

On behalf of the committee, I welcome the Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, the director-general, officials, departmental officers and members of the public. For the benefit of Hansard, I ask officials and advisers to identify themselves the first time they answer a question referred to them by the minister or director-general. Please remember to press your microphones on before you start speaking and off when you are finished.

I now declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio areas of sport, racing, Olympic and Paralympic Games open for examination. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

Minister, if you wish, you may make an opening statement regarding the sport portfolio area of up to five minutes.

Mr MANDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to begin by thanking the committee for its participation in today's meeting. I know that the sport, racing and games portfolios are of significant interest to the members and to the Queensland communities they represent. I welcome the opportunity to discuss the work being undertaken across these portfolios and how the government is delivering outcomes for Queenslanders.

The sport, racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games portfolio has a clear vision: for Queensland to be the home of Australian sport. Our purpose is to capitalise on the opportunity presented by the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, creating a lasting legacy for Queensland and ensuring more Queenslanders can participate in sport and enjoy healthier, more connected communities. We are delivering on that commitment through investments that increase participation, strengthen community sport and create lasting benefits for Queenslanders.

The 2026-27 budget delivers significant investment across the portfolio to ensure Queensland has thriving, inclusive and sustainable sport and racing sectors while we prepare to host a world-class Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2032. Through this budget, we are continuing to invest in grassroots participation, sporting infrastructure, high-performance pathways and major venue upgrades that will benefit Queenslanders long after the games have concluded.

Our focus on the future of sport for Queenslanders is why we have been committed to the development of a sport strategy. I am pleased to announce today our Sport Strategy—*Queensland Spirit: the road to 2032*, delivering a strong sporting legacy for Queensland. This is the first stage in building a lasting sporting legacy and helping more Queenslanders share in the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity presented by the games, and it is why we are shaping it around the Queensland spirit.

Sport is in our veins. It connects us. It unites us. In Queensland, sport is the volunteers at our grassroots clubs. It is the players running out on their local courts and fields. It is the pathways giving hopeful athletes the chance to chase their dreams. It is the elite athletes who represent us on the world stage, and I pass on all my good wishes to our team in Glasgow at the moment, of which there are, I think, 87 Queenslanders involved.

Queensland Spirit: the road to 2032 is underpinned by four priorities. Firstly, making sport more accessible, boosting participation and ensuring communities in every corner of the state benefit through programs like our Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program. Secondly, utilising the games to establish Queensland as the undeniable home of sport, talent and events. Thirdly, helping more children experience the benefits of sport, build confidence, make connections and lead active, healthy lives through programs like our Play On! Sports Vouchers program. Finally, embracing initiatives that would ensure there is a lasting legacy beyond 2032. By complementing the significant investment in new infrastructure, we will work on new ways to partner with clubs, industry and councils to inspire the state to be more active more often.

Queensland Spirit: the road to 2032 is the first stage of a plan to ensure we become the home of sport, with funding to attract more sporting events and organisations to this state. The plan has been informed by extensive community and industry engagement through the discussion paper 'What does 2032 mean for you?' We received nearly 2,000 survey responses and over 90 written submissions and more than 420 people attended community forums in Brisbane, Roma, Emerald, Cairns, Mackay, the Sunshine Coast, the Gold Coast, Townsville and Toowoomba during that engagement period. The feedback has helped us form the final plan, and we thank everybody for their contributions.

As I said, a key priority of the portfolio remains the delivery of the Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program. Through Games On!, we are delivering new and upgraded sports facilities across Queensland, ensuring communities across the state share in the benefits of hosting the 2032

games. In 2026-27 alone, there is an estimated $88.3 million of investments in Games On! for projects that strengthen local facilities, grow participation and support the next generation of Queensland athletes.

Next week also marks an important milestone, with the launch of a new round of the Play On! Sports Voucher program. This program provides investment in Play On! across the forwards, ensuring Queensland families can count on the real cost-of-living support provided by this government. Play On! helps Queensland families manage the costs associated with participating in sport and active recreation. Round 1 of Play On! opened in August 2025, with more than 118,000 vouchers issued on the first day alone. Our commitment to Play On! ensures cost is not a barrier to participation in sport for all Queensland children. We are investing in Queensland sport and recreation facilities.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the important work undertaken by the Department of Sport, Racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games, Stadiums Queensland, the Queensland Academy of Sport, Racing Queensland, the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission and the Brisbane Organising Committee for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Collectively, the work being delivered across the portfolio demonstrates our commitment to creating healthier communities, expanding participation opportunities and ensuring the benefits of the games are felt across Queensland for generations to come.

I would like to thank my department, as well as the entire team of Stadiums Queensland, for working every day to ensure Queensland is the home of Australian sport and that we get more Queenslanders active more often. I recognise the importance of the estimates process and welcome the opportunity to assist the committee with their questions.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go to the opposition for the first question.

Mr BUTCHER: My first question is to the director-general. We just heard that the sport strategy has been released today. Do you have a copy of that? Is there a copy you could table today?

Mr MANDER: We can do that, if requested.

Mr SPEAKER: We will be able to get that during the hearing.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, is it correct that your department was responsible for the drafting of the sport strategy?

Mr Hopper: As the minister alluded to in his opening remarks, the strategy has been developed off the back of significant consultation across Queensland, both in person and via online surveys and feedback. Subsequent to that, yes, the department led the drafting of the strategy.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, the timeline for the sport strategy release changed from September 2025 to November 2025. Now that it has been released, why was the strategy delayed several times and who was responsible for that delay?

Mr SPEAKER: Just one question at a time, please, member for Gladstone. We will go to the first question you asked.

Mr Hopper: What was the first question?

Mr BUTCHER: The timeline for the sport strategy release was changed from September 2025 to November 2025. Now it is released, why was the strategy release delayed?

Mr Hopper: Decisions on the release of strategies are ultimately decisions for executive government.

Mr BUTCHER: You are saying that the minister was responsible for the delay?

Mr Hopper: Executive government is responsible for the timing of the release of material. I certainly did not infer for one second that the minister was responsible.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, why was the strategy released today—the same day as the estimates hearing for the sport portfolio—and who chose the new release date of the strategy?

Mr Hopper: The decision on the timing of the release of the strategy is ultimately a decision for executive government.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, I am still trying to get my head around it. Why did it take so long? We asked the same question at last year's estimates.

Mr SPEAKER: That is the same question. You have repeated the question a number of times now. We will move on.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, can you confirm whether there was any funding allocated to the strategy in 2025-26?

Mr Hopper: Just to clarify, you are asking if there was money allocated in 2025-26 for a strategy that has been released today. I will take a moment for that. Member, obviously with the release of the strategy in the financial year 2026-27, that is where the money is allocated.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, when did you finalise the strategy and when was it provided to government?

Mr Hopper: I do not have that date immediately to hand, but I can assure the member that strategies with this level of consultation go through many iterations of drafting. I can endeavour to find that date, but there is no specific moment that I can think of at the moment where we hit that mark. Can you just give me a moment to confer with my colleague? A point well made by my colleague is that the challenge, member, in your question is that ultimately this relates to decisions of executive government, so I am not able to provide that date.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, as part of the strategy, how much of the funding has been spent on the strategy or has it been distributed to other programs?

Mr Hopper: Sorry, member, the allocations for this financial year towards the strategy? Is that what you are asking?

Mr BUTCHER: Yes.

Mr Hopper: I do not have the actual quantum as it is in the budget papers. While we are talking, we will get that. What I would say is: today is the release of the strategy, as the member has pointed out. Subsequently, there will be further announcements around budget allocations to specific programs. I imagine that the minister and the government would like to make those announcements in due course. Those allocations in the main will be related to programs that are released. I would not like to pre-empt any of those announcements being made by government at this time.

Mr BUTCHER: Are you taking that on notice to get that information like you said you would?

Mr SPEAKER: It is up to the minister if he is going to take that on notice and provide that information.

Mr BUTCHER: He did say he would get back to us today.

Mr MANDER: I will need clarification. I thought the director-general said that the announcements would be made in due course by the minister and executive government.

Mr SPEAKER: If that is your response, that is your response.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, the strategy was supposed to be released in 2025. I assume that funding had been set aside. Surely you can tell from the figures you have in front of you how much has been spent on this strategy up to this point.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker: you ruled earlier about asking the same question. I believe that is the same question now for the third time.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order, member for Gladstone?

Mr BUTCHER: Yes. We are reviewing the budget here. There has been money allocated in 2025. All I am asking is how much of that budget has been spent on this strategy to date.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: to the point of order that the member for Lockyer raised, this question was previously asked of the director-general, who answered that question directly. It is the same question.

Mr SPEAKER: I think there is a little difference in this one. I will go to the director-general to respond to the question as asked.

Mr Hopper: Sorry, member, could you please repeat the question?

Mr BUTCHER: The strategy was supposed to be released in 2025. There was funding set aside for that. Was there money set aside in 2025-26 for the strategy that was supposed to be produced and released in 2025, and how much of that has been expended or gone to other areas?

Mr Hopper: The money allocated in the 2026-27 budget is in support of the strategy that has been announced. Prior to the strategy being announced, we were extending programs to ensure the sports sector continued to be supported.

Mr BUTCHER: So there is no monetary figure that you have as part of the budget of how much has been expended since 2025?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the member is being argumentative in asking the same question again and is trying to badger the director-general.

Mr SPEAKER: I will decide whether that is the case. The question was around 2025-26—the previous budget, I think.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, point of order: listening to what the director-general said earlier, it is my understanding that he answered that question.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, if you could just respond to that question and clear it up, then we will move on.

Mr Hopper: If the member would just give me a moment to confer with my colleagues, then I will furnish the member with the figures as they are presented in the budget papers. They are the figures that are allocated to our department. If you would just give us a moment I should have that momentarily.

Mr BUTCHER: Mr Speaker, if this is going to take forever then could we get him to take it on notice or get back to us by the end of the session?

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, the minister is happy to take it on notice.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, in respect of the games legacy fund, is it correct that this funding pool primarily delivers funding for the Games On! program?

Mr Hopper: I will just seek a bit of clarity. Is that best dealt with here, or is that best dealt with in the games session? It is a games related question.

Mr BUTCHER: The minister mentioned the Olympic Games in his five-minute opening speech, so obviously—

Mr SPEAKER: There is a section for the Olympic Games, so any questions specifically around the Olympic Games or anything in that space we will deal with in the later session.

Mr BUTCHER: Chair, the question is around the Games On! program.

Mr SPEAKER: That is not specific to the Olympics so I will allow the question. It was directed to the director-general.

Mr Hopper: I am sorry; the question as I heard it was in relation to the legacy fund.

Mr SPEAKER: Could you repeat the question, please.

Mr BUTCHER: In respect of the games legacy fund, is it correct the funding pool primarily delivers funding for the Games On! program?

Mr Hopper: I would have to take advice from the minister as to whether he wants me to answer this question. It is a games related question because you are talking about the games legacy fund.

Mr SPEAKER: It crosses over again and talks about the games legacy fund. That part of the question is very much in the next session on the Olympics.

Mr BUTCHER: I am happy to move on to the next question. Director-General, can you advise how many Games On! applications there have been?

Mr Hopper: If you can just give me a moment. There have been two rounds of that program. Is there a specific round you are asking about or just as a collective?

Mr BUTCHER: As a collective.

Mr Hopper: Obviously the first stage of Games On! were the government election commitments; in round 2 we currently are looking at 202 applications.

Mr BUTCHER: Based on 202 applications, does that mean the program is oversubscribed or is that about where you thought you would be with those applications?

Mr Hopper: I am yet to see a sports program for infrastructure that is not oversubscribed.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, what proportion of funding has been allocated to the Games On! program compared to other initiatives that the government has in sport?

Mr Hopper: The total Games On! program is valued at $250 million.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, it was reported that the Suncorp Stadium upgrade would be funded through the legacy fund, and it was previously announced that upgrades to the venue were reportedly costed at about $500 million. Is the project cost expected to be more or less than $500 million?

Mr McDONALD: Mr Speaker, point of order: the member for Gladstone asked the question about it being reported, and I would like to know where. Can the member authenticate that question?

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have some authentication that you would like someone to table on your behalf?

Mr BUTCHER: Yes.

Ms BUSH: I am happy to table that.

Mr MANDER: Mr Speaker, point of order: that is a different question on the same issue. It is about the use of the legacy fund, which you have just ruled is appropriate for the next session. I would suggest that question should go to the Olympics session. The legacy fund is a specific fund for the games. They are asking about funding from that. That is the second question on the same theme and I suggest that it needs to go to the next session.

Mr SPEAKER: I think that is correct. We will put that in the next session, member for Gladstone.

Mr BUTCHER: I am just seeking clarity that Suncorp Stadium is not being used as a venue for the Olympics; is that right?

Mr SPEAKER: It comes in under the legacy fund, as I understand it.

Mr BUTCHER: I am trying to get to the point of where that funding is coming from for that $500 million-odd.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, point of order: you have given a ruling in relation to where this question is most appropriately to be placed, and obviously that is in the next session. We have had some information provided by the minister as well, so I would suggest that the member for Gladstone move on to his next question.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, I will let you re-ask the question. If you want to make it specific to this hearing, I will let you ask the question again.

Mr BUTCHER: I call up the CEO of Stadiums Queensland, Mr Todd Harris, to answer my question about the Suncorp Stadium upgrade. Where is the money coming from for that?

Mr Harris: As has been responded to by the director-general, the money is coming from the games legacy fund. Based on the Speaker's rulings, that question will be dealt with in the third session.

Mr SPEAKER: That clears that up. Member for Gladstone, we will deal with that in the Olympics session. Do you have another question?

Ms BUSH: I will take the next question. Mr Harris, my question is to you and it is in relation to Suncorp Stadium. Is it your understanding that the land that is currently occupied by Sports House is included in the Suncorp Stadium upgrade or the redevelopment footprint of that project?

Mr Harris: The land that is associated with Sports House is owned by the department. It is not owned by Stadiums Queensland. It may be a matter best responded to by the director-general.

Ms BUSH: Perhaps I can ask the director-general. Would you like me to re-ask the question? It is in relation to the Sports House facility adjacent to Suncorp and whether that is included in the redevelopment of the stadium.

Mr Hopper: As the CEO of Stadiums Queensland alluded to, Sports House is owned and operated by the department. It is certainly strategically located within the Suncorp Stadium precinct. It accommodates 19 sport and active recreation organisations, providing low-cost tenancy, equipment and administrative services, and meeting and conference rooms. At this point in time, to the best of my knowledge it is not involved in anything to do with the proposed works at Suncorp Stadium.

Mr SPEAKER: We will have one more question before we have the changeover.

Ms BUSH: I will stay on that issue. I am interested in what work the department is doing with the organisations at Sports House. What engagement is happening with them in relation to relocation or perhaps transitional arrangements with the organisations, if they were to be relocated?

Mr Hopper: There are a range of assumptions in that question. We certainly engage with the tenancies regularly, but there are no plans to relocate anyone because there are no plans for Sports House.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go to government members for the next questions, and I call the member for Lockyer.

Mr McDONALD: Minister, with reference to the Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program, how is the strategy backing grassroots infrastructure in the lead-up to the games?

Mr MANDER: I thank the member. I appreciate your lifelong interest in sport and I know your enthusiasm for infrastructure at the community level. We are committed in the Crisafulli government to delivering a lasting legacy across Queensland beyond the 2032 Olympic Games. One of the key ways we are ensuring this legacy is through the Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program. I am pleased to inform the committee that progress is well and truly underway, with over 119 sporting clubs and organisations already benefiting from the investment in better facilities.

Indeed, every single one of the round 1 Games On! projects are underway. Roughly 26 per cent have been completed or are in post construction. I am pleased to update you on some of the projects completed. For example, at Souths rugby union, we have delivered a new clubhouse and new facilities. Souths rugby's chair of building infrastructure and community, Chris Hourigan, said that the new facilities will provide enormous benefits on and off the field. He stated—

The new clubhouse is a gamechanger for Souths in terms of improved facilities for our players—our junior boys and girls, and senior women and men, as well as for our volunteers ...

At Brothers Junior Rugby League Football Club in Stafford we have delivered new lights. Gibson Park committee chair Steve Keating said that the upgrades would help them make Gibson Park the north side's go-to night-time venue for rugby league, touch and cricket. He stated—

On behalf of the Gibson Park Committee—and the Stafford community—we thank the Queensland Government for their backing and for helping us to deliver lasting benefits for local sport.

We have delivered upgrades to the change room facilities at the Hervey Bay Hockey Association. The Hervey Bay Hockey Association secretary, Cathy Milijasevic, said that the upgraded change room would support the club's future growth and ability to host major events. She said—

The Games On! program has allowed Hervey Bay Hockey Association to upgrade our change room facilities to cater for all levels of hockey tournaments, ultimately helping us attract elite events.

We have delivered a new clubhouse, including new female change rooms, for the Glenmore Bulls football club. The Glenmore Bulls football club president, Dr Sean Peckover, said that the new facilities were helping the club expand and better serve the community. He said—

We are grateful to everyone who helped us make this a reality, including the Queensland Government for its support through the Games On! program.

At the centre of that is our Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program, with $88.3 million invested in 2026-27 alone to ensure every Queenslander—not just those in the south-east—inherits a genuine grassroots sporting legacy from the 2032 games. This is funding new and upgraded change rooms, lighting, courts, clubhouses and female-friendly facilities. From Redcliffe to Ingham, from Longreach to the Gold Coast, this program is backing a record number of local clubs. We want Queensland to be the home of Australian sport, and the Games On! program is the practical embodiment of our vision that sport should be part of everyday life for all Queenslanders.

Mr KEMPTON: Minister, how is delivery of round 2 of the Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program progressing?

Mr MANDER: I thank the member for the question. Thank you for the representation that you continue to make for your electorate with regard to ensuring that your electorate, as remote as it is, receives funding for community sporting infrastructure.

After a decade of underinvestment in community sporting infrastructure, I was so pleased to be able to announce round 2 of the Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program earlier this year. Round 2 of the program introduced two new streams—the Field of Play Fund and the Partnership Fund—providing investment to sports organisations and local governments to build and upgrade purpose designed infrastructure. Round 2 has a $30 million investment and this round is targeted at making sport more accessible to more Queenslanders. It will support participation in physical activity and ensure communities right across the state are ready to shine leading up to 2032.

The Field of Play category will fund smaller, community-level infrastructure projects like shade infrastructures, LED lights and the upgrading of existing facilities to help more people get involved in sport. The Partnership Fund supports new, larger-scale projects like clubhouses and multiuse precincts to create spaces that are inclusive, functional and fit for purpose for both local use and future international events. This is infrastructure where Queenslanders actually play; it is change rooms,

courts, lighting and clubhouses delivered with a firm commitment that the majority of the benefits reach our regions. We want communities right across Queensland to point to their new or upgraded sporting infrastructure and say, 'We got this because of the games.' This is real, tangible legacy.

Mr JAMES: Minister, how does *Queensland spirit: the road to 2032* give the sports industry and state sporting organisations the certainty they have asked for?

Mr MANDER: I am genuinely excited to share with the committee how this year's budget provided certainty for our state's sporting industry. For 10 years under Labor, our state's sporting organisations were left hanging year to year, unable to plan or retain staff. It was a decade of uncertainty for them. This is not in the Queensland spirit. Our strategy finally fixes what Labor ignored.

We want Queensland to be the undeniable home of Australian sport, and the new sporting Partnership Fund gives the sector certainty over four years in genuine and meaningful partnership with industry. That certainty comes with shared expectations. Funding agreements will see organisations support the rollout of priority programs and pilots, demonstrating collaboration, modernisation and program sustainability. It is investment matched with accountability. Our ambition is a future focused, resilient and strong sport industry capable of delivering for the 2032 games and positioning Queensland as a global leader in sport and major event delivery.

I am pleased to inform you that we have fantastic feedback from across the sector about our new sporting Partnership Fund, including from Shantel Netzler, the QSport CEO. She stated—This is a fantastic announcement by the government, it ensures that QSport as the peak body of sport in Queensland is able to continue as a delivery partner with Government, to ensure we have stronger organisations, delivering greater participation outcomes across Queensland, more people on the field, volunteering and ability to support the industry overall.

Dane Cross, the CEO of Sporting Wheelies, said—

I'm really excited by it. Previous arrangements, operating year-on-year, without that ongoing certainty has been really difficult to plan in advance and really apply a strategy. Today's announcement has been really encouraging for our own strategic plan and our own direction with our sporting wheelies program.

Rebecca Randazzo, the Hockey Queensland CEO, said—

Today's funding announcement is really welcome from Hockey Queensland. Having this security of funding for 4 years allows us to make really great strategic decisions. Most of our organisations have 3- or 4-year strategies so to have our funding certainty to align with those timelines is really welcome. More importantly it allows us to do long-term planning we know to get participation programs up, they take multiple years, knowing that we've got that funding to plan over multiple campaigns to increase participation is really exciting.

Susan Wilson-Gahan, who is with the Queensland Team Handball Association, said—It's secured a lot of certainty for us because at the moment, handball is an unfunded sport in Australia from the Australian Sports Commission, so the funding in Queensland has been extremely important for Queensland's participation in national and international events and actually the success of Queensland across those events. We didn't really know until recently what the funding was going to look like going forward, so now we have confidence that we can continue with our programs and try to develop stronger participation numbers, and even stronger competitions, maybe even some international competitions being brought to Australia.

Luke Bates, from Golf Australia, said—

Today's announcement is fantastic to hear the four years of funding that's going to be locked away, it's great for golf. We've just launched our new strategy over the next four years, which is all about keeping more people playing more golf and this funding is going to be a big part of that to allow this to happen in Queensland.

Chris Rushton, from Gymnastics Queensland, said—

It's great to see the announcement today and really clarify the long term plans for us, especially as we head to 2032.

Dr ROWAN: My question is to the minister, and I ask: how is this state budget making sport more affordable for Queensland families through the Play On! program and other participation measures including in my electorate of Moggill?

Mr MANDER: Cost should never be a reason a Queensland child misses out on sport. This is why the new Play On! Sports Voucher program is backed by a $312.5 million investment from 2025 to 2029, making sport more affordable for families and enabling more children, especially those with disability and those in regional and remote areas, to take part. In the member for Moggill's electorate over 2½ thousand vouchers were redeemed across 21 activity providers. I thank the member for Moggill for his advocacy for the Play On! program which has clearly resulted in a strong uptake of our vouchers, getting kids in the Moggill electorate into organised sport.

I am pleased to inform the committee that because the demand from families and clubs for the new vouchers has been so strong, we are locking in funding for the Play On! program. This is a meaningful cost-of-living relief that Queenslanders can rely on going forward. As part of this incredibly successful program, I want to announce today that we are reaching our youngest Queenslanders, too, with the new Play On! learn to swim program. This program helps cover the cost of swimming lessons for eligible children aged zero to four with vouchers valued at up to $150, giving kids water confidence and water safety from the very start. This is early, preventative investment that eases cost-of-living pressure while building a participation base that we will carry all the way through to 2032 and beyond.

I am pleased to also share with you some of the details of regions that have benefited from the Play On! vouchers and the number of vouchers redeemed per electorate. I would use the current members' electorates as examples. Moggill, as I said, had 2,541; McConnel had 3,104 vouchers; Cooper had 11,649 vouchers—

Ms BUSH: Not enough.

Mr MANDER: It would be a great social media post. Mulgrave had 2,388 vouchers; Lockyer, 2,053; Cook, 1,917, well done; Ipswich West, 1,635; Gladstone had 3,800; and let's not forget Kurwongbah, 3,236 vouchers. That is a fantastic result.

Dr ROWAN: Well done, Minister.

Mr McDONALD: My question is to the minister also. What is the budget doing to get more Queensland girls and kids with a disability active through the Play On! voucher program?

Mr MANDER: These statistics are really encouraging. Under Labor, families and clubs were left with uncertainty about getting their kids active with no plan to continue sport vouchers beyond 2024 and no vision for resolving the cost-of-living crisis they created. The Crisafulli government's Play On! program is now fixing that.

Female participation is at a record high with 129,050 Queensland girls using vouchers to get involved in sport. That is a 30 per cent increase on the previous program. Participation for kids with a disability is also at a record high with 13,917 redemptions across the state. That is a 33 per cent increase. Indeed, we made a commitment that every Queensland child with a disability who applied for a voucher would receive a voucher. That is thousands of kids getting active who might otherwise have missed out. This is exactly the type of early preventive investment that builds healthier communities and a stronger participation base in the lead-up to 2032. Our government has delivered record vouchers and record participation to get more Queensland kids more active more often.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go back to non-government members.

Ms BUSH: I have a question to the DG and I come back to Sports House. This time last year at estimates the minister mentioned that there was a review occurring of Sports House. Since then I have been aware that your department has been engaging with a number of organisations there about the future of Sports House. My question is: what certainty has been provided to the 25 organisations at Sports House that they can continue to remain at that precinct?

Mr Hopper: Are you able to furnish me with the remarks made by the minister so I can check those?

Ms BUSH: They are publicly available on the *Hansard* record from last estimates.

Mr Hopper: Do you have them with you?

Ms BUSH: I do not have them with me, but he mentioned a review of Sports House was being undertaken. Since then your department has been liaising with organisations directly on a review. If you need authentication, I can probably get it by the end of the session for you.

Mr Hopper: I will have a go. As I have mentioned, it is a department owned and managed facility. It is on a 4,147 square metre freehold site on Caxton Street, Milton adjacent to the Suncorp Stadium entertainment precinct. Currently it accommodates 19 sport and active recreation state and national peak bodies and associations. Tenants are currently on a one-year lease extension, which is due to expire on 31 December 2026. The renewal of those tenancy agreements of course will continue to be considered.

In terms of the approach that you may be referring to, certainly we are looking across our portfolio of venues. The department operates six regionally significant sports venues. There is the Sunshine Coast Recreation Precinct, Gold Coast Recreation Precinct, Sports House Brisbane, which we are talking about, Townsville Sports Precinct, Toowoomba Sports Ground and the Gold Coast Performance Centre. These venues create inclusive, people-centred experiences with the aim to empower everyone to be active and elevate the Queensland sport and active recreation sector.

These venues achieve very high utilisation with 99 per cent tenancy occupancy, 324,450 hours of instructor-led activity, over 60,690 participants accommodated, and more than one million combined community and athlete visits across the portfolio. I would like to take a moment to congratulate all the staff who are involved in delivering programs at those facilities and ensuring those facilities are available to the public. They do a wonderful job and to accommodate that level of usage is exceptional. Of course, as you would expect, I continue to challenge them and encourage them to utilise those assets to the best of their ability.

Ms BUSH: I have a follow-up question. In relation to the lease agreements ending on 31 December 2026, at what point would those organisations expect to have any notification about their further extension at that site?

Mr Hopper: I would have to check but I would imagine that the folks managing that facility would be engaging with those tenants on a regular basis.

Ms BUSH: I am not sure if this will go to the DG or to Mr Harris. I am curious whether discussions have been occurring regarding the sale of any part of the Suncorp precinct or the use of public-private partnerships for any part of that precinct?

Mr Hopper: I would refer that to Mr Harris, the CEO of Stadiums Queensland, to answer if the Speaker is happy.

Mr Harris: If I recall correctly the question was: have there been any discussions about the sale of any parcel or land parcels?

Ms BUSH: Yes, any discussions regarding the sale of any part of the Suncorp precinct or the use of public-private partnerships for any part of the precinct?

Mr Harris: The answer is no.

Mr BUTCHER: My question is to the director-general. With reference to prehearing question on notice 4 and funding spent on programs including the disaster recovery program, the Emerging Athlete Pathways, Games On!, Play On!, SwimStart and Youth Development Partnership Fund, is the department now aware of how much was spent on these programs in 2025-26?

Mr Hopper: Yes, we are aware of what was spent on those in 2025-26.

Mr BUTCHER: You are aware of the figures, but they were not provided in the answer to the question on notice. Can you please advise this committee of the total sum spent on the programs listed in prehearing question on notice 4?

Mr Hopper: Member, can you just relay those programs again that you were interested in so I can make sure I get the sums correct?

Mr BUTCHER: The disaster recovery program, the Emerging Athlete Pathways, Games On!, Play On!, SwimStart and the Youth Development Partnership Fund.

Mr Hopper: Thank you, member. If you just give me a moment, we will get you a tally. It may be easier, if the minister was minded, to take that on notice so that we get our sums right.

Mr SPEAKER: We will come back to that before the end of the session.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, continuing on with that, based on the answer to the prehearing question on notice, do these programs not have a budget allocation for 2026-27?

Mr Hopper: As I alluded to earlier, with the release of the strategy today by the minister I am sure there will be subsequent announcements made in relation to programs and the level of funding for those programs, but that is ultimately a matter for executive government to determine when that will occur.

Mr de BRENNI: Director-General, I refer to the six-year badges that your department staff and the minister are wearing today. Can you advise the hearing whether they were funded by the department of sport?

Mr Hopper: I would have to clarify, but as I understand it these badges have been provided by Brisbane 2032.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, Damien Walker advised earlier this week that DPC is regularly updated on election commitment progress. Can you advise if the department is aware of any funding shortfalls or cost escalations identified by recipients of community sports infrastructure election commitments?

Mr Hopper: Obviously, the next generation of Queensland athletes needs the opportunity to train and compete in high-quality venues to grow their skills. The $250 million Games On! program is a commitment to enhancing regional sporting and community facilities to give our next generation of athletes the best chance of success. Leading into 2032, the Games On! program will deliver new or upgraded fields and courts, change rooms or lighting and clubhouse enhancements to hundreds of Queensland facilities across every corner of the state. There are 119 Games On! projects as part of the 2024 government election commitments that are being delivered by the Department of Sport, Racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games. As at 30 June 2026, thanks to the very hard work of the folks in my department and with the support of executive government, Queenslanders are already seeing the benefits, with 24 of these projects delivered. The department continues to actively engage with state-level organisations, peak industry bodies and local councils to understand current and future needs and factor this feedback into legacy considerations in the lead-up to the games. As we are before you here today, all projects that have an allocated sum of money towards them are working to deliver within that allocated sum of money.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, with regard to the funding we just talked about, you said that they are going to fall within the package of the funding that is available—$250 million. Of those election commitments, can you tell us the timeframes and if they are on track, because some of these projects have stalled or stopped? Can you tell us if they are on track to be delivered?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: there is an imputation or an inference contained within the question and I submit to you, Mr Speaker, that the question may need to be rephrased.

Mr SPEAKER: I listened very closely to the question. I thought the member was very careful in asking it. Director-General?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker—

Mr MANDER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I think the member might be referring to authenticating the comments that things are stalled.

Dr ROWAN: Yes, and that is—

Mr SPEAKER: Okay, so authentication.

Dr ROWAN: I would still submit, Mr Speaker, that I think that is an imputation or inference to say it is stalled. However, if authentication could be provided as well, then that is fine too.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I might get you to re-ask that question.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, out of the $250 million for this program, are the projects on track and will they be delivered with the $250 million for the program?

Mr SPEAKER: That is very good. Director-General?

Mr Hopper: All projects are progressing and they are all being delivered against the funding available to them by individual project, yes.

Ms BUSH: I was hoping to put this to the CEO of the Academy of Sport, if that is okay. Good afternoon, Mr Ayres. Mr Ayres, the Queensland Academy of Sport's FTE allocation appears to have been reduced from 123 FTEs to 118 FTEs. I was curious if you could advise which areas those positions have been removed from within the organisation.

Mr Ayres: Since that number was published we have had a change-up through recruitment processes that we have been looking to fill and we have also recently converted a number of our contractor staff to full-time employment, so we are now back above that number.

Ms BUSH: Mr Ayres, the budget papers also show that there is limited growth in funding in the lead-up to the 2032 games. Does your organisation hold any concerns about the level of ongoing funding in the lead-up to 2032?

Mr Ayres: We have committed funding through to June 2029 and will be making a further submission to government in the lead-up to that period. The funding we have been allocated through this cycle has helped us maintain consistency with our partnerships with Sport to deliver on what we need to for the Los Angeles cycle.

Ms BUSH: Mr Ayres, do the facilities at QSAC or Chandler require an upgrade or expansion ahead of the 2032 games?

Mr Ayres: We occupy parts of those facilities, so I can only speak about the parts that we are currently occupying as a leaseholder of Stadiums Queensland, so I would leave the additional parts to Mr Harris from Stadiums Queensland to offer. We have very good facilities at the Queensland Academy of Sport that are very fit for purpose for what our elite athletes need in the lead-up to the games.

Mr KING: Director-General, how much did the department of sport spend on advertising in 2025-26?

Mr Hopper: I will just refer to my notes to get you that answer.

Mr KING: No problem.

Mr Hopper: The Department of Sport, Racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games's vision is for Queensland to be the home of Australian sport. Our purpose is to capitalise on the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, creating a lasting legacy for Queensland and ensuring more Queenslanders can participate in sport and enjoy healthier and more connected communities. To deliver on this vision, the department is focused on three strategic objectives: Queensland as a sporting state, developing inclusive and sustainable places and spaces, and coordination of the games. The department promotes select programs with targeted, cost-effective digital advertising to ensure eligible Queenslanders and organisations are aware of initiatives that aim to inspire all Queenslanders to lead active lives in healthy communities.

All advertising activities are evaluated to ensure improved awareness and responsible use of public funding. As the members would have heard previously, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet provides a centralised coordination role in terms of whole-of-government advertising, including overseeing a cap on advertising spend, and oversight for media placement through the whole-of-government media buying agency, EssenceMediacom, is DPC's responsibility. Total media placement spend is subject to an independent end-of-financial-year audit, as per the standing offer arrangement with EssenceMediacom managed by DPC. DPC publicly releases media placement spend annually. Certainly from our perspective, any questions regarding media placement spend should be directed in the first instance to DPC.

Mr KING: To clarify, you cannot tell me how much the department of sport spent on advertising in 2025-26? That is for DPC, is that correct?

Mr Hopper: As I understand it, and from our working operations, yes, DPC has that responsibility. I understand that was stated during their session.

Mr KING: I do not know what the sum was, but can you advise what campaigns that unknown sum covered? I do not know.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order—

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order, member for Moggill?

Dr ROWAN: I do. My point of order relates to the responses provided by the director-general. He has clearly indicated questions in relation to the overall quantum of money that was expended by government could have been put to the DPC in the Premier's session. He has clearly outlined there is an opportunity to put that question in relation to the total quantum of money and how that is broken down by departments under the responsibility of the Premier.

Mr SPEAKER: Unless I misheard the question it was around what programs that money was spent on. Could you please repeat the question, member for Kurwongbah?

Mr KING: You were correct, Mr Speaker. That was my question: what campaigns that sum—I could not get the sum—covered. It would surely be the department of sport that decides what advertising campaigns they run. Sorry, member for Moggill.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: there was a part of the question where that unknown sum was indicated by the member for Kurwongbah. If they wanted to know the total quantum of money spent in relation to government advertising across departments that could have been put to the Premier in the session earlier this week. That is what I was responding to.

Mr KING: Point of order, Speaker: we had already clarified that I will not get that sum; that has already been done. I believe the member for Moggill is being frivolous. I only what to know what the campaigns are now.

Mr SPEAKER: I am not going to argue this point backwards and forwards.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, again, Mr Speaker: I find the comments by the member for Kurwongbah personally offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr KING: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kurwongbah. I will allow the question and call the director-general.

Mr Hopper: My apologies, member, there was a bit going on there. Could you please repeat the question?

Mr KING: What advertising campaigns did the department of sport cover with that sum?

Mr Hopper: As I have alluded to already, the department is responsible for the operation of six venues across the state. We run marketing activities and awareness campaigns in relation to those venues. That could be for school holiday programs, it could be for camps. A number of the facilities have active gymnasiums, learn-to-swim programs and provide classes. They are very well operated by a dedicated team of people across the state. As you would appreciate, there is a multitude of activities that could happen in any one week. Certainly, from a volume perspective, that would be the biggest constant level of activity.

As you may expect, the Play On! Sports Vouchers is a brand new program so that is an example of another campaign that was run. The minister did go some way to explain the outcomes but I would like to reinforce that as a result of the awareness that was generated we have seen 394,494 vouchers issued across the first two rounds of this new program. Pleasingly, as at 30 June 2026 we have seen 293,826 vouchers redeemed. Some 53,827 vouchers were issued to Queensland children via the Health Care Card or Pensioner Concession Card allocation. Of the 394,494 vouchers that were allocated, 280,855 were issued to recipients in South-East Queensland, which represents approximately 71 per cent, and 113,639 were issued to recipients in regional Queensland, which represents just under 29 per cent, with redemption rates of 73 per cent and 27 per cent respectively.

There are also over 3,757 activity providers that have registered for Play On!. We obviously need to create awareness for them to engage. Some 2,485 of those indicate that they have a current program to support children with a disability. Again, very pleasingly, 21,285 vouchers have been issued to Queensland children living with a disability, with 13,917 being redeemed, which is a 33 per cent increase compared with the previous program in 2024-25. Girls between the ages of five and 17 redeemed 129,050 Play On! Sports Vouchers, a 30 per cent increase compared with the previous programs.

The work being done there by a very committed team from the department has been exceptional. When we look to survey respondents, just under 80 per cent reported the program had a positive influence on increasing their child's activity levels. Over 95 per cent of survey respondents indicated that participating in the sports voucher activity has encouraged their child to be physically active in the future. This is just an example of the results where we run effective advertising campaigns, but rest assured they vary across the state. They are targeted and are driven by a very capable and dedicated team.

Mr SPEAKER: We will now go to government members for questions.

Mr KEMPTON: My question is to the minister. On the topic of sport, can the minister explain how the *Queensland Spirit: the road to 2032* supports community clubs and those volunteers who run them?

Mr MANDER: The member for Cook knows that community clubs are the foundation of Queensland sport, driven by more than 500,000 volunteers over 8,500 clubs. They are the lifeblood of grassroots sport—the coaches, the officials, the canteen workers, the administrators, the groundkeepers—and, of course, the referees—without whom clubs would simply not exist. I travel across Queensland chatting to community sporting clubs. They all mention that they need just a little more help—help to buy a bit more kit, help to keep volunteers and help to buy equipment—that will make their club more accessible. As part of our new sports strategy we are backing clubs in practical ways.

The new clubhouse grant program will provide small value grants of $3,000 to local clubs for equipment and operations. That funding can also support accredited upskilling such as first aid, coaching and officiating. Alongside that, we will boost the resources available on our highly popular Sport HQ platform. Sport HQ gives volunteers practical online learning resources and templates, from how to run an AGM or how to write a grant application to how to support athletes during and after their careers. This work complements the government's response to the parliamentary inquiry into volunteering by recognising and rewarding volunteers and stripping away red tape, including exploring

amendments to the Associations Incorporation Act 1981 so that clubs can focus on what matters most—putting more Queenslanders on the field. For a decade, Labor buried our hardworking club volunteers under red tape and took them for granted. This fund is stripping that away and backing them with clear assistance and crucial funding.

Mr JAMES: Minister, can you update the committee on how the 2026-27 budget is supporting our emerging athletes across Queensland, particularly in my electorate of Mulgrave?

Mr MANDER: Being from the regions you know how important it is to support athletes—our stars of the future—who are a long way away from Brisbane. Ensuring athletes enter Queensland's representative pathways and receive the support that they need to continue developing is critical as we work towards the 2032 games. Demand for previous athlete assistance programs has exceeded the available funding in each of the past two financial years, demonstrating a strong appetite among young Queenslanders to pursue their sporting ambitions. However, the evidence also showed that the existing model was not delivering equitable outcomes across the state. Only 1.69 per cent of supported athletes came from remote Queensland, despite the significant talent that exists in these communities. We also know that athletes living in regional and remote areas often face substantially higher travel and accommodation costs when participating in representative competitions and development opportunities. This is an issue that I am sure many members of the committee can appreciate and it was consistently raised, obviously in regional areas, during our consultation 'What does 2032 mean for you?'

This is why I am pleased to inform the committee that *Queensland spirit: the road to 2032* includes the new Grassroots to Gold program. Grassroots to Gold responds directly to the feedback we have heard from regional Queenslanders, providing greater support to athletes who face higher costs as a result of living outside South-East Queensland. The program delivers on the government's cost-of-living commitments and supports our goal of strengthening sporting pathways for Queenslanders, from grassroots participation through to elite competition. Importantly, Grassroots to Gold will better reflect the cost differential for athletes who are required to travel longer distances to pursue representative opportunities. It will also deliver increased financial support for young athletes and officials with disability, ensuring more Queenslanders have the opportunity to reach their full sporting potential regardless of where they live or the challenges they may face.

We are working to cement Queensland's place as the home of sport in Australia to ensure there is a lasting legacy beyond 2032 and to see more Queenslanders get active more often. We are proud to support Queensland athletes from the beginning of the journey right through to elite sport. While not every child will become an Olympian or Paralympian, we believe every child deserves to have the chance to discover a love of all sport.

Mr McDONALD: Can the minister outline the *Queensland spirit: the road to 2032* strategy and what it means for everyday Queenslanders?

Mr MANDER: *Queensland spirit: the road to 2032* is our plan to deliver a sporting legacy for all Queenslanders. It is backed by government investment over the next four years and is the first step on the road to 2032 and a sporting legacy that reaches well beyond the games. The strategy is built on four strategic objectives: Queensland is the home of Australian sport; the Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program; the Play On! Sports Vouchers program; and the opportunities beyond 2032. Together they cover everything from a child's first swimming lesson to elite athletes standing on the podium in 2032. Importantly, they were not designed in isolation. Between 8 May and 15 June 2025 the department ran a genuine consultation, the 'What does 2032 mean for you?' discussion paper, with over 420 people attending in person. I personally attended in Brisbane, Roma, Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast, Townsville, Toowoomba and Mackay. Over 2,000 surveys were completed and there were more than 90 written submissions. Queenslanders told us they wanted accessible and inclusive facilities, more affordable and flexible participation, and better support for volunteers. This strategy responds directly to all three.

Dr ROWAN: Director-General, how is the *Queensland spirit: the road to 2032* strategy securing major events and positioning Queensland as the home of Australian sport?

Mr Hopper: I am sure in due course, as part of the announcement of the strategy, executive government will have further announcements to follow, but what I would call out—and regularly led by the Premier if not the minister or in tandem across the executive government—is the locking in of the Magic Round at Suncorp Stadium until 2032. From 2027 it grows into a week-long festival of football, with more matches, more teams and a stronger statewide footprint. Congratulations also to the teams at DETSI, Tourism and Events Queensland, Stadiums Queensland and, in many instances, local

government economic entities. Really importantly, there will be, I am sure, more announcements about a Sport Attraction and Investment Fund in due course, equally looking at the Sponsorship Plus program and what that will be made up of. All of that ultimately is designed to ensure we are leveraging the opportunities of the next decade, including the games, to ensure more Queenslanders can experience world-class sport closer to home while delivering lasting benefits for communities across the state.

Another example of being well on our way to that is the wonderful announcement that Brisbane will be hosting the Bledisloe Cup on Anzac Day in 2027, 2029 and 2031 and, equally, two blockbuster matches between the Socceroos and Brazil—in Brisbane and, excitingly, also in Townsville—in September. The government and the department, working across government and with the statutory bodies, are all very aligned in their pursuit. The strategy as announced today certainly gives our department its marching orders. We look forward to playing a role in making sure Queensland is absolutely the home of Australian sport.

Mr JAMES: Which major regional infrastructure projects does this budget fund outside the south-east corner?

Mr MANDER: It is really exciting to see how we are investing in infrastructure projects right across the state, recognising, as this government does, the decentralised nature of our state. For 10 years Labor treated everything north and west of the Brisbane River as an afterthought. There has been a decade of neglect of our regions and this budget ends that. This budget is unapologetically statewide. Through Games On! and related programs we are funding two flagship regional precincts: $20 million in 2026-27 towards stage 1 of the Rockhampton Sports Precinct, a new home for netball with 16 outdoor courts, clubhouse and change room facilities; and $11.3 million towards stage 2 of the Great Barrier Reef Arena at Mackay, delivering new indoor courts and training areas for netball, basketball and all abilities events. We are also investing in regional venue maintenance, with the department's $21 million capital purchase program enhancing state owned facilities at the Gold Coast, the Sunshine Coast and Townsville. From Townsville to Bundaberg and Ingham to Longreach, this budget proves that the benefits of 2032 belong to all of Queensland.

Mr KEMPTON: Director-General, can you please tell the committee how the budget supports communities like mine to recover from natural disasters, and could you please provide some examples in my electorate of Cook?

Mr Hopper: As seen in the SDS on pages 8 to 9, there is the Sport and Recreation Recovery Grants, $41 million; and the Community and Recreational Assets Recovery and Resilience Program, $9.5 million. In Budget Paper 3, Budget Capital Statement, pages 96 and 97, there is the Sport and Recreation Recovery Grants, $40.998 million; and in Budget Paper 3, the Community and Recreational Assets Recovery and Resilience Program, $9.5 million. Queensland communities continue to be tested by repeated disaster events. Sport, as we all know, is often at the heart of those communities and is the glue that brings them all back together. This budget, with the $41 million, will help not-for-profit sport and racing organisations clean up, repair or replace equipment and facilities damaged by eligible disasters, in partnership with the Australian government. In addition, there is $9.5 million to support the clean-up and repair of community and recreational assets damaged by the extraordinary 2021-22 disaster events, again in partnership with the Commonwealth. Getting clubs back on their feet means getting communities back on their feet, and certainly our department continues to support the government in that regard.

In terms of some examples in the Cook electorate, for the Scenic Rim Walking Trail network, following significant damage caused by Tropical Cyclone Jasper and the associated rainfall and flooding events between 13 and 28 December 2023, the Cook Shire Council received $1.1 million through the Sport and Recreation Recovery Grants to restore key sections of the Cooktown Scenic Rim Walking Trail network. The project focuses on the rehabilitation of approximately four kilometres of walking trails that were impacted by erosion, flooding and damage to supporting infrastructure. Currently it is 75 per cent complete. The project remains on track for completion in September 2026.

Cooktown Bowls Club, following extensive damage from Tropical Cyclone Jasper and associated rainfall and flooding events, received $191,096 through the Sport and Recreation Recovery Grants to restore its playing surface and supporting infrastructure. There was significant stormwater run-off during the event resulting in erosion and scouring of the bowling green and surrounding areas. That affected, of course, both the safety and functionality of the facility, preventing normal club operations. We know that the lawn bowls club plays an important role in Cooktown as a recreational sporting and social hub. That was completed in March 2026. That has seen the successful restoration of the facility, enabling lawn bowls activities and community events to resume.

I have examples from the Lockyer Valley, with the Laidley netball court recovery project, and Mulgrave, with the Ivan Evans trail and the Southside Comets Football Club. They are all very important facets of the community. I am very proud of the work our team does in support of the government and its response to those natural disasters.

Mr McDONALD: Minister, many outstanding female Queensland athletes such as Arisa Trew, Ash Barty and Alexa Leary have inspired other Queensland athletes. Can you outline what the government is doing to ensure girls in communities like mine are engaged in organised sport as they move through their teenage years?

Mr MANDER: I thank the member for a really important question. Queensland is fortunate to have incredible female sporting role models such as Arisa Trew, Ash Barty and Alexa Leary who show young girls what is possible through sport, dedication and perseverance. However, while these athletes inspire participation, we know from the data that too many girls leave organised sport during their teenage years. AusPlay data shows a significant decline in participation among young women in the 15 to 17 and 18 to 24 age groups. These are the years when competing priorities, changing social pressures, school and work commitments, body image concerns, cost-of-living pressures and a lack of flexible participation options can all contribute to girls stepping away from sport.

Unfortunately, these trends have continued downward without implementing a sustained evidence-based response. That is exactly the type of challenge our new targeted pilot programs, in partnership with state sporting organisations, are designed to address. Rather than assuming government knows best, we are partnering with organisations that work directly with young women every week—our state sporting organisations and our local clubs—to identify and test practical solutions that will keep girls involved in sport for longer. Under the pilot, selected state sporting organisations will receive funding over a two-year period to develop, implement and evaluate innovation and retention initiatives specifically targeted at teenage girls and young women. This pilot could operate across a range of sports and regions, including metropolitan, regional and rural Queensland, allowing us to compare different approaches and identify what works best in different communities.

Examples of initiatives SSOs could trial include flexible and social competition formats that fit around school, study and work commitments; come-back-to-sport programs for girls who have dropped out and want to reconnect with their sport; female mentoring programs matching teenage participants with elite athletes, coaches and community role models; leadership and officiating pathways that keep girls involved, even if they are no longer competing regularly; and girls-only participation opportunities that build confidence and social connections, while integrating resilience and body-confidence education into sporting programs and coaching education to ensure clubs provide inclusive, welcoming and supportive environments for young women. Importantly, participating SSOs could be required to collect data and evaluate outcomes against agreed measures including participation retention rates, re-engagement rates, member satisfaction, volunteer involvement and progression into coaching and officiating roles.

This approach allows us to build a strong evidence base before expanding the successful initiative statewide. Rather than a one-size-fits-all solution, we want to identify the programs that genuinely improve retention and can be rolled out across Queensland. This work complements the success we have already seen through the government's PlayOn! sports voucher program, which has contributed to a 30 per cent increase in female participation amongst Queenslanders aged five to 17.

Getting girls into sport is important but keeping them involved through their teenage years and into adulthood is the next challenge because staying in sport is about more than just physical activity; it builds confidence, resilience, friendship, leadership skills and positive mental health outcomes. It also strengthens the pipeline of future Queensland athletes, coaches, officials and volunteers as we build towards 2032 and beyond. That is why the government is committed to not only getting more girls into sport but also ensuring they have every opportunity to stay involved, thrive and achieve their potential.

I give a shout-out to two of my daughters. I will describe them both as being in their 30s. One ran her first half marathon last weekend and the other is actively involved in hockey at St Andrews Hockey Club. It is great to see that, in their 30s, they are still realising the benefits of being active and playing sport.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go to non-government members for the next question.

Mr KING: Speaker, I thought we had a lot more time but the clock up there has stopped.

Mr SPEAKER: Ignore that clock.

Mr KING: Director-General, I do thank you for the fulsome answer you gave on which campaigns were funded. I understand the total funding envelope is with DPC, but are you able to break down the costings of some of the advertising campaigns that you ran or is that also externally controlled? You mentioned Games On!, Play On! and SwimStart.

Mr Hopper: Certainly I can look at campaigns I alluded to around our own facilities, but the centralised work of the significant campaigns is led by DPC. Some of our smaller work I can certainly look into, if the minister is inclined.

Mr KING: Will the minister agree to that?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, are you happy for that to be taken on notice? There was a question for the director-general about some information.

Mr MANDER: Yes, I am.

Mr KING: On the rebrand from 'department of sport and recreation' to 'department of sport', what costs were incurred for the rebrand?

Mr Hopper: That was certainly a machinery-of-government change. Again, if the minister was supportive, that was not last financial year but the one before, so I would need to see if we have that data. In the main, it was predominantly digital. I would note that the change that you are referring to was certainly in an effort to better reflect that the division is sport and racing, which aligns with the name of the department as well. That is a point I would like to make. If the minister is happy, I will see if we can find that. Mostly it is digital. We will have a look at what we can find, but I am not guaranteeing that we will get much.

Ms BUSH: I want to ask a couple of questions of Mr Harris from Stadiums Queensland. Mr Harris, what advice did you provide about the re-useable cup trial at the Gabba and the Queensland Country Bank Stadium?

Mr Harris: The member's question was about what advice I provided in terms of the re-useable cups. We have done quite an extensive trial. In terms of advice I provided to the trial, the purpose of the trial was to understand the benefits of re-useable cups and whether there were alternatives that could be applied within our portfolio of venues.

Ms BUSH: Is it then the fact that you would provide advice to the government upon the results of the trial? What advice was that?

Mr Harris: Really the intent of our trial was to understand what offerings we could apply or what the market could apply within our portfolio of venues. The purpose or intent of the trial was not to inform the government. There was a lifecycle assessment that was being conducted through the federal government that helped inform our process, but certainly those things were two very distinct things.

Ms BUSH: Mr Harris, cups at the flagship Stade de France venue during the Paris 2024 games were 100 per cent re-usable. Is Stadiums Queensland doing any preparatory work to transition its venues to re-usable cups in the lead-up to 2032?

Mr Harris: Certainly we had a number of different types for trial. We undertook a trial at the Gabba as far back as 2023. We trialled an offering called Wise, we trialled a separate offering called WOSUP and we also looked at the use of aluminium cans, so almost going back in time to the old cans. We then overlaid that information with the outcomes from the federal life-cycle assessment. There were certainly lots of learnings from the various offerings, but it is probably fair to say there is a lot more to be done to determine what could be in place in our portfolio on a pre- and a post-2032 utilisation. When we do come to 2032, though, the offering that will be put in place to our stadiums will be what is termed 'clean stadia'. We will hand the venues over to the organising committee and then they will make determinations around what products, what catering services and equally what type of implements will be in place for the games period.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, how many temporary or contract staff ended their employment with your department on 30 June 2026?

Mr Hopper: I am just checking my notes.

Mr MANDER: We will take that on notice, if you do not mind, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: We are getting a bit of a list on those.

Mr BUTCHER: In following up, can you also, Director-General, find out the value of the termination payments made in the 2025-26 financial year?

Mr MANDER: On notice.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, can you also tell me how many staff that was paid to at that time?

Mr MANDER: On notice.

Mr BUTCHER: Director-General, the agreement with the IOC commits Australia to ensuring an additional 500,000 people with disability are engaged in sport by 2032. How is your department working across government to deliver this, and will there be a dedicated strategy for this?

Mr Hopper: Speaker, that is a games related question. Do you want me to try to tackle it?

Mr SPEAKER: No, not if it is in the next section if it is the games.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Speaker: whilst the IOC sets that target, it is the responsibility of the department of sport to engage people with a disability in sport and physical activity, and so it is fairly within the remit of this hearing.

Mr SPEAKER: Could you repeat the question for me, please?

Mr BUTCHER: The agreement with the IOC commits Australia to ensuring an additional 500,000 people with disability are engaged in sport by 2032. How is your department working across government to deliver this, and will there be a dedicated strategy for this?

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the question.

Mr Hopper: I am obviously not going to address the IOC component to that, but, in terms of what the department is doing by way of support to people with a disability, it is very clear the Queensland government is committed to ensuring accessible and inclusive sport opportunities. During 2025-26, the Department of Sport, Racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games delivered a range of funding programs and initiatives to enhance participation and break down barriers for people with a disability.

The Play On! Sports Vouchers program that I talked to earlier saw 21,285 vouchers being issued to Queensland children living with a disability, with 2,486 organisations promoting opportunities for them to participate. Children and young people with a disability redeemed 13,917 Play On! Sports Vouchers, which is a 33 per cent increase compared with the previous voucher program. Again, I offer an acknowledgement to the hard work of the people who not only engaged with those activity providers to ensure they participated but also spread the message far and wide about the benefits of children with a disability participating in sport.

The Empower Legacy Research Project is also underway, with the Jamieson Trauma Institute analysing opportunities to increase physical activity participation for people with a disability. During the past year, the Para Sport Reference Panel was established by the minister, bringing together Paralympians, advocates and experts to shape policy, strengthen accessibility and ensure the 2032 Paralympic Games leave a lasting legacy for every Queenslander.

Deaf Sports Australia, Life Stream Services, Riding for the Disabled Queensland, Special Olympics Australia and Sporting Wheelies are then supported financially through our active industry base fund, making sport more accessible for all. In addition, the department, through the Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program, supports the development of quality, accessible and fit-for-purpose sporting infrastructure and enhances participation opportunities for people of all abilities across Queensland. I would expect, or suspect, that in due course, as a result of the release of the strategy, there will be more to be said on that by executive government, when they are ready to do so.

Mr SPEAKER: I was also one that was a bit thrown by the clock. Government members are a long way behind. I had better give some questions over here.

Mr McDONALD: Can the minister please inform the committee what the government is doing to lift the culture of community sport and improve sideline behaviour?

Mr MANDER: Every Queenslander deserves a safe, welcoming and respectful sporting environment. That came through very strongly with our consultation process. Our new Queensland Spirit in Sport culture campaign will promote and celebrate a positive culture in sport, starting with a focus on improving sideline behaviour. Delivered in partnership with the industry, the campaign provides practical tools and resources to support respectful and inclusive behaviour at every level of sport, with a particular focus on protecting children—directly responding to what participants and clubs told us they need. A positive culture is what keeps people in sport—players, volunteers, officials and families. This is all about making sure community sport remains somewhere everybody wants to be.

The member may not be aware, but in a former life I was an NRL referee, and I recall my junior refereeing days. Some of those were some of the most harrowing experiences I had in my referee's career compared to professional football, where people are even more passionate. One of the things I notice when I visit sporting grounds and clubs is that many of our officials are only 14 or 15 years of age, and they deserve protection and they deserve to be looked after. Again, one of my experiences in refereeing was that it was not necessarily difficult to recruit referees but it was very difficult to keep them. We have an important role to play, and the sporting codes and sporting organisations recognise this.

To maximise the reach, effectiveness and impact of the Queensland Spirit in Sport campaign, we will seek to deliver the initiative through an appropriate commercial partner with a capability to amplify campaign messaging, engage diverse audiences and drive meaningful participation and behavioural outcomes across Queensland communities.

Mr KEMPTON: Director-General, could you please update the committee on the upgrades being delivered at the state's own sports venues as part of the 2026-27 capital program?

Mr SPEAKER: I go to the director-general. Just bear in mind you have some questions to come back to before we finish at 2.45 pm.

Mr Hopper: I will be quick because we do have the answers ready for the questions taken on notice, and I assume we only have five minutes to go. The 2025-26 budget announced $64.2 million to upgrade the state owned and operated sports venues, which will play an increasingly important role as event and training facilities both before and after 2032 in preparing our home-grown athletes. These upgrades are already being delivered on the ground.

On 30 April 2026 we officially opened $12.5 million in capital works at the Gold Coast Recreation Precinct on Tallebudgera Creek with three new, fully inclusive and accessible accommodation blocks, with 96 additional beds, a new outdoor gym and an expanded car park. On 12 June 2026 we opened the $9.9 million activity at the Sunshine Coast Recreation Precinct at Currimundi, including a new and accessible gymnasium and a recovery space with ice baths and saunas.

Further projects are currently underway at the Gold Coast Performance Centre at Runaway Bay, Townsville, Toowoomba and elsewhere across the portfolio where inclusive, people-centred venues are serving everyone from beginners to athletes on the performance pathway. Again, well done to the teams delivering those projects.

Mr JAMES: My question is to the director-general. Could you please advise which programs or activities the department is undertaking in 2026-27 to support Queenslanders with a disability who want to play sport?

Mr SPEAKER: You only have a couple of minutes and then we will do the questions on notice, Director-General.

Mr Hopper: As alluded to, the Play On! Sports Voucher program has been exceptional. We have seen people with a disability redeeming 13,917 Play On! Sports Vouchers—a 33 per cent increase compared with historical data. The $1 million towards the Empower legacy research project is also underway by the Jamieson Trauma Institute, and we have also seen the minister stand up the Sport Portfolio Para Reference Panel, which has been outstanding.

We support Deaf Sports Australia, Life Stream Services, the Riding for Disabled Association of Queensland, Special Olympics Australia and Sporting Wheelies through some base funding activities. Again, we continue to ensure the Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program is supporting the development of quality, accessible and fit-for-purpose sporting infrastructure, enhancing the opportunities for people of all abilities to participate in sport in Queensland.

Mr SPEAKER: Let's go through some of the questions you took on notice.

Mr Hopper: Thank you, Speaker. In no particular order, the department spent $345,053 on its own activities last financial year. In terms of the question from the member for the previous year's spend on sport strategy versus this year's spend, $15.4 million was spent last financial year and $31.09 million is forecast for this coming financial year. In terms of the 2025-26 expenditure across disaster recovery, emerging athlete pathways, Games On!, Play On!, SwimStart and the Youth Development Partnership Fund, that totalled $127,185,000.

In terms of the question around medical retirements and voluntary redundancies, the department had zero voluntary or medical retirements between 1 July 2025 and 30 June 2026. The department separated from two employees through the voluntary redundancy process between 1 July 2025 and 30

June 2026. As a result, the redundancies were $578,341.21. In 2024-25 there were two employees with packages totalling $412,500.55. In terms of temporary staff leaving, we had 408 staff on the payroll as at 30 June. We had one temporary employee who ceased on 30 June.

In terms of costs for the name changes, MoG costs are considered cost neutral as it is about moving existing staff and facilities across payroll systems. There is no explicit spend. It is only digital for the name change. I think that covers it.

Mr SPEAKER: The sport strategy was one, I think.

Mr KING: I asked for the advertising costs for those particular campaigns. Was that the one you gave, the advertising costs?

Mr Hopper: That $345,000 figure was the cumulative advertising cost of our activities.

Mr de BRENNI: Speaker, I think the director-general was going to confirm—he was unsure about which agency funded the badges.

Mr SPEAKER: Did you take that on notice?

Mr Hopper: I gave an answer and I said that if it was not right I would come back. I do not have any advice to suggest that it is different. As we have the games session to come, I will ensure I clarify that answer in that session, if the minister is inclined to accept that approach.

Mr SPEAKER: We have reached the end of this session. Thank you, Minister, officials and departmental officers. The committee will now adjourn for a short break until 3 pm, when the committee will examine the estimates for the portfolio area of racing.

Proceedings suspended from 2.45 pm to 3.00 pm.

Mr SPEAKER: Welcome back, Minister and officials. The committee will now examine the estimates for the racing portfolio. Minister, if you wish, you may make an opening statement regarding the racing portfolio for up to five minutes.

Mr MANDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I know that the racing portfolio is of significant interest to members and to the Queensland communities they represent. I welcome the opportunity to discuss the work being undertaken in racing and how the government is delivering outcomes for Queenslanders.

The racing impact on the state is now more than $2.5 billion per year, of which more than half directly benefits regional economies. The industry is responsible for around 14,000 full-time jobs across the state. Beyond the economic benefits, racing is part of who we are, bringing our communities together to celebrate and connect in our cities and in our regional centres. We have just seen another Queensland Racing Carnival wrap up, Queensland Constellations Carnival, Inter Dominion Championship, Queensland Winter Greyhound Racing Carnival, and now the Northern Queensland Winter Racing Carnival is in full swing.

Across the three codes, the racing entertainment has been outstanding. That said, it is imperative that the industry not only remains sustainable but also continues to grow for the state. When we formed government we made a clear commitment to the people of Queensland to undertake a thorough review of the racing industry, focusing not just on one code but on all three codes of thoroughbred, harness and greyhound, and for this review to be statewide.

The department, Racing Queensland and the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission provided invaluable support last year for the Queensland Racing Review, which was delivered to the government on 30 September. The government's response to the review findings, *The next lap: a plan for the future of Queensland racing*, was released on 6 December 2025. After a decade with no plan, the industry finally has a clear path for the future of the industry to grow and benefit all Queenslanders while also improving integrity in racing and, above all, animal welfare.

A key part of this is ensuring the best infrastructure is in place. The 2026-27 budget delivers a significant investment in this through the new $200 million Racing Future Fund. It is designed to help deliver modern, fit-for-purpose racing infrastructure across the state while also providing a platform for industry-wide investment opportunities.

The next lap also outlined the need to deliver a streamlined racing governance model. This involved broadening expertise on the Racing Queensland Board to have greater industry representation as well as members who represent rural and regional Queensland. Amendments to the act which commenced on proclamation on 13 March 2026 saw nine appointments to the board including the appointment of Mr Matt McGrath as chairperson. A rural advocate director has been appointed to the board, and harness and greyhound representatives have also been appointed.

During 2025-26, funding of $25 million from the Racing Infrastructure Fund was allocated towards the first phase of The Terraces to replace the aging John Power Stand at Eagle Farm. It is part of an overall investment of $100 million for the project to ensure our premier venue remains competitive with the premier venues in Sydney and in Melbourne.

All of these actions highlight our ongoing commitment to the racing industry and the hardworking Queenslanders the industry supports. Across the state there are 120 racing clubs—all of which do a wonderful job in serving their communities. More than 1,600 race meetings are held in Queensland every year, bringing together more than 770,000 people in attendance. There are also 14,750 horses and greyhounds in training in Queensland, and their welfare has been at the heart of all our reforms. We will continue to keep this as our focus as we work with stakeholders to build an even bigger, stronger and safer racing industry.

The work being delivered across the portfolio demonstrates our commitment to ensuring the brightest future for the industry—for participants, employees and volunteers—and for communities throughout Queensland who simply love racing. In particular, I would like to thank the leadership and staff of my department, Racing Queensland and the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission for their hard work and dedication to this important industry. Racing is part of the fabric of Queensland communities and we look forward to continuing to support the industry. I once again welcome the opportunity to assist the committee with its questions.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Minister. For the first question we will go to the member for McConnel.

Ms GRACE: World-renowned QRIC Assistant Commissioner Kim Kelly has sent shock waves through the Queensland racing industry by officially resigning and raising serious concerns with the proposed hybrid integrity model, particularly around independence and governance. Minister, can you advise what actions you are taking on the concerns raised by Mr Kelly?

Mr MANDER: As I have just mentioned in my introduction, our government was committed to doing a review of the racing industry. One of the motivations for that when I was in opposition was constant feedback from the industry about the engagement and interaction between QRIC and Racing Queensland—the two controlling bodies of racing. We then did the review. The review came back and said that there were efficiencies we could achieve if we re-examined the model we currently have. The model is also, to put it frankly, costing a lot of money—money that was requiring the government to basically top up every year the operating costs of both organisations.

We then went about a process of looking at a governance model that would bring about those efficiencies and gain better coordination and cooperation between the two functions, if you like. We are still working on that governance model to make sure we get those efficiencies but also we maintain the highest levels of integrity. With my background in officiating, I do not need any encouragement, if you like, with regard to knowing how important integrity is, particularly in the racing industry, which of course involves gambling. We are determined to have a model that reaches the objectives we have with regard to getting the potential efficiencies the review identified and at the same time maintaining a high level of integrity.

I have had a number of personal conversations and individual meetings with Mr Kelly. He has expressed his views. He has had the opportunity to input into the process we are going through at the moment as we go through the implementation plan of the recommendations of *The next lap*. Mr Kelly has now made the decision he has made. I am sorry that he is leaving, but what I have found—particularly over the last couple of weeks and months—is that nobody is irreplaceable in any position anywhere in sport. I am sorry to see Mr Kelly go, but I am more than confident on two things: firstly, we will have somebody capable who will replace him in his role and, secondly, we will have a model that will address any concerns people have about a conflict of interest between the governing body and the body that is responsible for the integrity of racing.

Ms GRACE: Minister, it is a big loss. A lot of concerns have been raised. Can you guarantee that the integrity and independence of QRIC will not be diluted by this hybrid integrity model?

Mr MANDER: What I can guarantee is that whatever governance model we eventually decide on—we are treating this very seriously with regard to the time we are taking to get it right. We are having, as I mentioned, ongoing discussions with people who are experts in this area. I would note that when we brought the new board together one of the representatives on the board has a stewarding background. They have been a steward for decades. The reason for that appointment was to ensure we had people on the board who understand that stewarding can be done without fear or favour and without fear of consequences from the controlling body. The model that we currently have in

Queensland is not the norm across the nation. Most have some sort of hybrid governance structure and they run very effectively. There are a couple of models and variations to models that we are looking at. I believe that the majority of the racing industry is very supportive of the direction we are trying to go in with regard to the governance model. They recognise that what happened in the past is unsustainable and that we have to get better efficiencies moving forward. In short, my answer to the shadow minister's question is yes, I can guarantee that.

Ms GRACE: I invite the QRIC commissioner to the table, please. Commissioner, following the resignation of Kim Kelly, is the commissioner providing advice to the minister or RQ to address the many serious concerns raised by Mr Kelly regarding the proposed hybrid integrity model?

Ms Clark: QRIC has been engaged through the process in providing advice. That advice is informing the development of details for the implementation plan. That implementation plan is yet to be considered by executive government.

Ms GRACE: I invite the Racing Queensland CEO to the table, please. Mr Murray, why has RQ changed its decision to convert the current Bundaberg greyhound grass track to sand in favour of a new straight track contrary to the minister's promise in May 2025 and locals' wishes?

Mr Murray: Racing Queensland is committed to ensuring every greyhound has an opportunity to race on a consistent and safe racing surface, and the decisions made will continue to have this commitment at their core. On 24 September, representatives of QRIC completed a track inspection and advised that there were inconsistencies with the track surface, deeming it unsuitable for racing.

On 13 May 2025 the redevelopment of the greyhound track in Bundaberg was announced, with the project to be funded through the Racing Infrastructure Fund. The Bundaberg track redevelopment project was taken to market in November 2025 with an EOI process initially. Those who responded—there were five—were invited to provide pricing, which opened in January 2026. This window closed 6 March 2026. One response was received, including no local contractors, which has significantly impacted the pricing of the project. The procurement process was extended to those who expressed interest in the EOI process and they were encouraged to consider submitting pricing, but no further responses were received.

As a result, a determination was made by the Racing Queensland board to re-evaluate the project scope, and as part of the re-evaluation pricing estimates were obtained for a straight track and a one-turn track. The Racing Queensland board considered all information not limited to cost, welfare data, infrastructure requirements, the development site, participant feedback and available expert research and expected wagering outcomes. The decision to recommend a straight track was then communicated to the club in May 2026 before Racing Queensland hosted an industry forum in Bundaberg in June 2026 to convey the RQ board's decision and offer the chance for locals and industry to share their perspectives on the racetrack. Prize money enhancements, bonuses and grading concessions were also discussed at that forum.

Ms GRACE: What was the budget for the sand track and what is the budget for the straight track now? I believe the straight track is more expensive.

Mr Murray: The original budget that was announced in May 2025 was $4 million. The estimate has come back at $4.3 million. When we received the one response to the tender process it was significantly more. I am not prepared to share that cost in this forum. Because we will take the project out to tender again, I just do not want to impact pricing proposals.

Ms GRACE: Minister, it is reported that Bundaberg greyhound industry stakeholders are feeling betrayed and ignored by the backflip to deliver the new sand track. Will you direct RQ to deliver the sand greyhound track as promised in May 2025?

Mr McDONALD: Mr Speaker, point of order: I would ask that the member authenticate that. That is a very broad statement.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Kurwongbah is going to table a document. Minister, you have the document.

Mr MANDER: I have just looked at this briefly. This does not have my quotes in it. Let me just clarify the facts here. The temerity of the shadow minister to talk about—

Ms GRACE: The quotes are from the article.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order, member for McConnel?

Ms GRACE: Yes.

Mr MANDER: The quotes are from the article. They are not from me.

Ms GRACE: I said that stakeholders were feeling betrayed.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not think you were identified.

Mr MANDER: There was an imputation that I had broken a promise.

Mr SPEAKER: I am going to have the question asked again.

Ms GRACE: As reported, Bundaberg greyhound industry stakeholders are feeling betrayed and ignored by the backflip to deliver a new sand track. Will you direct RQ to deliver the sand greyhound track as promised in May 2025?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, point of order: in relation to the term 'backflip' in the question as asked—

Mr MANDER: Mr Speaker, I am happy to answer the question. The temerity of the shadow minister to talk about backflips! When I came to this job I basically had a posse of greyhound owners and trainers in Bundaberg fuming about being left behind by the previous Labor government, which promised they would upgrade the track—

Ms GRACE: We were going to deliver it.

Mr MANDER: They were going to do a lot of things.

Ms GRACE: You're not.

Mr MANDER: The former government was going to do a lot of things.

Mr SPEAKER: Stop for a minute. Member for McConnel, I have been firm since day one. We are not going to quarrel across this table. Minister, continue, please.

Mr MANDER: Trainers and owners were subjected to travelling hundreds of kilometres to other racetracks, returning at three or four o'clock and in the morning, putting themselves in peril on roads at that time of the morning—

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker, point of order: the question was whether they are going to deliver the sand racetrack as promised.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, in the interests of time, because I know there are more questions to come, if you could address that question.

Mr MANDER: Because of that pressure, and because of the non-delivery by the previous Labor government, and because we believed they were given false promises, we felt a commitment to give them the track they deserve. The promise was that they would have a new track. That is what the promise was. As the acting CEO has already outlined, we went through a process to work out what was the best value for money.

Through that process and through the quotes that were coming back, we were looking not only at the cost but also at animal welfare. This is an important consideration that we have, particularly in the greyhound industry, to make sure we can minimise the number of injuries to the dogs. Every piece of expert advice came back saying that the safest way to do that is with a straight track. With that in mind—and RQ are still going through the process—that is one of the options we are looking at because of animal welfare. I am not backing away from that. That is an important part of the industry. We want this industry to survive going forward. There is a lot of pressure right across the country and internationally with regard to the future of greyhound racing. I support it fully, but we have to make sure we put measures in place to minimise injuries to greyhounds, and the best way we can do that is with a straight track.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go to government members for some questions, starting with the member for Lockyer.

Mr McDONALD: Minister, can you update the committee on the government's response to the independent Queensland Racing Review and what it means for the future of the industry?

Mr MANDER: I thank the member for Lockyer. I enjoyed going to your local racecourse on a recent visit there. It is great to be reminded about how important racing is to our regions and country areas. There is a rich history in the Lockyer area with racehorses. I was on my way to Toowoomba and I must say that the president of the club did give me a bum steer with a tip.

After 10 years of successive Labor governments with no plan for Queensland racing, no plan for the John Power Stand, no plan for harness and no plan for the regions, the government has delivered one: *The next lap*. *The next lap* is our response to the independent Queensland Racing Review chaired by Matt McGrath, a former chairman of the Australian Turf Club. The review was a genuinely

consultative process in which the steering committee carefully considered 1,223 public submissions and visited 73 race clubs right across the state, from the south-east corner to the gulf. It was an incredible effort.

The review made 110 recommendations. This government has accepted 79 in full, accepted a further 26 in principle, subject to further analysis or partnership with other agencies, and not accepted only five. This is a comprehensive embrace of the reform. The plan is built around operational stability, fit-for-purpose infrastructure, the ongoing viability of country racing and improvements to animal welfare and integrity. Importantly, it has been designed so that any increase in operating cost is matched by corresponding gains in revenue. Infrastructure investment will be strategically sequenced so Racing Queensland can deliver on time and within budget.

Racing contributes nearly $2.5 billion to the Queensland economy each year and supports around 14,500 full-time jobs. Racing Queensland will appoint a dedicated implementation lead and has released a detailed implementation program in early 2026. I place on record my thanks to Matt McGrath and steering committee members Scott Neaves, Kym Daly and Lynette Keep.

Mr KEMPTON: My question is to the Acting CEO of Racing Queensland. Could you please update the committee on Racing Queensland's performance of the recent winter carnival?

Mr Murray: I thank the member for the question. As the minister touched on in his opening address, we have just completed three carnivals: the greyhound winter carnival, the constellations carnival, which included the Inter Dominion, and also the winter carnival for thoroughbreds. Frankly, we have delivered the most successful Queensland winter thoroughbred carnival on record, generating more than $412 million in domestic wagering turnover, which was 12.6 per cent up on 2025 and 4.1 per cent up on the previous record set in 2023.

The Doomben 10,000 meeting had record wagering for both the meeting and the group 1 feature, with the race generating more than $10 million in domestic turnover. We were fortunate to have the leading Hong Kong jockey, Zac Purton, come and race at that meeting with us. He battled with James McDonald, and they went head to head winning each of those early races on the day.

The Queensland Oaks Day, or Queensland Day, was also strong. It was fantastic to see the Premier out and part of that day. The Stradbroke Handicap is the one that I want to finish on here. We delivered $58.3 million worth of domestic wagering turnover, making it the highest turnover meeting of the carnival. Despite the heavy track conditions, turnover increased six per cent. The Stradbroke Handicap generated $13.4 million in turnover, which was up nine per cent on the previous year. It was a true Queensland affair, with Toby Edmonds teaming up with Taylor Marshall to win the Stradbroke Handicap with Spicy Martini.

Mr SPEAKER: We will have one question from the member for Mulgrave and then we will go back to opposition questions.

Mr JAMES: My question is to the Acting CEO of RQ. Can you please explain how racing contributes to the economy of Queensland?

Mr Murray: On an annual basis, Racing Queensland engages IER to conduct the size and scope reports of the Queensland racing industry. IER is renowned within Australian racing, tourism and event industries, providing more than 60 studies across Australasian jurisdictions. Over the last 10 years, the economic contribution has increased 104 per cent: with thoroughbreds up 102 per cent to $1.9 billion; greyhounds up 208 per cent to $348 million; and harness up 57 per cent to $223 million. It is not just economic contribution; it is jobs as well. Over the same 10-year period, jobs have increased 47 per cent: with thoroughbreds up 44 per cent to 10,813 jobs; greyhounds up 114 per cent to 1,947 jobs; and harness up 10 per cent to 1,234 jobs.

We know that racing underpins the social fabric of rural towns and brings together communities in trying and prosperous times. Racing is a real contributor to regional areas both economically and through jobs. Over half of the thoroughbred, harness and greyhound jobs are regional, and over half of the economic contribution is generated in regional locations as well.

Mr SPEAKER: We will have a question from the member for Maiwar.

Mr BERKMAN: We have already heard about the $200 million budgeted for the racing industry, which includes $100 million for infrastructure including the new Bundaberg greyhound track that has already seen cost blowouts. My question is to the director-general. How much of that $100 million of infrastructure is allocated towards the new Bundaberg greyhound racing track?

Mr Hopper: That question would be better answered by the Acting CEO of Racing Queensland, Mr Murray.

Mr BERKMAN: I am sorry. It is a government funding allocation but it is at Racing Queensland's discretion? How much of that money is going to go to them to build the racetrack?

Mr SPEAKER: I think the director-general was trying to get an answer for you through Racing Queensland.

Mr BERKMAN: Sure.

Mr Murray: The original $4 million announcement from the minister was from the previous Racing Infrastructure Fund. There will be a balance remaining in that Racing Infrastructure Fund. The announcement for the $200 million fund is separate, so the Bundaberg infrastructure project will not be funded out of the $200 million infrastructure fund that was recently announced.

Mr BERKMAN: Minister, what we are seeing here is that the government is spending public money—apparently because the industry cannot stand on its own two feet—on another racetrack, despite the fact that the last government funded racetrack has seen 37 dogs die at it since it was opened. Why is this something that taxpayers should fund?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order: there is an imputation in that.

Mr SPEAKER: I think so. Member, either rephrase the question or I will rule it out of order.

Mr BERKMAN: Simply put, why are taxpayers paying to fund infrastructure that has killed dozens of dogs since the opening of The Q in Ipswich?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the member for Maiwar's question is seeking an opinion. Under standing order 115, I would ask you to consider that matter.

Mr SPEAKER: I agree with the point of order, member for Maiwar, and the clock is against us anyway. I rule it out of order.

Ms GRACE: I have a quick one.

Mr SPEAKER: It would want to be quick; we have 30 seconds.

Ms GRACE: Minister, I refer to the $100 million allocated to the John Power Stand. Is that going to deliver in full the replacement of the John Power Stand? I think you mentioned $100 million before.

Mr MANDER: I will be very quick. That is a question that you would need to ask the Brisbane Racing Club. That is the contribution we are making towards the stand. We are still negotiating that particular agreement. That is the level of commitment that the government is going to give. They have to build to that amount of money or provide whatever extra money they want if they want more than that.

Mr SPEAKER: We have now reached the end of the time allocated for the consideration of the proposed expenditure for the racing portfolio. There are no questions on notice. Thank you, Minister, and departmental officers.

The committee will now examine the estimates for the Olympic and Paralympic Games portfolio area. Minister, if you wish, you may make an opening statement regarding the Olympic and Paralympic Games portfolio for a period of up to five minutes.

Mr MANDER: I would like to begin by acknowledging that today officially marks six years to go until the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Queensland, which is an incredibly exciting milestone. If any of the members of the committee want one of these badges, put your hand up and we will ensure we get one to you. I know the Olympic and Paralympic Games portfolio is of significant interest to members and to the Queensland communities they represent. I welcome the opportunity to discuss the work being undertaken across the portfolio and how the government is delivering outcomes for Queenslanders.

There is no question that the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games will provide a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to not only host the world's greatest sporting event but also deliver an outstanding future for Queensland and for Queensland sport. Our government is delivering a games for all of Queensland. Our games legacy is not just about essential new sporting facilities, better transport, jobs or tourism. Our greatest legacy will be to inspire more Queenslanders to be active regardless of age or ability and improve inclusion and accessibility to make this happen. We are already acting on that component of the 2032 Delivery Plan with the success of the Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program. Having the best infrastructure in place attracts greater participation, and Games On! is delivering just that for communities right throughout the state and will continue to do so.

Looking ahead, the Olympic and Paralympic Games Office is focusing on further embedding whole-of-games coordination as a number of agencies work together to deliver the games that Queenslanders deserve. City and regional readiness and operational planning will continue to be progressed including ongoing engagement with host and co-host councils. Additionally, legacy delivery will become more tangible over the next year with continued activity to drive games benefits for all Queenslanders. Over the coming year, pre-games training opportunities will also be a particular focus for the portfolio. As we get closer to the games we will see more athletes and more teams come to train in our state in order to acclimatise and understand what a Queensland games will be like. We will continue our collaboration with councils, facility operators and sporting organisations to position Queensland venues as training and preparation bases and assisting national Olympic committees and national Paralympic committees with their inquiries. Centres around the state with pools, tracks and courts are likely to be sought after as training venues. We will have world-class facilities.

Communities right across the state stand to benefit from welcoming visiting athletes and teams in the lead-up to the games and we will continue to work with the International Olympic Committee and the International Paralympic Committee as the sports program for 2032 is finalised, which will be expected by the end of the year. The new year is about moving to more detailed project planning and delivery, ensuring we remain organised, coordinated and ready as we work towards 2032.

Of course, we have already laid the foundation to deliver the games, establishing clear governance, defined responsibilities and strong lines of accountability. That may not be as exciting as a new stadium, but it does mean less complexity and duplication, greater efficiency and clarity. Stronger whole-of-government coordination means planning, delivery and oversight are integrated across government. We want this to be a games for Queensland by Queensland and for local businesses to share in the benefits.

We expect around $2.5 billion worth of contracts will be awarded by the organising committee. So far the organising committee has received over 3,500 thousand expressions of interest through their supplier portal and 78 per cent of their contracts to date have gone to Queensland businesses and almost 50 per cent of these have been small to medium businesses. Over the past year in moving forward we have been meeting with business leaders and communities across the state to let them know how they can get involved. We also have increased engagement with local governments across Queensland, recognising that these are Queensland's games and that preparation benefits extend well beyond Brisbane.

Perhaps most importantly, we are embedding legacy and accessibility into games planning now, not at the end, so long-term outcomes are built into decisions from the outset. As I mentioned, this will be a games for all of Queensland and we are working to ensure the benefits will be felt well beyond 2032. For the games we are not only looking at recruiting thousands of volunteers but also encouraging more and more volunteers across the state to keep our grassroots sporting clubs and community organisations strong well beyond the closing ceremony.

The Queensland Academy of Sport has been working incredibly hard as the newly formed statutory body to ensure that not only our current athletes but also the athletes of the future have the right support to excel on the world stage. Right now 88—sorry, I said 87 earlier—QAS supported athletes are preparing to represent Queensland in Glasgow for the Commonwealth Games.

In closing, the work being delivered across the portfolio demonstrates our commitment to hosting an incredible event that also ensures the benefits of the games are felt right across Queensland for generations to come. I would like to thank the Olympic and Paralympic Games Office in my department as well as the entire team at the QAS. We are working every day to ensure we deliver a games Queenslanders deserve. I continue to welcome the opportunity to assist the committee with its questions.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go to the opposition for some questions.

Ms GRACE: Director-General, it is understood that the government will pursue revenue-raising opportunities to cover the cost of infrastructure cost increases. One that was reported was increasing the number of seats to increase ticket revenue. What opportunities is the government exploring?

Mr Hopper: I think that question as it relates to infrastructure and capacity is really a question for the Deputy Premier and the department of state development. They have carriage of building the stage upon which the games will be hosted.

Ms GRACE: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I am clarifying that the cost of the seats is revenue raising to run the games. Of course, in terms of what is being explored regarding the number of seats, there must be a way of calculating how much you need to run the games.

Mr Hopper: If you are talking about ticketing revenue, that is a matter for the organising committee. They ultimately determine, based on what is provided through the build process, how many seats they will have available. Again, without speaking for them, as they look to allocate those seats across a range of different stakeholders, some of which will be contractually required—of course there will be general public and hospitality—ultimately that will then determine, when they couple that with demand, exactly what the ticket prices will be.

You are asking me to talk about two things, both of which I have no carriage of. One is the build and capacity, which is the department of state development—and I should have said 'and GIICA', who are doing the building on behalf of the government and leading that process—and the other is about ticketing and ticketing revenue, and that ultimately is a decision for the OCOG. As is known, they are seeking to be cost neutral and that will come down to how they build their revenues program.

Ms GRACE: Minister, the Premier today did not rule out capacity reductions in terms of ticket sales to fund the games to fit in the budget. Do you have any advice as to the impact this will have on ticket prices?

Mr MANDER: That is an incredibly broad question when you consider the number of locations that will have sporting events—everything from temporary stands right through to the 63,000-seat capacity at Victoria Park.

If I answer that by also referring to the member's previous question, obviously there is capacity with regard to the temporary stands. Whether it is at Rockhampton or whether it is at Maryborough or whether it is at Toowoomba, they are all the types of considerations that will be taken into account once we start working out what other minor infrastructure investment is needed to accommodate people. I am not sure I can say anything more than that.

Obviously, ticket sales are important. We will be looking to maximise the number of people who can come to the games, not just for revenue purposes but also to make sure that as many people as possible can see the games live. It is hard to be any more concrete than that, because the process is that we have to have the sports confirmed—not just the 28 core sports but any additional sports that might happen—and, once that is completed, we can then start assigning and clarifying and confirming the venues. Of course, the athletics is going to be at Victoria Park. Of course, the swimming is going to be at the National Aquatic Centre. When it comes to a lot of the indoor sports, we need to clarify what sports there will be and then how we need to accommodate those sports and then look at things like crowds. In terms of temporary stands and whatever is needed to house spectators, those factors come in then.

Ms GRACE: Director-General, how many affordable tickets will there be—or is there any modelling being made available to Queenslanders for the 2032 games in light of comments about revenue raising?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe this is a direct line of questioning that the director-general has referred to already in that it is for a different portfolio.

Ms GRACE: But they are not here and this is an Olympics question.

Mr SPEAKER: I think the director-general has sort of addressed this, but I will let you respond to the question.

Mr Hopper: I just reiterate that the decisions around ticketing revenue, allocation of tickets and tier of ticketing by venue are ultimately decisions for the OCOG, so I am unable to speak to what their processes are. They are a statutory body. They have a board. It is not my place to speak on their behalf on these matters. Ultimately, building on and reinforcing what the minister said, right now the IOC is in a process called Fit for the Future. It is currently considering not only the sports but, importantly, the disciplines that will be included in the games, and this is on top of any additional sports. That approach was approved at the International Olympic Committee at its 146th session on 24 June 2026.

The new methodology will apply from the 2032 games onwards and is intended to ensure future Olympic Games remain appealing, relevant and sustainable. The IOC's new process takes a discipline-based approach, reflecting the direct impact disciplines have on venue requirements and operational delivery. To be clear, an Olympic discipline is one or more events within a sport that require

either a dedicated field of play or a significant modification of a shared field of play with another discipline, generally involving a separate group of athletes. For example, swimming is a discipline within the sport of aquatics and the 50-metre freestyle is an event within that. The new discipline review process will involve initial—

Ms GRACE: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I think this is outside the realm of my question now on relevance. I do have other questions.

Mr SPEAKER: I think the director-general has made it clear in terms of his role and responsibilities as well. Member for McConnel?

Ms GRACE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Director-General, the department plays no role and the government will have no idea from the department about anything to do with affordable tickets?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Who AM I going to?

Mr Mc**DONALD:** I will say it for the third time: I think the shadow minister should move on. This again is aligned with the last that is outside this portfolio.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, I think that is a fair point of order. I think the director-general has been very clear. We will move on to the next question thanks, member for McConnel.

Ms GRACE: Director-General, has the department provided any advice to the minister or undertaken any modelling on budget costs associated with any additional security requirements for these new venues and athletes villages?

Mr Hopper: As the department does not have responsibility for that modelling, no, we have not.

Ms GRACE: Director-General, is the current fibre-optic capacity at each of the venue locations meeting the IOC's standards for the anticipated games broadcasting and data needs, and what are the estimated operating budget cost implications?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: There is a point of order from the member for Moggill, I think it was.

Dr ROWAN: There was, Mr Speaker. In relation to the question as asked by the member for McConnel, this would relate to the portfolio area directly under the responsibilities of the Deputy Premier and I would submit to you that that question should have been put in the session which was held earlier this week and could have been put to the Deputy Premier at that stage.

Mr SPEAKER: And I think that is also a valid point of order. The director-general has been very clear that that does not come under his portfolio. Member for McConnel, do you have another question?

Ms GRACE: I do, Mr Speaker. Minister, when you made comments about increasing venue size to increase ticket sales so we can fund the games, were you aware that the Deputy Premier was looking to reduce the scope of the National Aquatic Centre?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe there is an imputation there, but I would also ask for authentication.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, do you have some authentication?

Ms GRACE: It was in public. I think there is a press release we may have in relation to that relating to budget blowouts.

Mr KING: I will table the document.

Mr SPEAKER: The document has been tabled by the member for Kurwongbah.

Ms GRACE: I think there is some stuff there about blowouts. I am just trying to find—

Mr SPEAKER: It is coming around for the minister to have a look at. Minister, you have seen the article. Would you like to respond to that?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr MANDER: I have not had time to read it but—

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: in her question the member for McConnel referred to a reduction in capacity that the Deputy Premier had referred to. I would just like to see where that is in the document that has now been circulated.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel?

Ms GRACE: I think it is in there somewhere. Can I just ask another question?

Mr SPEAKER: Okay. We will move on. You have another question, member for McConnel?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker: is the shadow minister not going to authenticate the claim—

Ms GRACE: We are moving on.

Mr SPEAKER: We are moving on to another question. Member for McConnel?

Ms GRACE: Director-General, can you advise the total cost for the development of the official vision, including the launch of the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games 'Believe. Belong. Become.' motto?

Mr Hopper: I am unable to answer that question because I do not have carriage or responsibility for the development of 'Believe. Belong. Become.'

Mr SPEAKER: Next question, member for McConnel.

Ms GRACE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Minister, at any stage were you briefed or made aware that the development of the Queensland taxpayer-funded three-word motto had its origins in Christian organisations worldwide prior to the launch?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker: it is in direct line with the answer given by the director-general. This is not within this portfolio.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, did you have something you would like to say?

Mr MANDER: Yes, I will add something to that. Mr Speaker, the first thing is that it is not Queensland taxpayers' money; that was funded by Brisbane 2032, which will be a cost-neutral exercise over the running of the games. It is my understanding that there was extensive research done with regard to the motto 'Believe. Belong. Become.', which I love, by the way. I think it is fantastic. It can mean so much to the individual and to the athlete and to a community, a state and a country.

I am not sure what the inference is—what the shadow minister is getting at. Has she taken offence? The terms are generic and used in a whole range of different ways. I believe it will grow in significance the closer we get to the games, the more it is promoted and the more people see a little bit more of the meat in the skeleton—is that the right terminology? It does not sound right. It is something like that.

Mr KEMPTON: Flesh on the bones.

Mr MANDER: Flesh on the bones. Thank you. I knew I would get there! I honestly do not understand what the imputation is. It is a motto which I think Queenslanders will continue to embrace as we get closer to the games.

Ms GRACE: The point is: it is not original. It is actually used worldwide by Christian organisations. Were you aware that it is not original to Queensland?

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I am struggling to see where this fits into the appropriation.

Mr MANDER: It is three words. If you do not like them in that order, switch them around, but the words are powerful. They are obviously not unique words. You cannot have a copyright on words. I know that Brisbane 2032 went through an extensive process and when the motto was presented it had universal approval, which is very unusual when trying to get approval for emblems and things like this, because everybody has an opinion. It is one of those things that—

Mr McDONALD: That creates hope.

Mr MANDER: I will take that interjection; that creates hope. It is all about aspiration. It is all about the impact the games will have on our communities, on athletes and on our state. It is one that I totally back and am fully supportive of.

Ms GRACE: In view of a recent article regarding the Brisbane 2032 gifts register, is the government concerned about very expensive bottles of alcohol and is the government looking at reviewing the policy around gifts and hospitality?

Mr MANDER: I am unaware of the example that the shadow minister gave, other than what I read in the paper. My understanding is that the current policy of Brisbane 2032 has stopped that from happening. If overly expensive gifts are given, there is a process—just like every member of parliament has—with regard to gifts that are given. There are declarations that need to be made. If I am right with that particular example about a very expensive alcohol gift, that was returned immediately once it was realised what it was and how much it cost. I think the current policies in place are working and effective, and that is a good example of it.

Ms GRACE: Minister, in relation to that $82,000 bottle of cognac, is the minister aware exactly how the bottle was returned and if there were any costs involved in returning that bottle?

Mr MANDER: No, I am not.

Mr SPEAKER: We will now go to government members for questions.

Dr ROWAN: My question is to the minister. Could you please update the committee on what the government has achieved over the past year in preparing for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games?

Mr MANDER: Queensland won the right to host the games in 2021, but for more than 1,200 days—nearly four years—Labor squandered that opportunity through indecision, reviews, changing plans and internal disagreements. Instead of getting on with delivery, they created uncertainty for athletes, councils, businesses and communities. By the time we took office, Queensland had lost years that should have been spent preparing for the biggest event in our state's history.

The past year has been about turning Labor's chaos into delivery. With the major reviews completed and our 2032 Delivery Plan released, the government has established the foundations needed to successfully deliver the games. We have put in place clear governance arrangements, defined responsibilities and stronger accountability across the games system. Decisions are now being made faster, duplication has been removed and all partners have a clearer understanding of their role in delivering the games. Importantly, there is now a defined pipeline of venues, athletes villages and transport projects progressing under the delivery plan, providing certainty where Labor provided confusion. We have also strengthened engagement with all 14 host and co-host councils, recognising these are Queensland games and that the benefits must be shared across the state.

This year has seen a number of significant milestones. The Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee was streamlined in July 2025. The inaugural games leadership group met and new games governance arrangements were approved in August 2025. The Para Sport Reference Panel was established. The organising committee's procurement program launched in October 2025. The Games Vision was released in December 2025, and Queensland successfully hosted the fourth IOC Coordination Commission in May 2026. We are also embedding legacy, accessibility and inclusion into the planning now—not as an afterthought but as a core objective from the outset. After years of Labor's dysfunction, Queensland finally has a government focused on delivery. We are organised, accountable and getting on with the job of delivering a successful games and a lasting legacy for all Queenslanders.

Mr KEMPTON: My question is to the minister. All government members of the committee are regional members. Could you please outline how regional Queensland will share in the benefits of the 2032 games?

Mr MANDER: Let me be absolutely clear that these are Queensland's games and not just Brisbane's games. One of the biggest differences between this government and the former Labor government is that we have put regional Queensland at the centre of planning. Under Labor, regional communities were expected to watch from the sidelines while the benefits flowed to Brisbane. They had years to develop a genuine statewide vision and they failed to do it. The government is ensuring regional Queensland is a host, beneficiary and legacy partner in the 2032 games. Rockhampton will host Olympic and Paralympic Games rowing and canoe sprint events on the Fitzroy River, placing Central Queensland on the world stage. Maryborough will host archery. The Toowoomba Showgrounds will be upgraded into an Equestrian Centre of Excellence, creating a lasting legacy for riders, clubs and the broader equine industry. Townsville will co-host sailing and football, supported by critical transport infrastructure investments, while the Whitsundays will co-host sailing events and showcase one of Queensland's most iconic destinations to the world.

These games are about far more than venues. Regional Queensland will benefit from pre-games training camps, test events, torch relay activities, arts and cultural festivals and trade and investment opportunities that bring visitors and economic activity into the local communities. Businesses across regional Queensland will have the opportunity to compete for a share of the estimated $2.5 billion in

organising committee contracts and contribute to the $7.1 billion venue program. The games are also expected to help deliver a $4.6 billion uplift in tourism and trade across Queensland. While Labor's approach was Brisbane first and the regions second, our approach is Queensland first. We want young people in Rockhampton, Toowoomba, Townsville, Maryborough, Mackay and in communities across the state to see the games in their backyard, to participate in the opportunities they create and to benefit from the infrastructure investment long after 2032. These are not Brisbane's games—they are Queensland's games—and regional Queensland will share fully in the benefits and the legacy.

Mr JAMES: Minister, please outline how Queensland businesses are being given the chance to share in the economic opportunity of the games?

Mr MANDER: That is a great question, member, and I thank you for it. From day one this government has been focused on ensuring the 2032 games are not just a sporting event but a once-in-a-generation economic opportunity for Queensland businesses, workers and communities. We want these to be games for Queensland by Queensland, with local businesses sharing in the benefits every step of the way. Unfortunately, that was not the approach of the former Labor government. Labor spent more than 1,200 days talking about the games while creating uncertainty, confusion and delay. They also announced reviews, commissioned reports and changed courses so many times that businesses were left wondering where projects would be built, when procurement would begin and how they would get involved. Instead of providing confidence to industry, Labor left Queensland businesses in the dark. Every day of uncertainty was a missed opportunity for local companies to invest, plan, employ workers and prepare for the opportunity the games will create.

This government is taking a different approach. We are providing certainty, establishing clear procurement pathways and making sure Queensland businesses are at the front of the queue for games related opportunities. We expect $2.5 billion in contracts to be awarded by the organising committee. This is on top of the procurement opportunities flowing from the $7.1 billion venue program, athletes villages, transport projects and games related infrastructure delivered across government.

The response from Queensland industry has been overwhelming. Since the procurement program launched in October 2025, the organising committee has received more than 3½ thousand expressions of interest from businesses seeking to participate in games delivery. Importantly, Queensland businesses are already benefiting. Around 78 per cent of organising committee spending to date has gone to Queensland-based companies. Almost half of the contracts have been awarded to small- and medium-sized enterprises. The organising committee has engaged with more than 4,000 businesses through supplier forums, stretching from the Gold Coast to Cairns, ensuring opportunities are not confined to South-East Queensland. It has also directed around half a million dollars in spending to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island businesses, supporting greater participation in the games economy.

This government is determined to ensure that Queensland people build these games, Queensland businesses deliver these games and Queensland communities share in the economic benefits. The legacy of 2032 will not just be measured in medals; it will be measured in jobs, investment, business growth and opportunities right across our state.

Mr McDONALD: As you know, hosting the games is more than about the four weeks of sport. Can the minister explain how legacy is being built into the games planning?

Mr MANDER: The member is absolutely right: hosting the games is about far more than four weeks of competition. The real measure of success is the legacy Queensland is left with for decades to come. Unfortunately, legacy was one of Labor's favourite talking points and one of its biggest failures. They spent more than 1,200 days talking about Olympic legacy yet never established a framework to measure a single long-term outcome. Remarkably, their own party platform still points to the legacy of the 2018 Commonwealth Games. After years of planning for 2032, Labor is still looking backwards rather than delivering a clear plan to maximise the opportunities of Queensland's Olympic and Paralympic Games.

This government is taking a fundamentally different approach. We are embedding legacy into games planning now, not leaving it until after the closing ceremony. The department chairs the games Legacy and Impact Coordination Committee, bringing together games delivery partners to coordinate, measure and report on legacy outcomes across Queensland. Most importantly, we are delivering benefits to communities today through our Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program. Games On! is about ensuring local sporting clubs start benefiting from the games years before 2032. It is delivering upgrades to the community facilities Queenslanders use every week, improving playing surfaces,

clubhouses, lighting, accessibility, amenities and female-friendly facilities. It recognises that if we want more Queenslanders participating in sport and more young athletes following that pathway to 2032 and beyond we need quality local infrastructure now, not promises later.

We are also committed to ensuring the game leaves a transformative para-sport legacy. Our delivery plan includes a dedicated para-sport community facility and a focus on growing participation, improving accessibility and creating more opportunities for Queenslanders with a disability to engage in sport at every level. Importantly, we want the heightened awareness and inspiration of the Paralympic Games to translate into lasting participation and pathway opportunities across the state.

To ensure accountability ,we have commenced a benefits realisation framework to establish baseline measures and track economic, social and environmental outcomes over time. Unlike Labor, which talked about legacy, this government is building it, creating lasting benefits for communities, clubs and future generations of Queenslanders.

Mr McDONALD: My next question is to the CEO of Stadiums Queensland. Can the CEO outline for the committee the scope of the venues Stadiums Queensland manages and how the operating funding received in the 2026-27 budget will help to position the portfolio ahead of the 2032 games?

Mr Harris: Stadiums Queensland is responsible for the state's major sports facilities. We own nine venues and, coupled with the investment outlined in the 2032 Delivery Plan, the state will own the majority of venues for the 2032 games competition. Our portfolio comprises five stadia. Two of these stadiums, the Gabba and People First Stadium, are both oval venues. Three stadiums are rectangular, including Cbus Super Stadium, Queensland Country Bank Stadium and Suncorp Stadium. Each of Stadiums Queensland's venues is earmarked to host the games competition. The use of some venues depends on the games' sports program, which is to be finalised later this year.

Stadiums Queensland also owns two multifacility high-performance community sports venues: Sleeman Sports Complex at Chandler and the Queensland Sports and Athletics Centre. The Sleeman Sports Complex is a centre of excellence for the development of elite athletes in Queensland, will undergo upgrades for the 2032 games and will host cycling disciplines and aquatic sports. The venue is the training base for Swimming Queensland, Diving Australia, Diving Queensland, Gymnastics Queensland, AusCycling, Olympic Winter Institute of Australia, Queensland Weightlifting and the Queensland Academy of Sport. Facilities include: the Brisbane Aquatic Centre, which comprises two 50-metre pools, a 25-metre pool, dive pool and 10-metre dive platform as well as the dry land training facility; the Geoff Henke Olympic Winter Training Centre, which is the Southern Hemisphere's first year-round ski-jumping facility; Australia's premier track-cycling facility, Anna Meares Velodrome; and the Brisbane SX International BMX Centre, which is currently, this week, hosting the UCI BMX Racing World Championships. Other facilities include a high-performance gymnastics training centre, the Chandler Arena, Chandler Theatre and Chandler Lodge and Cabins accommodation and the Pace gymnasium. A number of community participation opportunities are provided at the centre, including Chandler Swim Club, Aquatic Achievers learn to swim and Pace gym.

As well as being the home of the Queensland Academy of Sport and Queensland Athletics, the Queensland Sports and Athletics Centre is a popular event space and a training hub for junior and elite athletes as well as members of the public. The venue hosts a range of events, from national and state championships through to school carnivals. QSAC features two international-standard running tracks, a 48,000-seat stadium, the National Throws Centre of Excellence, the Queensland Academy of Sport high-performance facilities and an eight-court beach volleyball complex. It also incorporates the 5,000-seat capacity Nissan Arena, which is home to netball in Queensland, including the Queensland Firebirds. QSAC's tenants include the Academy of Sport, Queensland Athletics, Little Athletics, Softball Queensland, Special Olympics Qld, Sandstorm and Netball Queensland. QSAC will play an important role in preparing our athletes for LA 2028 and the 2032 games. Nissan Arena is earmarked to host games competition.

Stadiums Queensland's portfolio also incorporates the Queensland Tennis Centre. The centre includes the 5,000-seat Pat Rafter Arena and 23 international-standard show courts, all featuring grand slam playing surfaces. Queensland Tennis Centre is home to Tennis Queensland and the Tennis Australia National Tennis Academy. The Queensland Tennis Centre will get a second arena to support hosting tennis for the 2032 games.

The final venue in the portfolio is the 13½-thousand-capacity Brisbane Entertainment Centre. The venue regularly hosts major international acts, with upcoming concerts from Tame Impala, Olivia Dean, Lily Allen and Benson Boone. The Brisbane Entertainment Centre is also identified as a 2032 games venue.

The state's existing portfolio of venues will be enhanced for the 2032 games, with the Queensland government responsible for the development of two major sport and entertainment facilities. Stadiums Queensland expects to own the Brisbane Stadium and the Brisbane Aquatic Centre. The 63,000-seat Brisbane Stadium at Victoria Park will replace the Gabba. The Gabba will be demolished to make way for the Gabba Entertainment and Housing Precinct.

The National Aquatic Centre will have a games capacity of 25,000 and a legacy capacity of 8,000. The National Aquatic Centre will host the majority of aquatic sports in 2032. The National Aquatic Centre will be supported by the Brisbane Aquatic Centre at the Sleeman Sports Complex, which will be upgraded to ensure it is a vibrant, accessible, high-performance and community hub. The proposed 17,000 capacity Gabba arena will replace the Brisbane Entertainment Centre. Stadiums Queensland expects that ownership and operation is dependent on the outcomes of the market process for the Gabba entertainment and housing precinct currently underway.

While SQ is preparing to own the two new 2032 games venues, government can make decisions to transfer additional assets to the portfolio if they meet the criteria under the Major Sports Facilities Act. Under the act, Stadiums Queensland can own any venues that have capacity to stage national or international sports, recreation and entertainment events or special events. Ultimately, the make-up of the portfolio is a decision for executive government.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go to opposition members.

Ms GRACE: Minister, in your answer to a question from government, you said that these would be Queensland games and Queensland businesses will build games venues. Can you assure Queenslanders that a Queensland builder will build the Olympic stadium?

Mr MANDER: The construction of the 17 new or upgraded stadiums is the responsibility of the Deputy Premier so that question is best directed to the Deputy Premier.

Mr SPEAKER: That is the Deputy Premier's area. Go to your next question, please.

Ms GRACE: With all due respect, Minister, that was a statement made by you just before. If this is in a different portfolio, I am clarifying the role you would play to ensure Queensland businesses build these venues?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: the minister has made it abundantly clear that this relates to another portfolio area with respect to procurement, vendor selection, construction and all of the other matters that are related to that. I submit to you that further detailed questioning about that should have been submitted in a previous session, under the responsibilities of the Deputy Premier.

Mr SPEAKER: Stadiums are under the Deputy Premier. I think this will be a fruitless exercise. Member for McConnel, do you have another question?

Ms GRACE: Yes, I do. Minister, as reported earlier this week, operational costs of $4.9 billion for Brisbane 2032 are expected to increase as a result of the decentralised nature of the games and will bear no resemblance to the original budget as stated by Mr Liveris. What action is the minister taking to guarantee Queensland taxpayers are not left with the bill?

Mr MANDER: The action that I am taking is instructing Brisbane 2032 to ensure that the operation or cost of the games is cost neutral. We have stated that time and again. I will state it again for the members of the committee. That is our aim and objective and their mission. The chair of Brisbane 2032 understands that clearly. That is why he is busily looking for corporate sponsorship. We have already announced, very excitingly, our first corporate sponsor, the Commonwealth Bank. There will be more announcements shortly along those lines. His job is to ensure that it is cost neutral.

All of these questions about different venues, the decentralisation and how many people will be able to watch the sports will be worked out over the next period once we follow due process, which is identifying the sports, ensuring we know—once they are confirmed—what facilities are needed for those sports to participate successfully and then things like temporary stands for spectators. All of those things will be considered then. That answer is going to be standard because those are the facts. That is what happens. That is how it works. We will be ensuring that the brief that Brisbane 2032 has been given, and I am part of that committee, is to ensure that objective is reached.

Ms GRACE: Minister, if the original $4.9 billion operating budget with which you are working with Brisbane 2032 bears no resemblance, has this figure been superseded with an updated estimated budget or is it—as I quote—a little bit flexible at the moment?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Speaker: if I heard the member correctly, there was an imputation or certainly it was hypothetical.

Ms GRACE: I have this article that was tabled and it has those quotes on it, from the minister.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I will allow you to answer.

Mr MANDER: This was actually a question on notice provided to the committee. Basically, it is the exact question and I will repeat the answer—

The operating budget for the Brisbane Organising Committee for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games has not been superseded.

Ms GRACE: Minister, are you confirming that, given Andrew Liveris's quote that it bears no resemblance, there is no updated figure and that figure remains at $4.9 billion? Is that what the answer to that last question stated?

Mr MANDER: The operating budget for the Brisbane Organising Committee for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games has not been superseded.

Ms GRACE: Minister, you were on the radio this morning in relation to gymnastics. Can you update the committee on what the government is doing to assist gymnastics to prepare for the 2032 games?

Mr MANDER: I mentioned earlier that, for some of the core sports, the venues are no-brainers. Obviously, we will be swimming at the National Aquatic Centre and we will be diving there.

Ms GRACE: Point of order, Speaker, on relevance: every time we have asked a question on venues, it has been deemed to be not in this portfolio. I am asking about what has been done to assist gymnastics. If we go into venues, I have questions on venues.

Mr SPEAKER: I suggest that the minister was very keen to respond to the question. He had only just started his response.

Mr MANDER: The point I am making is that for most sports where they will be played is pretty straightforward. For many indoor sports, like gymnastics, we are still working through where they will be played. As you know, we have an indoor stadium being built at Moreton Bay and one to be built at Logan.

Ms GRACE: And now we are talking about venues.

Mr MANDER: We have had numerous conversations with Gymnastics Queensland. My advice to them, and it will be my advice to the shadow minister, is: 'Be patient. We understand what your requirements are. We understand that you are looking for an upgrade.' It is our priority to ensure that sports like gymnastics are given a permanent home going forward.

I should also add, and I mentioned this earlier as well, with the PlayOn! vouchers gymnastics is the fourth most popular sport. The department has supported gymnastics across the state with over $16 million in funding being approved since July 2019. The Queensland government continues to be committed to that program. Through the Games On! program, $250,000 has been allocated to progress a business case and planning for a new facility at Mitchy youth club, which is not in my electorate but close by in the seat of Ferny Grove. Our 2032 Delivery Plan ensures that, regardless of where gymnastics events at the games are held—whether at one of the new arenas in Brisbane, the Gold Coast or the Sunshine Coast or at one of the indoor sports centres we have funded for delivery in Logan or Moreton Bay—gymnasts will have an excellent stage to perform on. As I have mentioned, the location of each sport will be confirmed following the release of the final sports program which is not anticipated until later in the year. We will continue to work with Gymnastics Australia and Gymnastics Queensland to progress this great sport in our state.

Ms GRACE: The delivery plan the minister just mentioned cancelled the project in relation to gymnastics. Can the minister clarify that he is now working with Gymnastics Queensland about the delivery of suitable facilities that will promote the sport of gymnastics?

Mr MANDER: Yes.

Ms GRACE: Minister, in relation to the gymnastics and your advocacy for the sport, do you have a budget in this financial year or over the forward estimates, or any timelines for delivering the needs of gymnastics before the 2032 Olympic Games?

Mr MANDER: Mr Speaker, I apologise for being repetitive, but I cannot be clearer about what the process is. We have to identify and confirm all the sports. Once we get that, we can then realise what venues are required, if there are any additional smaller venues that are needed, and we will go about doing that. I cannot add any more to that. I have already stated that process.

Ms GRACE: Minister, I am just clarifying your answer to the previous question. You mentioned that you were progressing the needs of gymnastics. I am asking: can you confirm there is a budgeted amount for this year or over the forward estimates that will address the needs of gymnastics, and is there a question mark about them being part of the 2032 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: I think a fair bit of this has been answered, but you might want to address the last part of the question.

Mr McDONALD: I believe there is an imputation in the last part.

Mr MANDER: I will do the last part first. I am not sure where there is a question about whether gymnastics is going to be involved with the games.

Ms GRACE: You said that before.

Mr MANDER: Me?

Ms GRACE: You just said that.

Mr MANDER: I have never said that. What I have said is it is not until all of the sports are confirmed. Gymnastics is a core sport. It ain't going anywhere. There is no danger of that whatsoever. In fact, it is one of the most popular sports at the games. We have all watched it and we have all seen the fantastic abilities of our gymnasts. I have been out to Chandler a number of times to watch the gymnastics. I love watching it. It is fantastic. I am aware of the shortcomings at their current facilities. If it was interpreted that when I talked about confirming the sports I was putting some sort of question over gymnastics, that is not what I meant at all. It is more about the additional sports. We have the 28 core sports. Now it is about the additional sports to see which ones are accepted and, therefore, what we need after that. That is an important part of the process: get the sports identified and then we can allocate and confirm the venues.

Ms GRACE: Speaker, my question was directly to gymnastics. It now being confirmed that it is definitely an Olympic and Paralympic sport, I ask again: does this budget, over the forward estimates, contain any amount to meet the needs of gymnastics, and what are the timelines about meeting their needs that the minister is working on—gymnastics?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Speaker: this is repetition. It is the same question being asked again. The minister has made it very clear in two responses so far.

Mr SPEAKER: It is very repetitious—unless the minister has something to add to it?

Mr MANDER: This question should have been asked in the sporting section because I think that is what the member is referring to—the ongoing support we are giving to gymnastics. The sporting section is where it is relevant. I have already mentioned the $16 million that we have given to gymnastics since 2019. They have also received base funding for state sporting organisations, and I have already mentioned that there are gymnastic centres or gyms that have gymnastics that are receiving the Games On! funding.

Ms GRACE: Point of order, Speaker: I am asking about the Olympic Games—gymnastics for the 2032 games specifically.

Mr MANDER: I honestly do not know what she is talking about. I have mentioned the infrastructure and I have mentioned the support we are providing for the operations of gymnastics. What else is there?

Mr SPEAKER: Yes. I think it is time to move on. Member for McConnel, do you have another question?

Ms GRACE: If the IOC is in charge of ticket sales and the organisation of the games, Brisbane 2032 are paying for the pins, and the Deputy Premier and GIICA are in charge of the venues, can the minister outline exactly what is in his portfolios for the Olympic and Paralympic Games?

Mr MANDER: Let me talk about the Brisbane 2032 Games Governance Model. My department is responsible for the Games Leadership Group, which is the overriding coordinating body for the games. We have delivered on the governance actions committed in the 2032 Delivery Plan and strengthened whole-of-games governance by reconstituting existing leadership groups to support efficient and effective cross-partner decision-making and oversight. This includes the Games Leadership Group, which is responsible for the overall strategic direction for the delivery of the games, facilitating collaborative decision-making by games entities and resolving important cross-partner issues.

The first meeting of the Games Leadership Group was held on 19 August 2025 and has had senior representation from three levels of government and the two key games bodies—the infrastructure authority and the organising committee. The Games Leadership Group, otherwise known as the GLG, approved the revised 2032 games governance arrangements, including all cross-partner community responsibilities for delivering critical games infrastructure, legacy and government services. The Department of Sport, Racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games has implemented the approved committee structure with games delivery partners, ensuring effective decision-making coordination for games planning and delivery of the games. The Games Leadership Group has met three times since inception to provide strategic guidance on critical matters such as oversight of the games host contract, whole-of-games risk management and the Games Coordination Plan.

The Games Executive Group, which has equivalent membership of the Games Leadership Group at the chief executive level, has also been established and held its first meeting on 21 July 2025. This group continues to meet regularly to oversee progress across the games entities.

Our 2032 Delivery Plan also clarifies roles and responsibilities so we can all get on with the job of delivering the games. In simple terms, the infrastructure authority is delivering the 17 new and upgraded venues required for the games.

The Queensland government ensures the delivery of the athletes villages and coordinates and provides the necessary public services and infrastructure to support delivery of the games and a lasting positive legacy. The organising committee organises and stages the games events. The department leads games-wide coordination, including preparation of the Games Coordination Plan, which ensures effective governance performance at the whole-of-games level.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go to the government members for the next question. Member for Cook?

Mr MANDER: Mr Speaker, I do have an answer to a question on notice that you may wish straightaway. The director-general has that.

Mr Hopper: To the question earlier in relation to the '6 years to go' badges, the department did not purchase the '6 years to go' badges. The '6 years to go' badges were purchased by the organising committee within its cost-neutral budget at no cost to taxpayers. I would like to acknowledge the team led by Cindy Hook. They are wonderful collaborators and we work very closely and very effectively with them. Importantly, the badges were delivered by a local Indigenous owned business, an example of how the games is supporting local small business and generating a positive legacy. Today, the '6 years to go' pins have been distributed widely across Queensland, with communities and schoolchildren from Cairns to Coolangatta receiving their own celebratory piece of Brisbane 2032 games history to mark the milestone. Of course, importantly, for ourselves as public servants, we will follow the appropriate gifts and benefits policy in recording the receipt of said badges.

Mr KEMPTON: My question is to the CEO of Stadiums Queensland. Can you please inform the committee how locked-in operational funding in this year's budget will assist in exploring the better use of technology in Stadiums Queensland venues such as the highly anticipated automatic beer machine trial?

Ms BUSH: Point of order, Speaker: does this not go to infrastructure?

Mr McDONALD: It is Stadiums Queensland and the games.

Ms BUSH: I understand that, but the point still goes to infrastructure, which is outside of the portfolio of what we are talking about today.

Mr MANDER: Just a clarification: we look after the stadiums. That is our responsibility.

Ms GRACE: But this is Olympics and that was in sports, not here.

Mr MANDER: They are playing Olympic sports, including Suncorp Stadium—

Ms GRACE: Point of order, Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I heard a line of questioning from the member for Cooper before to Stadiums Queensland. It is not very dissimilar.

Ms GRACE: That was in the sports portfolio. We are in the Olympic and Paralympic Games portfolio. That is my point of order. That was in the sports portfolio. This is a new portfolio. Stadiums is not in this portfolio.

Mr MANDER: Mr Speaker, most of those stadiums are going to have Olympic events staged in them. It is not the construction; it is there. Who does not want to know about beer dispensing!

Mr SPEAKER: Were you asking that question in relation to the Olympics?

Mr KEMPTON: Mr Speaker, I am talking about technology in venues, like technology in this room.

Mr SPEAKER: I am going to allow the question.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Do I hear you have a problem down there?

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, if you are inviting one, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: You have a point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: My point of order is in relation to the sessional orders that have been agreed to by the House and applied for this estimates hearing. They have been applied in a way that matters in relation to sports infrastructure and existing venues were the domain of the previous session. You ruled that way several times. My submission to you is that we are simply seeking a consistent application of your ruling, Mr Speaker, with respect.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: whilst I accept the proposition of the Manager of Opposition Business and consistency of ruling, my understanding and recollection in relation to some of the questions was with respect to construction, tendering and other infrastructure matters that pertained to the stadium as opposed to some of these other matters which do overlap when it comes to stadiums being part of the Olympics and Paralympics and particular events taking place there as well. I submit to you that perhaps that is where there have been some shades of grey as opposed to those previous elements which related to infrastructure and construction.

Ms BUSH: Speaker, I have a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: There is a little bit of grey there, so I am going to allow Mr Harris to answer what relates to the Olympics.

Mr Harris: I will be relatively brief. We have spoken previously in this chamber about some of the innovative things we are implementing across our portfolio. That has been ongoing for a number of years and will continue through to 2032 and beyond. Effectively what we are trying to do with our asset portfolio as it currently stands is get it to a place of readiness. We are doing a lot of trials—

Ms GRACE: Point of order, Speaker: that is in delivery of the venues, which is not relevant to this portfolio on the basis that previous questions we have asked have been ruled not relevant to this portfolio, particularly with regard to fibre-optic, security and a number of questions we asked.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: in relation to the question—and I respect your ruling that the question was allowed to be submitted—it is up to the witness how they provide their testimony and response. I think there were other elements that he was coming to, whilst referencing a broader response to the question.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker, and it adds a different context to this same issue: the proposition of the shadow minister was that the previous rulings were with regard to the stadium's construction, seating and infrastructure. This is about stadiums and the Olympic venues for 2032 and should be allowed.

Mr SPEAKER: I will take some advice. As I have said, I asked Mr Harris to respond to where it relates to the Olympics. That is it.

Mr Harris: All of these trials across our venues lead into 2032. We do not turn things on the night before the Olympics. We want to ensure our assets are functional and world class. The trials that we do across our portfolio, whether they be in 2026, 2029 or 2031, are so we are in a place of readiness for 2032. The Boxbar and EBar trials we have undertaken are to set us up to make us world class and give fans a world-class experience when the rest of the world is looking at Brisbane.

Ms BUSH: I move that the committee resolves to go into a private hearing to determine the split of questions allowed of the minister, as it has become unclear what the Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games is actually responsible for.

Mr SPEAKER: As far as the committee is concerned, there is a motion—

Mr McDONALD: Mr Speaker, there is a motion before the committee and I am happy to vote on it now. I say no, and I will use my casting vote to remain in the session.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go back to the member for Mulgrave for a question.

Mr JAMES: My question is to the CEO of QAS. Could you please outline what the Queensland Academy of Sport's statutory independence means for high-performance sports in Queensland?

Ms GRACE: Point of order, Speaker: this is more related to the sports portfolio than the Olympic and Paralympic Games portfolio that we are questioning now.

Mr SPEAKER: I am just about to find out. I call Mr Ayres. You know that we are in the Olympic session.

Ms GRACE: Point of order, Speaker: the question did not relate to the Olympic or Paralympic Games; it related solely to the Queensland Academy of Sport. There was no relevance in the question to the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Can you rule on the relevance for this portfolio, please, Speaker?

Mr MANDER: Mr Speaker, point of order: the whole existence of the Queensland Academy of Sport and its major strategic objective is to win gold medals. That is its objective. That is why it exists.

Ms GRACE: Speaker, point of order: I think the Queensland Academy of Sport is there for more than just to win gold medals at the Olympic and Paralympic Games. The question was not about winning gold medals in the Olympic and Paralympic Games. I believe that this is not relevant—

Mr SPEAKER: I have heard your point of order. I will listen to the question again.

Mr JAMES: My question is to the CEO of QAS. Could you please outline what the Queensland Academy of Sport's statutory independence means for high-performance sport in Queensland before the 2032 games?

Mr Ayres: On 1 July 2025 the QAS transitioned to becoming a statutory body. Since that time we have worked incredibly hard to stand up as an independent entity, delivering a new board that has oversight of the organisation and our new strategy to ensure we are very firmly focused on delivering and supporting our best athletes in the state to achieve medals and great success on the world stage.

One of the things that is really important for us in our statutory set-up is: we want to make sure we have absolute agility and flexibility to move and respond to the needs of our athletes and the coaches we support, in partnership with the national sporting organisations. Part of that is ensuring that a significant portion of our budget—last year it was 76.9 per cent of our budget—goes to frontline service delivery to ensure that our athletes are getting everything they need in order to prepare for the Los Angeles games in two years time, as well as then getting ready for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

As an ongoing piece for us with this ability as a statutory body, we are continuing to find operational efficiency to make sure we are focused on the front line. It also means that we are able to try to be more nimble in our partnership approach and arrangements with the high-performance sport system including our national sporting organisations and the state organisations we work with, university partners, commercial partners, philanthropic organisations and people, and the other institutes of sport. All of those things will help us deliver a better athlete outcome into the future.

Dr ROWAN: My question is to the chief executive officer of the Queensland Academy of Sport. Could you please outline how the QAS Para Unit and specific and para-athlete programs are building the pipeline for future Paralympians for the 2032 games?

Mr Ayres: The Paralympic side of our program is an incredibly important one to us. Over the last number of years, the national decline in total number of Paralympic athletes in the pipeline has given us a lot of things to focus on. Our High Performance 2032 Strategy has a real focus on this. That created the Para Unit, which was established last year.

Since the Para Unit was established, we have supported 61 athletes through that process as they are identified from different areas of the state and have progressed into training programs with the QAS and sport partners to ensure we are trying to double our pipeline in advance of the 2032 Paralympic Games. It has also meant that we have established a coaching program, which is called the next gen para coaching program. We have seen 14 coaches join that program who are now delivering significant coaching support across numerous sports within the state. We also have next week up in Townsville one of our first big regional para-talent identification programs running, with 24 athletes currently registered for that.

The Para Unit for us, about a year into its evolution, is definitely providing future talent that we are finding not just within sport pathways but also for people with a disability who have never considered Paralympic sport before.

Mr McDONALD: My question is to the CEO of QAS. Could you please update the committee on how the YouFor2032 program is finding the next generation of Queensland Olympians and Paralympians right across the state?

Mr Ayres: The YouFor2032 program continues to search right across the state, with our team getting in their minibus travelling up and down the coastline over the next couple of weeks. We have tested nearly 7,000 athletes across the state since the program was first launched, travelling to 29 different regional locations as well as through the south-east.

We have had 1,287 athletes progress through to our talent confirmation phase, with 618 of those progressing to our 12-month development phase. As I said, our team are back on the road now travelling through the state over the coming weeks. They will be in Ipswich tomorrow, the Gold Coast in coming days and then Sunshine Coast, Hervey Bay, Gladstone, Yeppoon, Townsville, Bundaberg, Toowoomba, Cairns, Logan and the Greater Brisbane area.

Importantly, YouFor2032 is not just about identifying athletes for Brisbane. It is also about the long-term pipeline that will support Queensland's and Australia's success at future Olympic and Paralympic Games beyond 2032.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I understand you want to make a comment?

Mr MANDER: I do not think there is anything to follow up with regard to questions on notice, but there is a clarification. In the previous session the member for Cooper threw out a $500 million figure about an upgrade of Suncorp Stadium as if that particular commitment had been made by this government. That $500 million was actually mentioned by the previous government when they were proposing to upgrade QSAC. That had nothing to do with this government. That is something she has got confused about with the previous government.

Thank you very much, Mr Speaker and the committee, for the examination of the accounts. I do want to thank my staff at the department. As we all know, an enormous amount of work goes into these processes. They are extremely hardworking. I appreciate the effort and time they put into this. I thank them. I thank the QAS, Stadiums Queensland and Brisbane 2032 for all of their efforts in what they do day to day to bring about the best stadiums, the best athletes and the best sporting programs in the nation.

Mr SPEAKER: We have now reached the end of the time allocated for the consideration of the proposed expenditure for the Olympic and Paralympic Games portfolio. The committee will now adjourn for a break. The hearing will resume at 5.15 pm with an examination of estimates for the portfolio area of transport and main roads.

Proceedings suspended from 4.45 pm to 5.15 pm.

ESTIMATES—STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE—TRANSPORT AND MAIN ROADS

In Attendance

Hon. B Mickelberg, Minister for Transport and Main Roads

Mr Tony Meredith, Chief of Staff

Mr Kav Samaraweera, Senior Adviser

Department of Transport and Main Roads

Ms Sally Stannard, Director-General

Queensland Rail Limited

Ms Kat Stapleton, Chief Executive Officer

Maritime Safety Queensland

Mr Kell Dillon, General Manager

Mr SPEAKER: There was a bit of confusion at the end of the previous session around committee votes. Standing order 179(5) provides—

If during an estimates hearing it becomes necessary for a portfolio committee to deliberate in private under Standing Order 207, the Speaker shall not attend the private meeting, and the Committee Chairperson presides over the meeting.

Schedule 3 provides—

Where a member of a committee requests discussion of a ruling of the Chairperson on this matter, the committee shall deliberate in a private hearing and determine whether any question which is the subject of the ruling is to be permitted.

If a question arises that requires deliberation or discussion then the committee should go into private session. A vote is not required. Indeed, a vote on the issue would contravene standing order 179(5). That should have happened in the last session, so apologies for that.

Mr SPEAKER: Good afternoon. We will now resume proceedings. For the benefit of those who have just joined us, I am Pat Weir, the member for Condamine and Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Under the provisions of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, I will preside over this hearing.

The members of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee are: Mr Jim McDonald, the chair of the committee and member for Lockyer; Ms Jonty Bush, the member for Cooper and deputy chair; Ms Wendy Bourne, the member for Ipswich West; Mr Terry James, the member for Mulgrave; Mr David Kempton, the member for Cook; and Mr Shane King, the member for Kurwongbah. The committee is joined by other members who have been granted leave to attend and ask questions at the hearing today.

I remind everyone present that any person may be excluded from the proceedings at my discretion or by order of the committee. The committee has authorised this hearing to be broadcast live, televised and photographed. Copies of the committee's conditions for broadcasters of proceedings are available from the secretariat. Staff who are assisting our witnesses here today are permitted to use personal electronic devices in the chamber. I ask all present to ensure phones and other electronic devices are switched to silent mode or turned off if not in use. I also remind everyone that food and drink is not permitted in the chamber.

The committee will now examine the proposed expenditure in the Appropriation Bill 2026 for the transport and main roads portfolio area until 9.30 pm. We will suspend proceedings for an intermission from 7.15 to 7.30.

I remind honourable members that matters relating to these portfolio areas can only be raised during the time specified for the area, as was agreed by the House. I refer members to the program set by the House, which is available throughout the chamber and on the committee's webpage.

I also remind everyone that these proceedings are subject to the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly. In respect of government owned corporations and statutory authorities, standing order 180(2) provides—

... a member may ask any question which the committee determines will assist it in its examination of the relevant Appropriation Bill or otherwise assist the committee to determine whether public funds are being efficiently spent or appropriate public guarantees are being provided.

On behalf of the committee, I welcome the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, the director-general, officials and departmental officers and members of the public. For the benefit of Hansard, I ask officials and advisers to identify themselves the first time they answer a question referred to them by the minister or director-general. Please remember to press your microphones on before you start speaking and off when you are finished.

I now declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio area of transport and main roads open for examination. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

Minister, if you wish, you may make an opening statement of up to five minutes.

Mr MICKELBERG: The Crisafulli government is delivering for Queensland after Labor's decade of decline. That is not a slogan; that is a fact. You only need to look at this year's QTRIP, which outlines a record $55.9 billion investment in Queensland's transport network. It is almost 50 per cent more than Labor's last budget. It cannot come a moment too soon, because today we mark six years until the opening ceremony of the Brisbane 2032 Olympic Games.

This is just the second Crisafulli government budget, and I reflect on how far our Olympic and Paralympic Games planning has come. This time two years ago, under Labor we did not even know where the main stadium was going to be located. Labor's stadium journey initially took us to the Gabba and then detoured to Victoria Park before the member for Murrumba U-turned and arrived at QSAC, which is not even serviced by a heavy rail line. How were our transport experts meant to plan for an event when they did not know where they needed to deliver the crowd?

Contrast that with what the Crisafulli government has achieved. We have delivered certainty when it comes to the main stadium and other significant venues as part of our 100-day review. That has allowed us to proceed with investments in key enabling transport infrastructure and for strategic event planning to begin. I look forward to updating the committee tonight on some of this progress.

When the Olympic flame touches down in Brisbane, Queenslanders can be assured that our transport network will be ready, but it is important to remember that our $55.9 billion investment is not for a sporting event. Queensland is a growing state. Many people are moving here to capitalise on the opportunity that the Crisafulli government has created. Our record $55.9 billion investment is designed to cater for our population growth and to deal with the infrastructure backlog that was left by the former Labor government. It is all about getting Queenslanders home sooner and safer. It does not matter if home is here in the south-east or in regional or remote Queensland, and it does not matter if people get home by car or public transport; we are investing for every single Queenslander.

Our achievements since coming to office have not been easily won. It has required tough decisions to be made. An example is standing up to the CFMEU, who are the enemy of productivity on Queensland construction sites. Rolling over to the CFMEU would have been the easy choice—it is what the previous government did—but the fact of the matter is that the projects outlined in QTRIP could not be delivered if we had a CFMEU holding the sector hostage and ministers who were willing to aid and abet their criminality. I have not and I will not meet with the CFMEU, and I only wish all members of this parliament could say the same.

Another hard decision the Crisafulli government made was to stand up for Queensland in Canberra and fight for a better deal on the Bruce Highway. We believed that the 80-20 deal was worth fighting for, even though the previous Labor government had rolled over. The result has been a $9 billion deal on an 80-20 basis that is currently being rolled out between Gympie and Cairns.

Speaker, 2025-26 was also the first full year of the LNP's permanent 50-cent fares—and hasn't that been a raging success! Importantly, it is now entrenched in law. It is all part of the Crisafulli government's goal of creating a reliable, productive and safe road network as well as a frequent, accessible, affordable and reliable public transport network. Our government is delivering a transport network for a growing state, and I look forward to sharing more of that information with the committee tonight. I warmly welcome your questions.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go to the opposition for questions. We are joined by the member for Aspley, and I will go to him for the first question.

Mr MELLISH: Speaker, with your indulgence, I want to thank all departmental staff for the work that has gone into estimates preparations, as well as all other agencies, in case I forget at the end. My first question is to the director-general. Earlier this week we learned of the whole-of-government advertising spend. Can you confirm the total sum of the Transport and Main Roads advertising spend in 2025-26?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order. My point of order relates to advertising, which was discussed under the remit of the Premier and the [Department of the Premier and Cabinet. That was an opportunity to put that question to the Premier and the responsibilities there.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order: in previous estimates it has been recognised that, given each department is responsible for its GACC requests and budgets, it is only fair the director-general provide the answers to those questions. For the benefit of the committee, I can refer to the 2025 estimates where, following the Premier directing that questions about individual campaigns be put to appropriate departments, the CEOs of those agencies did provide the figures in those hearings. Therefore, I submit that that should be taken into consideration and the answer should be able to be given.

Mr SPEAKER: That was actually said. I do recall that being said, so the best person to ask would be Transport and Main Roads. I will allow the question and call the director-general.

Ms Stannard: The member will be aware that our road safety advertising is a critical part of our work. We are horrified by the road toll, and we will continue to ensure we present communication to the public that encourages them to change their behaviour. We are concerned about the road toll and it is an important part of our customer communication. We also communicate when we are making changes to the road network or to public transport services. These are important messages that members of the community need to be aware of.

Indeed, this year we have delivered campaigns about the e-mobility law changes. It was really important for customers to understand that changes were coming. We are also doing significant work on the Bruce Highway, and I am sure we will talk about that this evening. We have continued to deliver the campaigns that we have always done about speeding and drink driving, just to try to curb that behaviour. Those kinds of campaigns are really important. We evaluate each one of them to ensure they are making a difference. They are part of our StreetSmarts Always On campaign.

Certainly, there is no single solution and we do not pretend that that is the only solution. We are happy to talk further about all of the other things that go some way to improving road safety. This is a complex issue and it is impacting communities. We take it really seriously, but research does demonstrate that sustained public education campaigns are most effective when they are combined with enforcement, legislation and safer roads and vehicles. We continually evaluate those campaigns and we use data to refine the messaging to try to make the most impact.

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet are providing centralised coordination in the whole-of-government advertising, including overseeing the advertising spend. That oversight for media placement, through the whole-of-government media buying agency EssenceMediacom, is DPC's responsibility. Total media placement spend is subject to an independent end-of-financial-year audit, as per the standing offer arrangement with EssenceMediacom. That is managed by DPC and they do publicly release that spend annually. That probably is the best place to get the detail.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Speaker: as I indicated in my earlier point of order, following the Premier's direction to agencies in the 2025 estimates hearing, I submit that agencies are able to confirm to committees the cost of specific advertising campaigns. I refer you specifically for your consideration to the health estimates hearing last year where the director-general was able to confirm the costs for the influenza campaign. If that was able to be delivered to that committee in those circumstances, it follows that the director-general can provide the cost for this campaign to this hearing.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: in relation to the 2026 estimates hearings, we had scrutiny with respect to the Premier and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. It was very clear from the responses provided there the processes that happen with a whole-of-government process with respect to advertising. The responses provided by the director-general of the Department of Transport and Main Roads are consistent with what we heard in relation to those estimates hearings on Tuesday of this week.

Mr SPEAKER: I will get a bit of advice. It is up to the department to furnish those figures if they are in receipt of them. We are trying to find the transcript but it was mentioned at the beginning of the week.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: if it would assist you, I can provide that transcript. The member for Ipswich West is submitting that for your consideration, Mr Speaker.

Dr ROWAN: On a further point of order: I have not yet been furnished with a finalised copy of the transcript from Tuesday. However, it was clearly articulated in the evidence of the witnesses on Tuesday, including the Premier and the director-general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, in relation to the whole-of-government arrangements regarding advertising and the processes that occur with that. Again, I would submit to you that the responses provided by the director-general of the Department of Transport and Main Roads in rounding out her answer to that initial question are consistent with the information that was provided on Tuesday of this week in that estimates hearing.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, can you provide that figure? If not, we will move on.

Ms Stannard: I have further detail about the ways we communicate with the public about sponsorships where we seek to change behaviour through influencers, through people who can influence.

Mr MELLISH: Point of order, Mr Speaker: we are just after the figure on that. We had a fairly lengthy and very fulsome and very helpful answer, but we are just after the figure at this point.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: my understanding in relation to the testimony on Tuesday is that those figures are centralised. Therefore, the question as asked would need to have been asked of the Premier and the representatives including the director-general from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet on Tuesday in order to obtain that figure given those figures are centralised across the whole of government.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I submit to you, Mr Speaker, it is nonsensical that a government department cannot answer how they fund advertising campaigns. I ask that you give consideration, through the member for Ipswich West, to the transcript of proceedings. The Premier stated in relation to a question about specific advertising campaign costs of agencies that the direct question can be put to the health minister or, in this case, to the transport department. I ask you to consider that precedent.

Mr SPEAKER: I will just ask the director-general: is advertising included in the transport budget?

Ms Stannard: We have a range of campaign information and communication, but DPC does do that media placement and the spend questions really do need to be directed there. They have some bulk purchasing arrangements. I do not have that detail in front of me.

Mr SPEAKER: Let's move on in the interests of time.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, is it your position that you are not willing to provide today how much the department has spent on drink driving, speeding, e-mobility and other transport campaigns using taxpayers' money?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker: again, it goes to the issue of where is the funding for this, and it is under DPC, as the Leader of the House has outlined. What has changed is Labor's out-of-control spending. It is now coordinated centrally—

Mr SPEAKER: You're making a statement.

Mr McDONALD:—in the Premier's department.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: it relates to the question as put by the member for Aspley. The characterisation of the response by the director-general would be inaccurate. The director-general provided a response to the question as asked, which was very clear with respect to the obligations and the responsibilities of whole-of-government advertising under the Premier and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I would submit to you that that question should be ruled out of order.

Mr SPEAKER: It is up to the director-general and the minister whether they answer the question. Member for Aspley, do you have another question?

Mr MELLISH: How much was budgeted for advertising in the TMR budget in 2025-26?

Mr SPEAKER: Who is that question directed to?

Mr MELLISH: The director-general, sorry.

Ms Stannard: I will confirm with a colleague if I may. Apologies for the delay, but I have been able to confirm that in 2025-26 we assigned $8.8 million in our budget, but the spend would need to be confirmed through DPC. We did contribute to whole-of-government programs.

Mr MELLISH: What campaigns was that funding for?

Ms Stannard: There were major campaigns that included the e-mobility laws campaign, the Bruce Highway 'Fixing the Bruce' campaign, our 'No Excuse for Speeding' campaign and our 'In Your Hands' drink-driving campaign.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, how many temporary or contract staff ended their employment with your department in the 2025-26 financial year?

Ms Stannard: We are very focused on reviewing our establishment. It is part of good government. For my department with the program ahead, it is really important that we focus our workforce on the key priorities and ensure we are able to deliver those. What that means as part of establishment management is that we do actively manage vacancies. When a vacancy occurs, we consider what is the best way to allocate that resource to the priorities we have at hand.

We do use temporary resources in the department. It would make sense that we run a number of projects that have a finite duration and so for the course of that project, we allocate temporary resources. They have a defined start and end date and when the project finishes some of our staff will finish that temporary role. They might go on to do another project at another time. I am just going to check if I have the number of temporary staff. I do not have in front of me at the moment the number of temporary staff who—I think your question was—ended at 30 June?

Mr MELLISH: Yes, it was those who ended at 30 June.

Ms Stannard: I do not have that number in front of me at the moment. I think for some of our staff, they will finish at the end of a project's duration, so it may not be right on that date. That is not something I have in front of me at the moment.

Mr MELLISH: Will you be able to source that by the end of the session?

Mr MICKELBERG: We will endeavour to get that information before the end of the session.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, I will go back to advertising. In relation to those campaigns you previously outlined, can you outline how much was budgeted for each of those campaigns?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: as we have already discussed, this comes under the responsibilities of the Premier and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. There is a centralised process in relation to that. Because those figures are centralised, a breakdown of those figures would have needed to have been asked of the Premier or representatives including the director-general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet during the session on Tuesday.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker. My point of order is in relation to the point of order from the Leader of the House. I recall quite distinctly in the previous session the director-general of the department of sport was able to provide specific advertising spend for specific campaigns. It follows, then, that—and based on my previous point of order in relation to the precedent set in 2025—the director-general is able to answer the question around the specific spend for specific campaigns, as other directors-general have.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: You have a point of order?

Mr McDONALD: I do, Mr Speaker. The issue is about funding, again, and this government does things differently. It is now centralised under the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to save money.

Mr SPEAKER: The director-general can explain the position. Director-General, could you respond to the question, please?

Ms Stannard: The figure I have in front of me is the combined figure for road safety advertising media placement. It was a budget figure, and the major campaigns were the four programs I described before: e-mobility laws, 'Fixing the Bruce' with regard to the Bruce Highway, 'No excuse for speeding' and 'In your hands' with regard to drink driving. It does include digital and social media posts which we do as part of our StreetSmarts 'Always On' campaign, so those are some own-channel where we have some reach—in fact, reach of over a million people in terms of what we have seen on that social media. I do not have a breakdown in front of me of those four in that budget figure.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, how many vacancies is the department currently carrying?

Ms Stannard: Vacancies, in a department of the size that we are managing, obviously vary from day to day and week to week. As you can imagine, cessations happen across the business for a whole range of reasons. We also have some roles vacant because people are on long-term leave such as maternity leave, parental leave and long-term sick leave, so any number of vacancies will have a range of reasons. They will not all be substantively vacant. As I pointed out before, we review every genuine vacancy and we do that to ensure that where we fill a role we are allocating it to the area of greatest need to deliver the priorities that are in front of us. We continue to advertise and fill positions, and I am sure you have seen a number of those positions advertised recently. We use our executive leadership team to review each of those vacancies to ensure we are filling the right areas with the right resources. I am just going to see if I have a vacancy number at a point in time. I have some stats here for 2025-26. Our vacancy rate was 3.6 per cent at 30 June, so with a budgeted FTE of 6,801 we had a vacancy rate of 3.6 per cent.

Mr SPEAKER: We might go to government members for a couple of questions.

Mr McDONALD: Minister, today marks six years until the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Can the minister outline the status of key infrastructure needed for the games?

Mr MICKELBERG: As I reflected in my opening remarks, look at how far we have come under the Crisafulli government over the last 12 to 18 months. We were awarded the games in July 2021 and, regrettably, we lost 2½ years under the previous government as they dithered on key decisions including, as I identified in my opening statement, the location of the main stadium, which is a critical decision to enable planning and investment in things like transport infrastructure. I think the contrast is quite stark when we look at the approach taken by our government in the 100-day review. It delivered the certainty that Queenslanders needed and that government needed, and that has allowed my department and the associated stakeholders to move on with the all-important transport planning for the games.

It would of course have been better had we had 2½ years extra to do that work. It would have given us an extra 2½ years to deliver the significant infrastructure required. Unfortunately, that opportunity was squandered under the former Labor government. Regardless, we are getting on with the job, member for Lockyer, and that includes completing projects like Cross River Rail, which we know, as a consequence of the approach taken by the former Labor government, stalled. It was promised to open in 2024. It will not be ready until 2029 and, as members and Queenslanders have previously been informed, the cost moved from a promised $5.4 billion under the former Labor government to more than $19 billion. That project will form the core of what will become sector 1—the main north-south rail line linking the Gold Coast and the Sunshine Coast to Brisbane.

We have also begun work on Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail—a project which will boost capacity and reliability between Brisbane and the Gold Coast. We are progressing with the Wave on the Sunshine Coast, and both of those projects had not begun when we came to government. In true Labor style, there was a lot of talk but not a whole lot of action. Increasing the capacity of sector 1 and its extension into the Sunshine Coast will be vital for the success of the games. We expect that the majority of spectators who are visiting for the games will be staying on each of the coasts and travelling to and from events each day, so major infrastructure like our investment in heavy passenger rail through Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail, Cross River Rail and the Wave will be essential enablers. Then there are the other projects right up and down Queensland that will be enablers for the games—projects like the Bruce Highway all the way through to exciting projects on the Gold Coast, including the extension of the light rail between the hospital and Harbour Town.

The strategic event planning is also underway, member for Lockyer. Later this year we expect the IOC to finalise the sport and the discipline program for Brisbane 2032. That will allow venues to be locked in and the concepts of operation for transport to be finalised. From next year we will move into the operational planning phase, and that will look at elements such as Translink uplift, the games route network, venue access as well as all of the activities associated with the games such as the Olympic torch relay, the festivals and the live sites that will be operational during the games. All of those are important considerations from a transport perspective to ensure we are able to service and deliver a successful games.

We expect that the competition schedule will be finalised around 2030-31, and that will provide us the final clarity on spectator movements. From that point on we will move into the readiness phase, and that will include community messaging, the delivery of temporary works and entering into service contracts, testing and other preparation works, so there is a whole lot of work to be done between now and 2032. I know that was an extensive response, but hopefully it gives an indication of the work that is underway and that has been done to date and what we are focusing on between now and 2032.

Mr McDONALD: Could the minister provide an update on how the Crisafulli government's 2026 budget is supporting the delivery of stage 1 of the Wave?

Mr MICKELBERG: Labor had committed to delivering heavy rail to Caloundra by 2015—before the member for Lockyer and I were in this parliament. That is what Labor said they would do, but it did not happen. It did not happen under Labor—that is a consistent refrain, unfortunately—but our government is getting on with the job. I can advise that contracts have been awarded for design and preconstruction works of that major project. What we call the brownfield package, which will deliver the connection to the existing rail line—the rail network at Beerwah—has been awarded to the Beerwah Coast Connect consortium and the stage 1 greenfield package has been awarded to the CoastalTraX consortium. We are also rolling out as a part of the Wave what is called the European Train Control System, ETCS. It is a really important system which enables reliability and also frequency. That package is being delivered by Alstom and UGL in relation to the Wave.

Stage 1 of the Wave will include 19 kilometres of new dual-track line with new stations at Aura, Bells Creek and Caloundra. There will also be significant upgrades to Beerwah station. Over the next 12 months we will be working with the delivery partners undertaking site investigations and finalising the designs in preparation for major construction work to commence next calendar year. Unfortunately, member for Lockyer, if it was up to Labor, that is where we would be stopping. However, our government is committed to stage 2 and to stage 3 of the Wave all the way through to the Maroochydore CBD and on to the airport. I can advise that the Wave 2 greenfield package is underway and we expect to announce a successful bidder later this year. We are also undertaking a procurement process for the stage 3 civil component and the market sounding for fleet operations and the maintenance packages, so a whole lot of work is underway.

I note that the federal government has not committed funding for the Wave stage 2 or 3 which is incredibly disappointing. Unfortunately, I have no explanation as to why Labor have not committed to the Wave stage 2 or 3. Certainly, on the Sunshine Coast, I know my community wants to see that investment to deliver the legacy infrastructure that the Sunny Coast needs to support our growing population. Like many parts of Queensland, as the population grew on the Sunny Coast we saw an underinvestment in transport infrastructure by the former Labor government. I would like to see the federal government come to the party to work with the state government to deliver the Wave stages 2 and 3. We believe the Sunny Coast has been ignored by Labor for far too long. This is their opportunity to demonstrate they are genuinely committed to supporting the growing population on the Sunny Coast and to delivering the important infrastructure that we need.

Mr JAMES: Minister, the Bruce Highway Targeted Safety Program funded in the Crisafulli government's 2026 budget is delivering significant benefits for communities up and down the coast. Please outline the importance of an 80-20 deal with the federal government?

Mr MICKELBERG: I agree with the member that the Bruce Highway Targeted Safety Program is delivering important upgrades and significant benefits right up and down the coast. The program is all about delivering targeted safety investments and improvements at high-risk locations in order to reduce the severity and frequency of crashes. That is not only going to save lives but also going to improve travel reliability. The member knows well what it means for his community when there is a crash on the Bruce Highway and it is closed for an extended period of time. We want to ensure we improve travel reliability for regional communities like those the member for Mulgrave represents.

It is important to note that the program is focused on locations from Gympie all the way up to Cairns, so all of that money will be spent outside the south-east in areas where we do not have divided dual carriageways, in particular. The program focuses on white centre line treatments, road widening, audio tactile line marking and pavement strengthening. I know in too many sections of the Bruce Highway the pavement is not acceptable. That is a legacy of underinvestment by the former Labor government, but we are making that investment now to deliver a better Bruce Highway. We are fixing the Bruce. There will be new overtaking lanes and rest areas. I was recently able to open a new rest area north of Gympie at Curra alongside the member for Gympie. We will be rolling out more rest areas up and down the Bruce Highway to allow people to manage fatigue. We are improving dangerous intersections on the Bruce and we are replacing or widening narrow bridges. The challenges associated with navigating some of the narrow bridges on the Bruce Highway was a particular concern raised by the trucking industry.

I can advise that project is powering along, with 65 projects underway or complete as at June 2026. In addition, we have 52 tenders expected to be released to market during the 2026-27 financial year. It is an aggressive funding profile and the money is heading out the door faster than our federal

government colleagues thought was possible. I think they were a little surprised we were able to get it to market this quickly, but it has not just happened. I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the hard work done by my department under the leadership of the director-general as well as RoadTek, our design and construction partners who are rolling out these projects.

The member for Mulgrave specifically asked about the 80-20 funding agreement. We were really pleased to be able to reach that agreement with the Albanese government in relation to the Bruce Highway. As the member no doubt knows—and I think Queenslanders are aware of now—the former state Labor government rolled over and agreed to a 50-50 funding split on the Bruce Highway. It is our view—and it has always been our view—that that was unacceptable and we campaigned hard for restoration of that 80-20 funding split for the Bruce Highway. Disappointingly, had we followed the path of agreeing to a 50-50 funding split, the Bruce Highway Targeted Safety Program would not have been a $9 billion program, it would have been a $3.6 billion program. We would have had $5.4 billion less to spend on this vital connection. We know that the Bruce Highway needs investment and we are really pleased to be rolling out this $9 billion program. We continue to work with the federal government. We advocated strongly and forcefully for restoration of the 80-20 funding split in relation to the Bruce Highway. I was pleased that they listened to that advocacy and reversed the position previously agreed to by the former Labor state government.

There is a contrast in the approach taken by our government in relation to the Bruce Highway in terms of our advocacy of the federal government to deliver this $9 billion investment. It is important to see the investment that we are rolling out. Far too often we see those opposite articulate hollow words when it comes to funding from Canberra. The member was not in this place at that point in time, but other members of the committee were, and they would remember the rhetoric associated with 50-50 hospital funding by the former Labor state government. When it is their Labor colleagues federally, they have been silent. In fact, they agreed to 50-50 on the Bruce Highway. It is unacceptable. It will never be unacceptable and that is why we fought for 80-20 and we are delivering it right now.

I think it goes to show that Labor are more interested in mounting political campaigns than advocating for the delivery of infrastructure for Queenslanders and fighting for Queensland's fair share. We will continue to fight for Queensland's fair share. I will continue to argue firmly and forcefully to ensure we get the investment that we need in Queensland's road and transport network.

It is also why we will not accept a 50-50 deal for another project on the Bruce Highway—the Gateway to Dohles Rocks Road upgrade. We have an agreement for 80-20 on the Bruce Highway. We will not roll over and accept 50-50 for that upgrade. I have made that very clear to Catherine King the federal minister. I expect them to honour an 80-20 agreement on the Bruce Highway.

Dr ROWAN: Minister, I refer to the Queensland Transport and Roads Investment Program, QTRIP, and specifically the Warrego Highway and Mount Crosby Road interchange. Local residents in my electorate are questioning the timeliness, scope and funding provided by both the federal and state governments for the completion of this project. Could you please provide the committee with an update on this project?

Mr MICKELBERG: At the outset, I acknowledge the strong advocacy of the member for Moggill for his community, particularly in relation to this project. He has made the importance of this project for his community very clear. The member asked about scope. The design for this project looks at a new interchange near the future Moggill pocket arterial connecting Mount Crosby Road via a southern service road. It also includes a new dual lane bridge that gives an alternate connection through to Karalee via a signalised intersection on Junction Road, plus minor upgrades to Mount Crosby Road itself. The existing interchange bridge stays as it is.

I also want to furnish the member with details around funding because that is clearly front of mind for locals in that part of the world. The project is jointly funded by the Queensland and Australian governments on a 50-50 basis and the total investment currently stands at $277 million. I want to flag, though, that as a part of the former Labor government's $6.7 billion worth of QTRIP project blowouts which I received upon taking office, the Mount Crosby interchange was captured in that list and was underfunded to the tune of just a shade under $200 million. We do have a funding shortfall in relation to that particular project as a consequence of the mismanagement of the former Labor government. The member may also be interested to know that in the former Labor government's last budget in 2024, over $200 million of the committed $277 million was actually allocated beyond the forward estimates, which blatantly shows that the former Labor government had it on the backburner when they were in government, despite their rhetoric now they are in opposition.

Now to timeliness, because I know that is at the heart of the member's question. I understand why his community is interested. I have been out on site with the member for Moggill and we have inspected that part of the world and, in particular, the Mount Crosby interchange. I understand its importance for his community. It is as true for that project as it is for a number of major projects in the transport capital program that the impact of the federal Labor government's environmental approvals framework under the EPBC Act are a significant strain in trying to get that project underway.

Just so we are clear, we still do not have federal government approvals in relation to that project. During the design phase the department was required to carry out additional ecological surveys under the EPBC framework—surveys beyond that which was originally scoped, and it was not anticipated by the department at the outset. Meeting those federal requirements properly has pushed out finalisation by at least 18 months, and we continue to go back and forth with the federal government. We want to resolve that as quickly as possible, but I would say it is an incredibly bureaucratic process. We will do our bit. We just ask the federal government to do their bit.

I would like to say to the committee that this uncertainty reflects the reality of delivering jointly funded infrastructure and the impact of EPBC. It is reflective of many major projects right across Queensland, unfortunately. I make the point to the committee that meeting Commonwealth environmental obligations is not optional—sometimes I wish it was, to be frank, member for Moggill, but it is not—and the recent changes made by the Albanese government to the EPBC Act have actually made it more difficult in terms of the speed with which we can get a project up off the ground.

Nonetheless, once the necessary environmental approvals are obtained and the design is finalised, that will provide us with a clearer picture in relation to the funding shortfall and we can consider that project holistically and make decisions and move forward. To that end, I want to thank the member for Moggill for his advocacy and the manner in which he has engaged on that project and on the issue. He is a forceful advocate for his community. I am sure that residents in that part of the world can be reassured that the project remains a priority for our government and on the radar and that progress is ongoing. All we ask is that the federal government come to the party and do their bit as well, in terms of both funding and the approvals in relation to the EPBC process.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, with reference to the Tiaro Bypass, is it correct that the Tiaro Bypass total project estimate is now $650 million, representing a Queensland government contribution of $130 million and a $520 million contribution from the federal government?

Ms Stannard: The member may be aware of the work we did with Rodd Staples, commenced at the time when you were in government, and indeed we continued that work. Rodd gave us some really clear advice about how we publish project budgets. He gave us advice that talked about limiting public reporting until the scope risks and business case approvals were clearly defined. He talked about that reducing the risk of unrealistic expectations. I give that as context to how we work through each project at this time.

We are seeking to maximise value for money by reserving any release of project budgets until such time as we have contracted those. The Tiaro Bypass, as the member is aware, is jointly funded by the Australian and Queensland governments on an 80-20 basis. The final design was released in November 2025. It does include 8½ kilometres of highway on a new alignment east of Tiaro, with a concrete centre median. It is also featured in the 2032 Delivery Plan, highlighting the criticality of infrastructure upgrades on the Bruce to support movement of all Queenslanders during the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

The Australian government did announce additional funding as part of the 2026 federal budget. That supported progression of the project towards procurement, and that will progress subject to the required environmental approvals which the minister has just spoken about. There will be a two-stage procurement process to secure the major construction contractor and we will be doing industry briefings in late July, at about this time, and seeking interest from prequalified contractors in August. That will move us through the progress of the project, but it would be pre-emptive of me to talk to the budget without that contract being in place.

Mr MELLISH: I table an image from the TMR website, through the member for Cooper, which lists the project at $336 million. That was updated just two days ago. Has the project amount increased under the Crisafulli LNP government?

Ms BUSH: We are tabling a document, for the record.

Mr SPEAKER: We will pass a copy to the director-general.

Ms Stannard: I can see the information from the website that you have identified. My understanding is that this project did have cost pressures and that that was announced by the minister when he came into the portfolio. That is probably all I can say to that cost at this stage. I know we have examined a range of ways of delivering this bypass.

Mr MELLISH: You can confirm that that project has increased in budget and it will not be delivered for $336 million?

Ms Stannard: I can confirm it will not be delivered for $336 million. The eventual contract price will be published when we contract that project.

Mr KING: The Commonwealth allocated an additional $99.7 million to the Boundary Road level crossing removal project in their budget. Given the available Commonwealth funding, can you advise why the state has not progressed the project to contract?

Ms Stannard: Certainly rail level crossings are a focus for us at this time. The member may be aware that we are doing significant removals of rail level crossings through a number of projects underway at the moment, including some near where you live. The design for the Boundary Road rail level crossing upgrade was completed in late 2024 after dealing with the complexities. It is a complex location. We are designing an overpass over an existing rail line and there is a three-way intersection so it is a complex project—you know the one. It will reduce congestion. It is an important project. We have acquired the land needed for the upgrade. The demolition of structures on the land began back in March of this year and we did complete that in July. We remain committed to the project for future delivery. It is an important project. It did not progress to procurement as originally planned. The project was adjusted. It is really about supporting that pipeline that we have in front of us. Level crossings are complicated projects to deliver and, as you can imagine, the market is quite busy delivering those level crossings we do have in progress. With a view to seeking best value from the market, we will bring that to market when we are able to do so and when we have capacity in the market and when budget is available.

Mr KING: There is no expected timeline at all?

Ms Stannard: The project remains a planned investment—one that we are looking to progress when we are able to do so.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, Channel 7 have reported that leaked CBRC documents show that the Wave stage 3 is a $5 billion project. Is that cost correct?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order. I ask that the member authenticate that claim.

Mr MELLISH: I am happy to authenticate that.

Ms BUSH: I will table those.

Mr SPEAKER: We will get a copy to the director-general.

Dr ROWAN: Another point of order, Mr Speaker. My point of order is that I think there are a number of matters which are under active investigation with respect to the matters raised by the member for Aspley by relevant agencies. I ask you to consider that matter.

Mr MELLISH: On his point of order, Speaker, that is not a point of order at all that the member for Moggill was raising.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Moggill, it is obviously in the public realm. Director-General, I would ask you to respond.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Speaker. This is a document that says ‘secret documents’ and ‘7 News’ and there is a set of texts on it. Can the member point to where this is in the budget, because this could be fabricated.

Mr SPEAKER: I am sure if it is fabricated the director-general will straighten that up fairly quickly.

Mr McDONALD: I am talking about the document. This is supposed to authenticate it.

Mr SPEAKER: We have viewed articles many times before.

Ms Stannard: The Wave stage 3 is a really exciting project. It will deliver high-frequency public transport, a corridor that is really important for the Sunshine Coast, high-capacity vehicles and a seamless connectivity with the Wave stages 1 and 2 from Birtinya and then the metro will continue through to the Sunshine Coast Airport. It is a great way to deliver public transport into the environment of the Sunshine Coast where the densities are suitable to have this kind of transport. It is critical for the infrastructure we need for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games that will support events

and accommodation on the Sunshine Coast. Beyond the games, the Wave will leave a lasting legacy. It really will enhance the appeal of the region to millions of tourists each year and it will be shaping a really connected, liveable and prosperous Sunshine Coast. It was announced as part of the delivery plan for the games and is fully funded.

Mr MELLISH: Further to that document, is the department breaking the project up into 13 separate work packages to stage the allocation of funds over multiple budget processes?

Ms Stannard: I had the opportunity to talk about the procurement approach we are using for the Wave stage 3 recently at an industry event. It is a deliberate approach and I am happy to talk to the committee about it.

What we are doing for the Wave stage 3 is procuring two alliance partners. Alliances are a really important way to deliver complex programs of work where the design is still to be finalised whilst we are in delivery. You would understand the time pressure we have. For some parts of that project, we have design that is well developed and the MRI is a good example. We have some design for that part of the project. To deliver the Wave stage 3 metro and pass through underneath there, we need to deliver additional infrastructure and weave that between existing road network, new road network and the connection to the rail. That design is not fully complete.

In order to get on with delivery, we will procure two alliance partners and then give them packages of work to deliver. This approach has been used widely in Australia. It is not so common in Queensland but it is one that we are using for the Bruce Highway. We will have a series of panels that will be delivering work. In the case of the Wave stage 3, we will let individual packages of work. Those alliance partners are in procurement at the moment. There are three tendering for that work and, once we award, we will have two alliance partners and then we will provide scopes of work to those partners to get on with delivery.

The member is correct: there will be packages of work. They will be given to an alliance partner to proceed with. It mitigates some risk for the department and the state in allocating a big package of work to one provider. We are able to keep two providers delivering that work. It also allows a full range of construction contractors from across the different tiers of the sector to be involved in that program of work so we are really looking forward to local contractors being involved in the delivery of what is a very big project.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, will any parts of the preserved CAMCOS corridor be given to private developers for any purpose other than public transport?

Ms Stannard: Recently, we were able to give some clarity to a number of property owners in what I will call the southern part of that corridor that is for the Wave stage 3—property owners who had potentially been impacted by the CAMCOS corridor or by the planning for the Wave and MRI. We were able to give them some certainty about whether or not their properties would be needed. We are continuing to refine the corridor north of the Maroochydore town centre and continuing up to the Sunshine Coast Airport. As we finish that planning, we will then be able to give certainty to those properties where owners may have interest.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, you mentioned the Mooloolah River Interchange. Can you outline the current timeframe and budget for that project?

Ms Stannard: The approach we are taking in managing QTRIP time and cost certainty is really important to us. We understand the risk of setting out timeframes and then feeling like we are being held over a barrel by a contractor, if I am really honest. In order to prevent that, we are moving through procurement. Once we have awarded a contract, we will be able to advise the value of that contract and its timeframes. At this stage, we really are still in procurement for those packages of work.

Some really important early works have commenced at MRI. RoadTek have been assisting us to get on with that quickly while we are doing the broader procurement. That has resulted in some really rapid work up there, which I am really pleased to see. They have done a great job.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, in relation to the Wave stage 3 your department said, 'In this case the intention is to go to open market.' That was from a public briefing into an unrelated bill. If the department is still going to open market on the Wave stage 3, can you advise whether Gamuda Engineering, which has engaged the minister's brother as a lobbyist, will be given consideration as part of that process?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order: I think that is speculation. It is not even in the contract. There is also an imputation.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: apart from an imputation, it is a hypothetical question as well. I would ask you to rule on that, Mr Speaker.

Mr MELLISH: On that point of order, I am happy to rephrase the question.

Mr SPEAKER: That would be a good idea.

Mr MELLISH: If the department is still going to open market as indicated, can you advise whether Gamuda Engineering will be given consideration as part of the process?

Ms Stannard: We are in procurement right now for what will ultimately be two program alliances. They will deliver civil infrastructure for the Wave stage 3 and the MRI. It is really important that we have two so we can continue to keep that competitive commercial tension throughout the process. We got a really strong response. Indeed, the procurement process was open market and then we down selected to three program alliances. The membership of those program alliances is on the public record. We are transparent about who are the members of those program alliances. I do not have that detail in front of me but I could google it for you. The three program alliances are currently in the process of tendering. We will award two of them as successful participants in the program. We could get the membership of each of those for you. To the best of my recollection, Gamuda is not a member of any of those alliances but I would like the opportunity to verify that, if that is okay.

Mr MELLISH: Moving on, Director-General, can you advise which projects fall into the transport infrastructure government election commitments, as identified by your department?

Mr McDONALD: Whoa.

Mr MICKELBERG: There would be no time left for any other questions.

Ms Stannard: The comments are because there are a lot of them. I think we have 127 government election commitments or it could be 172. My team is definitely going to be handing me a list. I will not pretend I can recite those. It is going to come any minute because I know we have listed that.

TMR is delivering 122 of the government's 2024 election commitments. That represents over 15 per cent of the total across government. Ninety-seven of those government election commitments relate to TMR transport infrastructure portfolio projects, which are delivered as part of the broader QTRIP. Key election commitments that received additional funding in the 2026-27 state budget: Caboolture-Bribie Island Road; the Bribie Island bridge; the Bruce Highway, Maryborough to Gin Gin, and the Walker Street intersection improvement for planning and preconstruction; Shute Harbour, construct a four-lane boat ramp and car park; the Stafford Road and South Pine Road intersection at Everton Park and upgrade to that intersection; and the Landsborough-Maleny Road and Maleny-Montville Road intersection to improve safety. Cross River Rail is responsible for the delivery of one government election commitment. Queensland Rail is responsible for the delivery of two government election commitments. The remaining 119 government election commitments sit with Transport and Main Roads. I can continue now with the list.

Mr MELLISH: Just the major ones might be useful, Director-General.

Mr SPEAKER: The director-general was asked a question. Can you respond, thank you?

Ms Stannard: We have a significant investment in the delivery of the Bribie Island Bridge. There are a number of dangerous intersections that are being upgraded at the D'Aguilar Highway, Mount Mee Road and Campbells Pocket Road. We have money for a business case for the design of safety upgrades at intersections that link Elm Street, Myall and Diamond streets in Cooroy. We have funds for upgrades to the intersection at Landsborough Maleny and Maleny-Montville roads which I spoke about. There are funds to upgrade the Angus Smith roundabout in Douglas, including the installation of traffic lights. There is an investigation of options for Binstead Way and Pacific Pines Boulevard intersection. We also have funds to increase the height of the Austinville causeway. We are working with council to stop erosion on the riverbank of the Oxenford Pony Club fields. We also have funding to deliver M1 sound barriers at a couple of locations.

There are significant funds for the Walker Street and Bruce Highway intersection as well as funds for Summerholm Road intersection on the Warrego Highway. There are funds for the completion of a business case into a second road into Highfields from Toowoomba. We are in the process of a project for flashing lights for Glenvale State School.

We also have government election commitments that relate to service improvements. Gold Coast on-demand transport is made permanent. We have accessible stops and service changes in Cairns and one at Geebung. Gold CityGlider is also an election commitment. There is the route 444 extension,

the Far North Queensland public passenger transport service trial and Bribie Island on-demand transport. We are also working with local councils to deliver the supporting infrastructure for those projects.

I am not sure that I have been comprehensive, but they are some of the highlights that I have in front of me.

Mr MELLISH: Minister, today the Premier said, 'We are building things and we are building them on time and on budget.' Have any of those projects increased in cost or had their timeline extended?

Mr MICKELBERG: I make the observation that those government election commitments are things that are getting built because our government made that commitment and our government was elected and our government is delivering, as opposed to that approach taken by the former Labor government. I have spoken at length about that. I thank the member for the question because it gives me an opportunity to talk about his record and the approach taken by the former Labor government. As I said in one of the earlier answers, when we came to office we inherited a $6.7 billion blowout in QTRIP projects. Not a single project was on time or on budget. That is the member for Aspley's record. That is what I inherited. I will give the member for Aspley credit in one regard: he did engage—the department, I should say—

Mr MELLISH: Point of order, Speaker: relevance to the question. It was asked whether any of those projects have increased in budget or had their timelines extended.

Mr SPEAKER: That was the question. Minister, factor that in amongst your response, please.

Mr MICKELBERG: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, as part of the comprehensive program that is QTRIP, what we inherited was a $6.7 billion blowout under the former Labor government, under the member for Aspley's stewardship, and we received advice—

Mr MELLISH: Point of order: I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and asks you to withdraw.

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw. We received advice, as the director-general alluded to, from a gentleman by the name of Rodd Staples, who was commissioned by the department under the former Labor government—an eminently qualified expert with respect to the delivery of transport infrastructure, how to stage it, how to ensure we deliver value for money. I am pleased that the former Labor government had at least acknowledged that it was not going well under their watch and commissioned Mr Staples.

Part of the advice that Mr Staples gave us was to take a different approach in relation to procurement—to ensure we engage with industry and inform them as to the timeframes and the type of projects that are coming through the program but not to publish budget numbers in advance because we could drive better value for money for the taxpayer. That is the approach we have taken. It is the approach we took with QTRIP last year and it has continued in the budget this year through the QTRIP program.

I will make some observations, though, with the specifics of the member for Aspley's question. In many cases, in relation to government election commitments that we made, we are doing more—more than we promised at the last election—because since coming to government we have identified that the need is even greater. I will give an example in my own part of the world: the Wave stage 3. We made a promise to extend the Wave to Maroochydore. We are going right through to the Sunshine Coast Airport because it is very clear that that will deliver a better benefit for the Sunshine Coast community and deliver a greater capability. That is not something we promised before the last election. Indeed, that is something we committed to as part of the 2032 Delivery Plan.

Similarly, the Gold Coast Light Rail extension from the hospital to Harbour Town was not something we committed to at the last election, but it is something we are funding in this budget because it is something we believe in, we have identified there is a need and we are getting on with the job of doing just that.

I reject the premise of the member for Aspley's question. I make the observation that our government is delivering major transport infrastructure, and we will continue to deliver that infrastructure on time and on budget.

Mr KEMPTON: Minister, I refer to the delivery of the $55.9 billion QTRIP program. Can the minister advise how the department is working with industry on its delivery?

Mr MICKELBERG: The member for Cook's question gives me an opportunity to continue to talk about some of the issues I was just discussing. Getting industry on board with delivery of the huge pipeline of work that we have will, of course, be critical. Our government is very cognisant of the fact that we cannot do it alone. We have been talking extensively about how we can improve the procurement and delivery of projects. It has to be considered in the broader context of reform led by the director-general off the back of the Staples report which I just mentioned—the outcome of the work done by Mr Rodd Staples. You can see that in action in the panel arrangement that the director-general alluded to that has been put in place for things like the Bruce Highway Targeted Safety Program. I refer to the previous answer to the member for Mulgrave's question that talks to the amount of work we are getting out the door for that very important program. It could only be delivered because the changes—and the director-general spoke to it—we have put in place have meant we have been able to expedite and deliver more work, more shovels in the ground more quickly, because of the changes off the back of the recommendations and the advice received from the Staples report.

I contrast that with that which has been uncovered through the commission of inquiry into the CFMEU. I think Queenslanders have been rightly horrified to see what has been exposed in relation to the practices of the former Labor state government. We know they had an open-door policy to the CFMEU. The member for Aspley, the then minister for transport and main roads, continued to meet with the CFMEU after those unions stormed the TMR building, the building of his own department. They stormed that building in 2022, yet the member for Aspley continued to meet with the CFMEU as the minister for transport and main roads. I think that is disgraceful and I think Queenslanders think it is disgraceful.

Mr MELLISH: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and asks that you withdraw.

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw. It was also recently disclosed in public hearings of the CFMEU commission of inquiry that ministerial involvement in the implementation of BPIC was 'very high', with departmental officers aware that Mr Bailey, the member for Miller, the then minister, was meeting regularly with the CFMEU and with his office passing on the union's demands.

It was even worse than that, member for Cook. It has been shown in the commission of inquiry that the department was directed to focus on the implementation of BPIC, which is also known as the CFMEU tax, and that required departmental staff to meet with the CFMEU in situations that officers have described as terrifying. TMR staff, it has been uncovered, were instructed to cease engagement with the construction industry about the implementation of the CFMEU tax. I would suggest that the former Labor government did not want to hear the truth about that tax.

The commission of inquiry was told that the government was living in some sort of fantasy land where they believed that BPIC was going to save money, even though the input costs on major projects would be higher. That was the former government's assessment: the CFMEU tax would save money on projects, despite the fact that the evidence said it would increase input costs. Industry was sounding the alarm in relation to BPIC, but the government were not listening because it did not align with their own internal narrative, member for Cook. The contrast could not be starker. On one hand you have a former Labor government that was beholden to the CFMEU masters who were pulling the strings, and that resulted in projects blowing out in the billions. It was $6.7 billion in QTRIP alone.

On the other hand you have our government listening to stakeholders, working with industry and working with unions—I might add, those unions are not aligned with the CFMEU, they want to drive productive outcomes, they want to have safe worksites and they want to deliver for Queensland. I am more than happy to work with those unions, but I will not work with the CFMEU, whose business model is built on destroying productivity and riding roughshod over Queenslanders. We are delivering projects on time and on budget for the people of Queensland because we work for them, not for the CFMEU.

Mr KEMPTON: Minister, again in relation to the $55.9 billion QTRIP program, can you advise how important it is that all of these construction sites remain safe for workers?

Mr MICKELBERG: At the outset, I state that we are committed to ensuring Queensland construction sites are safe and that workers are well paid and highly productive. That is our commitment. That will ensure the best outcomes for those construction companies delivering these major projects. It will ensure the best outcomes for construction workers and for Queensland taxpayers.

Unfortunately, that has not always been the case. Under the former government, worksites became battle grounds. They were rife with union thuggery, which was masterminded by the CFMEU and condoned by former Labor government ministers. The CFMEU were fighting for control of construction sites in Queensland and they were being aided and abetted by the former Labor government and by former Labor government ministers.

We have all seen the footage of fights breaking out on the Cross River Rail picket lines, but it was more than physical violence. The commission of inquiry has heard of some of the psychological trauma that was caused by the CFMEU's fear campaigns. They would target family members. They would damage property. It was a deliberate campaign to instil fear and to destroy productivity. All of that was well known at the time, member for Cook, by the former Labor government, but they chose to turn a blind eye. Disappointingly, they chose to turn a blind eye.

To maintain safe workplaces, it is important to have a strong watchdog on the beat that workers can rely on. The commission of inquiry has also heard how the watchdog—Workplace Health and Safety Queensland—was corrupted under the former Labor government. I refer to claims that individuals within WHSQ were working as agents of the CFMEU, targeting companies for health and safety violations at the direction of the CFMEU. We have heard that inspectors were told to issue infringements when they were not warranted as part of the deliberate CFMEU campaigns. We know that WHSQ inspectors were raising concerns with the responsible minister, but, incredibly disappointingly, those pleas for help fell on deaf ears.

That corruption of the system as a whole undermined the safety on worksites. It undermined whole-of-site safety systems. It further reduced productivity on construction sites. Workers and contractors lost faith in the independent umpire's ability to manage site safety. Sites were needlessly shut down by the CFMEU. They frequently used fake or manufactured safety issues, which the commission of inquiry has heard about frequently. Worse, it actually impeded the ability of Workplace Health and Safety to respond to legitimate and serious safety concerns because they were being used as a plaything of the CFMEU's. It played out in transport infrastructure and the delivery of major projects.

The CFMEU's persecution of construction companies that would not bend to their will was a deliberate campaign designed to exert their influence and deliver on their objectives, but it was at the expense of Queenslanders. The fact that some of the former Labor ministers who let that situation develop still sit in this place is a disgrace, in my view.

Our government, in contrast, has restored the independence of Workplace Health and Safety Queensland. The result is safer worksites for construction workers. We will always side with construction workers over CFMEU bosses. We will continue to restore productivity on major projects, like the transport infrastructure pipeline that we are delivering as part of this budget.

Mr SPEAKER: The next question will be from the member for Lockyer.

Mr McDONALD: My question is also to the minister. Can the minister provide an update on recent e-mobility legislation changes and what TMR resources will be used this financial year to assist with police enforcement?

Mr MICKELBERG: As the member is aware, on 4 June this parliament passed our government's nation-leading e-mobility laws—laws that strike the right balance between the need to address unsafe and illegal devices and enabling the ongoing safe and legal use of e-mobility devices. The new laws provide police with the power to crack down on illegal and high-powered devices, which directly addresses the significant community concerns that our government heard across multiple inquiries in relation to the issue, including through the work of your committee, member for Lockyer.

The key reforms, which you know well, member for Lockyer, include police powers to seize illegal devices and conduct RBTs. They include parental responsibility offences, new device compliance requirements, new path speed limits to protect pedestrians and increased penalties for risky behaviour such as not wearing a helmet. Riders need to be at least 16 years of age and hold a minimum of a learner's licence. There will be some exemptions available.

Our reforms address the community feedback about licensing, age requirements, e-bike compliance and path speed limits, while preserving safe and legal e-mobility use. Most of the reforms commenced on 1 July. The licensing and age limit requirements, including exemptions, are scheduled to commence on 31 August 2026. To date, we have had over 100 illegal devices seized. I do hope, member for Lockyer, that none of them were partially funded by the former Labor government's flawed e-mobility rebate scheme that they rolled out pre-election.

In the first 10 days of the new laws coming into effect, there were 420 infringements issued for things like drink riding, not wearing helmets and the like. One of the elements of our new laws was about giving the police the ability to do RBTs. It was a loophole the former Labor government knew about. In fact, they promised to act on it, but, disappointingly, they did not act. It shows the contrast between a Labor Party that are soft on crime and do not give the police the powers they need and our government, which is empowering police to do their job to keep Queenslanders safe. Our TMR officers will be out there supporting the QPS in their enforcement work over the coming months and year. We will ensure we identify and remove as many illegal devices from our streets as possible.

As I said, the next tranche of e-mobility laws comes into effect next month, and that will require the users of e-mobility devices to have a licence. That will ensure they have an adequate level of knowledge about the road rules—an important recommendation that came out of the inquiry. We said that we would implement nation-leading laws when it comes to e-mobility, and the success that we are seeing demonstrates that we will back up those laws with nation-leading enforcement. The feedback we have received from police is they are seeing a reduction in the use of illegal devices on our streets. There is more work to be done, but we are giving them the tools they need to get on with the job.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go back to non-government members. Member for Maiwar, do you have a question?

Mr BERKMAN: I want to put a question to the director-general on the Active Transport Grants Program, which has replaced the cycle network and walking local government grants programs. I understand those grants are usually announced in June, very shortly after the budget, but they have not been announced yet. Can you tell us what is the total amount allocated for this round of grants, and when will they be announced?

Ms Stannard: Sorry, I have just been handed the wrong brief, but I am sure my team are going to look for that brief that you have just asked me about because I do not have those statistics on this particular brief. I do have some information in my own folder. My apologies.

The department has allocated really significant investment into active transport because we are focused on expanding and making it really easy for people to walk or ride as part of their everyday travel. It includes making sure these choices work as standalone trips or as a component of a multimodal journey—for example, to access public transport. That is something that we are really focused on. If we continue to make it easier to combine walking and riding with public transport then our transport system can offer more flexibility and more efficient travel options. That will help address traffic congestion in some locations and support healthy lifestyle choices. I am sure you are aware of the benefits.

We do build significant active transport infrastructure as part of some of our broader transport projects and through the implementation of the active transport infrastructure program. In the budget we have $312 million between 2026-27 and 2029-30 towards that grants program.

Mr BERKMAN: The second element of the question was: when will the grants be announced?

Ms Stannard: The minister has just reminded me that I have read out the total investment in active transport initiatives, not the investment in the grants program.

Mr BERKMAN: Yes.

Ms Stannard: That might have confused the member, so I am sorry for that. The grants total is $15 million, but I do not have the details of when that will be announced. I guess that is a matter for the government to determine when those announcements will be made.

Mr BERKMAN: As I have discussed previously with the minister and the department and former ministers, everyone is well aware that Taringa station is long overdue for an accessibility upgrade. Despite meeting all the criteria, the reason it does not happen is that it is difficult to access the site which makes it expensive to upgrade. You may not be aware, but there is currently a major development proposed immediately adjacent that will constrain the site even further. In that light, will the department now prioritise the upgrade at that site before it becomes more difficult and more expensive to upgrade in the future?

Ms Stannard: I appreciate your focus on local railway stations. They are a really important way for people to access the public transport network. Like you, I am passionate about how people connect to those stations. Many people walk, ride or use a bus to get there. They do not all drive to those stations, so we have to make sure we prioritise all of those needs.

The station is in a cutting, so you know it is difficult geography. I note you have identified a development coming. I am not aware of the specific development. That kind of development we do often get notified through our planning teams so that we are aware of those developments as they occur. I do not have the specifics of that one in front of me, but that is the sort of thing we would want to look at. I think I would refer it to my planning team to look at as the development progresses. I do not have that in front of me.

Mr BERKMAN: For what it is worth, it is 10 Morrow Street.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, Queenslanders first learned of the delayed expansion of the Metro network from a Brisbane City Council sitting. When did your department first learn of Brisbane City Council's intention to delay the Metro rapid business cases until 2028?

Ms Stannard: Obviously, the Brisbane Metro in operation now in Brisbane is carrying large numbers of people. People are voting with their feet and enjoying access to those new vehicles on that dedicated busway infrastructure. We are working collaboratively with Brisbane City Council. They are leading the Brisbane Metro expansion business case. My understanding is that it will include consideration of key corridors where we see high volumes of bus travel. I am not aware of a delay that you have pointed to. I am not sure if that is a statement that I am not aware of.

Mr MELLISH: Further to that, in the department's understanding, when are the rapid business cases in relation to the Metro which are jointly funded commencing?

Ms Stannard: It is a planned investment. The member is correct. There is joint funding allocated between the federal government, the state government and Brisbane City Council. As I understand it, the local government, through the Rt Hon. Lord Mayor, is engaging with the Commonwealth. As I understand it, the PPR will be with the Australian government for consideration such that when that funding is released they will be able to progress. We need to have that Commonwealth funding released would be my understanding. My team is working closely with Brisbane City Council as the lead as they progress that scope. Obviously Brisbane City Council, therefore, will determine the timeframes as the lead agent on that business case.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, I refer to a statement in Brisbane City Council's 2024 *The race to gold* document, which states—

With 8 years left to prepare for the Games, Brisbane Metro is the only new mass transit solution that can be built and ready for services in time for 2032 in Brisbane.

Director-General, given the delay to the rapid business cases, is it not correct that Brisbane will now not receive any new mass transit options to support the 2032 Olympic Games?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order: I believe that is a hypothetical.

Ms BUSH: If you remove the only option, what have you got left?

Mr McDONALD: I believe it is a hypothetical but I also believe it is seeking an opinion. Perhaps it may help if the member can authenticate that.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have any authentication?

Mr MELLISH: I am happy to authenticate the Brisbane City Council document.

Ms BUSH: I am happy to table that.

Mr SPEAKER: We will get a copy to the director-general. This does not state anything about it being delayed that I can see.

Ms BUSH: It is in the highlighted section.

Mr SPEAKER: That does not say that the project is going to be delayed. Could you rephrase your question?

Mr MELLISH: I am happy to rephrase the question. Director-General, other than the Metro project, are there any other mass transit solutions or mass transit projects that will benefit Brisbane for the 2032 Olympic Games?

Ms Stannard: The first thing I would like to say is that the team are working incredibly hard to plan for the Olympics and the growth of South-East Queensland continues, so we are really looking forward to the opportunity the Olympics presents us to provide the infrastructure and services that the growing region will need.

As the venues have become more firm in recent times we have been able to update our planning. Transport planning is a complicated tool but it is a really powerful tool. It gives us great information about where people will come from, where they are going to and how they will access those venues. With the change for the stadium to be in the CBD, that is actually fantastic for mass public transport because most of our network is radial and it connects people to the CBD.

One of the fundamental changes that customers will see in the inner city by 2032 is that Cross River Rail will be fully operational. That will mean permanent rail services through the Exhibition station on that new alignment as well as through the tunnel under the CBD. As a little bit of a transport geek, transport models are not great at forecasting new stations, but when Albert Street station opens really close to the university and this end of town I think it will exceed every forecast in that model.

That rail investment that is underway and in delivery, combined with the investment in rolling stock which will increase the size of the fleet by 30 per cent, really gives us the potential to fundamentally change rail connectivity to Brisbane. That will service not just long-distance commuters but all of those suburban commuters who hop on the rail network close in to the inner city, and it will fundamentally change how people move about Brisbane.

One of the things about rail, obviously, is: with its dedicated corridor it does not get delayed, just like the busway where the Brisbane Metro is operating now. Services on the busway also have that congestion-free ride into the inner city. What I think Brisbane will see is a fundamentally different transport network when we get to 2032.

To support that games-time transport we are doing detailed planning, and we have moved ahead on that long-lead-time infrastructure—that rail infrastructure that takes longer to deliver. We are modelling games-time travel demands now so that we can understand what we might need to do as a temporary overlay. It makes sense in all major sporting events like this. There will be reallocations of road space temporarily to provide access for shuttle buses that will connect people from rail stations to venues. We are also providing technical input at the moment into the competition venue planning, just to make sure each of them has safe, efficient and inclusive access. With the Paralympics closely behind the Olympics, that inclusive access will be critical to make sure that all spectators can get to each of the events they want to see.

We are doing our modelling so it can be updated from now right through until games time. What we know from global experience is that the program of events can change right up to the last minute, even the week before. When a sponsor wants to have a different advertising regime they might move the starting time of an event. We will be able to update our transport modelling. One of the teams that suffer the most with questions from the DG is the modelling and data analysis team, which has access to so much data. We are working through that now to see what we might need to do as a temporary games lane, where we give priority to buses or VIPs or, indeed, athletes. We have made some strong commitments about how we get athletes from the villages to each of those venues. Our transport planning is well underway.

There are a number of things that will change in Brisbane's transport network over the next six years. Expansions of Brisbane Metro may well be part of that. The business case is in procurement now, so that is great news. Respondents will be able to tender for work on that business case. Meanwhile, we are seeing the benefit of some of the on-road priority on Gympie Road. We know that is a key part of the corridor where bus transport is really important. We are looking to see what we might need in that corridor. We will be able to work with Brisbane City Council on that. We will be studying those venues and each of the access points as we understand the capacity of each of the venues to refine that modelling. We are accelerating a lot of delivery in order to be ready for the event, and I am really looking forward to seeing how that transports Brisbane.

Ms BUSH: My question is also to the director-general. Director-General, Brisbane City Council's Story Bridge Renewal Progress Update, which was released in June of this year, estimates the total cost for the staged renewal of the Story Bridge to be $3.6 billion. May I ask what discussions your department has had with Brisbane City Council with respect to funding requests?

Ms Stannard: As an asset owner of over 3,000 bridges across the state, I know well the challenge of maintaining bridges through their whole life. We have timber bridges and we have steel bridges. As a result, we have some great technical capability in the transport department. We have certainly been providing access between our bridge experts and the council's bridge experts so they can swap notes about the best way to deal with each of our assets.

Brisbane City Council has advised us about the planning that is underway. To the best of my knowledge, their business case is not yet complete. I think there were some early estimates that they have started to talk about. I know the challenges of trying to maintain bridges in good quality service throughout their life. That is an ongoing challenge. I cannot speak to their cost estimates at this time.

Ms BUSH: I will ask a follow-up question of the minister. Minister, would it be correct that the state will not be providing financial assistance to Brisbane City Council for the Story Bridge renewal?

Mr MICKELBERG: I reiterate the comments of the director-general. Obviously Brisbane City Council, as the asset owner, is doing the work in relation to the business case. I understand that the Brisbane City Council has approached the federal government and asked for an 80 per cent funding commitment. I think it is appropriate, given the scale of the infrastructure, that the Australian government does support Brisbane City Council. Obviously, we need to see the outcome of the business case that they are working through at the moment.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, is it correct that the government has just released an industry sounding into 600 new buses which specifies that the buses must be diesel only?

Ms Stannard: It is certainly the case that we are looking ahead to the procurement of buses and what will be required for the asset base that we are responsible for. It is the big fleet. It is important that we deliver that fleet and renew that fleet as we go forward to ensure we can maintain service continuity. Bus operations are provided by a range of operators throughout the region, and their service continuity is important—as is value for money—to the Queensland government as that network continues to grow in demand.

Historically, bus operators owned and controlled the assets required to deliver that task. That model was appropriate at the time; however, there are benefits in shifting this model. Value for money is at the heart of our thinking about how we take the transport network forward. We know the city and the region are growing and that mass public transport will be a critical part of keeping the liveability that we already enjoy in this state.

The state budget did announce that TMR would procure and own a fleet of diesel Euro 6 buses. It is a very important investment because those modern Euro 6 standard buses emit much less pollution than the older diesel buses in the fleet. It is also true that we had done significant market sounding and industry engagement about the transition to low-emission vehicles over time. Both operating and manufacturing industries have given us feedback about a steady, stable transition and about the best way to progress with that over time. We have opened market sounding, and that is to help us design the bus procurement that we will take forward given the funding that has come through in the state budget.

Mr MELLISH: In relation to that market sounding, how long is it expected those buses will remain in operation for?

Ms Stannard: Modern buses of this kind will be reliable for some time into the future. Our understanding is that the buses will have a life of about 20 years once they are in operation. We certainly seek to maintain them in good working order to enable that, so that is my expectation.

Mr MELLISH: In relation to that market sounding, are there any local content requirements for that?

Ms Stannard: The Queensland Procurement Policy gives good guidance to our department about how we are to procure everything that is funded in Queensland. That guidance delivers a range of local benefits. My recollection is that there are 12 different aspects of benefits that we need to look through in the Queensland Procurement Policy and that we need to identify. What we have seen through a range of tenders that we have been involved in is that the market is best placed to give us advice about how local benefits can be delivered for each of the specific procurements that we do. It will probably make sense to you, knowing Queensland, that the local benefits we can deliver in Cape York are different to the local benefits we can deliver in Mount Isa and different to the local benefits we can deliver here in the south-east. We will be engaging closely with the market about what the best value for money way is to deliver the buses that are needed in operation in South-East Queensland that are suitable for the climate and the operating environment in which we are working.

Mr MELLISH: When are you expecting those 600 buses to be in operation? Is there a timeframe for that?

Ms Stannard: We are expecting to move through market sounding and then move into procurement. We are looking for the first delivery of buses to be in the 2027-28 financial year.

Mr MELLISH: Just to clarify, from 2027-28 is there an end date on that market sounding procurement process?

Ms Stannard: Similar to my approach with regard to infrastructure, we are going to be dealing with the market about what it makes sense to do. Different scales of manufacturing will be able to deliver different beat rates of delivery. They will be out of scale, given they have a known pipeline of work ahead, so I would not want to pre-empt what the market might offer us in that delivery.

Mr SPEAKER: We will now go to government questions.

Mr McDONALD: I have a question for the minister. With reference to the registration and licensing modernisation budget measure, can the minister please provide an update on the replacement of the department's licensing and vehicle registration system, TRAILS?

Mr MICKELBERG: I want to thank the member for Lockyer for his question. I will just give the background, as I know not everyone is across TRAILS. TMR's licensing and vehicle registration system is called TRAILS and it has been in service for over three decades. There are not too many other computer systems that are that old and are still in use. The experts talk about its legacy architecture, which is just a polite way of saying that it is completely outdated. It is enormously complex, it is particularly costly to maintain and it is difficult to adapt to modern needs as well.

Any changes made to that system risk breaking something, and it is a constant issue that the department has had to manage for over a decade. Under the previous Labor government, in 2023 we had a situation where double demerit points were accidentally applied to more than 2,800 customers, resulting in some motorists having their licences incorrectly suspended. The committee may recall that during the recent inquiry into e-mobility there were a number of people calling for devices to be registered. The honest truth is that the registration could not even be considered because the TRAILS system as it exists right now cannot support that outcome.

The previous Labor government announced a couple of different attempts to modernise the system during their 10 years in government, but no serious progress unfortunately had been made. Despite the essential nature of that system, I understand their reluctance. It is not an easy system. It cannot be taken offline until a replacement system can be built. It is a very complex undertaking; it is the equivalent of trying to do an engine change on a 747 while it is still in flight. It holds the registration details of over six million vehicles and the licence information of around four million drivers. It has more than 23 million transactions each year, and there are so many reliant users, such as the QPS system, which the member for Lockyer knows well. All of them are reliant on this system.

Our government, however, was elected because we said we would make the tough decisions, so we will be proceeding with modernisation of the TRAILS system. Our approach will be different, however, to Labor's previous failed attempts. We will be adopting a phased approach that will see this monolithic system replaced with modular, independent services which will improve maintainability and reduce the system-wide impacts from failures. It will be achieved over a number of years. For customers, that will mean we will have a more flexible system that will allow services to be better tailored to the needs of all Queenslanders. This is core to our government's commitment to better customer services for all Queenslanders.

Dr ROWAN: My question is to the director-general. I have noted the machinery-of-government changes relating to TRAILS, which is the vehicle registration and licence database. Director-General, could you please advise if the department has previously investigated options to give vehicle registration discounts based on employment status, such as being an apprentice, and the findings as to whether this was possible?

Ms Stannard: The minister just gave a great description of the TRAILS system, probably in more succinct terms than I would. It is a very robust system and has been in place for many years. They tell me there are 35 million lines of code in this system, so you can understand it is a complex system.

The introduction of a new concession for apprentices is something that has been contemplated in the past. It is something that would need very rigorous analysis. Any concession has to have a really clear definition of eligibility and a way for someone to prove that eligibility. It also is a really interesting question about the relationship between the vehicle use. Some apprentices might be driving mum and dad's car, so it would be important to consider how you relate that to the registered vehicle if you were to consider something like that for an apprentice.

The TRAILS system knows who the vehicle is registered to. I think probably the most important thing to understand is that the apprentice might drive a vehicle to work but it may be mum and dad's car. I am not sure if that is the kind of eligibility we are looking for in a scheme like that, but it is one we

would need to consider. If we were then trying to relate the apprentice—who would need to prove they are an apprentice—to the registration, then we would need to do that in the TRAILS system. As the minister has just identified, that system is complex to change.

I can inform the committee today that the Transport Registration and Integrated Licensing System does not have the ability to provide a rebate. That is not a function we have in that system following receipt of registration. We do rebates for other departments but it is not something we can do within TRAILS so it could not be administered in-house by TMR. Registration concessions that apply for people with appropriate concession entitlements are a legislated matter. That is defined, and it is something that there has to be verifiable data on. At this time, the Transport Registration and Integrated Licensing System does not have the functionality to provide that kind of rebate for apprentices.

Mr KEMPTON: Minister, with reference to the Barron River bridge project published in this year's QTRIP, can you please outline the actions expected over the coming year to advance this project in line with the Crisafulli government's commitment?

Mr MICKELBERG: I thank the member for Cook for the question. More particularly, I want to thank him for his tireless advocacy on behalf of the constituents of Cook and the broader Far North. I also want to thank the member for Barron River for her advocacy in relation to the Barron River bridge. It is a bridge I know well. I used to drive over it twice a day, every day, when I lived either in Atherton and worked on the coast or in Trinity Beach and worked in Atherton, so I understand its criticality for the people of the Far North.

Let me start with why that project matters. The existing Barron River bridge is obviously an important piece of infrastructure, but it currently operates under significant restrictions for the safety of road users. There is a 42½-tonne weight limit and a 60-kilometre-an-hour speed limit. My department carries out inspections on the bridge every three months over a four-week period. I want to acknowledge the member for his advocacy in relation to trying to minimise the impacts of those inspections which are necessary to ensure its safe operation.

During those inspection works, the bridge operates under single-lane conditions. Other restrictions are also put in place, as the member knows. I want to acknowledge that it is a real and recurring impact for the local community and for freight operators, and it underscores why replacing that bridge is a priority. As I said, I have driven that road countless times and I understand the importance of maintaining a safe and productive road network.

Before the last election, our government made a commitment. As a consequence of the advocacy of the then hardworking candidates for Barron River and Cook, we made a commitment to deliver a new bridge over the Barron River at Kuranda, and since coming to government we have been delivering on that promise. Not only did we secure a funding deal with the Australian government to construct the bridge; we have also progressed beyond the planning into the procurement process. Early market engagement and involvement from proponents is ongoing, and we are ensuring we work closely with the industry so we can get it right. It is a complex piece of infrastructure to build in a complex environment and a critical link as well for the people of the Far North.

In terms of the scope and the delivery approach, we are using an early contractor involvement process. I am advised that my department has had good input from contractors who are participating in that process. Generally speaking, that type of approach means that a successful contractor works alongside the department during the design in order to identify constructability, cost and risk issues, which obviously is particularly important in that part of the world given the environmental sensitivities of the site.

Construction of the new bridge is expected to commence in 2028, and the new bridge is scheduled to be open to traffic in 2031, subject to weather and construction constraints. The reason for this—because I know it is front of mind for the member for Cook and also the committee more broadly—is that the environmental considerations for this project are significant and we are not going to shy away from that fact. Earlier this year, the department lodged the environmental approval for the project under the Commonwealth government's environmental approvals framework under the EPBC Act. The Barron River is an environmentally significant waterway, and a project of that scale, which obviously crosses it, needs to have a rigorous environmental assessment.

That referral process and the environmental approvals that flow from it are why construction is not scheduled or expected to start until 2028. If we could expedite that process we would start earlier, but we have to work within the framework we have, which is the federal government's EPBC Act. We

want to get it right. I acknowledge the genuine need to manage the environmental risks and the considerations, but we need to balance that with getting on with the job of a major project that will deliver major benefits for the entire region, whether that is for the member for Mulgrave's constituents or the member for Cook's constituents or the broader Far North.

On cost, I would note for the committee that as with any project that is still progressing through the early contractor involvement and design and construct tender evaluation, final costings will be confirmed once that contract is awarded and the design is locked in following the ECI process. Nevertheless, we are working hard to pull whatever levers are available to ensure we deliver that project on time and on budget and provide an outcome for Queenslanders in your part of the world, member for Cook. We know the Far North has been waiting for this for a long time and we are getting on with the job of delivering it as quickly as possible.

Mr JAMES: Minister, please advise how the Crisafulli government's 2026 budget invests in safety improvements and upgrades to the Mount Lindesay Highway.

Mr MICKELBERG: That is another important question because it speaks to another key road corridor that our government is investing in. It is part of our record transport infrastructure spend as a part of this budget.

As the committee would be aware, the Mount Lindesay Highway is a designated national land transport network route. It runs from Browns Plains in Logan City through Scenic Rim Regional Council down to the Queensland-New South Wales border. It is a critical corridor for that rapidly growing part of South-East Queensland. Our government, particularly through the advocacy of the member for Scenic Rim, committed $7 million prior to the last election, planning projects on the highway between Jimboomba and Beaudesert. Planning is underway for safety investments and improvements across a 20-kilometre section of the highway between Jimboomba and Beaudesert. That planning work is about developing both short- and long-term solutions for safety and capacity which will inform future funding decisions. I would be pleased to furnish the member and the committee with the details of that work if we work through the different components.

Firstly, we are planning safety and capacity improvements between South Street in Jimboomba and Cedar Vale Road in Cedar Vale. That will extend the benefits of the Jimboomba duplication further south along the corridor. Secondly, at Veresdale we are progressing a wide centreline treatment across a two-kilometre section of the highway. We know that those wide centreline treatments are a proven, cost-effective safety treatment that reduce head-on and run-off road crashes. I just spoke about how we are rolling that out on the Bruce Highway as well.

Thirdly, between Cedar Vale and Woodhill we are planning improvements to the overtaking lanes on that stretch of the highway. I am keen to see a business case for those works next year. Fourthly, at four intersections between Woodhill and Gleneagle we are planning channelised right turns, which improves safety by separating turning traffic from through traffic. The design for those intersections is expected to be completed in this financial year.

I also want to make mention of what has already been delivered because there is good news to report there as well. In April this year we completed duplication of the highway through Jimboomba from Johanna Street to South Street, taking that section from two lanes to four. That is an upgrade that supports Jimboomba's growth with upgraded intersections, improved safety around school zones and better connections for people who are walking and riding. Anyone who has driven through Jimboomba over the past few years—and I am sure the member for Lockyer has been through there plenty of times—will know how significant the growth has been in that part of the world, and that project is responding directly to that growth. The project was jointly funded with the Australian government and after a decade of decline where we had $6.7 billion worth of cost blowouts and delay after delay on projects under Labor, I am pleased to share with the committee that project was completed on time and on budget.

Mr McDONALD: Hear, hear! Last question—

Mr MICKELBERG: I am still going. There is more good news.

Mr SPEAKER: You have two minutes.

Mr MICKELBERG: I understand, Mr Speaker. In addition to that good work, there is also planning underway to deliver safety improvements under the Targeted Road Safety Program including at the intersection with Millstream Road. It is anticipated that project will move into procurement stage later in the financial year.

To summarise for the member for Mulgrave, the Jimboomba duplication is delivered and it is already benefiting the community. We now have four distinct pieces of planning work underway across the Jimboomba to Beaudesert section, each targeting a specific safety or a capacity issue with business cases and design progressively landing through this financial year. I want to assure residents along that corridor that the department recognises the safety challenges of that section of the highway. They have a strong advocate in the member for Scenic Rim, who is ceaseless in his advocacy for more investment in that corridor. This planning work is a genuine pipeline towards further investment into the future.

Mr McDONALD: The last question will go to the member for Mulgrave.

Mr SPEAKER: We only have one minute left. It will want to be a quick question.

Mr JAMES: I have another highway question, Minister. Please advise how the Crisafulli government's 2026 budget invests in safety improvements and flood resilience upgrades to the Flinders Highway.

Mr SPEAKER: You have one minute.

Mr MICKELBERG: I am not going to do this justice in one minute. We are doing too much to do it justice in one minute. John Wharton would be very disappointed if I did it for one minute, but I will do the best I can. We recognise the importance of those critical road corridors like the Flinders Highway. In fact, the director-general and I traversed the Flinders Highway alongside mayors, the regional director and the like both this year and last year. We know that corridor is important and we know that a considerable amount of work is needed.

We have some priority works. We have some works at Canal Creek. We are getting on with the bridge replacement and upgrade works there. We know that is a flood-prone pinch point and we are replacing that aging infrastructure. Between Hughenden and Richmond we are delivery progressive upgrades along the highway. Mr Speaker, just let me go for a couple more minutes. Thirdly, between Richmond and Julia Creek—and I know the member for Traeger would want to know this—we have progressive upgrades. They are continuing the task of trying to lift the standard of that highway along its length rather than just leaving isolated black spots. Fourthly—and then I will pull it up; we have more to talk about, but I am mindful of time—at Alec Creek we are funding an upgrade at another of the floodway locations on that highway where time and again communities and the industries that depend on it have been cut off. We are doing the work required, whether it is here in the south-east on the Mount Lindesay Highway, on the Flinders Highway in the north or indeed on the Bruce Highway. Right across Queensland we are getting on with the job of delivering better roads.

Mr SPEAKER: The committee will now adjourn for a break. The hearing will resume at 7.30 pm to continue the examination of the estimates for the portfolio area of transport and main roads.

Proceedings suspended from 7.16 pm to 7.30 pm.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Welcome back to the Legislative Council chamber. We will now resume the examination of estimates for the portfolio area of transport and main roads. I am Jon Krause, member for Scenic Rim and Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Under the provisions of the Parliament of Queensland Act, I will preside over this evening. Welcome back, minister and officials. I intend that we go to non-government questioning for the first patch after 7.30 pm. I call the member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I call the Queensland Rail CEO, Ms Kat Stapleton, to the table. Welcome, Ms Stapleton. Documents released under RTI show that media and comms staff in your organisation made comments on social media accounts of members of parliament 'at Nev's request'. Is it usual practice for Queensland Rail to engage in political commentary with members of parliament?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order, member for Lockyer?

Mr McDONALD: Firstly, I would like to authenticate that claim—

Mr MELLISH: I am happy to table through the member for Cooper.

Mr McDONALD:—and have a look at that.

Ms BUSH: Tabling a document.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Cooper, for tabling that document.

Mr McDONALD: I believe it is also a hypothetical question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will consider that further point of order but, first of all, can we send the document to Ms Stapleton and also to the minister, and even the director-general perhaps? The question was: is it—could you just repeat the last part of the question?

Mr MELLISH: Yes, the last part was: is it usual practice for Queensland Rail to engage in political commentary with members of parliament?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, I do not think that is a hypothetical question. Ms Stapleton?

Ms Stapleton: Certainly for Queensland Rail, we have also taken an approach to being transparent with our employees, and I believe this refers to the new rostering model that we have adopted. I understand that we were simply correcting the perceived rumours that may have been circulating and certainly we wanted to make sure that we provided reassurance to our staff and to the community in terms of what was happening with the rostering model. We have engaged, as we have said previously, with our workers and with the unions in the lead-up to the changes through an extensive consultation process.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Ms Stapleton. Did you or Mr Nev Conway have any conversations with the minister or anyone in his office prior to Queensland Rail engaging in political commentary on social media?

Ms Stapleton: I can confirm that I did not have any conversations with the minister or the minister's office in relation to any political statements. That certainly would not be something that I would be engaging in.

Mr MELLISH: Ms Stapleton, can you advise the number of rail services that are being suspended each day due to the reduced timetable Queensland Rail is currently running?

Ms Stapleton: May I just clarify that this relates to the South-East Queensland customer optimised timetable?

Mr MELLISH: Yes.

Ms Stapleton: Thank you. If I may provide some context, earlier in quarter 4 of FY26 Queensland Rail announced to the public on Friday, 1 May that, as a result of protected industrial action, we had insufficient rolling stock available to be in a position to deliver a full timetable, and a full timetable for Queensland Rail is 8,503 services weekly. As a result of rolling stock unavailability, we had no alternative but to put in place a new reduced customer optimised timetable. That is what we refer to as the COT. This came into effect on 5 May and has been in effect since then. The customer optimised timetable is approximately 80 per cent of what we used to provide out of the 8,503 services. Members may obviously take into account that on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays there is a different number of services. Friday is usually the highest day, and then Saturday and Sunday also have different timetables. As a result of protected industrial action, Queensland Rail had no alternative but to introduce a reduced customer optimised timetable from 5 May which has been in effect since then.

Mr MELLISH: So just to clarify those numbers, it was 8,503 services under the ideal timetable?

Ms Stapleton: The typical timetable when we are running a full timetable is 8,503, from recollection—and I hope I do have the number right; I have looked at it many times. That is the usual full timetable, and we had no alternative but to reduce it to approximately 80 per cent of that, and that depends, again, on the day and whether it is a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday or it is a Friday. The numbers will fluctuate a bit.

Mr MELLISH: CEO, is it Queensland Rail's intention to return to a full timetable once all enterprise bargaining agreements are agreed?

Ms Stapleton: Certainly, we are here to deliver for Queenslanders in South-East Queensland as well as those in the regions. I am hopeful that we will be able to reach agreement on the remaining enterprise agreements at the earliest opportunity. As people on the committee may be aware, we reached in-principle agreement not so long ago on three of the agreements, representing over 3,000 people. If that is helpful, I can go through the exact agreements. I am not sure if that is helpful to the committee. Would it be helpful?

Mr MELLISH: I am happy with that answer.

Ms Stapleton: Yes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ms Stapleton, we might move to another question. If the member for Aspley asks about that then I am sure we would be willing to hear about it, but have you concluded your answer on the previous question?

Ms Stapleton: Certainly, unless the member wishes for me to elaborate; thank you.

Mr MELLISH: Ms Stapleton, how many train sets are right now out of action due to maintenance?

Ms Stapleton: Just to help with the context of the fleet that is available to Queensland Rail, we have access to typically 120 three-car sets, which are Queensland Rail car sets. These are 100s, 200s, 120s, 220s, 160s and 260s, both IMUs and SMUs. Again, these are three-car sets. Queensland Rail also has access to the New Generation Rollingstock, which is maintained by another provider under the ownership, if that is the right word, of the department of transport, and these are six-car sets. In order to run the timetable, we require both New Generation Rollingstock as well as Queensland Rail's rolling stock. In terms of the specific question as to how many are available or, if I may mention, not available—and I did check the numbers in the last couple of days—of the 120 sets, 44 are currently not available as a direct result of protected industrial action and six of them are at Maryborough, in the Downer facility, where they are undertaking their 16-year overhaul, and these are the 160s and 260 train sets, both IMUs and SMUs.

I must say, we are making good progress. It is a good partnership. We are making progress on getting them through. In addition to that, we have 12 sets—again, these are three-car sets—which are in the shed undertaking routine maintenance. If you add it all up it is 120 minus 44, minus 12, minus six of what is available of the Queensland Rail fleet to supplement the New Generation Rollingstock which is available to us through Alstom.

Mr MELLISH: To clarify, how many of the next generation rolling stock are out for maintenance at the moment? Sorry, you might have mentioned that in your answer already.

Ms Stapleton: No, I did not have the opportunity to mention that. Since this is a contract that is not run by Queensland Rail, I cannot comment on how the supplier undertakes their maintenance but up to 65 six-car sets are available to Queensland Rail. We do not always get exactly 65. Sometimes you may receive reports of kangaroo hits as well as deer on the Gold Coast line. Coming from Canada we usually see deer in Canada, I was not expecting to see them on the Gold Coast. We do not always get the full complement.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you for the very detailed answer. Minister, we asked a similar question in a question in notice and you were unable to provide any of those details. Why were you unable or unwilling to provide any details about an issue that is crucial to everyday Queenslanders as they try to navigate the rail network at the moment?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: could I be furnished with a reference to the question on notice that was being cited in the question? There was not actually a number related to that.

Mr MELLISH: It is estimates question on notice No. 1. I am happy to provide it but you should have a copy.

Dr ROWAN: There did seem to be an imputation or inference contained within the question as well.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for that point of order, Leader of the House. It is estimates question on notice No. 1, if any members wanted to have a look at that. To your other point of order about there being an imputation in the question, I think that is a valid point of order. I will not rule the question out of order; however, member for Aspley, perhaps you could restate your question without that imputation.

Mr MELLISH: Minister, we have just received a very fulsome answer from the Queensland Rail CEO, why were you unable to provide that information in the estimates question on notice?

Mr MICKELBERG: At the outset, I would make the observation that it was a different question. In fact, I will read the question on notice for the benefit of those who may not have had the opportunity to read it. It reads—

With reference to the provision of train services—

Will the Minister advise since 3 April 2026 (or closest reportable date) the (a) total number of six-car train services that have operated (reported separately in a table by train line), (b) ...

Mr MELLISH: Point of order on relevance, Mr Deputy Speaker: I did not ask him to read out the entire question.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: he asked the question and referred to it and this is the question which was asked, which is very relevant to the context of this answer.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, there is no point of order. You have asked a question referring to an estimates question on notice. The minister is responding by reference to the question on notice. The minister is being relevant and I would ask the minister to continue, please.

Mr MICKELBERG: It continues—

(b) total number of three-car train services that have operated (reported separately in a table by train line) and (c) total number of cancelled train services (reported separately in the following format for each train line and cancelled service per train line (DD/MM/YY)—(Inbound/Outbound), (Terminus), (Scheduled Departure Time from Terminus)?

The observation I would make is that is a very different question than was just asked by the member for Aspley. I refer the member to the answer to that question which states—

I am advised that, given the vast scale of Queensland Rail's network and operations, generating the extensive data as requested relating to the period since 3 April 2026 is a complex and resource intensive task that would significantly divert important Queensland Rail resources away from key operations. As such, this data is not available.

And it goes on. The reason that information was not provided is because Queensland Rail have indicated it would be excessively onerous and divert resources from their core task, which is already being made more difficult as a consequence of union protected industrial action. Their core task is running rail services for Queenslanders—whether that is passengers or freight. That is their job. We will endeavour to provide information wherever possible but, to be very clear, the member for Aspley asked a very different question to the CEO of Queensland Rail to that which is countenanced in question on notice No. 1. I suggest to you that he is deliberately seeking to conflate issues in his approach. I entirely reject the premise of his question. I want to make it clear that Queensland Rail will always endeavour to be transparent and open, as will I.

I want to acknowledge Queensland Rail staff who are working tirelessly in incredibly difficult conditions as a consequence of the decisions of union bosses who are deliberately seeking to disrupt the delivery of Queensland Rail services. I thank all of the Queensland Rail staff, the executive and all of the hardworking staff who are toiling in difficult circumstances to deliver services in spite of the actions of union industrial bosses who are deliberately seeking to weaponise that disruption.

Unfortunately, what we have seen from the member for Aspley is a failure to call out that course of action from their union bosses. He remained silent in relation to the AMWU. He has asked a question in relation to the number of trains that are offline. Let's be very clear why those trains are offline. They are offline because the AMWU are failing to maintain those trains. They are offline because of union protected industrial action. The CEO just said that. I have said to the member for Aspley, if he wants to do a press conference with me and call on the AMWU to withdraw their protected industrial action so we restore these services, I am happy to take him up on that. I think that is a good outcome for all Queenslanders. We should be working together to get these services back up and running.

What you are seeing, though, is petty political games from the opposition. They are not genuinely committed to trying to address these sorts of issues. In fact, we know their track record when it comes to unions, particularly those unions that seek to disrupt the delivery of government services and major projects. I completely reject the premise of the member for Aspley's question and I ask him to do better for all Queenslanders.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, with reference to the advertising campaigns that were mentioned earlier, can you advise the priorities advocated for by the department in expending the $8.8 million in TMR's advertising budget?

Ms Stannard: The major campaigns in the year ahead that we have identified are the e-mobility laws campaign, an important campaign for ensuring people understand the new laws relating to the use of e-mobility, what vehicles are legal and how they can best use those safely. There is the Bruce Highway 'Fixing the Bruce' campaign, where we are aware the significant works underway will cause some travellers on the Bruce Highway to encounter roadworks possibly more than once on their journey. We want to ensure people are aware of those roadworks so that they can drive safely and to the conditions and ensure road workers are safe when they are doing that work. The 'No excuse for speeding' campaign is a really important campaign. We know that the fatal five contribute to over half—in fact, almost 60 per cent—of fatalities on the road network, and speeding is one of those that can exacerbate the level of injury or death from someone who makes a simple mistake. The 'No excuse for

speeding' is a really important campaign. The fourth is the 'In your hands' drink-driving campaign. Unfortunately, we are seeing an increase in the prevalence of drink and drug driving contributing to fatal and serious accidents on the road network so it remains a key priority for us.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We might have some government MP questions now. Member for Mulgrave?

Mr JAMES: Minister, can you please provide an update on the Cairns Common User Facility and how the Crisafulli government's 2026 budget is supporting the progression of this important project in the Far North?

Mr MICKELBERG: I want to thank the member for Mulgrave for his question and note the strong advocacy of the member, alongside the member for Cook and the member for Barron River, when it comes to getting on with the job of delivering for Cairns and the Far North more broadly, in particular the Cairns Common User Facility. They know what it means in terms of job creation, in terms of economic development, particularly in the Far North but more broadly as well, and what benefits a completed CUF can bring to a part of Queensland that has been left wanting for far too long under the former Labor government during their decade of decline.

Let us be clear how we got here, member for Mulgrave. Back in 2021 the then deputy premier and now opposition leader, Steven Miles, announced that the project would be delivered for $360 million, with a funding commitment on a 50-50 basis from the Australian government. At the time the Labor government left office, the true cost had blown out to $826 million. That is their record: $826 million—more than double what Queenslanders were promised. They knew it. That is the worst part; they knew it. They sat on that blowout. They let the project sit idle for three years. They only handed it over to Ports North weeks before the last election. They dumped the problem on someone else rather than try to be open and transparent and to level with the people of the Far North. They shifted the problem to Ports North after many years of mismanagement and incompetence under the now opposition leader. Our government inherited that mess and we have done the responsible thing. We ordered a proper review of the cost and the scope. We kept the faith with the Commonwealth on a funding partnership. We have kept this project moving rather than let it die on the vine which, based on the evidence, you would have to suggest was Labor's approach in relation to the Cairns Common User Facility.

I can advise the member and the committee that Ports North has now opened expressions of interest from the private sector to co-invest in the delivery and operation of this facility. The member for Mulgrave joined me when we announced that alongside the Labor federal minister, Catherine King, and local Labor federal member Matt Smith. This is the new face of the project, with the intent to maintain a common user model that shares infrastructure across operators. The approach brings private capital to the table so that Queensland taxpayers are not left carrying the can for Labor's cost blowouts on their own.

Ports North will be shortly hosting an industry briefing to walk proponents through the market engagement and co-investment process. I note there has been strong interest already. In terms of what we want to deliver, I want to see a CUF in Cairns that supports Defence and Border Force vessels, our tourism reef fleet, commercial fishing and towage operators, specialist boatbuilders and the superyacht and cruise sectors that all call into Cairns as well. That means long-term and secure jobs for people of the Far North, it means support for local industries and it means ongoing support for the tourism operators at the gateway of what is the jewel in the crown of our tourism assets in the Great Barrier Reef.

My message to the member for Cairns, and my message to Cairns residents in particular, is: this project was neglected, it was mismanaged for years under Labor and they hid the real cost. Let us be very clear. Labor knew before the election of this blowout. They hid it deliberately. Our government has restored transparency. We have brought the Commonwealth back to the table and we are now opening the door to partner with the private sector to get on with the job. We are getting on with the job of a project that Labor promised but could never deliver. Our funding remains on the table as part of the 2026 budget and we will give the people of the Far North a Cairns Common User Facility in line with the original intent, delivering on a project that Labor never could and Labor never intended to deliver.

Mr JAMES: Minister, with reference to the reconstruction works on the Gillies Range Road on pages 101 and 102 of this year's QTRIP, can you provide an update on the works to restore this road in my electorate of Mulgrave?

Mr MICKELBERG: I am pleased to update the committee on this important recovery project for Far North Queensland—as the member identifies, in his own electorate. I also want to thank him for his hard work in ensuring that the concerns of his constituents when it comes to roads in his electorate are brought to the fore. Whether it is for the Bruce, the Gillies, the Palmerston or any of the other major roads that are critical arteries for his residents, his advocacy plays a strong role in our government getting on with the job and delivering these works.

Major reconstruction works are now underway on the Gillies Range Road. That is repairing the extensive damage caused by Tropical Cyclone Jasper and the severe flooding that followed. The member will be aware, but I want to share with the committee the sheer scale of what we are dealing with here. The project that the member refers to addresses 19 damaged sites along the range, including several substantial landslips, all of which require works to restore the road to its pre-cyclone condition. It is a jointly funded federal government and Crisafulli government project through the Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements. We know that recovery from a disaster event of this magnitude genuinely requires both levels of government working together, and that is exactly what is occurring here under the existing 75-25 funding arrangements for disaster recovery funding.

I would also note that this is not the first milestone in this recovery effort. Slip repairs near Lake Barrine were completed in 2025, and what we are now seeing is the continuation of works across the broader Gillies Range Road corridor. I can confirm that this next stage of reconstruction is expected to be complete next year, weather and site conditions permitting. This kind of work in that part of the world, as I am sure the member appreciates, is inherently weather dependent and complex. I would be remiss not to remind the committee, as I know the member for Cook and the member for Mulgrave know, of the harsh realities of working on active landslip sites in Far North Queensland, particularly given some of the wet conditions we have seen and the long wet season we have had.

I want to speak to why this matters so much for the region. I know the member knows, but for the benefit of the committee and for Queenslanders more broadly, the Gillies Range Road is an essential link between Cairns and the Atherton Tablelands. It supports freight movements, it underpins agriculture and industry on the Tablelands, and it is an alternative when we have challenges on the Kuranda Range. I have driven back down the Gillies many times after getting stuck on the Kuranda Range in a previous life, as I am sure the member for Mulgrave has as well, and I know that locals on the Tablelands depend on the Gillies, the Kuranda and the Palmerston and sometimes the Rex, unfortunately, when you have go right to the north and work your way around when there are inevitable challenges, whether they are crashes or some of the impacts from the challenging weather we see in the Far North.

I do want to acknowledge the disruption that this work has caused and will continue to cause for those in the Far North. We will continue to seek to ensure that safe and reliable access across roads in the region can be maintained. I do appreciate the patience and the understanding that has been shown by locals while those works and indeed many other similar DRFA works are continuing on places like the Palmerston and the Cook highways. Unlike in Brisbane, where redundant capacity exists much of the time—in places like Brisbane communities can work around challenges frequently where there are road closures—I recognise that communities in places like the Far North simply cannot do that when these connections are closed and while these repairs are underway in places like the Gillies. That is why our government is taking a calm and methodical approach—measuring twice and cutting once; I know you like that, member for Lockyer—ensuring we can deliver these disaster recovery works. I know that is an approach that will pay dividends for the people of the Far North going forward.

Mr McDONALD: Minister, can you please provide an update on the repairs to the Bremer River Bridge, referenced at page 37 of the QTRIP, which affects many in my community in Lockyer?

Mr MICKELBERG: This is a really important question in relation to the Warrego, a key artery for the member's community just as the Gillies is for the member for Mulgrave's community. To date, the works undertaken include site compound establishment, clearing earthworks, service relocation works, and pile cap and foundation strengthening works. Work is already underway. Work is underway to include strengthening the bridge abutments and the approach span piers and headstocks.

I want to address something directly here because it is relevant to how the community perceives progress. This rehabilitation is being carried out from underneath the bridge. That means that a great deal of the structural work is not visible to commuters driving it each and every day but it is underway nonetheless. I encourage all members and the community more broadly not to mistake that lack of visibility for a lack of progress.

The underlying structural strengthening is substantial and it is proceeding in line with the program expectations we set at the start. Looking ahead, the project will move into several further stages. We will install additional edge and cross girders, which involves modifying the bridge headstocks and piers to accommodate a new girder installation on both sides of the bridge. We will replace the welded connections with bolted steel plates, spliced across the welded girder flange and web joints. We will upgrade the safety barrier and then undertake finishing works, including resurfacing of the bridge deck. The rehabilitation is anticipated for completion by the end of this year, subject to weather and site conditions.

I also note for the committee that the project includes the installation of variable speed limit signage on both the east-bound and west-bound carriageways. Once that signage is operational, it will allow posted speed limits of up to 100 kilometres per hour to be reinstated on the east-bound carriageway, while retaining the ability to reduce speed limits when required for night-time, oversize and overmass vehicle movements, which we are seeing increasingly frequently on that corridor.

I go to the second part of the member's question. The member asks me about alternative approaches. Yes, I am aware of what was previously proposed. I think it is important that the committee understand why we have taken the approach we have taken as opposed to that of the former government. The former government's plan was to redeck the bridge. That was the member for Aspley's plan. That plan would have required shutting the west-bound bridge for around six months. It would have forced all traffic, both east bound and west bound—I can see the look on the member for Lockyer's face, which will not be captured in *Hansard* but for the purposes of *Hansard* it is extreme surprise. There is a better adjective but I do not have it in my repertoire.

Ms BOURNE: Advice from the department.

Mr MICKELBERG: What was that, member?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members. There will not be discussion across the table.

Mr MICKELBERG: Obviously members can appreciate what closing that bridge would have resulted in. It would have forced all traffic, east bound and west bound, onto a single east-bound bridge for the entire period. Can you imagine the congestion on that key corridor not just for Ipswich but also for Toowoomba and the Lockyer? On top of that, I am advised that the redecking approach would have cost significantly more than the budgeted amount that was set aside by the former government.

By contrast, the major rehabilitation approach we are delivering was identified as the preferred solution because it extends the surface life of the bridge for decades to come. It allows the removal of the current speed restrictions once complete. I can hear the mutterings of the member for Ipswich West. I look forward to her updating her community about the important progress that we are delivering, fixing the Bremer River Bridge when Labor could not.

Ms BOURNE: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: I take offence at those comments and ask for them to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, would you withdraw those comments in relation to the member for Ipswich West, please, because she has taken offence.

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw. What we are delivering extends the surface life of the bridge, as I have said. It allows the removal of the current speed restrictions once complete and it achieves all of that with considerably fewer traffic impacts during construction. Working from underneath the structure, rather than closing a carriageway for months, means that commuters have continued to use the bridge throughout the works. Locals in Toowoomba, the Lockyer and on the downs who may need to travel to Brisbane, perhaps for medical appointments or to visit family, or maybe freight operators taking goods to port are all looking forward to these works being completed and I am, too.

As the works remain ongoing and the speed restrictions remain in place, I want those residents, as well as locals in Ipswich, to consider what life would have been like if we went ahead with the Labor government's plan to close the bridge for at least six months while it was being redecked. It would have been chaos. I am pleased that the people of Queensland voted for a change of government and we were able to take a more nuanced approach that reduces the impact on local residents and those who use that critical corridor each and every day. We will get on with the job of fixing the Bremer River Bridge in a way that will deliver a lasting legacy for Queenslanders and also reduce the impacts they would have otherwise seen under the Labor government.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will go to non-government questions.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, what is the total sum of revenue the department will receive from the Camera Detected Offence Program in 2026-27 and over the forward estimates?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, I ask for a point of clarification on the question. Are you asking about the budgeted amount of revenue to be collected in 2026-27?

Mr MELLISH: Yes.

Mr MICKELBERG: I seek clarification, Deputy Speaker: revenue is appropriated to Treasury and then subsequently, through a budget process, is allocated to departments. Indeed, some of that is allocated through that process but the actual revenue is—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you raising a point of order around whether it is—

Mr MICKELBERG: I am, yes. I am asking for clarification as to relevance to this portfolio, as worded.

Mr MELLISH: On that point of order, this is the transport budget estimates hearings. I have asked for the budgeted amounts that the department of transport has budgeted for next year and over the forward estimates.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take the point raised by the minister. Member for Aspley, perhaps you could rephrase the question along the lines of how much revenue the department is expected to receive in that respect.

Mr MELLISH: I am happy to rephrase. What is the total sum of budgeted revenue the department will receive from the Camera Detected Offence Program in 2026-27 and over the forward estimates?

Ms Stannard: The Camera Detected Offence Program is a really important program in enforcement. One of the things that we are seeing, as I talked about earlier, is the road toll and lives lost on the roads going in a direction that none of us want to see. Enforcement is a key part of how we seek to change behaviour on the road network. I have just reviewed the information that I have which is not for the 2026-27 year. I am sorry that I do not have that information in front of me.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, as you would be aware, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act, colloquially known as the TO(RUM), outlines the explicit purposes for which revenue raised under the Camera Detected Offence Program can be used. Is any revenue budgeted to be raised under this program set to be redirected to fund the government's Bruce Highway commitments?

Ms Stannard: The member is correct that the criteria that determines the use of camera detected offences funding is defined under the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995. That distribution of funds is something we take very seriously. The community gives feedback about where revenue from speeding fines is used and we adhere very closely to that act because it is really important that we have communication and transparency with the community about how that income will be used.

The Bruce Highway Targeted Safety Program is where I want to talk about the importance of safety infrastructure in reducing lives lost on the roads. The targeted safety program is using what are proven low-cost measures that we can apply over the long length of the Bruce Highway and that have been proven to reduce lives significantly. We have evidence of the significant benefit from wide centre lines in reducing head-on accidents. We also have significant evidence of audible tactile, so the bumps along the edge of the road, which show a significant reduction in people running off the road and striking an object. Those two safety measures are low cost but really high benefit in terms of road safety. One of the things that CDOP revenue can be used for is safety—anything that reduces the frequency and severity of road crashes. It is in accordance with TO(RUM) that some of the funds will be used to improve infrastructure that saves lives, and it will be part of our Bruce Highway Targeted Safety Program that some of those funds will be directed to that program of work.

Mr MELLISH: Minister, why have you removed funding from the Camera Detected Offence Program and redirected it towards the Bruce Highway 80-20 funding arrangement?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: can the member authenticate the basis of his question?

Mr MELLISH: Point of order: the authentication was in the previous answer.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have sought advice, member for Aspley, and I think there may be an inference in your question, but if you restate it simply as a 'have you' question, you may put the question.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Minister, did you direct the department to remove funding from the Camera Detected Offence Program revenue to fund the Bruce Highway commitments?

Mr MICKELBERG: The answer to the question is no. This budget delivers a record amount for the Bruce Highway—the $9 billion Targeted Safety Program—all of which is to be spent and is being spent on road safety upgrades on the Bruce Highway. I know the member for Aspley does not know the Bruce Highway extends beyond Noosa, but indeed all of that money has been spent north of Noosa.

Mr MELLISH: Point of order: I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, the member has taken personal offence. Would you withdraw?

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw, Deputy Speaker. As I was saying, this budget delivers a record amount invested on the Bruce Highway and we will continue to invest in road safety measures and improvements. The need on the Bruce Highway is so great that, tragically, in I think 2024 there were 42 lives lost on the Bruce Highway alone. I think in anyone's book that is unacceptable. We will continue to invest. I want to acknowledge that the federal government have recognised the legacy of underinvestment in the Bruce Highway and are partnering with us to deliver the Bruce Highway Targeted Safety Program. It is only one part of our investment on the Bruce Highway; I make that observation. To be very clear, all of that $9 billion program will be spent north of Gympie—which is north of Noosa, incidentally—and all of it will be spent on road safety initiatives. That is what Queenslanders expect and Queenslanders deserve. The member asked a pretty direct question and the direct answer is no.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, will the new Gold Coast metro bus project cost more or less than the option of light rail it replaces?

Ms Stannard: I will just clarify you are referring to the Gold Coast Surfer that the government has recently announced. That project is an important one to deliver a high-frequency, metro style bus operation into an area that is looking forward to improved public transport connectivity between the rail, the airport and the southern end of the Gold Coast. It is an important project because it will deliver a reliable service, a metro style service, running at high frequency from Robina to Coolangatta via Burleigh Heads and the Gold Coast Airport. It is backed by priority intersection improvements along the Gold Coast Highway between Burleigh Heads and Bilinga, a new transport interchange at Gold Coast Airport and a service running west of Burleigh to Varsity Lakes and Robina, where customers will be able to interchange to rail. The modern vehicles will combine the space and accessibility of light rail with the flexibility of a bus, making it easier for more people to travel.

To the member's question, it does replace parts of the network where the Gold Coast Light Rail stage 4 project was contemplated. At this stage, the cost of that project is not in the public domain. We have not yet tendered that service or delivered the infrastructure that is associated with it. I could not make a really definitive comment about what the total cost will be. I can say that the Gold Coast Light Rail 4 project did include very specific infrastructure over a long corridor, and that is probably all I could say without evidence.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, I note the department's own Gold Coast Light Rail stage 4 preliminary evaluation back in 2024—a very good document, done when you were also director-general. In that document, bus rapid transit was considered and excluded among many reasons because it required more land than light rail and presented a similar cost to light rail. How has the department's advice changed?

Ms Stannard: The member is correct. When we examine dedicated corridors for public transport, we examine all manner of modes that can operate in those. The intent for the Gold Coast Surfer is that we will provide priority through intersections, locations where congestion might be impacting on service reliability, but not that we will build a dedicated corridor. It is a different approach to the approach that was contemplated in the Gold Coast Light Rail 4 planning document, where we were considering a dedicated busway style corridor.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, leaked documents obtained by Channel 7 show that only $8 million in funding over the next three years has been allocated to the Gympie Road Bypass Tunnel project, a tunnel that the Premier committed to in 2024. Director-General, when did the department undertake a review into the Gympie Road Bypass Tunnel?

Mr McDONALD: Point of order: it is again about authentication of that claim.

Mr MELLISH: I am happy to table that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can table the document through the member for Cooper.

Ms BUSH: I am tabling the document on behalf of the member.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. We will send it to the director-general. Member for Aspley, can you assure the committee that this is—it looks like a screenshot from a 7News Facebook page.

Mr MELLISH: A screenshot from a Channel 7 news story.

Mr McDONALD: A further point of order, Deputy Speaker: again regarding authentication. This is a screenshot. Can the shadow minister refer to the budget documents in this year's budget? That is a screenshot of a document, but where is that in relation to this budget?

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: the member for Lockyer has put this argument several times today. It has been discharged on each occasion. The requirement for the member is to authenticate the basis on which his question is framed. He has done that; he has met that standard. I would submit to you that the member for Lockyer's points of order repeatedly on this issue are now starting to border on disorderly.

Mr MICKELBERG: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: on the tabled document—to the point of order—I cannot actually make it out. The sides of it are cut off. I actually cannot see the reference. The member draws this as authentication, but you cannot see from the very document he has tabled what it refers to. In many places—

Mr MELLISH: Point of order.

Mr MICKELBERG: It is cut off on the edges. It has also got this big thing in the middle saying 'post-2032'. It is very hard to make an assessment as to—

Mr MELLISH: Point of order on that, Deputy Speaker: the reference is to the Channel 7 story regarding the document or the document itself. It has been widely publicised in the media about the funding arrangements of this project. If the minister is pretending this is not a reference to a real document, that is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr MICKELBERG: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: perhaps if the shadow minister, the member for Aspley, has that document he can table it to authenticate it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, please, members. Member for Aspley, could you restate your question, please?

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, it has been reported by Channel 7 that only $8 million in funding over the next three years has been allocated to the Gympie Road bypass tunnel—a tunnel that the Premier committed to in 2024. When did the department undertake a review into this project?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, Director-General. I have sought advice from the clerk about the authentication. The advice is that the authentication provided by the member for Aspley as it relates to the basis of his question is sufficient, so I will put the question to the director-general.

Ms Stannard: I thank the honourable member for the question and for the clarity. I will go to the project first and then answer your question about the planning. north Brisbane tunnel, as it is referred to, is published in QTRIP as a planning project which is underway. It is in QTRIP. The timeframe is given as underway. The investment ID is 4056697, and you can refer to that on page 36 of QTRIP as a planned investment. Responsibility for that investigation transitioned from the Queensland Investment Corporation to Transport and Main Roads in 2025, and my department reviewed the planning that had been undertaken by QIC.

This year the government provided additional funding to TMR to progress investigations for a tunnel on the north side of Brisbane. That is, therefore, displayed in QTRIP as a planning project. Those investigations will consider the transport network interfaces between the tunnel and align with a broader capital works program we have underway. Connectivity with key population centres will be considered as part of that planning process. Additional planning milestones are subject to further consideration and detailed investigation. The member would be aware that any infrastructure of that size and scale requires significant planning and time to do that planning and detailed modelling.

I could not comment on the veracity of reporting. It could be a point in time, and I am not 100 per cent clear about the timing of that or what else was in the document. I could not comment on the veracity of that reporting, but I can confirm that additional funding was provided to TMR to progress investigations for a tunnel on the north side of Brisbane, and we have that displayed in QTRIP.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, what is the total allocated funding for the Gympie Road planning program?

Ms Stannard: The Gympie Arterial Road planning project is a transport planning study for a critical six-kilometre section of Gympie Arterial Road from Beams Road in Carseldine to the Bruce Highway at Bald Hills. The planning study contract was awarded in July 2026, following an invitation to offer that closed in May 2026. That planning study will deliver a master plan and an investment strategy to ensure existing and future road connections in the corridor connect seamlessly.

Several major upgrades, including the Linkfield Road Overpass upgrade, are progressing on the north Brisbane corridor. This planning study will ensure the long-term transport needs of the corridor are considered, alongside those investments already committed. The planning study is jointly funded by the Australian and Queensland governments, with each committing $5 million.

Mr MELLISH: On a different topic, Director-General, can you confirm the current budgeted amount for the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project?

Ms Stannard: The project is published in QTRIP. I was just going to look for where that was published.

Mr MICKELBERG: I think it is on page 109.

Ms Stannard: Luckily the minister knows QTRIP. On page 109 of QTRIP, the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project is published. There is an Australian government contribution of $2,875,078 and a Queensland government commitment of $2,875,078.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, who made the decision to cut active transport components of the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, there is an inference in that statement. Could you rephrase the question, please?

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, has a decision been made to cut active transport components on the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project?

Ms Stannard: The Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project is a really important project. It will double the capacity of rail between Kuraby and Beenleigh on the line that connects Brisbane and the Gold Coast. That capacity is really important to unlock space for additional train services to meet that growing travel demand between Brisbane and the Gold Coast. It does form part of our integrated public transport plan for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, where we foresee really significant demand between the Gold Coast and Brisbane.

In October 2025 the project alliance agreement was signed, establishing an alliance between Transport and Main Roads, Queensland Rail and ActivUs Alliance, to deliver the Logan and Gold Coast rail package. The project includes a design phase. It would make sense to the member that when we go to market for a project like this we progress design to a certain level and then the alliance comes on board and refines that design as they work their way through the corridor examining the best way to deliver the project.

The project includes 14 kilometres of new active transport infrastructure, together with four kilometres of existing on-road infrastructure, which will provide a continuous active transport connection along the corridor and represent a significant improvement for users of that corridor. This is a change to the 2023 reference design. The updated design has a greater focus on local walking and cycling connections to stations, while continuing to deliver new segments of the principal cycle network.

The updated design does not preclude further walking and cycling network improvements, which will continue to be provided into the future. We have consulted with key stakeholders and the broader community throughout that design process. We are carefully considering all of the feedback as we inform our ongoing refinement of the updated design. The responsibility for detailed design now sits with the ActivUs Alliance, and they will be working through that project as part of the alliance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We might go to questions from government members. I call the member for Mulgrave.

Mr JAMES: Minister, what happened to the Cairns Western Arterial Road project? Please provide some history on this project and what action is expected this year.

Mr MICKELBERG: I am pleased to update the committee on how this budget is progressing works on the Cairns Western Arterial Road. Let me first place that project in proper context, because it does matter for how the committee should understand its priority.

Upgrading the Cairns Western Arterial Road, or CWAR as we refer to it, is one of the biggest projects that will be delivered in Far North Queensland for a long time. It forms part of the 2032 Delivery Plan, as I know the member knows, which was published by our government last year. This is a project that the government is committed to. To be frank, it would not be progressing had it not been for the advocacy and the efforts of the member for Barron River, alongside her Far North Queensland LNP colleagues.

Let's not forget that this is a project which was sent back to the drawing board by the Albanese Labor government after their infrastructure review because they were concerned about the scale and the risk of cost blowouts under the former Labor government. Since taking office, our government has been calmly and methodically doing the planning needed to give the Australian government confidence to proceed. We are providing them planning that they can rely on to fund it so that we can deliver the project.

This project is one of the hard delivery horizons tied to games infrastructure. It has been fast-tracked via the games legislation introduced by the Deputy Premier which passed the parliament a few months ago. The failure of the former Labor government to get this project moving in recent years is precisely why this budget is backing in works needed now to keep the project moving towards main construction on the first section.

Just last week the Premier was on the ground in Cairns alongside the member for Barron River announcing that the contract had been awarded for water and sewer relocation works between the bridge over the Barron River at Kamerunga and the Captain Cook Highway, with works to start in coming weeks. This is a major step forward towards getting main construction underway and locals will finally see progress. These works are expected to be complete in late 2027, weather and construction conditions permitting.

Ultimately, you cannot duplicate a major arterial road through a live utility corridor without first safely relocating telecommunications, power, water and sewerage infrastructure out of the construction footprint, as I know the member for Mulgrave knows well, particularly given his past employment as the mayor and a long-standing councillor in Cairns. We know that skipping or rushing that step risks service disruptions to residents. It risks damage to critical infrastructure and costly delays once major construction begins. While that may sound like an elongated timeframe, ultimately what we are doing de-risks the project's construction.

In the meantime, we will be seeking to do everything we can to ensure there is no daylight between the completion of early works and the start of main construction. That is why it is important that the main construction procurement for section 1 works is sequenced appropriately, and we will be looking to undertake that activity in the coming financial year. This gives locals in the Far North certainty and clarity that the project is going ahead, despite the countless baseless claims and scare campaigns by Labor and, in particular, by the member for Cairns to the contrary—disgraceful conduct. I hope it goes to show the people of the Far North that Labor and the member for Cairns cannot be trusted. They cannot be trusted on their word. It is only our government that is actually getting on with the job of delivering major projects for the Far North like the Cairns Western Arterial Road. The reason our government is getting on with the job is the advocacy of hardworking local members in the Far North.

To be absolutely clear, relocation works are now underway. Main construction tender is the next part of the process. Physical duplication works will commence progressively once those early works are completed, getting on with the job of delivering an important upgrade for the people of the Far North.

Mr KEMPTON: Minister, in a similar vein, can you provide an update on the Cross River Rail project and how productivity has changed since 2024?

Mr MICKELBERG: I thank the member for Cook for the question and for his interest. I am pleased to advise the committee that productivity has returned to Cross River Rail construction sites and we are starting to see some real progress in the construction phase. Our focus will soon be on the difficult commissioning phase. Cross River Rail will of course be a really important project for the 2032 games, but it probably would not have been ready for the 2036 games if Labor were still in power, to be frank.

Significant progress has been made at each of the new underground stations. While people passing those sites will have seen the completion of the canopies and the like, the real action is happening underground, where the crews are moving into the final stages of equipment installation and fit-out. This includes the finishing of tiling. Testing is underway on the escalators, the platform screen doors, the ICT capability, CCTV, fire and electrical systems—really complicated systems. All of that is underway underground right now.

Not all of the action is underground. Seven of the eight surface station rebuilds have been completed, two of the three new Gold Coast stations are open and major works are happening at stabling facilities like Clapham Yard. I want to again thank passengers in particular for their patience and their cooperation during the recent rail closures to enable works at Clapham Yard and other parts of the network to continue.

The member asks how this compares to productivity under the former Labor government. We have heard through the CFMEU commission of inquiry how the project was targeted by the CFMEU specifically. Even before the contract was signed, the CFMEU was putting pressure on the builder. Over time that escalated to the point where the union was organising fake environmental protests. CFMEU picket lines descended into fist fights and fake safety issues regularly halted works. It was all aimed at destroying productivity onsite. It begs the question: what did the former Labor government do about it? I see the member shaking his head. Nothing is what they did. They turned a blind eye to that project, as with so many other projects, while that project faced significant delays and the costs to taxpayers grew by the billions.

In contrast, our government, the Crisafulli government, is standing up to the CFMEU. We have restored productivity on Cross River Rail and we are getting on with the job. The commissioning phase will soon move into full swing. This will range from testing every component in situ to testing to ensure all of the separate components work together. Train testing will begin with a single train before working up to simulations of everyday operations—a considerable amount of work. There will also be extensive simulation testing to ensure that all the systems will work under the various different scenarios that could occur. All of this is necessary to ensure emergency services and regulators are satisfied that safe operation can be achieved.

I do note that the member for Miller, the former former transport minister, has recently put out a newsletter to his constituents claiming that the project is 'virtually complete' so there is no reason that it cannot open until 2029. That is what he reckons. It demonstrates that either he is a former minister who has absolutely no understanding of how major rail tunnel projects work or he is trying to deliberately mislead his constituents. To be frank, if I were the member for Miller I would be not be talking about Cross River Rail, given his record, particularly his record in some of the testimony we have heard in front of the commission of inquiry in relation to his conduct with the CFMEU and how that affected the delivery of the Cross River Rail project. It makes me wonder if his apprentice also thinks that system testing is not needed. If he does not agree with the member for Miller, I would ask the member for Aspley to correct the record and indicate his support for important system testing on projects like Cross River Rail.

Mr McDONALD: My question is to the minister. During a recent question time, the member for McConnel suggested that Exhibition station and Fortitude Valley station could not be opened simultaneously during the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Can you please comment on the operation of these stations during the games?

Mr MICKELBERG: For clarity, the member for McConnel asked a question without notice to the Acting Minister for Sport and Racing about claims that Fortitude Valley rail station could not be opened while Exhibition station is during the games.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: it occurs to me that the matters that the question pertains to are under active consideration by either the Speaker or another committee of the House and that the minister ought not to compromise those proceedings in his answer to the question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it a standing order 271 issue that you are referring to, Manager of Opposition Business?

Mr de BRENNI: Possibly.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is there any further detail or pointer you could give to the committee in relation to that point of order, Manager of Opposition Business?

Mr de BRENNI: My understanding is that the Speaker is considering the matter.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What matter?

Mr McDONALD: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment. Are you objecting to the question itself being asked?

Mr de BRENNI: My understanding is that the minister has written to the Speaker in relation to this matter and that is under consideration. My understanding would be that a member can choose how to prosecute a matter. They can do that through formal procedures or through another method. It occurs to me that the minister has chosen to progress that through a formal procedure rather than through this committee hearing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Although that was a little bit cryptic in terms of how it is being described, I think I understand what you are saying. I am going to seek some advice.

Mr McDONALD: Further to that point of order and in order to assist, I understand what the Manager of Opposition Business is alluding to, but the question is simply about the operation and budget regarding those Olympic and Paralympic stations during the games.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There were also references to the member for McConnel, which I think is what the Manager of Opposition Business is raising his point of order about. I have heard the points of order. Just give me a moment.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: if it assists the committee, it might be appropriate to consider a rephrasing of the question without the element that possibly offends the Manager of Opposition Business if the matter is under active consideration by the Speaker.

Mr MICKELBERG: Mr Deputy Speaker, just to aid the committee, the Manager of Opposition Business asserts that I have written to the Speaker. I do not believe that I have written to the Speaker in relation to this matter.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having sought advice from the Deputy Clerk, I will deal with the points of order that have been raised. If indeed the substance of the question that the member for Lockyer has raised has been mentioned in the House before, if there had been a question of a complaint or issue being raised with the Speaker around that question, then the advice I have received is that the Speaker has also provided guidance that that particular issue should not be prosecuted in the media or by other means until that consideration is complete. However, that does not mean that the substance of this question cannot be put to you, Minister, as the Leader of the House has very wisely suggested, without reference to the particular member that the Manager of Opposition Business was raising the issue about.

That all being said, member for Lockyer, the question was about Exhibition Station and the other station and the 2032 games. Could you put your question without that reference at the start.

Mr McDONALD: Certainly. Minister, it was suggested that the Exhibition and Fortitude Valley rail stations could not be operated simultaneously during the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Can you please comment on the operation of these stations during the games?

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is your point of order in relation to 'it was suggested'?

Mr de BRENNI: Indeed.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I understand. Minister, I am going to put the question to you on behalf of the member for Lockyer. Can you please provide some information to the committee about the operations of the Exhibition and Fortitude Valley stations during the 2032 games?

Mr MICKELBERG: As the minister responsible for trains, I appreciate the opportunity to clear up the situation. To be clear, by 2032 Exhibition Station and Fortitude Valley Station will be operating on completely separate lines and they will be operating simultaneously on a daily basis once Cross River Rail opens. In fact, they operate simultaneously when events are occurring at the exhibition grounds, and I look forward to train services using Exhibition Station in the coming weeks when the Ekka is on.

During the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games the Victoria Park precinct will obviously be the centre of all of the action and will be well placed to cater for the games and events that will be occurring in legacy mode. The precinct is lucky to be serviced by a number of different transport hubs, including the Fortitude Valley and Exhibition rail stations. We also have easy access to the Herston and Kelvin Grove busway stations. Active transport, taxis and rideshare will also provide options for visitors.

There have been rumours that we will need to demolish and rebuild Exhibition Station. I want to be crystal clear: that is complete and utter rubbish. We will be undertaking some work to improve access to the platforms, particularly for wheelchairs. The department is working through all of those options to ensure all visitors using the station have a great experience not just for the games but also for the legacy post 2032 as well.

This is all part of our broader planning for the games. It shows the contrast between our government and that which came before us in the failed former Labor state government under their decade of decline. We are working through the plan in a calm and methodical way. What we saw under Labor was not planning; it was chaos, crisis and mayhem, and it was Queenslanders who paid the price. We are getting on with the job. All I would ask those opposite to do is stop spreading misinformation in relation to these matters and get on with delivering a successful games in 2032. I think that is what all Queenslanders want.

Mr McDONALD: My question is again to the minister. Can the minister provide an update on the Beerburrum to Nambour rail upgrade project and its importance to the wider rail network?

Mr MICKELBERG: The Beerburrum to Nambour Rail Upgrade stage 1 project is a critical infrastructure project to increase capacity and improve reliability on the north coast line, supporting enhanced passenger and freight services. The project supports an integrated transport network on the Sunshine Coast and is a key enabler for the Wave. The project will realign the existing rail line between Beerburrum and Glass House Mountains, removing three level crossings. It expands park-and-ride facilities at Beerburrum, Nambour and Landsborough and delivers a range of new or upgraded rail and road infrastructure to support and improve safety.

We are getting on with the job of delivering this project with $251.9 million allocated to the project in 2026-27, supporting more than 330 jobs over stage 1. In May 2026 detailed designs were shared with the community, giving locals a clearer picture of this critical upgrade. The detailed designs reflect feedback provided mid last year, giving locals an understanding of how this long-awaited upgrade will transform rail travel and freight movement along the north coast line. This follows main construction work commencing for the rail duplication late last year, with earth works and other related activities to build the formation of new road and rail infrastructure.

This is a project that has been spoken about for nearly the entire time that the member for Lockyer, the member for Aspley and I have been in this parliament, having all come in in 2017. I think it was 2018 when this was first announced by the then deputy premier Jackie Trad and minister Bailey at the time, yet they laid no rail line whatsoever. It is astonishing to think that you could go from 2018 to 2024 and not lay a single piece of track on that project. We are getting on with the job. The main construction is underway. It is pleasing to see us delivering this important upgrade for the Sunshine Coast and broader Queensland, particularly in relation to the freight that moves through that corridor.

Mr KEMPTON: Minister, can you provide an update on the Keeping Our Waterways Safe program and how it is improving safety on our waterways.

Mr MICKELBERG: Our government is investing $15 million in the Keeping Our Waterways Safe program. It places a stronger emphasis on vessel owner accountability and enhanced on-water compliance to keep our marine environment and waterways clean, safe and navigable. Under our Keeping Our Waterways Safe program, Maritime Safety Queensland removes derelict and abandoned vessels where they present safety, navigational or environmental risks. To apply vessel owner accountability, cost recovery is pursued where possible. If owners fail to act, MSQ uses regulatory powers to remove hazards, recover costs and prosecute owners as required.

Since the commencement of our government's Keeping our Waterways Safe Program on 1 July 2025 and to the end of May 2026, 369 derelict vessels have been removed or otherwise resolved, including 242 removed by MSQ and partner agencies and 127 removed or resolved through other means such as owner action or other resolution pathways. There are currently 698 vessels of interest being monitored, 272 of which are identified as derelict and the remaining 426 are at risk of becoming derelict. It may aid the committee if I bring up Kell Dillon from MSQ, with the director-general's indulgence, to provide some additional detail on how we remove vessels from the waterways. Do we have time, Deputy Speaker?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are 39 minutes to go.

Mr MICKELBERG: He might need all of it.

Mr Dillon: The Keeping our Waterways Safe Program has a budget allocation of $15 million over three years from financial year 2025-26 to financial year 2027-28. It is specifically to remove derelict, abandoned and unsafe vessels from Queensland waterways. Vessels always remain the responsibility of their owners. Where a vessel is abandoned or left to deteriorate, MSQ will intervene to remove derelict, abandoned and unsafe vessels from Queensland waterways, with costs recovered from

owners where possible. This is done by Maritime Safety Queensland marine officers identifying and monitoring vessels of concern either through a direct observation or through reports from the community or from our stakeholders.

Once identified, Maritime Safety Queensland undertakes investigations to establish ownership and engages marine surveyors to assess the vessel's condition and nominal value. The cost of each removal varies based upon the vessel's size, condition and location. Complex and high-cost removals—particularly where vessels are abandoned—create pressure on the program to deliver within a budget funding envelope. Contractor availability and operational capacity constraints during periods of high demand, particularly after cyclones and flood events, are also a budget challenge. Depending on a vessel's conditions, MSQ may issue a formal direction requiring the owner to remove or rectify the vessel. Where the owner cannot be identified or the vessel is deemed abandoned, MSQ will act to remove it as abandoned property or a hazard to navigation or a hazard to the environment.

Contractors are appointed through the program to remove vessels, with all procurement activity undertaken in accordance with the Queensland government procurement policy for goods and services. This includes obtaining and evaluating written quotes from at least two contractors and considering previous contractor performance. Procurement requirements may be streamlined during a declared disaster, such as a cyclone or a major flooding event, to expedite the removal of vessels destroyed or significantly damaged by the event. Owners who fail to comply with the direction to remove their vessel may face further compliance and regulatory action, including cost recovery through the courts.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for that detailed answer. We will go to non-government questions and the member for Kurwongbah.

Mr KING: My question is to the director-general. Your department's disability action plan, which was due to be published in late 2025, was published on the department's website today. Can you advise why the plan was delayed by more than six months?

Ms Stannard: The new disability action plan was released today online. It covers the period between 2026 and 2028. It is an important plan in demonstrating our commitment to ensuring Queensland's passenger transport network is accessible for everyone. We took some time in the development of the plan in order to consult appropriately with industry stakeholders, disability advocates, people with disability and government to ensure the plan reflects the voices of people with disability.

It is the fifth plan to be developed and it is the first time we have co-designed the plan. It covers all aspects of the state managed passenger transport network, including bus, train, tram and ferry services, as well as commercial passenger vehicles like taxis and rideshare. It recognises that significant effort and progress has been made to embed accessibility within all TMR products, services and infrastructure. It is a nice opportunity for me to acknowledge Kevin Cocks, whom I met with today and who is leading our accessible transport network team. The work they have done has certainly transformed our department, and we are pleased to be embedding that work across the business. Now accessibility for everyone is part of BAU in the transport department; it is not a long list of actions that need to occur done by some unit off to the side.

The plan talks about 20 initiatives signalled to further enhance accessibility of the network. That covers wide parts of our responsibilities—policy planning, partnerships, stations and stops, vehicles and information. That is an important focus to make sure we are providing forms and information in a manner that is suitable for everyone to use. Taxis and booked hire services are also an important part of the plan, and the delivery of the Wheelchair Accessible Taxi Grant Scheme is part of that.

The new plan is live. It is available from the TMR website. As I hope I have been able to outline briefly, it is a comprehensive plan about what we have underway. The determination of dates for release is a matter for executive government.

Mr KING: I have a question to the CEO of Queensland Rail. I table question on notice No. 1100 of 2025, which confirmed planning was underway for three stations signed off under the former Labor government. These stations are not mentioned in the new and upgraded train station section in the disability action plan released today. Are these station projects still underway?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will give the CEO a chance to review the document.

Ms Stapleton: I thank the member for the question. Accessibility and having accessible stations is very important for Queensland Rail.

Mr MICKELBERG: Point of order: could we get a copy of the question on notice? I do not think it has come to this table yet.

Ms Stapleton: I have a copy. I am considering it at the moment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The CEO of Queensland Rail has the call. Do you need time to consider the detail of the question?

Ms Stapleton: I have just read it very briefly. Unfortunately, I do not recall the question from 2025 but I now have it in front of me, so thank you. In terms of setting the scene about station accessibility and upgrades, we were very happy to see a number of stations being upgraded as part of tranche 4, which I spoke about in the last estimates or the estimates before. This included the four Bs—which are Buranda, Banyo and Burpengary—as well as Morningside and Lindum. We are quite pleased to see the stations being upgraded, as well as the many stations that were mentioned today that will be upgraded. Having said that, the responsibility for selecting future stations rests with the department of transport. As such, Queensland Rail obtains instructions in that regard.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are there further questions from non-government members?

Mr KING: I was going to ask if you have received those instructions. Were these ones that were mentioned before still underway? I will name them: Bray Park, Sunshine and Eagle Junction.

Ms Stapleton: I thank the member for the question. From recollection—I do not have all of the details in front of me—we had commenced doing some concept designs. However, I am not aware of any funding being made available in the Queensland Rail plan for the future.

Mr MELLISH: Ms Stapleton, is it accurate to say that as part of the budget, Queensland Rail returned around $119 million for capital works not completed?

Ms Stapleton: May I clarify if this is in relation to the capital plan for FY26? Is that correct?

Mr MELLISH: Yes, it is in relation to the capital plan for FY26.

Ms Stapleton: May I take a moment to consider? We do have large capital budgets. I will preface this by saying that we are still being audited at the moment and so the numbers I provide will be preliminary. The Queensland Audit Office is working with us at the moment. Once this is completed the financials will go to the audit committee and then to the board before they are published in September.

The Queensland Rail capital plan comprises three parts which are the sustainment capital plan, the internal growth capital plan as well as externally-led capital projects. These capital projects are typically undertaken or led by the department of transport or Cross River Rail. I will focus on the sustainment part of the Queensland Rail capital plan. The budget for FY26 was $560.5 million and the figure for the actuals—and again I will preface this by saying these are not audited financials—was $511.9 million. This relates to the sustainment part of Queensland Rail's capital plan. If it pleases the committee, I can talk about the other parts which are growth and external growth.

Mr MELLISH: That is okay. We are happy with that response.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you have finished answering the question of the member for Aspley, we will go to another question.

Ms Stapleton: If that is satisfactory to the honourable member—

Mr MELLISH: I am happy with that, thank you.

Mr KING: Director-General, I refer to prehearing question on notice No. 6. Would you be able to provide those figures per train line rather than as a total? I see those totals are accumulated together on question on notice No. 6.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: the minister responded to the questions on notice and provided full answers. This is the same question that was provided—

Mr MELLISH: It is a follow-up.

Mr McDONALD: It is the same question.

Ms BUSH: It is a follow-up to the question.

Mr KING: That is exactly what it is.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: for your consideration, I think the member is just seeking further detail beyond what was provided.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: if the member wanted that detail, that could have been explicitly specified in the request with respect to the question on notice.

Mr KING: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: that is exactly what the question did ask. It asked per train line and the answer was accumulative, so now I am asking if it can be provided per train line. I note that if the member for Moggill or whoever else would like a copy, I have a copy.

Mr McDONALD: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: the answers were given to the questions and there were some questions that were going to be very onerous and costly for the department to answer in terms of resources to find those things out, so they were given as a cumulative total. It would be unfair for the minister or the DG to try to get that information today.

Ms BUSH: It is not a matter for you, member.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr KING: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: as a member, I asked a question and I do not think it is up to the member for Lockyer to decide what I want in my answer. I am allowed to ask the question. The question was asked from this committee and it was not answered to my satisfaction. I am just asking to be furnished further detail. The member for Lockyer might not like that.

Dr ROWAN: I raise a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the same point of order, member for Moggill?

Dr ROWAN: No, it is a different point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your further point of order, because if it is the same point of order, it will be disorderly.

Dr ROWAN: It is the same question being asked. The question was asked as a question on notice. It was asked a particular way. The member is now asking the same question which was asked as a question on notice which has been answered by the minister.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. I have not even seen the question on notice. From what I am hearing, the member for Kurwongbah is seeking further details about a question on notice that was a prehearing question on notice—

Dr ROWAN:—which he has already asked.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been here a few years and I think that is a permissible question. It is up to the director-general as to how they answer the question.

Ms Stannard: You are right; the question on notice has been provided, answers have been given in the table that identified the number of days that a partial closure applied to those train lines and the total number of days that each train line had a full track closure in the period 1 November to 14 July. Track closures are going to be something that we will be dealing with going forward. We have a rail program now that exceeds more than $20 billion in the program going forward; it is a huge rail program. To do that work safely, there will be a need for important closures of the rail line. I am sure you understand that in your neck of the woods. It is not something that I can identify. Train lines are also very integrated. We treat the Beenleigh line and the Gold Coast line as one line when it operates, so to try to separate these out by line would be a really difficult thing to do. It is not something I am able to add any detail to at this time.

Mr KING: Somehow you would have been able to get the individual figures to add to that cumulative number. I am wondering if we could have those figures as best you can give them in this forum, please?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I will put that question to the director-general, but I think there is an assertion in that statement which perhaps should not be put in a question. I think the director-general is able to respond.

Ms Stannard: It is a question on notice that we examined and did table an answer on. I would add for the benefit of the committee that we had a closure at Bowen Hills around Easter and that affected every line. It affected the Doomben, Airport and Shorncliffe lines and all the lines to the north. We had a similar closure on the south side at the same time around Park Road impacting the Cleveland, Gold Coast and Beenleigh lines. I would not be able to separate those out by line because we were affecting all those lines at the same time and that is the reason we have presented the information in this way.

Mr KING: Thank you. I am satisfied.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: For the record, I consulted with the clerk and he thought there was an argument in that last question from the member for Kurwongbah. Anyway, the question was answered. I call the member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: There are no arguments in my questions. Director-General, I refer to a statement on the Queensland government website—and I am happy to table it—encouraging businesses to 'Apply for an automated vehicle trial permit and find out more about applying for an automated vehicle trials in Queensland'. Has the department undertaken any consultation with the Queensland public on autonomous vehicle trials?

Ms BUSH: I will be tabling those on behalf of the member.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question was to the director-general. Director-General, did you hear the question clearly?

Ms Stannard: I was reflecting on our Connected and Automated Vehicle Initiative that we had previously run with one of the universities as part of a research program. The department is not in the process of trialling automated vehicles. We did do a joint research project for the CAVI program and that was about ensuring that we understood what regulatory responsibilities we might have as the regulator as automated vehicles come to the network. The key thing that the advice on this part of the website shows is that should one of the taxi operators—you might have heard of some of the taxi operators that are operating automated vehicles in the US—want to operate here, this would be the process for them to contact us.

At this stage we are not doing any trials of that kind. That CAVI program has been completed. We have learned a lot about the technology. What you can also see there is that there are levels of automation. My vehicle gives me some guidance about the edge of the road or braking but it is certainly not a highly automated vehicle, but we are seeing that come to market around the world.

Mr MELLISH: Thanks, Director-General. Minister, we have heard that foreign tech companies are eyeing up Queensland and that driverless vehicles, taxis and trucks could be on our roads sooner than expected. Minister, have you had any discussions with foreign tech giants to bring driverless vehicles on to Queensland roads?

Mr MICKELBERG: The answer is no.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Further questions?

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Minister. My question is to the Queensland Rail CEO, Ms Stapleton. Noting that station staff often assist people with a disability with boarding and station access, what consultation did Queensland Rail have with the disability sector before station staff rostering was revised?

Ms Stapleton: In relation to the changes we made to the rostering system, I am advised that we have consulted extensively with not only various stakeholders, including staff, as early as from early 2024 but also a number of disability or accessibility groups. I do not have the specific names of these groups, but I am advised that we did consult with them.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, CEO. Director-General, with regard to the Coomera Connector future stages—namely, between Coomera and Pimpama—will this be delivered by 2032 in line with the 2032 Delivery Plan?

Ms Stannard: The Coomera Connector stage 2 is how we refer to the section you are talking about and future stages of the Coomera Connector. You will know the Coomera Connector is a 45-kilometre north-south high-speed motorway that will support future transport needs for the northern Gold Coast and Logan areas. Coomera Connector stage 2 includes the almost five-kilometre section from Pimpama to Coomera from Yawalpah Road to Shipper Drive, directly connecting to the Coomera Connector stage 1 project. This stage is a priority transport infrastructure project and it has been identified in the games delivery plan. Design and site investigations are underway, but the environmental impacts do need to be considered under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, and that will require a public environmental report in due course. Future stages for the remaining kilometres from Loganholme to Pimpama and the business case, which includes stage 2, are currently being evaluated by Infrastructure Australia. They gave some feedback on our early drafting. I travelled to Sydney to meet with them to work through some of that and we are addressing their feedback at this time.

Mr MELLISH: Just to clarify on that, so will it be delivered by 2032?

Ms Stannard: Given the nature of Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act approvals and the time that is required, particularly in an area with sensitive environmental considerations, it would be pre-emptive for me to judge the time when we would complete that work, but it is a priority transport infrastructure project.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One more, member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: Director-General, can you advise where in the budget paper or QTRIP document funding appears for the Birdwood Road Veloway project?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Director-General, do you need a moment to consult?

Ms Stannard: There is some detail which I am sure will come when my team can grab that. It is one of the projects that has been around for a while. With regard to Veloway 1, there are several crossings on Veloway 1 with Brisbane roads that are currently at grade and there are a number of opportunities for us to improve connectivity and safety for Veloway 1 users. The Birdwood Road velobridge was prioritised for design because the current alignment includes a footpath, property accesses, bus stop and traffic lights. At this stage a revised construction commencement date for the proposed velobridge has not been confirmed. Delivery timing will depend on the availability of funding, the completion of planning activities and program prioritisation to ensure the project is delivered efficiently and with minimal disruption. Construction, as with all projects, is subject to available funding, and we do need to balance that against competing statewide investment priorities. We do have significant work to do in active transport in order to ensure that the inner city around the key venues is walkable and accessible, and those are key priorities for us as we move towards Brisbane 2032.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will now move to questions from government members.

Mr JAMES: Minister, please provide an update on the Crisafulli government making 50-cent fares permanent. How has it improved patronage on public transport across the state and how has this delivered cost-of-living relief for Queenslanders?

Mr MICKELBERG: Our government's permanent 50-cent fares—the LNP government's permanent 50-cent fares—are continuing to deliver savings to the hip pockets of Queenslanders in the midst of a cost-of-living crisis that Labor have left Queenslanders in, incredibly disappointingly. In the 2025-26 financial year more than 292 million trips were taken in South-East Queensland since permanent 50-cent fares were introduced in February 2025, delivering savings of more than $631 million compared to Labor's previous fare structure. Patronage increased in South-East Queensland by 23.6 per cent over the same period. As at 30 June 2026, patronage in South-East Queensland for the 2025-26 financial year was 11.1 per cent higher compared to the previous financial year. Rail was 6.7 per cent higher, bus was 12.8 per cent higher, Gold Coast Light Rail was 10.7 per cent higher, and ferries were 17.8 per cent higher. This has also benefited people in regional Queensland in the member for Mulgrave's electorate, where bus patronage has increased approximately 10 per cent compared to the previous financial year, with an estimated 12.03 million trips being taken.

We are putting money back in the pockets of Queenslanders through our LNP's permanent 50-cent fares. That means that those kitchen table conversations around bills might be a little easier, or it might make a family day out on the weekend a little bit more achievable. I have heard stories from Queenslanders about picking up an extra shift because they are able to get there a little bit easier. A lady shared with me her story of being able to go to bridge when she could not otherwise previously. Because of the 50-cent fares, she could afford to get there more readily. We know that the former Labor government used 50-cent fares as a pre-election sugar hit. They spent more on advertising their trial than they did on making 50-cent fares permanent, and they did not fund their scheme beyond the trial. It is our government that have locked 50-cent fares into law through the Revenue (Cost of Living Relief Locked-in Law) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2026, which the House passed at our last sitting. This ensures that this cost-of-living support will remain permanent for Queenslanders long into the future.

Dr ROWAN: Minister, with reference to the Queensland Transport and Roads Investment Program, QTRIP, can you please provide an update on the Kenmore roundabout and Our Lady of the Rosary School intersection safety upgrade project, as well as timelines for the construction of the Moggill District Sports Park footpath and extension of the 444 bus service, all within the electorate of Moggill?

Mr MICKELBERG: I thank the member for the opportunity to furnish the committee and the member with some details on some of the wins and the commitments that he was able to deliver for his community at the last election, particularly as each of these is going to make a significant difference as to how his community is able to move around.

This budget delivers funding committed by our government to improve safety and congestion at the Kenmore roundabout and to make safety improvements at the Our Lady of the Rosary intersection at Moggill Road, Kenmore Road and Almay Street. I can confirm that the project's focus is targeting increased traffic flow, improved safety for all road users and better network reliability through the area. I want to acknowledge the member for Moggill and his community's role in shaping this project's direction. Community consultation in April 2021 found that 94 per cent of respondents rejected signalising the roundabout. I have been out there onsite with the member for Moggill and we have looked at the ground and we have listened to the community, businesses, residents and the local school and spoken about what they want, and the member for Moggill has advocated for what they want as opposed to imposing a solution on them that they do not want. In October 2025 we awarded a design contract for a revised scope focused on intersection upgrades and congestion, rather than the option the community had told us was not going to work for them.

The member asked about the connection to the Moggill District Sports Park via the footpath. I am pleased to share with the member that it is funded and it is published as a planned investment in this year's QTRIP, on page 36. While design and investigations remain ongoing for the project, I am hopeful we can undertake a procurement process later this year and we will get started soon after that. I know that this will be an important victory for the member for Moggill's community. We went out onsite and had a look at some of the challenges for the community in that part of the world, particularly for those who travel to and from the park, whether that be after school for sports training or for weekend sports or taking the dog for a walk. I am sure the member will be proud to deliver that outcome for his community. To be clear, that delivery is the result of the member for Moggill's advocacy and listening to the needs of his community. It is our government that is getting on with the job of delivering, after his advocacy.

The member also asked about the 444 bus extension. Again I note that prior to the last election the LNP committed to extend the 444 bus service to the Moggill District Sports Park. The facility—as the member knows well—is a key community sporting facility for the wider Moggill community and includes sporting facilities for AFL, cricket, netball and tennis. It is a great facility, but it is underserviced right now by public transport. The member for Moggill listened and advocated and we are getting on with the job of delivering. The 444 route extension is scheduled to commence this year and will provide a public transport link for school students and other users of the local sporting facilities to access the sports park. I want thank the member for Moggill again for his advocacy, for listening to the community and delivering what they want and need. Our government will get on with the job of delivering on the commitments he made before the last election.

Mr McDONALD: Can the minister provide an update on how the Crisafulli government's budget is delivering for the Warrego and Summerholm Road upgrade project in my electorate?

Mr MICKELBERG: I know that this is important for the member's constituents in Lockyer. The member often reminds me of the importance of progressing this project and of the need to ensure those safety improvements are delivered, not only at that intersection but also right along the Warrego more broadly. After his service as a Queensland Police Service officer prior to coming to this place, he is very focused on delivering those road safety investments and a better road network for his community.

Our government, through the member for Lockyer, committed before the last election to upgrading the Summerholm Road intersection with the Warrego Highway at Hatton Vale. To put it simply, I can confirm that detailed designs for safety improvements at that intersection are now underway and it is backed in with funding in this budget. I want to furnish the committee with some of the details as to why funding this work is important and why it remains a priority.

The member for Lockyer is well familiar with the serious crash history of that intersection. We visited the intersection a couple of weeks ago. Between 2015 and 2025 there were 11 reported crashes at that intersection including, tragically, two fatalities. That is a heavy toll for any single intersection along any highway—let alone the Warrego—and it is precisely the kind of risk on our regional roads that our government is committed to addressing. The safety concerns in that particular location relate primarily to high-risk right turns and U-turn movements. Drivers attempting to turn right or perform a U-turn face a long wait for gaps in high-speed highway traffic. We saw that when we were onsite. That is the core problem, which I am sure frustrates locals each and every day but can also tend to compromise safety. The design solution we are progressing is seeking to target exactly that.

I want to take the committee through that design solution. First, we will install a right-turn lane from the Warrego Highway into Summerholm Road, giving highway traffic a safe deceleration and holding lane, rather than turning directly from live traffic. Summerholm Road will also be widened and

the guardrails will be realigned to properly accommodate heavy vehicles. Finally, we will upgrade the lighting, the signage and the line marking across that intersection. That will mean necessarily that the right-turn facility on the Warrego from Summerholm Road will be removed, as will the U-turn facilities at that intersection. I acknowledge that there is a trade-off involved in removing that right-out movement, because it does change how some local traffic will travel. When it comes to timing, detailed design is expected to be complete later this year. This project is progressing on schedule through its design phase and will subsequently progress into construction in this financial year.

Thanks to the hard work and the tireless advocacy of the member for Lockyer, the Crisafulli government is delivering on its election commitment by progressing detailed design for a genuinely evidence-based safety upgrade at a priority intersection with a serious crash history. This is just another key outcome that our government's 2026 budget is delivering for Queensland. I thank the member for Lockyer for his advocacy and for listening to his community and delivering this important upgrade.

Mr KEMPTON: Minister, is there any plan to put tolls on the Story Bridge in this budget?

Mr King interjected.

Mr MICKELBERG: The member for Kurwongbah thinks it is one of his questions—and it could be, because, indeed, we have heard that scare campaign mounted by Labor in questions. I thank the member for Cook for his question. Yet another year has gone by and there is no toll on the Story Bridge. In fact, the clock is ticking on the Leader of the Opposition. I said that he should resign if there is no toll on the Story Bridge by January 2028. There is not yet, and there will not be under our government. The only party talking about tolling the Story Bridge is Labor. Only Labor think it is a good idea to toll the Story Bridge. I want to be categorically clear that our government will not toll the Story Bridge.

To be frank, the Leader of the Opposition said there would be a toll on the Story Bridge. I said at the time that if there is no toll on the Story Bridge by January 2028, and if he makes it that long, he should resign. I stand by that comment. Another year has gone by and there is no toll on the Story Bridge. It is just another Labor mistruth—I would use another word but I am not allowed to. Queenslanders have seen through Labor's playbook. They have seen it time and time again—Labor mistruths, Labor deliberately spreading fear and apprehension within the community unnecessarily. Our government cannot be clearer: we will not toll the Story Bridge. It is only Labor that is talking about tolling the Story Bridge.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am advised that either you or the director-general would bring more information back to the committee on two questions.

Mr MICKELBERG: I am aware of one.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What was that one?

Mr MICKELBERG: The member for Aspley asked how many temporary employees ceased on 30 June 2026. The answer is that 21 employees ceased employment with the department on 30 June 2026 as a result of the expiry of temporary engagements.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have a note in front of me that indicates the director-general was going to come back with some information about membership alliances.

Ms Stannard: Yes, I did advise the committee that the membership of each of the alliances who are tendering for the civil infrastructure work on the Wave is published online. I trust that meets the needs of the committee.

Mr MICKELBERG: Mr Deputy Speaker, with your indulgence, can I thank some key staff for their engagement?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are in government members' question time. If there is no objection, the minister could do that and that might enable us to finish at 9.30.

Mr MICKELBERG: I thank the committee for their indulgence. I echo the comments of the member for Aspley in thanking all of the hardworking staff who have made this estimates consideration possible. I want to thank departmental officers right across the Department of Transport and Main Roads, ably led by the director-general. In particular, I want to thank the staff of TMR's governance branch, who have gone above and beyond—as they do every year—in preparing for this process. I want to thank each of the government owned corporations that sit in my portfolio responsibilities, along with the statutory authorities, each of the ports who are here tonight, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority,

Queensland Rail and the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority. I thank my ministerial staff, who ably assist me with bringing up documents on the computer that I cannot read because I need glasses. I thank the members of the committee, particularly the secretariat and other parliamentary staff for facilitating this process. I would like to thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, alongside the Speaker, for your adjudication of tonight's proceedings.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: This concludes the hearing of estimates for the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee for 2026. I would like to thank the committee members and the visiting members who participated in the hearing. Thank you also to Hansard and the parliamentary broadcast staff, together with of the all other parliamentary staff who have assisted here today. We have reached the end of the time allocated for the consideration of the proposed expenditure for the transport and main roads portfolio area. I note there are no questions taken on notice. With that said, the time has expired. I declare the hearing closed.

The committee adjourned at 9.30 pm.