



TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr SR King MP (Chair)
Mr CE Boyce MP
Mr BJ Mellish MP
Ms JE Pease MP
Mr TJ Sorensen MP

Members in attendance:

Mrs DK Frecklington MP
Mr SJ Minnikin MP

Staff present:

Ms D Jeffrey (Committee Secretary)
Ms M Telford (Assistant Committee Secretary)

PUBLIC HEARING—INQUIRY INTO THE OPERATIONS OF TOLL ROADS IN QUEENSLAND

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, 17 JULY 2018

Brisbane

TUESDAY, 17 JUNE 2018

The committee met at 9.29 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open the public briefing for the inquiry into the operations of toll roads in Queensland. Thank you all for your interest and your attendance here today. I want to start by acknowledging the traditional owners of the land on which our parliament stands. My name is Shane King, the member for Kurwongbah and chair of this committee. Other committee members here with me today are Mr Ted Sorensen, member for Hervey Bay and deputy chair; Mr Colin Boyce, member for Callide; Mr Bart Mellish, member for Aspley; and Ms Joan Pease, member for Lytton. Also in attendance are the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs Deb Frecklington, member for Nanango, and Mr Steve Minnikin, shadow minister for transport and main roads and member for Chatsworth. The committee has granted leave to Mrs Frecklington and Mr Minnikin to attend the briefing and ask questions.

The committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard. You will be provided with a transcript. The purpose of today's briefing is to assist the committee with its inquiry. Media is present and will be subject to the chair's direction at all times. The media rules endorsed by the committee are available from committee staff if required. All those present today should note that you might be filmed or photographed during these proceedings. I ask everyone present to turn mobile phones off or to silent mode. I also ask that if witnesses take a question on notice today they provide the information to the committee by 4 pm on Tuesday, 24 July 2018.

BUYERS, Mr Gregg, Program Director, City Projects Office, Brisbane Infrastructure, Brisbane City Council

BYRNE, Mr Henry, Group Executive, Corporate Affairs, Transurban Ltd

CLARKE, Mr Phil, Ombudsman, Queensland Ombudsman

CROWHURST, Mr Nicolas, General Counsel, Tolling Customer Ombudsman

GALES, Ms Marie, Manager, Transport Planning and Strategy and Congestion Reduction Unit, Brisbane Infrastructure, Brisbane City Council

GILLAM, Ms Linda, Business Improvement and Strategy Manager, Compliance and Regulatory Services, Lifestyle and Community Services, Brisbane City Council

HENDY, Ms Lisa, General Counsel, Queensland Ombudsman

JOHNSON, Ms Sue, Group Executive, Queensland, Transurban Ltd

MAGOFFIN, Mr Geoff, General Manager (Customer Services), Customer Services Safety and Regulation, Department of Transport and Main Roads

MAHON, Mr Andrew, General Manager (Transport Regulation), Customer Services Safety and Regulation, Department of Transport and Main Roads

MITCHELL, Ms Julie, Deputy Director-General, Policy Planning and Investment, Department of Transport and Main Roads

STAPLETON, Mr Mike, Deputy Director-General, Customer Services Safety and Regulation, Department of Transport and Main Roads

STEWART, Mr Scott, Divisional Manager, Brisbane Infrastructure, Brisbane City Council

TUBB, Mr Brad, Director (Transport System Governance), Policy Planning and Investment, Department of Transport and Main Roads

WELKE, Mr Jordan, Acting Assistant Ombudsman, Queensland Ombudsman

CHAIR: I now welcome representatives from the Department of Transport and Main Roads, the Tolling Customer Ombudsman, the Queensland Ombudsman, Transurban and Brisbane City Council. I invite each organisation to make a short opening statement.

Ms Mitchell: Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the committee this morning. As representatives from other organisations have been invited to attend here today, I will limit my opening statement to providing a broad background to tolling in Queensland and the state's involvement in the process. The application of tolls for users of road infrastructure projects has been used by both the Queensland government and Brisbane City Council to bring forward important bridges, tunnels and other high-quality road infrastructure and enhance the South-East Queensland road network.

A key principle of Queensland's tolling policy, which provides the framework for consideration of new toll roads, is that a free alternative route be available to motorists. This means that people who choose to enjoy the benefits that the infrastructure provides, like improved travel time reliability, pay the toll and other motorists can continue to use the pre-existing free alternative routes and not pay tolls. The collection of tolls from those who choose to use the infrastructure allows the cost of the building, operating and maintaining of a road to be recouped under a user-pays system without capital or maintenance costs to the state. Without private sector investment, construction and maintenance of these roads and the benefits they provided would not have been possible at that time. The results would be less overall capacity on the road network and increased congestion and lower travel time reliability on the existing untolled routes.

The Gateway Bridge was the first of the current toll roads to open, in 1986, and was followed in 1988 with the opening of the Logan Motorway. Both projects were initially designated for tolling periods of 30 years duration. However, the tolling periods were extended in 2011 to accommodate the costs of significant upgrades required to the Gateway and Logan motorways to cater for the growing traffic demand. These upgrades included construction of the Gateway extension and the duplication of the Logan Motorway in 1997 and the \$2.12 billion Gateway upgrade project, including duplication of the Gateway Bridge over the Brisbane River completed in 2011. Since 2010 four further toll roads have been opened in Brisbane—Clem7 and Go Between Bridge in 2010, Airport Link in 2012 and most recently Legacy Way in 2015. In 2014 Transurban Queensland acquired the tolling concessions for all Brisbane toll roads with the exception of Airport Link, which it acquired in 2016.

The statutory basis for approving and operating Queensland's toll roads is set out in the Transport Infrastructure Act. The operation of each toll road is controlled by the relevant toll concession agreement and toll declaration. The toll concession agreements are long-term commercial agreements between the toll road operator and the state for the Gateway and Logan motorways and Airport Link and Brisbane City Council for Clem7, Legacy Way and the Go Between Bridge. The Queensland government is not involved in the day-to-day operations of the toll roads. Under the concession agreements, Transurban Queensland operate and maintain the toll roads to standards set by the state or Brisbane City Council in return for the right to collect and retain toll revenue. The concession agreements also include a series of key performance indicators in a number of areas including customer service. Specific indicators measure Transurban's performance in complaints handling and accuracy of tolling. An annual audit of performance is undertaken to confirm whether targets have been met.

The Minister for Main Roads declares the maximum tolls that may be levied on Queensland toll roads. The tolling declarations provide for maximum tolls to increase annually in line with CPI. Transurban Queensland has discretion to charge tolls up to the approved maximum. Transurban Queensland acquired the concessions for the established toll roads on the basis of a reasonable return on investment calculated on actual and projected traffic volumes, approved maximum toll levels and their estimate of the ongoing maintenance of the road and its operational costs. Under the toll concession agreements, if the state were to require Transurban Queensland to collect tolls lower than the approved maximum toll levels, Transurban Queensland would be entitled to compensation from the state. Any compensation the state is required to pay would result in less funding being available for road and transport projects and maintenance around the whole state. For state infrastructure, the

minister also approves the maximum fees and charges that may be levied. Transurban Queensland has discretion to levy fees and charges up to the approved maximum. Transurban Queensland has recently exercised this discretion and reduced or removed a number of fees, including the manual top-up fee.

The vast majority of toll road users make arrangements to pay for their tolls by either opening a toll account or taking up one of the payment options available for casual or infrequent use. A compliance and enforcement system is however required to address the small minority of toll road users who avoid paying their tolls. The objective of a compliance and enforcement system is to encourage behavioural change so motorists pay their toll. The act provides a broad statutory basis for the tolling compliance and enforcement system. If a toll road user does not make an arrangement to pay their toll within three days of travel on a road, Transurban Queensland sends an unpaid toll invoice to the registered operator of the vehicle. If this invoice is not responded to, they will mail a demand notice for non-payment of the toll as provided by the act. It is an offence under the Transport Infrastructure Act for a vehicle's registered operator to fail to comply with the demand notice unless they have a reasonable excuse.

If a demand notice is not complied with, Transurban Queensland may refer the matter to the Department of Transport and Main Roads or Brisbane City Council. The next steps are undertaken by the state or Brisbane City Council which, if appropriate, will consider using a penalty infringement notice, known as a PIN. If the PIN is not paid, the department refers the matter on to the State Penalties Enforcement Registry, known as SPER, for enforcement action. It is important to note that the money received through the payment of PINs issued by the state is paid into the state's Consolidated Fund and no portion is shared with Transurban Queensland. The state is not a debt collector for Transurban Queensland.

Customer service is a key issue for all parties here today. The state has worked with Brisbane City Council and toll road operators over the past few years to improve and simplify the tolling system for the benefit of toll road users. In 2013 a number of customer service initiatives were implemented including a joint toll road website, improved toll road signage and a customer service charter identifying consistent service standards across all toll roads. In 2016 the department, SPER and Transurban Queensland reached agreement on a number of significant changes to the compliance and enforcement framework. A key principle was to reduce the number of cases referred to the state for enforcement action by providing Transurban Queensland with greater opportunity to collect its tolling debt. The changes have been successful in reducing the number of PINs issued annually by the state by about 80 per cent, with a commensurate reduction in unpaid PINs referred from the department to SPER.

Earlier this year Minister Bailey introduced legislation for demand notice aggregation. Under this process Transurban Queensland may include a number of unpaid trips on one demand notice, reducing the administrative charges levied on motorists. Transurban Queensland estimates demand notice aggregation results in a reduction of up to \$36 million per year in charges to motorists. While a number of improvements have already been made to the system, the department is committed to identifying and pursuing opportunities for continual improvement to tolling. The department welcomes the opportunity to assist the committee with its inquiry today.

Mr Buyers: Good morning, committee. Brisbane City Council is responsible for three tollways: Clem Jones Tunnel, Go Between Bridge and Legacy Way. As Transport and Main Roads just outlined, the framework for these tollways is through a declared local government tollway under the provisions of the Transport Infrastructure Act. The Clem Jones Tunnel links the Pacific Motorway and Ipswich Road at Woolloongabba through to Lutwyche Road and the Inner City Bypass at Bowen Hills. The Go Between Bridge is an inner-city bridge that connects South Brisbane through to Coronation Drive and Hale Street at Milton. Legacy Way connects the Western Freeway at Toowong through to the Inner City Bypass and Kelvin Grove Road and the Inner City Bypass at Kelvin Grove. The Minister for Main Roads made the initial declarations for each of these local government tollways as follows: Clem Jones Tunnel on 28 July 2006, Go Between Bridge on 25 June 2015 and Legacy Way tunnel on 12 November 2013. Since this time there have been a number of amendments to these declarations that reflect the changes in arrangements from time to time.

Tolling has enabled these roads to be constructed sooner than otherwise would have been the case, and this has allowed the road network to cater for growth and relieve congestion in the inner-city area of Brisbane. The Transurban Queensland group currently holds the concession rights for each of the local government tollways under Brisbane City Council's control. The obligations for operating and maintaining council's local government tollways are established in a concession deed for each of the individual toll roads. These concession deeds are on the public record. Council's role in relation

to these tollways is to manage the relevant concession deed, ensure compliance with the minister's imposed conditions through the local government tollway declaration process and undertake enforcement activities for matters referred to council by the operator for failure to pay notices of demand.

Council is of the view that these tollways have helped complete key missing motorway standard links in the major road network in Brisbane and have provided significant benefits to the users of these toll roads and to all motorists on the surface road network. Council is of the view that these tollways are well managed and provide a high level of customer service. However, there remain opportunities for all parties to continue to look for improved customer service opportunities and ensure that all fees, charges and enforcement activities are fair and reasonable.

Council has seen a significant material reduction in matters being referred to council for enforcement since a revised process was implemented last year. Transurban is best placed to comment on the day-to-day operation of these toll roads and the compliance arrangements for collecting unpaid tolls and to provide an overall view of the operation of these tollways. Thank you.

Ms Johnson: I run the Transurban Queensland business. With me today is Henry Byrne, who is from Transurban and looks after corporate affairs and investor relations. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today to talk about the benefits that toll roads bring to South-East Queensland motorists and also the broader state economy. Brisbane is one of the most liveable cities in the world. That is one of the reasons I came back to Brisbane earlier this year with my family to live.

Today I would like to talk about three topics: toll road usage, toll pricing and, an area that I am very passionate about, customer experience. It was four years ago that the government of the day made a decision to sell the toll roads of South-East Queensland. That was through a competitive auction process. We were lucky enough to be successful in that process and we paid just over \$7 billion for the toll roads in South-East Queensland at that time. One of the most significant factors that we considered was the toll price of the day, and that had been set—and was set—by the government. That was a significant factor in determining how much we would pay for those toll roads at that time.

There are three shareholders in Transurban Queensland: Transurban, which is an Australian listed company, Australian Super and the Abu Dhabi Investment Authority. We estimate that around one in five Australian workers may have an investment in Transurban Queensland through their superannuation funds.

Since 2014, when we came in, we have seen a 16 per cent increase in toll road usage in South-East Queensland. What does that mean? We see nearly half a million trips being taken on toll roads in South-East Queensland on any given workday. That is half a million trips every single workday. In the 2017 financial year there were 146 million trips taken on a toll road in South-East Queensland. That tells us that customers are recognising the value of travel time savings and also the travel time reliability that toll roads bring them.

When we look at the benefits that toll roads bring, we know that there are 70,000 hours in travel time saved every single workday. Again, these are big numbers: 70,000 hours every single day. We also know that the economic benefit of toll roads in South-East Queensland is considerable—that is, \$30 billion in the past 10 years. Motorists in South-East Queensland have options, and toll roads provide the options to get around the CBD. They form an orbit. We know that one in four motorists who choose to use a toll road are crossing the Brisbane River and avoiding the CBD. It would be wrong to say that toll roads in Brisbane are underutilised, particularly as we see close to half a million trips—470,000—being taken every single workday.

Brisbane has some of the lowest toll road prices in the country on a per-kilometre basis. As I said, the toll prices were set by the government in 2014 and were a significant factor in our decision to pay \$7 billion at that time. With an investment of that size comes obligations to both bank lenders and our shareholders. These obligations were entered into on the basis of the contract that was set in 2014. As I said earlier, with the toll prices we are still seeing growth and people are seeing the value of toll roads in South-East Queensland. For us, the toll prices are set and we focus on how we continue to add value. Since 2014 we have invested an additional \$3 billion in South-East Queensland. That is through the acquisition of Airport Link. We are also delivering the Inner City Bypass project and the Logan Enhancement Project. We have also been investing in customer service and customer experience. That is a topic that I would like to cover now.

When we talk about customer experience, we look at two areas: the on-road experience that we provide for motorists and the off-road experience. With regard to the on-road experience, we are really proud of the team that we have—a highly trained team that is helping motorists who may break

down or may have an incident on the toll road. There were 4,000 of those last year. Our highly qualified team makes sure that toll roads are some of the safest roads in the country and they are doing a great job with that.

When it comes to off-road service, we have invested more than \$70 million in overhauling the customer systems. When we came in in 2014, service was not at a level that we felt was acceptable and we have invested a lot to make change in that area. As I say, our new system went live at the end of last year and with that came a substantially improved website. We are getting good feedback from our customers with regard to that. We have also released two smart phone apps into the market for our 1.6 million customers. We have seen a good take-up of those apps since we released them. We also changed our call centre adviser. We moved to a tier 1 provider, which also provides services to Amazon, Apple and Spotify—so some of the best customer experience companies in the world. Our goal is to have the best possible experience through that as well.

One of the areas that we are most pleased with is the significant reduction in fees and fines. We would prefer that nobody pays a fee and nobody pays a fine. We have been working hard to reduce those. As outlined earlier, we have reduced the number of people receiving a fine by more than 80 per cent. With the new legislation coming in, we have also seen a significant reduction in the number of people receiving notices of demand. We think that will continue.

When it comes to complaints, it is on the public record that we have seen a significant reduction in the number of complaints going through to the ombudsman. That has halved in the four years. Last year we saw a more than 33 per cent decline in the number of complaints there as well. That is all as a result of the investments we are making in customer service.

If we look at the future, we know that Brisbane is continuing to grow. It is estimated that there will be five million people in South-East Queensland by 2030, and toll roads are an essential part of making sure that we continue to have a really liveable city. We are committed to continuing to improve the customer experience both on and off the road. With that, I am happy to take questions as we go through this.

Mr Crowhurst: The Tolling Customer Ombudsman, Michael Arnold, sends his apologies for not being able to attend today. He has been overseas. Mr Arnold has been dealing with tolling customer inquiries and complaints since 2004, starting in Victoria. In 2011 he was approached by the Queensland government to provide ombudsman services to Queensland Motorways Ltd which led to further arrangements with respect to BrisConnections. Then when Transurban took over they extended that arrangement for ombudsman services going forward.

In 2013 the Tolling Customer Ombudsman sought and was granted recognition by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner as an external dispute resolution scheme for the purposes of privacy related complaints—that is, the referral of credit issues. This recognition requires the TCO to adhere to the core benchmarks of industry based EDR schemes, which are accessibility, independence, fairness, accountability, efficiency and effectiveness. Accordingly, we are dedicated to providing a free and independent alternative dispute resolution process for customers and operators.

Our decisions are binding on the tolling operators, if accepted by the customer. We have the power to make recommendations and decisions regarding any inquiries or complaints that fall within our jurisdiction under the contractual arrangements that we have with tolling operators. Where those complaints will fall outside of jurisdiction, we will refer back to the tolling operator with a recommendation to engage directly or refer on to appropriate organisations such as the Queensland Ombudsman.

There is no obligation on a customer to participate in the Tolling Customer Ombudsman scheme and all customers maintain their rights if they do not accept an outcome. They can pursue a complaint in any other forum if it is available to them. Essentially, our philosophy is that any inquiry or complaint should initially be resolved between the tolling operator and the consumer directly, without referral to us. We are in the process of trying to assist tolling operators across the country by informing them of the nature of complaints that we see so that they can improve their customer service and, essentially, put us out of a job. The ultimate aim is that there should not be a need for the Tolling Customer Ombudsman.

However, in the event that a matter is not resolved, we have a variety of ways that we can approach the situation. We will review the details that were initially provided to us. Again, we refer the complaint to the relevant tolling operator for investigation and response. We will facilitate discussions between the parties, dealing with mediation or conciliation if appropriate before making a decision,

which is referred to as a determination. There is no appeal, per se, or automatic appeal right from a TCO decision, but if it is not accepted by the parties then the complainant can exercise his or her legal rights in another way.

There are three main areas that often come to us that we cannot deal with. The first one is any grievance relating to infringement notices issued by authorities, even if the infringement may have happened on one of the relevant toll roads. We cannot consider the level of tolls or fees fixed by tolling operators in consultation with state governments. We cannot consider disputes about vehicle classifications.

In conclusion, we are an independent and impartial external dispute resolution scheme. We are not here today advocating for any particular outcome, but we look forward to sharing our experience and expertise in order to help obtain the best outcome for all stakeholders.

Mr Clarke: Thank you, Chair, for the opportunity to make some brief comments. In regard to tolling matters, the Queensland Ombudsman may investigate the administrative actions of the Department of Transport and Main Roads, the Brisbane City Council and the State Penalties Enforcement Registry, SPER. They are public agencies, and that puts them in the Queensland Ombudsman's jurisdiction. Complaints about toll road operators are out of jurisdiction for my office. Members of the public who contact the Queensland Ombudsman with a complaint about a toll road operator—Transurban—are referred to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman for consideration.

Between May 2015 and February 2017 my office treated complaints about toll road operators as within jurisdiction. Legal advice received just prior to that time supported that decision. However, legal advice received in February 2017 confirmed that toll road operators were out of jurisdiction for my office. As a result, from 1 March 2017 all complaints about toll road operators were dealt with as being out of jurisdiction and, as I just said, complaints are referred to the TCO.

All public agencies in Queensland must have a complaints management system. The office of the Queensland Ombudsman generally requires complainants to first exhaust the agency's complaints management system prior to investigating a complaint within the office. Complaints about the actions of public authorities that issue an infringement notice—DTMR or the Brisbane City Council—stemming from tolling matters can be made to the Queensland Ombudsman's office. However, disputes about liability for the offence are not usually investigated and are instead declined on the basis that the Magistrates Court is the proper forum in which to dispute the matter.

Complaints about enforcement actions taken by SPER can be made to my office as well. The underlying debt the subject of the SPER action may relate to tolling offences either partially or totally. The office's assessment of SPER complaints relates to SPER enforcement action and administrative processes rather than the value of the debt. Complaints regarding SPER in respect of tolling issues fall into the following broad categories. One is that the ultimate debt is disproportionate to not paying the toll, indicating a lack of understanding on behalf of the complainant that the debt is not related to the toll amount but is the total of a penalty for an offence and related administrative costs. That is a very significant element of dissatisfaction with the system—people's misunderstanding of how tolling and the infringement notice debts relate to each other. The second category is that the person did not receive the infringement notice from the issuing authority and, therefore, did not have an opportunity to respond or pay the fine before its referral to SPER. The third category is the enforcement action—frequently, that licence suspension or some other severe action is unfair or unreasonable in the circumstances. My office has a generally cooperative relationship with public agencies and has not recently experienced particular challenges with having complaints appropriately managed. That is, the reactions and the interactions that we have with DTMR, SPER and BCC are generally productive and cooperative arrangements to try to resolve matters in an appropriate way.

In regard to the relationship between the TCO and the Queensland Ombudsman, there is really no substantial relationship at all. We operate in two different parts of the tolling system. The nearest thing to a relationship is the referral of complaints about toll road operators by my office to the TCO when they come in. We refer out-of-jurisdiction matters. This does not involve follow-up by my office or any ongoing cooperation in regard to the management of individual complaints. It is purely a service to complainants who have come to my office in error and we refer them on. I note that the TCO has referred to similar arrangements in the alternative. The office will, however, seek to ensure that the advice we provide to complainants is correct and may liaise with the TCO from time to time to that effect. That is simply to make sure that anything we say to a complainant will, in fact, be the case when they arrive at the TCO and the contrary.

As part of my submission to the inquiry, which I anticipate will be made after today's proceedings, I anticipate providing details of the numbers of complaints received and referred by public agencies, including references to the TCO, over the last few years. That data will be drawn

from the production database in my office and is in part available at the moment but I have not included it in today's comments. I will include it in my summary when I make a submission to the inquiry.

Overall, it is clear from the interactions between my office and complainants that the public is somewhat confused about the operation of the tolling complaints system. Therefore, my office has on its website guidance about making tolling complaints. I note the comments previously made about agency websites, cooperative websites. It remains my view that the public is confused about the complaints process, in particular the relationship between a tolling debt and an infringement notice and how those complaints are dealt with. Finally, I look forward to assisting the committee with its deliberations.

CHAIR: We will now start with questioning. I believe the member for Nanango has a question or two.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I do. Thank you very much, Mr Chair. I start by thanking everyone for attending today's briefing. My first questions are directed to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman in relation to complaints. I note the comments made by the Queensland Ombudsman, who has correctly pointed out that the complaints process is to go directly to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman. Mr Crowhurst, you are general counsel. Are you an employee of the Tolling Customer Ombudsman?

Mr Crowhurst: I am a consultant to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman. I am not part of the contractual entity that operates that scheme at the moment.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It was not on advice that the ombudsman did not attend today's hearing?

Mr Crowhurst: No, not at all. He landed back from Europe yesterday, back into Melbourne.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Lucky him. Could you please confirm the office address of the ombudsman?

Mr Crowhurst: There is no standing office address physically located.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: There is no office of the ombudsman?

Mr Crowhurst: We have PO box mailing facilities in Melbourne and in Brisbane, but we had so few requests for physical meetings that it was not economically viable to maintain a standing office.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Is the Tolling Customer Ombudsman a full-time position?

Mr Crowhurst: No, it is not.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Is it true that when someone calls the office of the ombudsman an automated message is played?

Mr Crowhurst: Yes. If nobody picks up immediately then there is an automated message referring to the website.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The message just prompts you to leave a complaint via voicemail?

Mr Crowhurst: Via voicemail or refers to the website to fill in the complaint form.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: If you were to send in a complaint via fax, is it correct that the fax number is actually the Hawthorn Post Office?

Mr Crowhurst: I believe so, yes.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The ombudsman does not have its own office and it does not have an ability to receive a fax. If you were wanting to make a complaint about a toll road here in Queensland and you were to send a fax it would go to the post office in Hawthorn, Victoria?

Mr Crowhurst: It would, yes. I am not sure how many faxes we have received. Overwhelmingly it is done by email.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: There is probably no choice. Mr Crowhurst, could you please outline for me the total number of complaints received by the ombudsman from Queensland toll road users? Are all of these complaints recorded in a register of complaints?

Mr Crowhurst: They are all recorded in a register. I do not have the up-to-date stats for July 2018 on me at the moment, but we were anticipating putting in a written submission post this briefing and I can give all of that out of our database.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: In the normal case, is it made public or are we able to receive those complaints? We do have that on notice that they will be?

CHAIR: We will take that on notice.

Mr Crowhurst: It will be provided in the written submission but we also do six-monthly reports, which are made public, that have high-level statistics where you can obtain those. They are on the website.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you all for participating this morning. Mr Crowhurst, what are the total annual costs of the Tolling Customer Ombudsman and who are those costs recovered from?

Mr Crowhurst: All costs are recovered from the relevant tolling operators, who fully fund the scheme. It is free for consumers. It is approximately \$250,000 a year.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you everyone for attending today. I have a couple of questions for Transurban. In relation to projects you are doing, you mentioned the Inner City Bypass upgrade. Could you elaborate on how that project came about?

Ms Johnson: I was not in Queensland at the time it came about, but my understanding—I am happy if Brisbane City Council adds to this—is that there were discussions with Brisbane City Council about what opportunities there were to improve congestion and that is how the project came about. We are really pleased, obviously, with the additional capacity that will bring. That project is actually close to completion. We are very excited to deliver that for the people of Brisbane.

Mr MELLISH: It was not always a Transurban project?

Mr Buyers: I am happy to provide a bit more background in relation to the Inner City Bypass project. Following the successful completion of the Legacy Way project, council continued to monitor usage along the Inner City Bypass and saw continuing growth on particularly the section of the Inner City Bypass between Kelvin Grove and the connections to the other major roads to the north, being Airport Link, Lutwyche Road, Kingsford Smith Drive and the Clem Jones Tunnel. We had planning underway to widen that section of road to four lanes in each direction. It was at that point we were proceeding with those plans and Transurban put forward an innovative proposal to help deliver and partially fund the Inner City Bypass upgrade with a particular focus on including incident response and road operations for the Inner City Bypass to elevate that to a level similar to that provided on the tunnel projects and the toll road projects. Council saw that as particularly of value to ensure that that critical bit of infrastructure continues to operate at the highest level possible.

Council assessed the innovative proposal put forward by Transurban Queensland and was able to reach agreement with Transurban Queensland for them to take over the lead role in delivering that project but additionally roll in incident response and operations for the Inner City Bypass into the Legacy Way concession arrangements for the remainder of the Legacy Way concession period.

Mr MELLISH: Essentially what I am getting at is: how is the upgrade being funded?

Mr Buyers: There are a couple of different funding streams for the Inner City Bypass upgrade. There was scope within the existing approved maximum toll levels for Legacy Way to increase up to the maximum allowable toll under the minister's declaration. There was a change to the tollway declarations for Legacy Way, Clem Jones Tunnel and Go Between Bridge to take heavy commercial vehicles up to a multiplier of three times the toll of a car for those facilities to bring it in line with most of the other toll roads around the country and similar to what has been rolled out for the Logan Enhancement Project. Those funding streams contributed to the costs of the ICB upgrade itself.

Mr MELLISH: I refer to a *Courier-Mail* article from 2015 with the headline 'Inner City Bypass to be widened to four lanes'. It mentions that council is going to fund the \$80 million upgrade to the Inner City Bypass. At what point did that change from council funding it to the project being funded by increasing tolls?

Mr Buyers: The initial project was announced as a project that was going to be delivered by council and the estimated value was \$80 million. Council proceeded with a procurement process for a design and construction contractor for that project. The final outcome of that was a revised cost of around \$60 million. It was at a similar time that Transurban Queensland put forward a proposal to take on that responsibility. That is when the alternative funding arrangements were considered by council.

Mr MELLISH: Essentially, in 2015 it was going to be funded by council and then at some point after the last council election it was to be funded by tolls?

Mr Buyers: We can provide some more information on the exact timing of that in our written submission.

Mr MELLISH: Sure.

CHAIR: We will put that question on notice.

Ms PEASE: Thank you very much, everyone, for coming in to provide such comprehensive information. Mr Crowhurst, previously you discussed the assessment process where you can put your request in via email, telephone, voice message or fax. What happens after that? What happens when you receive the complaint?

Mr Crowhurst: We will initially review it to see that it is within jurisdiction. We will refer it back to the relevant tolling operator for an initial response, which we expect within seven to 10 days, depending on the complexity of the complaint in question. If their initial response does not resolve it to the consumer's satisfaction we will take further measures, depending on the nature of the complaint, such as shuttle negotiation, mediation or conciliation.

Ms PEASE: What would those other methods take the form of?

Mr Crowhurst: We will do it as either a face-to-face meeting between the parties or a telephone conference. It really depends on where everyone is located and what is most convenient.

Ms PEASE: Just to reiterate, you are currently funded at a cost of \$250,000 and it is funded by Transurban?

Mr Crowhurst: Predominantly by Transurban but remember we cover Victoria and New South Wales as well, so the other two tolling operators contribute.

Ms PEASE: I am just trying to find out your independence. Where do you stand with that and how do you manage that situation, because you are funded by the tolling operators?

Mr Crowhurst: It is interesting, because there has been a lot of talk around this in the financial services sector for industry based EDR schemes. Essentially, the funding arrangements are entirely separate to the ability and the contractual authority that is granted to industry EDR schemes to run the dispute process fairly and efficiently. Of course, the whole faith in the system gets undermined if we start being biased one way or another and so we have to really preserve our integrity and our independence quite carefully, irrespective of hurdles such as the funding being entirely one-sided.

Ms PEASE: I can imagine. Thank you very much. My further questions would be to Transurban or the department of transport. I am not really sure who would be most appropriate to answer. We talked about the different levels of costing for different vehicle types. You mentioned that they are set. Can you give me some examples? I understand that vehicles over 1.5 tonnes gross vehicle mass are considered to be commercial and are charged a higher rate. What do you imagine some of those vehicles might be?

Mr Tubb: The vehicles you are talking about are light commercial vehicles, so it is a class 3 vehicle. They are load-carrying vans or utes that are registered for commercial purposes, so between 1½ and 4½ tonnes. It could be things such as a Falcon or Commodore utility or a dual-cab ute.

Ms PEASE: Is that picked up when the vehicle is registered as a commercial-use vehicle?

Mr Tubb: Correct.

Ms PEASE: What about a little Hyundai that pathology people use to drive around? Are they considered a commercial vehicle?

Mr Tubb: They are not a load-carrying van or utility.

Ms PEASE: It is the actual vehicle itself? It is not the weight?

Mr Tubb: It is the combination of the type of vehicle and whether it is registered for commercial use.

Ms PEASE: It has to be a load-carrying vehicle or ute and then registered for—

Mr Tubb: Yes.

Ms PEASE: I have a question around the costing, because I know that it is much more expensive for commercial vehicles to make use of—

Mr Tubb: Yes, it is 1.5 times the car toll.

Ms PEASE: What is the reasoning behind that?

Mr Tubb: That was a decision of government when the tolling regime was put in place a number of years ago.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Ms Johnson, relating to complaints, I note that under the Road Franchise Agreement you are required to maintain a system for receiving and addressing the complaints of toll road users. Over the past three financial years, how many complaints have you received on all toll roads that you operate in Queensland?

Ms Johnson: With regard to complaints, we would prefer that we do not have any, of course. We have 30 million customer interactions every single year, so we do get complaints and we work with those to improve the system. I do not have the number for the past three years. I do know that when we look at the complaints that are related to customer service, so the things that we control, there were 250 in the month of June.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Can you take on notice the question regarding the figures for the past three years?

Ms Johnson: I would have to take that on notice. I do not have those figures here.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you. Over the past three years, what is the total value of compensation paid by Transurban and its subsidiaries to the Queensland government for incurring demerit points for not meeting the KPI benchmarks under the Road Franchise Agreements?

Ms Johnson: Again, I have been here since the beginning of this year and there have not been any that I am aware of.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: None for not meeting the KPI benchmarks under the franchise agreement, just in your first six months?

Ms Johnson: That is right, certainly in the time I have been here. I can respond for that period.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Is anyone from Transurban able to respond for the period prior to when you were here?

Ms Johnson: We would have to take that on notice, of course.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Of course, the inquiry is not just about—

Ms Johnson: Of course.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am really interested in the amount that has been paid to the government for not meeting or reaching the KPIs under the franchise agreement. Can that be taken on notice for the past three years?

Ms Johnson: My understanding is that we consistently do meet, and in fact exceed, our KPIs, particularly if you are focused on customer experience. Again, I can confirm with more detail when we come back.

CHAIR: For clarification, we will put on notice the question: if you have not met KPIs, what money was returned?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: That is wonderful, thank you. Still in relation to complaints, in the past three years, from August 2015 to February 2018, Transurban has received or been subject to 48 per cent of all of the complaints that actually made it to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman. Given the high level of those complaints, does Transurban support increasing the KPI benchmarks in the Road Franchise Agreement about improving the complaint management process and targets to reduce that level of complaints?

CHAIR: Member, are you asking for an opinion?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am happy to reword it.

CHAIR: Sure.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Has Transurban considered whether there is a need to change the KPIs that are set out in the Road Franchise Agreement?

Ms Johnson: We have pretty strict KPIs. As I said in my opening remarks, we have been focused on customer complaints since coming in in 2014. In four years we have halved the number of complaints that go to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman. Last year we reduced that by more than 33 per cent. The numbers are publicly available. They have certainly reduced considerably. I talked about some fairly recent and substantial changes that came in in the past six months. With an overhauled system, the apps that we have introduced, the hardship policies we have been looking at and particularly the change in legislation, we are very confident that those numbers will continue to go down. The numbers are actually heading in the right direction and have been since the time we came in. We do have strict KPIs already.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Therefore, Transurban is satisfied with the KPI benchmarks under the Road Franchise Agreement?

Ms Johnson: Again, in my opening remarks I talked about the fact that I have a strong focus on customer experience in particular. My wish would be that there are no complaints. Again, with the number of interactions we have—30 million a year—complaints help us to refine processes and the like. We will keep improving customer experience regardless, but we do have strict KPIs already.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: To clarify, Transurban is satisfied that the KPI benchmarks set in the Road Franchise Agreement are at an appropriate level?

Ms Johnson: Again, we will meet those, but we will keep exceeding them. That is our goal, always.

Mr MINNIKIN: Ms Johnson or Mr Byrne, over the past three financial years, how many times has an e-tag device or the reading devices on the gantries failed? What is the total cost to tourists through video-matching fees incurred because of those failures?

Ms Johnson: The tags are devices that work very well. They are the centre to most of the tolling arrangements. We actually proactively look at tag performance and reach out to customers if we think that a tag is coming to the end of its life or if we see that a battery may not be working. We have a proactive approach to that now. We are not seeing a lot of failure with regard to that. We have a lot of checks and balances in place to make sure that customers are being charged appropriately.

Mr MINNIKIN: I go back to the question: how many are there? Do you know the actual quantum?

Ms Johnson: It would be very, very few. If those instances do occur, we will refund anybody who has been charged a video-matching fee. There are instances where customers take a tag out of their car and a whole lot of other arrangements that are out of our control, so to say that a tag has failed is not as simple a thing as you are suggesting it is. We do talk to customers and we have health checks and proactive campaigns to talk to a customer if we think their tag is no longer working.

Mr MINNIKIN: I appreciate that, Ms Johnson, but would it be possible, on notice, to find from your records over the past three financial years how many have failed, where you have had to do video matching? That would be appreciated.

Ms Johnson: We will take that on notice.

CHAIR: We will discuss it at the end and go through all the questions on notice.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you. In relation to the tags themselves, if a vehicle has an allocated e-tag but it is not detected when the vehicle uses the toll road, does Transurban notify the motorist to check their tag or the device so that they do not incur unnecessary video-matching fees?

Ms Johnson: We have a process for that; exactly. That is what I was saying earlier. We have processes in place that will detect that or we will see that something has changed and reach out to a customer and make contact with them.

Mr MINNIKIN: In cases where the e-tag device or the overhead gantry system fails, does Transurban automatically refund all video-matching fees?

Ms Johnson: If for some reason a charge is not appropriate, we will always refund that.

Mr BOYCE: My question is in relation to fees. For the past three financial years, how much revenue has Transurban charged Queensland motorists for fees and what component of that was video-matching fees?

Ms Johnson: I would start by saying that we do not profit from fees. We would prefer that nobody pays a fee at all. We run at a loss with that. The numbers I have are related to the area where people do not pay for a toll and we have been looking to recoup that. With regard to that, we collected \$26 million and it cost us \$31 million, so we run that part of our business at a loss. With regard to the specific question around the video-matching fee, I do not have that number on me. We run all of those parts of our business at a significant loss.

Mr BOYCE: Would those figures be available on notice?

Ms Johnson: I am not sure. We are a listed company. I would have to understand what the protocol is regarding that. I do not know the protocol with regard to that.

CHAIR: We will put that question on notice and if you reply that it is inappropriate then so be it. Is that okay?

Ms Johnson: Yes.

Mr BOYCE: Can I put that on notice, please?

CHAIR: Yes.

Mr MELLISH: To Transurban, do the Road Franchise Agreements basically dictate how much you can charge in tolls?

Ms Johnson: That is right

Mr MELLISH: And they were set in 2014?

Ms Johnson: That is right. The toll roads for South-East Queensland came up for sale at that point. The toll prices were set as part of that agreement or contract, if you like.

Mr Byrne: A lot of those agreements predated the transaction, so we acquired pre-existing agreements where the toll-pricing regime had been set some time in advance of 2014.

Mr MELLISH: I see some of the changes SPER made to penalty infringement notices and how they interacted with Transurban in 2015-16. Can you elaborate a little on how that has affected your business and whether it has made it easier?

Ms Johnson: Again, focused on the customers, we have been looking at ways to reduce the number of people who go into the infringement or the SPER process. TMR and BCC make that determination. For us, it finishes after quite a lengthy process. I have a handout. I do not know if it would be helpful to show the process, which is quite lengthy.

CHAIR: If you have one to table, that would be helpful.

Ms Johnson: Yes. Basically what you are talking about is at the end of a lengthy process whereby we have tried to have communication and be in contact with customers who have not been paying. The majority of people pay within three days. It is actually a very small number of people—a fraction of a per cent—who will move into the infringement process and, again, that is after a lengthy process of us trying to make contact and communicate with customers. I definitely point out also that we have focused on hardship. Where we see instances of hardship, that process would not occur. Again, it is a fraction of a per cent of people who are choosing not to pay.

The whole system is about fairness to people who are paying. We are very different from a lot of other businesses, such as utilities and telcos, that can cut off a service. We cannot cut off a service, so this is the way the system goes. As I say, we have a long period, which is outlined in that document, from the point of travel. There are three days to pay. Then there are contact points with a toll invoice and then we move through to notice of demand. We have a lot of contact points in the middle where we are reaching out to customers through SMS and email to say that they have a toll that they need to pay. It is a last resort that that would go through to TMR and BCC and ultimately on to SPER. Collectively we have been focused on reducing the number of people. I think all of us have spoken about that in our opening statements, to say that that has reduced by more than 80 per cent, which is a significant achievement in four years.

Ms PEASE: Ms Johnson, you mentioned that there was a 16 per cent increase in toll usage in recent times.

Ms Johnson: That is right.

Ms PEASE: I guess that is fairly easy for you to comment on, because you are seeing the cars going through et cetera. What sorts of strategies do you have in place to increase the use of toll roads?

Ms Johnson: We are very focused on showing the travel time savings and the value. It is a value exchange and it is a decision that people are making based on that travel time saving and also the travel time reliability. If you think about getting to the airport particularly, we know that people are very conscious of making sure they meet their flight. Travel time reliability will come into play with the decision there.

The focus for us is around making sure that customers understand the travel time savings that will be offered. At the decision point on 'should I use the non-tolled road or should I use the tolled road?', we would like customers to have full information to make that decision. With the numbers that we see, we know that people are seeing the value in the travel time savings.

Ms PEASE: Do you have any strategies in place to increase their usage apart from noting that it is beneficial for them to cut time? How are you promoting that? How are you encouraging people to make use of the toll roads?

Ms Johnson: We do have proactive communications with our account customers. With our 1.6 million customers we are communicating all the time around the things that we are doing. If you think about improvements, the Logan Enhancement Project is one that is going to result in significant improvements for people. I guess through the promotion of those activities we are looking at helping people make those decisions.

Ms PEASE: I ask that question because the forecasts of how many people would use toll roads were significantly higher than the numbers of people who actually use them. I am wondering how we can encourage people to make use of those? I am referring to the forecasts when the tunnels et cetera were originally built.

Ms Johnson: I would be happy to address that. Transurban did not participate in those toll roads at that point in time. Those forecasts were categorically incorrect. My understanding is that some of those forecasts were suggesting traffic would be equal to the Hong Kong tunnel usage. There has been legal action since then around those incorrect forecasts. Two businesses have actually gone under based on incorrect forecasts. We did not participate in that process. Those forecasts were categorically wrong. They are not a baseline that anybody should be looking at.

We came in in 2014. We have a considerable team that looks after traffic forecasting. They obviously forecast the traffic growth in line with the investment that we made at that time. The growth is in line with our expectations when we came in in 2014. I think it is really dangerous to go back to those numbers because there have been court cases around those numbers because they were so wrong and people made investments based on incorrect and really bad forecasts. As I say, we are as expected and we are actually within a one per cent tolerance of the forecast that we made in 2014.

Ms PEASE: Is the increase in the use of toll roads comparable with the increase in traffic on our roads? Has any comparison been done there? Does it correlate with those figures?

Ms Johnson: Toll road usage is actually higher than growth on non-tolled roads in South-East Queensland.

Ms PEASE: My next question is probably completely out there. In terms of active transport, has any consideration been given to encouraging the use of active transport on toll roads?

Ms Johnson: We do have considerable bikeways and the like. Every development that we are involved in has elements of that—considerable elements, actually. The Gateway Upgrade North is an example—and TMR might be able to elaborate with the specific detail. There are extensive bike paths included in that.

We are focused on the whole-of-city solution. When you look at how it should all work—in terms of public transport we have two great projects, Cross River Rail and the Metro, and there is also active transport—it all needs to come together. If we are looking at growth of up to five million people by 2030 we have to have all of this available for people. I think it is great because it gives choice—a free road, a toll road, public transport and active transport. We are very committed to all of that.

Ms PEASE: I think it was the department of transport that talked about recouping fines when they go up to SPER. You go through the process of making the claim when it goes up to SPER. Does Transurban get the money for the initial toll that was incurred?

Mr Tubb: No, they do not, as Julie tried to make clear, as did our counterparts in council. Transurban Queensland tries to recover the unpaid toll. If they are unsuccessful they then refer it to either ourselves or council to consider issuing a PIN. The PIN value is actually like that for other fines for speeding and so on. That is determined through penalty units. The value of the PIN is unrelated to the amount of toll. It is set as it is an offence under the transport legislation and TQ gets no share of that. If a PIN is paid that goes into the Consolidated Fund.

CHAIR: I would just like to clarify that. The original fine is then gone because it is not paid? It is the PIN that goes into the Consolidated Fund?

Mr Tubb: Strictly speaking Transurban Queensland do not issue fines.

CHAIR: The initial fee—

Mr Tubb: The unpaid toll debt that TQ has when they refer it to either ourselves or to the Brisbane City Council is written off at that point in time. This is where it gets difficult for people. If you have used the toll roads over an extended period of time without making arrangements to pay, your unpaid trips could be in different stages of the compliance and enforcement process.

This is where it gets complex for people. Your older debt could have gone through to the stage of having a PIN issued by ourselves or the Brisbane City Council and the newer trips are still with Transurban Queensland. You might contact Transurban Queensland and say that you want to pay your debt and that gets sorted, but your older trips are now sitting with the Brisbane City Council or the state for enforcement action. That is where it can get tricky for people.

To our way of thinking, there is a very clear line. There is the debt that is owed to Transurban Queensland up until the point they request us to consider a PIN and then from the time a PIN is issued TQ drops off the scene and then it is ourselves and council that will then issue the fine and seek to recover that as a debt owing to the government.

CHAIR: It is so much easier if it is paid in the first place. I think we all agree with that.

Mr Tubb: I think Mr Crowhurst made the point that in an ideal world we would not be issuing PINs because people would understand that they have used a toll road, that they have to pay, that they know how to pay and that they have paid.

Mr SORENSEN: Does Transurban collect or gather data on toll road users even when they are not using the roads?

Ms Johnson: I am not sure I quite understand. No, we have very strict guidance on what we can use data for. We can only use that for the purposes of tolling.

Mr SORENSEN: Do you sell or exchange data on toll road users with other parties?

Ms Johnson: Categorically no.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: To increase toll road utilisation, especially during off-peak times, has Transurban considered discounted tolls or a subscription system?

Ms Johnson: We will always look at options, but, as I said at the beginning, with the \$7 billion investment we have obligations both to bank lenders and to our shareholders. We will look at options but there is nothing at this point, other than obviously working with the toll that was set by the government, that works for that \$7 billion investment.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The point is that we are trying to do everything we can to bust congestion in and around this beautiful city and what can we do to encourage people to use these amazing toll roads. What many road users would like to know is: is there an ability for Transurban to consider a discount for off-peak times? Has Transurban considered the fact that a road user may consider using your toll roads more if there were a discount of, say, 50 per cent at off-peak times—at night or prior to the morning peak travel time? Would Transurban consider that or have you considered that since this toll inquiry has been put in place?

Ms Johnson: There are two things. One is that toll road usage is increasing. People are using toll roads more and more. The second is that we made a decision to invest \$7 billion based on toll prices that were set by the government of the day. Transurban is not in a position to discount. We have made a heavy investment there. The government can subsidise. We have seen examples of that in New South Wales. We came in four years ago, so basically we are four years into a very big home loan, if you like, or a period of paying that back. Transurban is not in a position to do that.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Where are your call centres located?

Ms Johnson: We have different levels within our business. There are the simple queries that customers will call us with. We have a call centre based in Manila. As I said earlier, we have moved to a tier 1 provider. When we came in in 2014 the call centre was really not up to our standards. We looked at where the best service is available. That is having a call centre in Manila. Amazon, Apple and Spotify are also serviced out of there. We have high call resolution rates. Customer feedback is very positive about the experience that customers have there. Then we have a team that is based at Eight Mile Plains which will help customers if there are more complex queries. We have two customer service teams looking after customers.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Your main call centre has a high quality—

Ms Johnson: It does.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: That is not based in Queensland. To get the best bang for your buck you have moved to Manila?

Ms Johnson: We have two—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: But it is a smaller one here?

Ms Johnson: We probably have about 80 people in the team at Eight Mile Plains that is looking after those more complex queries. We do find that more people are using self-service channels so we invested in the website recently. Our apps have been really popular as well. We still have calls, of course, so we do have two call centres.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: You may have to take this on notice. Can you let me know how many calls per annum for the last three years were taken by the Manila call centre and how many were taken by the Eight Mile Plains call centre?

Ms Johnson: It is calls as well as emails, web chats and a whole lot of channels that we offer. We will put in our submission a whole lot of information about all of the service options that we offer. We are very happy to put a lot of detail around that in the submission.

CHAIR: You could go back to when you took over. That would be great.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am very interested in the number of calls to the call centres. I do not know whether the call centres are handling email complaints, but it is calls that I am interested in. Thank you, I will look forward to that information.

Ms Johnson: Again, we are seeing a decline. Other channels are being preferred by customers as well. We have all of that available. We will put in a full piece of information in a submission.

CHAIR: This question may have been answered previously, but there was a lot of information at the start. There is no way to pay cash anymore, is there? We have had a few people saying, 'I would love to be able to pay cash.' I remember the tubs on the Gateway. They have gone; I know that. There is no ability to pay cash anymore, is there?

Ms Johnson: There are no tubs on the road. That is better for everyone. I think those in the room would agree on that.

CHAIR: For motorcyclists they were a pain.

Ms Johnson: You can pay by cash. Within Queensland we have thousands of outlets with extended hours. People can pay at Australia Post outlets, service stations, newsagencies, 7-Elevens. We have a lot of outlets available for customers with extended times and hours.

CHAIR: If you went through and your e-tag did not work and you had to be notified—you wanted to pay it but you only have three days to pay and by the time you are notified the three days have expired—what would happen? Just to clarify this for me, if someone ends up with a fine because they have not paid in that time, in that situation you completely refund that amount because there has been an error?

Ms Johnson: We have introduced what we call the first-time forgiveness program. We understand that customers may move and, as you point out, maybe not receive a notice and that sort of thing. If that is the case then we would refund that. We also have proactive campaigns where customers may travel and get a toll invoice and not have an account. We look at account conversion and we will waive the fee in that instance as well because we are trying to get toll road users to actually have an account and just have it set and go. More than 95 per cent of people have that set-and-go experience and we want to increase that number. We are doing various things to make sure that is the case.

CHAIR: I understand that. You get a letter in the mail way after when you were supposed to have paid because you may not be aware that you did not pay. All the toll roads are very well signed. I have travelled in New South Wales and ended up on a toll road and tried to figure out how to pay. I was successful. We do not seem to have that problem.

Ms Johnson: We are pretty well signed. We are looking at improving the signage that we have—the blue and yellow colouring. As we are going through we are replacing and updating that so that it will be even clearer for people. We introduced a new app in time for the Commonwealth Games for casual customers or people who are visiting. We get great feedback from people in Cairns, for example, who come to Brisbane who just want to pay for the toll. They also want to be notified that they are on a toll road. We have an app now that will notify you when you are on a toll road and allow you to pay for just those tolls. That is just for occasional customers. That came from us listening to customers and asking for a solution for those types of customers. We are looking at different options all round.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I have some questions for DTMR. Over the last three years, what is the total value of compensation paid by Transurban and its subsidiaries to the Queensland government for incurring demerit points for not meeting its KPI benchmarks under the Road Franchise Agreement?

Mr Tubb: No demerits have been incurred to date.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: In the last three years you have received none?

Mr Tubb: That is correct.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: In the last three years—this is very similar to what I was asking Transurban—from August 2015 to February 2018, 48 per cent of all complaints to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman have been about Transurban's operations right here in Queensland. Given the high level of those complaints, has your department considered increasing the KPI benchmarks in the Road Franchise Agreement about improving the complaint management process and the targets to reduce the level of complaints? This is set out in the Road Franchise Agreement.

Mr Tubb: We continue to monitor the KPIs but we have made no changes to date.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I note that you have made no changes to date. I am being careful to not ask for an opinion. Based on your evidence, Mr Tubb, that there has been no compensation paid by the company to the government, is it the case that those KPIs have or have not been breached?

Mr Tubb: The KPIs have not been breached as they are set out in the Road Franchise Agreement.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I might leave it at that.

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is also to the representatives of the Department of Transport and Main Roads. Again, thank you for joining us this morning. Are there different video-matching fees for different toll roads in Queensland?

Mr Tubb: There used to be. The Airport Link video-matching fee was around the 90-cent mark because they had a different tolling system as part of the Airport Link tunnel. When TQ acquired Airport Link in 2016, they harmonised the video-matching fee with that that applied on the Gateway and Logan motorways so there is currently a 49-cent video-matching fee for all toll roads in Brisbane.

Mr MINNIKIN: When was that effective from, roughly?

Mr Tubb: The 49-cent fee was from the latest CPI increase. The Airport Link fee was reduced when TQ acquired the Airport Link franchise in 2016.

Mr MINNIKIN: I notice that in 2002 the Victorian government, using figures provided by Transurban, found that a cost based admin fee of between 28 cents and 93 cents could be justified for manually processing a toll charge. I presume Transurban no longer manually process toll charges yet currently their website—in fact, the handout provided today—shows that there is an admin fee of \$23.81. What actions have you taken to ensure that Transurban is not profiteering from admin fees?

Mr Tubb: The admin fee for a demand notice is, as you say, \$23. The invoice fee is around \$8 or thereabouts. Admin fees are approved by the minister at the relevant time. They set the maximum fee along with the tolls. As part of the Airport Link acquisition, the department had those reviewed and was satisfied that the fee was appropriate in the circumstances.

Mr MINNIKIN: There is a cost difference of about \$15 between the processing fee and the \$8?

Mr Tubb: The various charges do vary between Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. Sometimes these things can have a historic basis to them. I make no comment other than that they do vary for the same type of activity between Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr MINNIKIN: Yes, they do—as the quality of our roads varies between states.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: You mentioned that the minister sets the admin fee.

Mr Tubb: Yes.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: What is the maximum admin fee?

Mr Tubb: Currently the maximum admin fee is \$23.81.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: To confirm, the maximum admin fee that can be charged—

Mr Tubb: For a notice of demand.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—for a notice of demand is \$23.81. To confirm for the record, Transurban charged the maximum admin fee. Is the invoice fee set by the minister as well?

Mr Tubb: No, that is not.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: So that fee of \$8.50 is not set by the minister.

Mr Tubb: No.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is just the maximum admin fee.

Mr Tubb: That is right.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: You also said that there was a review into that admin fee.

Mr Tubb: When the Airport Link franchise was acquired by Transurban Queensland in 2016, we reviewed the fees and charges that would apply. There was advice taken by the top four commercial firms and the advice was that the fees were reasonable in the circumstances. There was a degree of confidentiality around TQ's in-house costings, but it was assessed by an independent entity which advised that they were reasonable.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Tubb, I note that you referred to other states. Are you able to provide the committee with the amount of the admin fees charged in other states?

Mr Tubb: Yes, we can. In fact, I have them here. I could read them out.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am happy to take them on notice.

Mr Tubb: Okay, we will provide it.

Ms PEASE: Mr Crowhurst, you may have already outlined that you will be providing this information. If that is the case, I apologise. With regard to Transurban, Sue Johnson has indicated that there has been a significant decrease in complaints to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman. I have written down '80 per cent'. That might be incorrect. Can you correct me?

Ms Johnson: Eighty per cent was the reduction in the number of people getting a fine. We have reduced it by 50 per cent in the time that we have been in Queensland, and last year the year-on-year was around 33 per cent. They are public documents.

Ms PEASE: In terms of the complaints that you receive, do you have any figures or information on how many you receive with regard to the go via network in Queensland?

Mr Crowhurst: Yes, and we will be providing those in written submissions.

Ms PEASE: So you will provide that information?

Mr Crowhurst: Yes.

Ms PEASE: Do you not have that information to hand?

Mr Crowhurst: I do not to hand in terms of the up-to-dates.

Ms PEASE: Sue, would you have that information?

Ms Johnson: Yes. I think the latest numbers are that about 30 per cent of all complaints are related to Queensland. Again, we would prefer there to be none but that is where it is. We do look at the number that comes through for tolling compared to other publicly available ombudsman statistics. If we look at telecommunications and other utilities, we know that we have a very low number of complaints. Again, we would love there to be none, but when we look at publicly available information—and we will have that in our submission as well—it shows that tolling in its own right has a lower number of complaints compared to those other utilities and things. We will keep working to reduce the number of complaints. We are working hard on that.

Ms PEASE: To clarify, there has been a reduction?

Ms Johnson: That is right.

Ms PEASE: It is sitting at around 30 per cent of all complaints for your network that are going to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman?

Ms Johnson: When you look at the total number across Australia.

Ms PEASE: Across Australia, that is right. That is what I mean—within Australia.

Ms Johnson: That is publicly available.

Mr Crowhurst: That is right.

Ms Johnson: We can confirm all those numbers.

Mr SORENSEN: I have a question for the department of transport. You talked about video matching of the customer and the numberplate on the car, but do you do video matching with the type of car? I will give you an example of a person in Hervey Bay who was getting a bill all the time for somebody else. When the photograph was sent to him, it was a utility going through the toll roads and his car was a sedan. The department of transport gave him a new numberplate. Do you ever match the car with the numberplate to match it with the identity that you have?

Mr Stapleton: I do not know how Transurban handles its video matching, but I can tell you how the state does with the Camera Detected Offence Program. I make the point that we are not the ones doing the video matching on the numberplates in this instance, but we have a manual process when we do it for other types of offences such as speeding offences or red-light camera offences. We do a visual check to ensure that the vehicle type is in fact consistent with the registration of the vehicle.

Ms Johnson: Some of that is automated—the video detection, if you like—and we have manual reads as well. There will be instances where numberplates have mud on them, they are difficult to decipher or the automation does not work so we then have a manual read process. I do not know what has happened in the example that you have given. I would be very happy to talk to you and understand the detail of that, but we also use other information from TMR to match. I am happy to look into what you have explained and try to understand that particular situation.

Mr SORENSEN: This went on for months and months. He kept getting billed for this person going through. It must have been a really bodgie numberplate because he kept getting billed. He was coming to see me all the time saying that it was not his car, but nobody would listen to him.

Ms Johnson: It is difficult for me to talk to it, but I am very happy to talk to you and understand that situation.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Has the department reviewed the price of tolls, especially lowering tolls during off-peak periods or introducing subscriptions? Has there been any review into whether that would reduce congestion and encourage more people to use toll roads?

CHAIR: Remember that we are not after an opinion.

Mr Tubb: No, the department has not actively undertaken that activity. As has been pointed out, the maximum toll levels have been set for the various concessions. If the department were to direct or require Transurban Queensland to charge a lower toll, that would, under the concession agreements, open the state up to payment of compensation.

I would note that if tolls were reduced that could potentially induce cars to use the currently tolled routes but that would have the effect of more cars, more congestion and less travel time reliability on the toll roads. An advantage of using a toll road in terms of travel time reliability would potentially be compromised if you had more vehicles using the toll roads.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I think at the moment we are a long way off congestion on our toll roads. Under the Road Franchise Agreement, Transurban provides DTMR with an annual toll road performance report. Where does the department publish that report?

Mr Tubb: The department does not publish that currently.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Is there a reason within the franchise agreement or the agreements between the government and Transurban as to why that report is not published?

Mr Tubb: No is the answer. The only thing that would perhaps not be published is if there was any financial information that could be confidential. Otherwise there is no reason why the report could not be made public.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: To be clear, currently the department does not publish that report anywhere, but aside from financial information it is a report that could be published?

Mr Tubb: Yes.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: There is no prohibitive nature or clause under the Road Franchise Agreement as to why it cannot be published?

Mr Tubb: There is nothing that comes to mind immediately.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will look forward to encouraging the department to publish that report. How many complaints has the department directly received about the Tolling Customer Ombudsman?

Mr Tubb: About the Tolling Customer Ombudsman? I do not recall us receiving complaints, per se. I can talk about complaints received generally. This is people writing to the minister or through ministerial representations. The number of complaints that the department receives has been reasonably constant over the last number of years—certainly since 2013. Something around 10 a month would be typical. The nature of the complaints does change from time to time. In 2013—that was when we had a whole series of new toll roads coming on—complaints of signs were a particular issue and so that was dealt with. Then in 2016 there were complaints around fees and charges; that was quite prominent and that has continued because a lot of PINs were being issued at that point in time which caused a lot of angst. We analyse the complaints we receive. It tends to reflect what is going on in the toll road world at the time. We have had nothing against the TCO, per se.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I would counsel my colleague the member for Hervey Bay to send a ministerial in on that one. In relation to those complaints that you say have not come from the TCO, what performance audits have been undertaken since the beginning of the Road Franchise Agreement? What performance audits, if any, have been undertaken by the department of the adequacy of the complaints being sat with the Tolling Customer Ombudsman?

Mr Tubb: We monitor the number of complaints that have been referred to the TCO and keep tabs on them. We also obviously keep tabs on what comes in to the department and the minister. We have quarterly meetings at a senior concession group meeting with Transurban Queensland. As there are trends that we observe we raise them with Transurban Queensland. We and council have been working with Transurban Queensland to try to improve the complaints process and also the treatment of customers. As I say the complaints do change from time to time, but Transurban Queensland certainly has been responsive in dealing with issues that we have identified.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I wish to follow up on a previous line of questioning in relation to the KPIs. It is quite clear from your answers and from Transurban's submissions to the committee that the KPIs have been met; there has never been a breach or it has not gone over from the Road Franchise Agreement. Given that there is still such a high number of complaints being dealt with by the Tolling Customer Ombudsman part-time office, the minister and you—obviously Transurban has a complaints centre in Manila and Eight Mile Plains—would it be a correct assumption that the KPIs are not adequate? Should they be reviewed? I know it is an opinion, but are they adequate?

Mr Tubb: I believe they are adequate. I make the point, as has been made previously, that 95 per cent of toll road users make arrangements to pay and the number of people who have issues is relatively small in percentage terms. When there are 400,000 to 500,000 trips a day, a small percentage can end up being a reasonable number. That is part of it. In percentage terms I think it is fair to say that the number of complaints is relatively modest, even though it is numerically high.

CHAIR: I want to clarify for myself after that line of questioning. Is the number of complaints dropping?

Ms Johnson: Significantly, absolutely. In four years, as we say, TCO complaints have halved. Last year was a big year with change, so that has come down year on year by more than 33 per cent. The legislation only came in earlier this year. I think the committee was part of reviewing the legislative change.

CHAIR: We are familiar with that one.

Ms Johnson: With improvements to technology, particularly the website—that is something we have invested heavily in—and with so many changes that are all positive for customers, we definitely have seen a downward trend and we think that trend will continue.

Mr MELLISH: I have a question for Transurban initially. Are the KPIs that were mentioned earlier all part of the Road Franchise Agreement that was set in 2014?

Ms Johnson: That is correct. The KPIs were set then.

Mr MELLISH: I refer to the suggestion of subsidising or reducing tolls. Because of the way the Road Franchise Agreement is structured, you do not have any capacity to do that yourselves essentially?

Ms Johnson: It is actually the complexity of a decision to invest \$7 billion that comes into play. That decision was based on the toll price that was set in 2014. As I said earlier, we have obligations to lenders as well as to shareholders. Also we are seeing toll road usage grow. We do not have capacity to do that. As I say, there are decisions for government around that.

Mr MELLISH: You have a responsibility to Australians with regard to superannuation?

Ms Johnson: As I said earlier, we estimate that around one in five Australian workers are potentially invested in Transurban Queensland through their superannuation funds. That is correct.

Mr MELLISH: If Transurban cannot do it, it would have to come out of DTMR, if government was to go down that road; is that correct?

Mr Tubb: That is correct. Under the concession deeds, if the state were to direct tolls to be lowered that would require compensation to be paid.

Mr MELLISH: If DTMR has a set funding envelope for each year, that would have to come out—

Mr Tubb: It has to come from somewhere.

Mr MELLISH:—of other projects? It would have to come out of other road upgrades around the place?

Mr Tubb: Yes. DTMR has money. At a whole-of-state level, the money has to come from somewhere.

Mr MELLISH: As a local member, I certainly would not want to see local road upgrades in Aspley being pushed off for a few years to lower toll road charges.

CHAIR:—or Hervey Bay. Speaking of that, I think the member for Hervey Bay has a question.

Mr SORENSEN: I have brought this up in committee before. The change of address is a very significant issue. What steps have Transurban taken to address this issue? I will give you an example of what I am talking about. We live in a technological world. You send things out in the post but if people have changed their address the mail goes nowhere. Why can we not send out an email if they have an email address, because it costs you virtually nothing compared to using the post?

Ms Johnson: Some of it is a requirement as far as sending things by post is concerned. We acknowledge that people do change address. We proactively conduct health checks with account holders. Our preference is to have a phone number, a mobile number and also an email address. We have quite a number of those. When we have those we will reach out to customers on a regular basis to say, 'Are all your details up to date?' and that sort of thing. We definitely have a requirement for notices of demand to go via post. Again, we do proactively reach out through all channels regardless of that. A move to technology and recognising technology would definitely be a good thing as well.

Mr SORENSEN: That does not happen in my area. Most of my complaints would be from people who have changed their address but for some reason or another the person who got the mail did not give it back to the postman and things like that. You are not using emails or phone numbers to contact those people.

Ms Johnson: We have millions of proactive outreach activities—

Mr SORENSEN: I understand that. However, when people get bills of up to \$4,000 or \$5,000 there must be warning bells to say there is something wrong there.

Ms Johnson: Again, the majority of people pay within the three days and then the process that I handed out—

Mr SORENSEN: I understand all that.

Ms Johnson:—showed the contact points that we make all the way through to try to reach out to customers. If we have an email or a phone number we do reach out to customers. Obviously there are people who are in hardship, and if that is the case we will work with them. Anybody who is in that situation needs to tell us. Then there is a small group of people who actually choose not to pay, and that is not fair to everybody else. I think it is about looking at the whole system, and the majority of people actually do pay. It is difficult if you change address and we do not have that information or TMR does not have that information. Again, we are being proactive.

Mr SORENSEN: I know it does not happen in my area because my major complaints are about changing address. When the debt runs up and they find out that it is in the thousands of dollars, they do not want to pay it, I can tell you.

CHAIR: Then they come and see you.

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is to representatives from the Department of Transport and Main Roads. As we have heard this morning, data can come in all shapes and formats including faxes apparently to the Hawthorn Post Office. Do you collect and gather data of road users even when they are not using the toll roads, say from CCTV cameras?

Mr MELLISH: Point of order, Chair. That question was asked earlier.

CHAIR: It was asked. As I say, he might be asking for a clarification.

Mr MINNIKIN: Of Transurban.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It was asked of Transurban.

Mr MINNIKIN: This is to DTMR, not Transurban.

Ms Mitchell: The department has a number of CCTVs around the network that it uses for red-light cameras et cetera. I might actually hand you to Mike with regard to that. Do you know the answer to that question? You only take a photo when somebody breaches.

Mr Stapleton: We do collect data obviously on the breaches. We also use CCTV footage and automatic numberplate recognition technology around heavy vehicle enforcement on fatigue. We do numberplate matching for those. We also match numberplates against the registration database. We no longer issue the stickers for registration, so we do that enforcement via camera. The answer is, yes, we do collect data. We do not hold the data indefinitely. There are time periods about how long we can hold data et cetera.

Mr MINNIKIN: Do you sell or exchange the data that you collect to other parties?

Mr Stapleton: Not that I am aware of. We do provide data to toll road operators in relation to the breaches we have been discussing this morning. The extent of that data is very limited and they can only use it for a very limited period of time.

Ms Mitchell: We do have a bluetooth program where we monitor the operation of our road network and the speeds. That actually picks up data at different points along the road. That data is anonymous but it is matched to a certain number and so that gives us speed. We do swap that data with other people who collect similar data. We do not sell that data at this point in time. We report on

that data because it gives us all of our rolled-up key performance indicators for the performance of a road network and we can see whether that is improving or degrading annually. It is merely performance data that we keep.

Mr MINNIKIN: You do not sell the data at the moment? You obviously exchange data where you need to with third parties like Transurban for their processes; that is a given. Even though you do not sell it at the moment, potentially would it be looked at in the future?

Ms Mitchell: I would not say that it would not be, but I think it is a matter of policy. Obviously privacy would be a major consideration in that.

CHAIR: It is a bit of a hypothetical.

Ms Mitchell: Absolutely. However, there are a lot of apps such as Here, Waze and Google in which you are a probe for that data source that sends it back to other users. It would be in that kind of a frame, not personal identification data.

Mr MINNIKIN: To be absolutely clear, you do not sell any data to any other third parties?

Ms Mitchell: As I said, I think we may trade the rolled-up bluetooth data on particular roads with other people who collect the same data—I think it is in telematics—and they give us the similar data back. We combine them together to get better data.

Mr MINNIKIN: You trade, but you do not sell?

Ms Mitchell: It is not personalised data in any shape or form. It is merely rolled-up data.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you for attending today, Mr Clarke. How many complaints does the Queensland Ombudsman receive about Transurban or its subsidiaries?

Mr Clarke: As I alluded to in my opening comments, I will provide a comprehensive dataset in my submission but we do have some data today that may be of use to the committee. I will ask Mr Welke to summarise that.

Mr Welke: In the financial year ending 30 June 2018 we received 118 contacts from members of the public who wished to make a complaint about a toll road operator. They were advised that it was outside the jurisdiction of our office and referred to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The Queensland Ombudsman's website refers complaints about Transurban and its subsidiaries to the Tolling Customer Ombudsman. Have you then received complaints back about the service provided by the Tolling Customer Ombudsman?

Mr Clarke: When we advise people to go to the TCO we inform them that the TCO is outside of our jurisdiction, and therefore it is extremely unlikely that people would come back. Mr Welke may know the number of contacts we have had, but I would not think they would be indicative because we initially advise complainants that we are not able to assist them in terms of the service they receive from the TCO.

Mr Welke: That is correct. When I looked at the data for the last financial year, most of the complaints related primarily to the toll road operator. I think there were one or two that identified the Tolling Customer Ombudsman, but they were given the same advice: that is outside of our jurisdiction.

Mr MINNIKIN: Mr Clarke, is it best practice for an ombudsman to have a pre-recorded phone message or a fax machine based in a post office when people ring in with complaints?

Mr Clarke: I would be speculating on that. It is not something I have looked at. It is not the situation with my office, but we are a much bigger organisation and we cover a much bigger spectrum. I am not an expert on industry based ombudsmen and it would be speculative for me to answer the question.

Mr MINNIKIN: What is your best practice customer service?

Mr Clarke: As I said, we are a much bigger organisation. People can make complaints via a number of means, including attending at the office and making face-to-face complaints if they wish. They can also do it via all the other mechanisms you would expect. The only one they cannot currently use which might be in general use would be via a telephone app, a web based complaint form is however available through other devices. I could not comment on whether that is best practice or not; that is simply our practice.

Mr MINNIKIN: You have more modern forms of communication than a fax machine?

Mr Clarke: We will receive a very small number of complaints via fax into my office, and they are regarded as a written complaint.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Ms Johnson, when was the last time Transurban reviewed the role of the Tolling Customer Ombudsman? Would you support appointing the Queensland Auditor-General as the Tolling Customer Ombudsman under the Road Franchise Agreement?

Ms Johnson: We think it is important that there is an independent ombudsman service and that that function is suitably qualified. The industry nature of this is very common, so it is common that an industry will fund an ombudsman service. That means that customers do not have to pay for that—it is free of charge for customers—so it is very much aligned to what other industries are doing. From my perspective, as long as there is an independent, suitably qualified ombudsman service and somewhere for customers to go, that is the primary consideration for Transurban.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Crowhurst, the Road Franchise Agreement states that franchisees must provide toll road user services which meet or exceed the benchmark established by the KPIs when interacting with toll road users. It goes on to say—

Tollroad User Complaints of the following nature will be excluded from the assessment:

1. Tollroad User Complaints relating to Tolling policy (such as the types of fees and charges).
2. Infringement notices issued by an Authority.

Does the Tolling Customer Ombudsman service also exclude these types of complaints from your numbers?

Mr Crowhurst: Yes, it does.

CHAIR: If there are no further questions, we will go through the questions on notice.

Mr Tubb: Mr Chair, I would just like to correct the record, if I could.

CHAIR: Certainly.

Mr Tubb: Earlier I was asked a question about the invoice fee that attaches to an invoice. I said that the minister did not approve that. It is in fact specified in the Road Franchise Agreement.

Mr MELLISH: Just to clarify, that Road Franchise Agreement was set in 2014?

Mr Tubb: The original Road Franchise Agreement was in 2011.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I want to clarify that, because I note that Mr Mellish was talking about 2014. Can you clarify whether the first Road Franchise Agreement was signed with QML in 2009 or 2011?

Mr Tubb: With QML the Road Franchise Agreement for the Gateway and Logan motorways was 2011, and then in 2014 the franchisees changed when it was acquired by Transurban Queensland.

CHAIR: Is the toll concession agreement commercial-in-confidence or would the committee be able to get a copy?

Mr Tubb: The Road Franchise Agreement is a public document. It was tabled in the parliament and is available on the Transport and Main Roads website.

CHAIR: The first question on notice to TCO was with regard to the number of complaints, and we are all right with that one. If possible you were going to look at the quantum of failures of tags. In relation to the quantum of video-matching fees over the past four years, let's go back to since Transurban took over. I am sorry to increase your workload from three years to four years.

DTMR were going to find out the amount of admin fees from other states, and the member for Hervey Bay was going to take a question offline about numberplate changes, so we will sort that question out.

There being no further questions, I remind witnesses to provide those answers to the committee by 4 pm on Tuesday, 24 July 2018. I would like to once again thank you all for your attendance at today's briefing. A transcript will be available on the committee's parliamentary web page in due course. I declare the briefing closed.

The committee adjourned at 11.23 am.