

Title: (Legislative Assembly Logo)  
Creator: Adobe Illustrator(TM) 3.2.2  
CreationDate: (4/30/93) (11:45 AM)

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF QUEENSLAND

## PARLIAMENTARY TRAVELSAFE COMMITTEE

# SHARED BIKEWAYS

Parliamentary Travelsafe Committee Report No. 25

# **PARLIAMENTARY TRAVELSAFE COMMITTEE**

## **48TH PARLIAMENT**

### **2ND SESSION**

**CHAIRMAN:** Mr John Goss MLA, Member for Aspley

**DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Mr Terry Sullivan MLA, Member for Chermside

**MEMBERS:**

Mr Bob Dollin MLA, Member for Maryborough

Mr John Hegarty MLA, Member for Redlands

Mr Rob Mitchell MLA, Member for Charters Towers

Mr Bill Nunn MLA, Member for Hervey Bay

**RESEARCH DIRECTOR:** Mr Rob Hansen

**RESEARCH OFFICER:** Miss Amanda Waugh

**EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT:** Miss Catherine Bird

## ***PREFACE***

This report presents the proceedings of a public forum the committee convened in May 1997 on issues affecting pedestrians and cyclists on shared bikeways. The committee has decided to release these proceedings to stimulate further discussion of safety on shared bikeways and, more generally, the status of cyclists and pedestrians in our transport system.

The forum was a very useful exercise for the committee. It enabled us to gather information about the problems occurring on shared bikeways and the people who use them. Based on the feedback we received, it appears that the forum was equally useful to the participants. Many commented that it had been informative and well organised, and gave them a welcome opportunity to share their views.

The proceedings are offered for the information of Members and the general public, and as the foundation of an inquiry in the future.

I commend this report to the House.

Mr John Goss MLA  
Chairman

---



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b><i>i</i></b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b><i>iii</i></b>
<b>PART 1 ~ INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b><i>1</i></b>
THE TRAVELSAFE COMMITTEE .....	1
BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF THIS REPORT .....	1
<b>PART 2 ~ SYNOPSES OF PRESENTATIONS MADE AT THE COMMITTEE'S PUBLIC FORUM ON SHARED BIKEWAYS</b> .....	<b><i>3</i></b>
MR MARK KING ~ MANAGER, ROAD USER BEHAVIOUR, QUEENSLAND TRANSPORT .....	3
SGT BRUCE JACKSON ~ STATE TRAFFIC SUPPORT BRANCH, QUEENSLAND POLICE SERVICE .....	5
MR KERRY FIEN ~ SENIOR TECHNICAL OFFICER, BICYCLE TRANSPORT PLANNING, BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL .....	8
MR TED RADKE MLA ~ MEMBER FOR GREENSLOPES .....	10
MR CLEM CAMPBELL MLA ~ MEMBER FOR BUNDABERG .....	12
MR MICHAEL YEATES ~ CONVENOR, BICYCLE USER RESEARCH GROUP .....	14
MR NOEL TURNER ~ TECHNICAL OPERATIONS, ROAD CYCLING ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA .....	17
MRS DONNA BRENNAN ~ REPRESENTATIVE, BRISBANE BICYCLE TOURING ASSOCIATION .....	19
MR MICHAEL FANNING.....	21
MS HELENA BOND.....	23
MR BEN WILSON ~ VICE PRESIDENT, BICYCLE INSTITUTE OF QUEENSLAND .....	25
MR BILL MCKENNY ~ COMMITTEE MEMBER, QUEENSLAND MARATHON AND ROAD RUNNERS CLUB.....	27
MRS MARGARET MIDDLETON.....	29
MRS MARJORIE KUSKIE ~ REPRESENTATIVE, QUEENSLAND COUNTRY WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION (CALOUNDRA BRANCH).....	31
MR GLENN SEARLE ~ REPRESENTATIVE, SAFETY INSTITUTE OF AUSTRALIA (QUEENSLAND DIVISION) .....	33
MR JOHN MACPHERSON ~ REPRESENTATIVE, PARAPLEGIC AND QUADRIPLLEGIC ASSOCIATION OF QUEENSLAND .....	36
MR DES SPILLER.....	38
MR JON KNIGHT ~ MEMBER, CRITICAL MASS.....	40
MR JOHN HEPBURN ~ REPRESENTATIVE, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH.....	44
MR JAMES WHELAN ~ SMOGBUSTER'S PROJECT OFFICER, QUEENSLAND CONSERVATION COUNCIL .....	46
MR BRIAN CLARK.....	48
MR KEN HARRIGAN ~ NATIONAL SERVICES MANAGER, NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIA.....	50
MR JURIS GRESTE ~ SECRETARY, AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF URBAN STUDIES, QUEENSLAND DIVISION.....	52
MRS KATHRYN MAHONEY.....	54

***PART 3 ~ FORUM CONCLUSIONS* .....56**

***REFERENCES*.....60**

***APPENDIX A ~ PUBLIC FORUM SPEAKERS AND DELEGATES*.....62**

***ABBREVIATIONS***

<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>DEFINITIONS</b>
ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
AS	Australian Standard
BBTA	Brisbane Bicycle Touring Association
BCC	Brisbane City Council
BIQ	Bicycle Institute of Queensland
CBD	Central Business District
CR	Councillor
CUST	Bicycle Federation of Australia Cyclists Urban Speed Limit Taskforce
IRTP	Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South East Queensland
PM	Particulate Matter
QCC	Queensland Conservation Council
QCWA	Queensland's Country Women's Association
RACQ	Royal Automobile Club of Queensland
WHO	World Health Organisation



## ***PART 1 ~ INTRODUCTION***

### **THE TRAVELSAFE COMMITTEE**

1. The Travelsafe Committee of the 48<sup>th</sup> Parliament was appointed by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly on 15 September 1995. This resolution was amended on 18 April 1996 during the second session of the 48<sup>th</sup> Parliament.
2. Under the new resolution the committee monitors, investigates and reports on:-
  - (a) issues affecting road safety including the causes of road crashes and measures aimed at reducing deaths, injuries and economic costs to the community;
  - (b) the safety of passenger transport services, and measures aimed at reducing the incidence of related deaths and injuries; and
  - (c) measures for the enhancement of public transport in Queensland and reducing dependence on private motor vehicles as the predominant mode of transport.

### **BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF THIS REPORT**

3. The Deputy Chairman, Mr Terry Sullivan MLA, proposed that the committee examine safety on shared bikeways. This followed the death of a young cyclist and the serious injury of an elderly pedestrian on shared bikeways in Brisbane's northern suburbs. Mr Sullivan also met with bikeway authorities in Brisbane, Mackay, Gympie, Townsville and the Sunshine Coast, and Bike Victoria in Melbourne.
4. The term 'shared footway' used in the *Traffic Act 1949* denotes common pathways on which pedestrians have right of way over other users. The committee has deliberately used the term 'shared bikeway' to limit the scope of the public forum to shared, off-road thoroughfares for cyclists and pedestrians, and exclude the separate issue of cyclists riding on footpaths. Cycling on footpaths has been legal since the *Traffic Act 1949* was amended in 1993.
5. Shared bikeways have been a popular initiative by governments in recent years. Cyclists are increasingly using shared bikeways to commute between residential areas, business districts, universities and recreational venues. Shared bikeways are also popular with pedestrians who walk and jog for exercise and enjoyment. Bikeways are important elements in regional transport plans and provide for arguably the most efficient and environmentally sustainable forms of transport available.
6. Problems arise on shared facilities because of conflict between different users. This conflict at its worst can lead to collisions between users that result in serious injury and even death. The committee is aware of two deaths arising from collisions on shared bikeways in Brisbane. The committee sought a community perspective on these problems. It convened a public forum on May 26 1997 in Brisbane and invited interested groups and individuals to speak. The following topics were provided as a guide to discussions:

- Shared bikeways - what are they and why are they built?
  - Safety considerations on shared bikeways - what are the risks?
  - The contribution of design, construction and maintenance to safety on shared bikeways.
  - Achieving safe use - what rules/etiquette apply and who administers/decides them?
  - The rights and responsibilities of pedestrians, cyclists and other users.
  - Providing for users with special needs.
  - The use of shared bikeways by commuter cyclists.
  - Improving safety on shared bikeways - engineering, education and enforcement.
7. 102 people attended the forum including 24 speakers. A list of the names of all delegates and speakers at the forum is at Appendix A. The following participants provided submissions:
- Bicycle Mackay
  - Bicycle Transport Planning Unit, Brisbane City Council
  - Bond, Helena
  - Cairns Bicycle User Group
  - Fanning, Michael
  - Knight, Jon & Hepburn, John
  - Logie, Rob
  - Plowman, Beth - Road User Behaviour Section, Land Transport and Safety Division & Integrated Transport Planning Division
  - Queensland Police Service, State Traffic Support Branch
  - Road Cycling Association of Australia (RCAA), Sara & Noel Turner
  - Spiller, Des
  - Walters, Bill
  - Wilkes, Peter - Queensland Transport, Road Safety (Southside)
  - Wilson, Ben - Bicycle Institute of Queensland
  - Yeates, Michael - Bicycle User Research Group and Bicycle Federation of Australia Urban Speed Limit Taskforce
8. This report presents the edited transcripts of the presentations made at the forum and a brief summary of the forum conclusions. The contents of submissions are reflected in the edited transcripts. These were prepared with the assistance of Ms Wendy Skelcey from the Parliament's Education, Training and Protocol Services Section.

---

***PART 2 ~ SYNOPSES OF PRESENTATIONS MADE AT  
THE COMMITTEE'S PUBLIC FORUM ON  
SHARED BIKEWAYS***

**MR MARK KING ~ MANAGER, ROAD USER BEHAVIOUR,  
QUEENSLAND TRANSPORT**

9. Until recently, Queensland Transport had not produced a single document which would clarify its position on shared bikeways. Today, I will speak about the policies and programs of Queensland Transport relevant to shared bikeways, some of the issues that have arisen in practice, and future developments which show the new direction of Queensland Transport's view on shared bikeways.
10. Queensland Transport is not in the business of providing bikeways. That is done by the Main Roads Department and by local governments. Our role is to play a part in advocating bicycle-friendly, on-road facilities and to promote road sharing between drivers and cyclists on the roads. We are aware that the road is not a very safe place for cyclists and support a limited segregation of cyclists and drivers through bikeways. This is because the existing infrastructure throughout Queensland makes it very difficult to plan a whole bikeway system from scratch. The system has to utilise what is already available and there will always be interfaces with the driving environment.
11. Queensland Transport's view on shared bikeways is reflected in the way it has treated footpath cycling. Footpath cycling was introduced in 1993, because we felt that on the basis of the research provided, it was much safer for bicycles and pedestrians to be interacting, rather than bicycles interacting with cars. On a safety basis, we supported the notion of bicycles and pedestrians sharing the same space.
12. In practice, there have been a number of concerns about shared bikeways. Most concerns were expressed at a seminar organised by Queensland Transport in 1995, which involved various cycling groups, some pedestrian advocacy groups and the National Seniors Association. One point that was raised was the fact that even if pavements are delineated for the use of both pedestrians and cyclists or signed for cyclists only, the pathway will be used by all, even by those walking their dogs, because the surface of the pathway is comfortable and predictable for pedestrians.
13. Behaviour on shared bikeways has proven to be difficult to regulate, because it is difficult to legislate. It is also very difficult for police to enforce relevant regulations.
14. As everyone may be aware, some serious crashes have occurred on shared bikeways. Obtaining data on collisions between pedestrians and cyclists on shared bikeways is quite difficult. Our road crash database reveals small numbers of accidents, but this may be because these types of

- incidents are not reported. The Queensland Injury Surveillance and Prevention Program, which collects data from a number of hospitals around Queensland on people who present with injuries, indicates that numbers are small. However, again it may be that people's perceptions that a considerable problem does exist in this area do not match with the reality of the situation.
15. The focus of Queensland Transport is changing. We are now looking at a broader focus on preferred modes of travel. This is best reflected in the soon to be launched Integrated Regional Transport Plan (IRTP), which supports segregation of cyclists and vehicles. The IRTP encourages the desired behaviour of pedestrians using pedestrian facilities and cyclists using cyclist facilities, by designing the facilities to discourage pedestrians from using cyclist paths in favour of their own facilities.
  16. Such segregation is motivated by the intention to increase the proportion of trips taken in south east Queensland, both walking and cycling, from current levels of about 15 to 20 percent. It is intended that the share of cycling will increase from 2 to 5 percent over the next 15 years, which represents a substantial increase. It is felt that shared bikeways are unattractive to cyclists and pedestrians because of the dangers inherent in having the two modes mixing.
  17. The IRTP also intends to conduct trials concerning different ways of segregating cyclists and pedestrians. Its aim is to design safe cycling and walking facilities into new transport infrastructure. Part of the thrust is a South east Queensland regional cycle plan, with the intention of extending this throughout Queensland over a period of time. Local and state governments would be involved and current local government cycle plans would be integrated into the broader regional plan. Shared bikeways would be considered as part of the integrated regional network, but the thrust of the IRTP is away from shared bikeways.
  18. Queensland Transport is intending to establish a State Cycle Committee with representatives from state agencies, local governments and cycle user groups. The committee would compile guidelines on policy and the planning and provision of infrastructure such as bikeways and shared bikeways.
  19. This committee would provide a mechanism for communication and information dissemination between the Government and the community. The process is dependent upon how motivated user groups are to come to us, and whether we have a particular issue on the agenda.
  20. In conclusion, one point to be made is that the discussion has centred on cyclists and pedestrians. However, a number of other user groups, such as rollerbladers, skateboarders and people with disabilities use these shared bikeways, and we should not forget these groups.

---

## SGT BRUCE JACKSON ~ STATE TRAFFIC SUPPORT BRANCH, QUEENSLAND POLICE SERVICE

21. The State Traffic Support Branch is the policy-making area for traffic-related matters for the Police Service. In dealing with the rights of cyclists and pedestrians on shared bikeways, I refer you to the provisions of the *Traffic Act 1949* and the *Traffic Regulation 1962*, which pertain to the key elements of this topic.
22. Section 4 of the *Traffic Regulations 1962* defines a 'cyclist' as the rider of a bicycle, tricycle or power-assisted cycle.
23. Provisions of *Traffic Regulation 1962* regarding the regulating of motorists include:
  - Section 159(1) which provides that motorists (not including drivers of power-assisted cycles re s.159(1A)) are precluded from driving on footways;
  - Section 38(1) which provides that motorists when entering or leaving land abutting a road, are required to give way to all vehicles, pedestrians, persons in wheelchairs and cyclists using bikeways; and
  - Section 32C(2) which prevents the driver of a vehicle, other than a bicycle, tricycle or power-assisted cycle, from driving on a bicycle lane or a bicycle path unless under specific situations including entering or leaving a road, parking or turning.
24. Provisions of *Traffic Regulation 1962*, regarding the regulating of cyclists include:
  - Section 159(1A) which provides that unless prohibited by a local law, a cyclist may ride on a footway if reasonable precautions are taken to avoid a collision with a person or thing on the footway and if that person rides in such a way as not to cause a danger or obstruction to persons or things on the footway; and
  - Section 159A which relates to the use of segregated footways, shared footways, bicycle paths and bicycle lanes by cyclists.
    - Subsection (2) requires such a cyclist to keep their vehicle as close as practicable to the left boundary of the bicycle lane or path;
    - Subsection (3) requires such cyclists to pass on the right when overtaking another cyclist travelling in the same direction, unless the overtaken vehicle is making a right-hand turn. The overtaking cyclist shall indicate the intention to overtake by using hand signals, as prescribed in s.45 of the *Traffic Regulation*. The overtaking cyclist is not to ride in front of another cyclist until clear of that cyclist;
    - Subsection (4) requires cyclists not to travel on the side specified for pedestrians, when travelling upon a segregated footway;
    - Subsection (5) requires cyclists to give way to any pedestrian entering or upon shared footways; and

- Subsection (6) specifies that each bicycle must keep to its respective left-hand side of the bikeway when passing oncoming cyclists on a shared footway, segregated footway or bicycle path.

- 
- Section 93 places conditions upon how a cyclist rides which include:
    - the seating equipment;
    - how many people the cycle can carry;
    - the ruling that one hand must be kept on the handle bar;
    - the concern of carrying articles so that the control of the cycle is not compromised; and
    - quantifying a definition for what constitutes 'following too closely'.
  - Section 94(1) states that it is an offence for subject cycles, toy cycles (rollerblades, roller-skates and skateboards) or wheelchairs to be towed.
25. Provisions of *Traffic Regulation 1962* regarding the regulation of pedestrians include:
- Section 41(1), paragraph (f) which places a specific restriction on pedestrians in relation to bikeways.
    - (i) A pedestrian shall not 'stand upon or proceed along the side of a segregated footway which corresponds to the side of the segregated footway sign applicable to that person's direction of travel on which the symbol of a bicycle is depicted'; and
    - (ii) A pedestrian shall not 'cross a bicycle path or a segregated footway, if in doing so, that person would impede the progress of any bicycle, tricycle or power-assisted cycle travelling along such a bicycle path or segregated footway'.
26. Section 41(1)(f)(i) essentially provides that pedestrians on segregated footways must stay on that side of the path which has a sign indicating usage by pedestrians only. On a segregated footway cyclists are to remain on one side of the path, and pedestrians are to remain on the other.
27. Upon detection of a breach of these offences, offenders are to be issued with a traffic infringement notice. However, a major issue which precludes the detection of offenders, is the isolation of bikeways from regular access by police patrols. High-profile enforcement is an effective tool to uphold legislative controls.
28. In considering the degree of seriousness of the offences listed, personal safety is the overwhelming consideration. Competent engineering of bikeways will remove the primary concern of the causation of injury and this combined with an education program highlighting the dangers associated with combining bicycles and pedestrians, will hopefully curtail the levels of enforcement needed and promote the enjoyment of all for shared bikeways.
-

---

**MR KERRY FIEN ~ SENIOR TECHNICAL OFFICER, BICYCLE  
TRANSPORT PLANNING, BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL**

29. My role within the Brisbane City Council (BCC) is to conduct strategic planning for cyclist facilities and to introduce education and encouragement initiatives aimed at increasing the amount of cycling in the city from the current 1.5 percent of all trips to 8 percent of all trips by the year 2011, which is higher than the recommendations of the Integrated Regional Transport Plan. We think this is an achievable target.
30. This forum is about shared bikeways. In fact the official term, 'shared footways', conveys the type of use of the facility - a pedestrian priority facility. Pedestrians have the right of way and cyclists must give way to them. Shared footways can be on or off-road - on-road being on the footpath, or the nature strip beside the road, or off-road through parkland or any sort of open space.
31. Ideally, all users will share the facility - they will keep to the left, cyclists will ring their bells as they go past and pedestrians will move to the left and allow a cyclist through. However, coming to terms with this concept of sharing facilities, appears to create a problem with users.
32. There are many different users including racing cyclists, walkers, runners, wheelchair users or people exercising their dogs. In Brisbane, shared footways are primarily built for cyclists. They are funded from cyclist funds, given priority under a system that mainly considers cyclists' needs and they are basically constructed for cyclists. The obvious question is why then aren't pathways for bikes-only built?
33. This was the intention of the first bikeways built in Sandgate in 1977. However, as soon as the path was laid, pedestrians began to use the facility. Their rationale was that cyclists were using the pedestrian footpaths which was illegal at the time, and that in the early days the bikeways were not heavily used. The enforcement of laws related to shared footways was also difficult for the police. After a short period, these dedicated bikeways were converted to shared footways.
34. Today, there is basically no operational difference between footpaths and shared footways. The Austroads Guide indicates there is not really any need to mark shared bikeways any more, because operationally they are basically the same as footpaths. The rules, such as giving way to pedestrians are almost identical. The only difference is that shared footways are designed for cyclists' use.
35. The Bicycle Brisbane Plan approved in 1995 changed the focus from recreation to transport, including transport to school and to work. There is a move away from shared facilities to the provision of on-road bike lanes and specific bike-only facilities.
36. The Integrated Regional Transport Plan and our own Travel Smart document has set the tone for increasing the proportion of cycling in the number of trips, so that more people will ride bikes and fewer people will be driving private cars.

37. In terms of complaints registered by users of shared footways, it would seem that since 1993, when cycling on footpaths became legal, the level of complaints from pedestrians has risen quite dramatically compared with that from cyclists. This may partly be attributed to the fact that pedestrians now have a greater ownership of these pathways, because cyclists are permitted to use the footpaths.
38. The most common complaint from pedestrians is that cyclists rush past without warning and in some cases cause accidents, whilst cyclists complain about pedestrians blocking the whole path and showing little consideration for cyclists. Another problem encountered by cyclists in particular, is that of unleashed dogs, which can be very hazardous.
39. When addressing the issue of cyclists' registration, it should be noted that if either a cyclist or a pedestrian causes an accident on a bikeway, neither can be identified. If everybody using these shared footways was aware of the rules and obeyed them, perhaps there would be fewer problems.
40. The issue regarding the volume of users on these shared footways raises the question at what point does a facility of this nature become non-viable. Even the Austroads Guide to Traffic Engineering Practice, does not specify particular volumes when referencing the change from shared to segregated facilities.
41. The Brisbane City Council believes that a type of warrant should be established for cycling on shared footways. This could include such considerations as the volume of pedestrians, volumes of cyclists, the speed at which 85 percent of the cyclists travel, the widths of the path, sight distance and the type of use. This could then be applied to existing paths and perhaps go some way to a possible solution for pathways in general.
42. Design, construction and maintenance have an important role to play in the safety of shared bikeways. The Brisbane City Council is committed to the use of the Austroads Guide to Traffic Engineering Practice, which indicates all of the guidelines for the construction and maintenance of bikeways. Problems which emanated from past guidelines, such as the usage of bollards, are not deemed appropriate today and the BCC is attempting to rectify these problems.
43. In conclusion, I would like to reiterate the need for some warrants to be determined for the use of shared facilities and the application of these to existing and future footways. This initiative, together with an effective education program for all users of these facilities (e.g 'Sharing the Path' promotion, which gives free bells to all cyclists) and some measure of enforcement of associated rules, is seen by the Brisbane City Council as providing a realistic solution to the problems.

---

**MR TED RADKE MLA ~ MEMBER FOR GREENSLOPES**

44. I refer the committee to a speech I made in Parliament on 11 July 1996 concerning an unsafe bikeway. With regards to that particular bikeway, I would like to focus on four associated issues:
- ownership of bikeways;
  - safety pertaining to bikeways;
  - future objectives and planning; and
  - the impact of legislation.
45. With reference to the ownership issue, there appears to be some difficulty in identifying which level of government owns a bikeway. In my electorate of Greenslopes, there is a bikeway that runs between Esher Street and Birdwood Road on the western boundary of the South East Freeway. The land is owned by the Transport Department as part of their freeway corridor. I believe that the shared footway comes under the control of the Brisbane City Council.
46. However, along the western side of the South East Freeway are commuter bikeways running through the western side of Toohey Forest and closer to town there is a commuter bikeway that is owned by the Transport Department. Constituents find the issue of ownership very confusing, especially when they are attempting to communicate with the appropriate authorities.
47. Concerning safety issues, this bikeway between Esher Street and Birdwood Road experiences problems with the location of driveways. There are approximately four driveways located in a dead-end street, which are crossed by the bikeway and this is extremely hazardous for the motorists reversing from their driveways. The bikeway also has hairpin bends, one of which limits visibility to seven metres for the cyclist or the pedestrian and this bikeway is also totally enclosed by the noise barriers of the freeway on one side. The absence of any lighting in this area, together with the three-metre high noise barrier, the presence of trees and shrubs and the fencing of neighbouring houses, completes a picture of a very scary facility for constituents to use.
48. With regards to the future, I understand that Connell Wagner are conducting an investigation into a commuter bikeway along my section of the South East Freeway. I have been advised that they may be considering building a commuter bikeway that will cross the freeway over bridges such as the Esher Street Bridge. They will either suspend the bikeway from the bridge or build it beside the bridge. My concern with this idea is that if the cyclist bridge is suspended from an overhead traffic bridge, you will lower the height of all the city's bridges. Secondly, in the event of the construction of a large piece of machinery to be transported to the coalfields for example, the suspended bridges would have to be dismantled to allow freedom of passage for freight of that nature.
49. Some may believe that legislation will alleviate the problems associated with these shared facilities. However, I do not believe that it is feasible for police officers or council officers to be able to ticket every person who infringes the laws relating to these facilities.
-

50. I conclude by endorsing the construction of separate, dedicated bikeways and pedestrian paths. In my electorate where the two are shared, it is absolute chaos and the constituents are not in favour of these facilities.

**MR CLEM CAMPBELL MLA ~ MEMBER FOR BUNDABERG**

51. I believe that there are many people who are not familiar with the appearance of a segregated footway sign or have no understanding of what it signifies. I do not recall ever having seen a segregated footway sign myself. I refer to this because of a problem which occurred in my electorate of Bundaberg concerning a second-best situation with the Burnett River traffic bridge.
52. The Police Service and the Transport Department decided to remedy the situation of cyclists on the roads with cars and heavy vehicles, by moving them to the pedestrian paths, which were only approximately a metre in width. At intervals, extensions were added to the steel pedestrian way to allow bicycles to pass. Further extensions were made to provide a two-metre wide shared footway. At each end of the bridge was a shared footway sign. However, there was also a bike sign at one end of the bridge and a pedestrian sign at the other. Consequently the public didn't understand whether this was a shared footway (where all users keep to the left) or a segregated footway (where cyclists and pedestrians keep to separate lanes).
53. Following almost two years of confusion, the Transport Department placed a pedestrian sign above the bike sign and a bike sign above the pedestrian sign. This appears to have resolved the situation.
54. I am concerned with segregated footways and do not agree with them, because by segregation we are not teaching our cyclists and pedestrians the road rules. Children should learn the rules of a dual carriageway and know that they should always stay on the left and pass on the right.
55. The Burnett River traffic bridge has dual usage - recreational and commuter. Although the Burnett River traffic bridge was not designed as a shared facility, we believe that the system that we have adopted to accommodate both bicycles and pedestrians has worked. Understanding the signage and its implications greatly contributes to the relatively smooth functioning of these facilities.



---

## **MR MICHAEL YEATES ~ CONVENOR, BICYCLE USER RESEARCH GROUP**

56. The fundamental question of defining what a bikeway is and discovering that it is actually a footpath has been a very important issue to raise. I address the question, 'Shared bikeways.....is there any alternative?'
57. The Bicycle User Research Group is interested in both user and research aspects of cycling. I am also the convener of the Bicycle Federation of Australia Cyclists Urban Speed Limit Taskforce (CUST). My concerns can be summed up by saying that cyclists' needs have been and continue to be ignored by road authorities.
58. Cycling and walking needs, including the needs of those with mobility disabilities, relate to a means of transport. These facilities should always be safe, direct and convenient and there are very good guidelines to ensure that they are. However, guidelines are not mandatory, so therefore we try to negotiate acceptable, excellent or other levels of service. As there is no control over the quality of these services and no process for enforcing the appropriate levels or standards, substandard facilities are almost inevitable.
59. Authorities have tended to make roads and streets less safe with more vehicles travelling at higher speeds, rather than addressing the needs of pedestrians and cyclists in a network sense throughout the urban areas. This is evidenced by actions such as removing pedestrian crossings, which effectively removes the right-of-way situation favouring pedestrians and cyclists.
60. I will use the Brisbane City Council, as an example as it is a lead agency. In a sense it has refused to provide safety for cyclists using the road system and I use the word 'has', because there is a change being talked about. It has chosen to place paths in park-type settings and continues to do so.
61. Some years ago, Queensland Transport and Main Roads initiated a program called Safe Bikeways in which \$15 million was invested. The message was that the roads were not for cyclists. There are dual messages here. We have never had similar amounts spent on 'cycling-on-the-roads' projects. It is important to recognise that this is part of the problem and why bikeways are used incorrectly.
62. It is utterly inevitable that conflict will arise using these shared facilities. Therefore we have to emphasise the idea of coexistence. The paths are used by too many different and often conflicting users - high and low speed cyclists, pedestrians of all ages and people with disabilities. To examine terminology such as 'separation', 'shared paths' and 'segregation', leads us to the same problems that we have with the definition of 'bikeways', 'footpaths' and so on.
63. In reference to behaviour on shared facilities, I believe that there has not been a fundamental debate on issues such as which side of the path pedestrians should walk, the effectiveness of

---

cyclists ringing bicycle bells to alert pedestrians of their presence, or the determining of a suitable speed for commuting cyclists on a shared facility.

64. In my view, if bike paths are to accommodate a range of users, including those with disabilities, parallel road facilities for cyclists are inevitable and essential for reasons of space, money and simplicity. At the moment, we have an 'off-road at any cost' mentality. Two examples of this attitude are the Captain Cook Bridge, which was built in fairly recent times and made no provision for pedestrians or cyclists. There is now a proposal to put a structure underneath. The second example is the proposed Indooroopilly Green Bridge. Both these projects involve high costs and offer low levels of perceived personal safety. These are million dollar projects, but basically nothing has been done for pedestrians and cyclists. In both cases, cyclists and pedestrians could use the existing bridges if priorities were reallocated.
65. I believe that the Travelsafe Committee may have contributed to the idea that cycling on roads is dangerous and perhaps, therefore inappropriate. Report No. 9 Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety 1993 at page 26 suggests that cyclists and pedestrians should avoid the dangers of roundabouts. We would say there is no choice. Since then, Queensland Transport has introduced 'safe' double-lane roundabouts, yet I challenge anyone to ride in the middle lane. The Brisbane City Council continues to build the medium-sized roundabouts rather than the smaller ones constructed by other local councils. Roundabouts can be designed to be much safer for pedestrians and cyclists. Authorities such as Brisbane City Council and Queensland Transport / Main Roads decline to think so.
66. Notes taken from a paper submitted by Michael Yeates include further points for consideration:
- - Authorities should provide better standard on-road cycling conditions or low speed environments to encourage cyclists who wish to travel on roads at speeds perceived to be too fast for pathways. Fast cyclists will use safe and convenient conditions if provided on adjoining roads. Only then is it reasonable to expect these cyclists to vacate the paths.
  - It is a far cheaper and much safer option for everyone if speed limits are reduced in urban areas, thus reducing the danger to everyone using the roads. Road safety teaches students that cars are dangerous and have complete priority. At the outset of projects such as Safe Routes to Schools, the initial focus is on student safety but invariably these projects are controlled by traffic engineers and the emphasis 'becomes' traffic orientated.
  - European safe routes to schools provide just that, aiming to encourage more cycling and walking rather than more cars. The routes are usually on local streets and roads with special facilities. Young children (and drivers) learn to operate in mixed traffic. This experience is considered likely to improve judgement and risk appreciation leading to safer driving habits later.
  - In summary, all paths are likely to be shared because enforcement is both difficult and impractical. In all cases (wherever possible), bike paths should therefore be designed for cyclists, pedestrians and those with access disabilities. This requires a much greater combined width (>4 metres) to provide adequate operational clearances (see Austroads 1993) for the high speed commuter and 'sport' cyclists. Preferably therefore, high speed cycling should be encouraged on-road by provision of safe

conditions (e.g safe speed limits and/or speed reductions). Where not achievable, cycling facilities (e.g bikelanes) must be provided on road.

---

## **MR NOEL TURNER ~ TECHNICAL OPERATIONS, ROAD CYCLING ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA**

67. In opening my address, I would like to draw your attention to comments made by both the Chairman of the Travelsafe Committee and by a member of the Queensland Conservation Council. The Chairman, Mr John Goss observed that Queensland was far behind other areas of Australia with regard to seeking solutions to the use of shared facilities by pedestrians and cyclists.
68. James Whelan was concerned about the amount of land thus far allocated to cycling and pedestrian facilities. I make the point that in Europe, a great deal more land and facilities are devoted to these needs. They do this despite an exceptionally small tolerance for extra land use and much greater population densities. Their higher allocation of land to these facilities is something that we should take on board.
69. The eight issues which are to be addressed at this forum, represent a reasonably comprehensive set of parameters, which should be the foundation for competent urban planning incorporating cycling facilities in all regions - urban, sub-rural and rural.
70. As to the integration and complement of on-road facilities with off-road facilities to create comprehensive cycling networks, there is no point in having either good on-road or off-road facilities if they are separated because of inappropriate connectivity and standards. We suggest that shared bikeways or shared pathways are inevitable. They are such a great facility for so many users. In total, I have identified 12 categories of users.
71. It is not simply a matter of a pedestrian/cyclist conflict over the usage of the off-road facilities and paths. It is a matter of who uses them and for what reason. Identifying the needs of these people will largely influence the development of the standards and the philosophy behind the construction of any off-road facility.
72. When considering the safety factors of a shared facility, we have identified variables such as the quality of the path, the volume of 'traffic' on the paths, the different types of users and people's attitudes or code of protocol that people might practice when using these facilities. The European model adopts a voluntary code in relation to a mixed facility or path system.
73. When considering the design of these facilities, Part 14 of the Austroads Standards must be considered and should be the minimum standards against which any bike path design criteria is measured. They are certainly the benchmarks that should be used to provide facilities, not used as a criteria for not providing facilities.
74. The standard to which the facility suits the users will determine how people behave. No degree of protocol or enforcement of rules and regulations will be effective, if the facility does not allow the user to behave in an appropriate way in terms of cooperation and coexistence. Queensland Transport has been endeavouring to establish a level of service parameter for a facility. This initiative could be developed in combination with the Part 14 recommendations on facility construction and also in consultation with user groups. I believe that this suggested

process is critical and should be taken on board by Queensland Transport, the Brisbane City Council, rural local authorities and any other concerned authorities, for the future development of shared facilities.

---

## **MRS DONNA BRENNAN ~ REPRESENTATIVE, BRISBANE BICYCLE TOURING ASSOCIATION**

75. The Brisbane Bicycle Touring Association (BBTA) is a group of recreational cyclists, numbering between 150 and 200 members. Our main focus is on touring, although we also concentrate on social rides in and around Brisbane and South east Queensland. As a touring association, we are very concerned that discussions about shared bikeways might lead to cyclists being encouraged to be off the roads, as most of our cycling is on-road.
76. The BBTA makes good use of the shared bikeways around Brisbane, particularly where they connect with quiet back roads and these roads are also ideal for beginner cyclists. As we cycle in large groups ranging from 10 to 25 people, we are very aware of the associated safety issues such as stopping and starting. With bikeways in particular, we are concerned about the entries and exits to shared bikeways and the presence of bollards. It was one of our members who had the collision with the bollard on the Kangaroo Point bikeway.
77. If roads are considered dangerous for cyclists, then signposting to alert motorists to the fact that cyclists are crossing roads at certain junctions needs to be addressed. At present, the onus would seem to be on the cyclist to show care, and motorists and pedestrians have right-of-way.
78. To reiterate a former comment, the BBTA would not like to see the situation occur where large amounts of money were invested in shared facilities, or bike-only pathways and cyclists were then banned from the roads where those facilities existed. Coronation Drive is a good example of where hostility is demonstrated towards cyclists using the road, as motorists believe that cyclists have no right to be using the road when a bikeway exists in that area.
79. Education for cyclists, pedestrians and motorists is a key issue. We need to avoid the situation where we are looking at mutually exclusive categories here. Most cyclists are also pedestrians and motorists.
80. Safety issues are also a major concern. The presence of bollards has already been mentioned and we are aware that the Brisbane City Council is removing them. The following points pertain to other safety issues:
- the use of white lines as demarcation, rather than using physical dividers;
  - the difficulty of negotiating access to roads via right-angled turns - the need is for a type of angled return;
  - paths need to be wider, even though there is awareness of the fierce competition for the limited space available;
  - applying the same rules that exist for road usage to the use of shared facilities - i.e you walk towards the oncoming traffic, because as many have pointed out, the ringing of bicycle bells does not always achieve the desired result;
  - the lack of lighting, particularly in areas of high usage.

81. On a positive note, the cycling paths in general are very good. The usage of such facilities for both cyclists and pedestrians may vary greatly. Therefore, when addressing the needs of these groups, consideration must be given to each group and compromises will have to be made to arrive at a suitable outcome.
  
82. As a touring group, we think Brisbane with its beautiful climate and generally low density of traffic is a great place to cycle. We enjoy cycling through the parklands, along waterfronts and away from high density traffic areas. In general, most motorists are quite good at acknowledging the presence of cyclists on the roads.
  
83. What we are doing here today is very positive and we are encouraged by people wanting to change these things and make it more cycling friendly.

---

## MR MICHAEL FANNING

84. I'll begin by saying that I am a pedestrian, a cyclist and a motorist. I use that order because I believe that is the way a transport hierarchy really should work in a truly civilised community. When discussing shared facilities, I would also include roads, which I regard as a shared facility. Consider the notion that pedestrians and cyclists behave badly on the bike paths because of the car culture that exists.
85. The culture of the motor car and speed is all we know. Is it any wonder that we have carnage on our roads and confusion on our bike paths? Most of what we do in the name of road safety only reinforces that culture of speed: air bags; ABS braking; the black spot scheme and of course the notorious bicycle helmet laws. Imagine the reaction from the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland (RACQ) if statistics from injuries and deaths from motor sports or freak accidents in garages were included in the road toll figures. That is what occurs with cycling. Councillor Maureen Hayes recently claimed that cycling is the most dangerous form of transport. According to World Health Organisation figures that I have viewed, it is actually the safest - and that includes walking.
86. We make our roads safe by turning them into motor-traffic only zones. Non-motorised potential road users are kept from the road system by propaganda which scares them, or by engineering and legislative measures which discourage or prevent them from even trying. Massive subsidies are committed to private motor transport at the expense of our under-funded and overpriced public transport system. Both state and local governments state their commitment to encouraging motorists to use alternate, more sustainable forms of transport, yet the majority of transport funding is committed to projects which entrench our dependence on cars.
87. This contrasts greatly with countries such as Germany, The Netherlands and Austria, where authorities for over 20 years have endeavoured to ensure that residential streets are safe places for people to walk, to cycle and to play. They have grown up in a culture where everybody uses the roads.
88. Orthodox road safety has always had its critics. In September 1996, Britain's Ministry of Transport released a document titled, 'Child Pedestrian Safety in the United Kingdom: A Strategy for Reducing Child Pedestrian Casualties' and I quote from this document: -
- It is clear that the physical imbalance between a vehicle and a child is extreme and it is only long familiarity that allows it to go almost unnoticed. Drivers in their increasingly quiet, smooth and secure vehicles are too insulated from the risks they impose on pedestrians and children in particular. These risks need to be exposed and minimised.*
- Rather than throwing the onus on children always to adapt perfectly to traffic, we want traffic to adapt to children and other vulnerable road users. Above all, that means cutting the speed of motor vehicles.*
89. In a culture where crash-proof and unnecessarily powerful cars are allowed to be advertised as safe, this is political dynamite.
-

90. The adult driving the powerful car and using it to intimidate pedestrians or cyclists is surely a victim of the current motor supremacist safety education policy, as is the cycling lycra lout, who may intimidate pedestrians on his perceived bike space. Adults, who were educated as children that they had a right to walk and cycle will be more tolerant motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. A community with tolerant attitudes would then not have difficulties in using these shared facilities.
91. The Parliamentary Travelsafe Committee could introduce these concepts into our auto-centric road safety policies and into our basic driver training. One step could be to refute the myth that road taxes pay for the road system. The roads are paid for by the community and it is time that all members of the community gained the benefit of using them safely.

---

## MS HELENA BOND

92. I would like to provide this forum with feedback I received from a large number of cyclists. They participated in a discussion over the Internet on the use of shared bikeways. I am unable to speak with a great deal of personal authority about shared bikeways, as I am only a recent resident of Brisbane. However, the following issues were most frequently raised:
- the term 'shared bikeways' was interpreted by most to mean paths shared by cyclists and pedestrians where pedestrians have right of way. The majority believed bikes actually belong on the road;
  - cyclists are always pedestrians and very often are motorists also. They acknowledge that pedestrians can be unpredictable in their behaviour and that is normal behaviour when you are walking;
  - if shared paths are to be truly shared, then the responsibility should be shared. The present situation always puts the onus on the cyclist to avoid pedestrians and cars;
  - insufficient bicycle parking facilities means that cyclists are restricted in the places that they may travel to by bicycle. As many as 10 bikes may be accommodated in one car space, using a toast rack formation of Sheffield stands. (Today, when I arrived at the free car parking space under the freeway, I found no allocated space for my bike.);
  - nervous cyclists would rather use quiet roads than a shared path as they find the former a safer place to cycle; and
  - most paths are not easy to cycle on and they must be even more difficult for wheelchairs.
93. I have submitted further notes containing input from discussions held with cyclists and other users of shared pathways concerning major issues such as safety, design, rights and responsibilities of users and various other areas of concern. The main points are:
- priority should be given to make the roads more cycle-friendly;
  - on-road cycle routes are preferable because they are well maintained, well lit and clearly marked for cyclists;
  - shared facilities should only be provided as a last resort or where it is possible to provide a useful linking path where no road exists;
  - provision of free or cheap, secure bike parking would be a real incentive to use bikes more; and
  - good bike/public transport is needed.
94. Safety considerations include:
- collisions of all natures;
  - narrow paths - there should be provision for at least three lanes of traffic;
  - many obstructions at entry and exit points are dangerous - pinch point bars would be a satisfactory choice;
  - entry and exit points should be clearly marked with on-path markings;
-

- where blind corners are unavoidable, mirrors should be installed;
  - pathways should widen at junctions;
  - surfaces need to be smooth but not slippery when wet and they need to be regularly cleaned, as debris can be very hazardous;
  - irresponsible users are a major hazard;
  - facilities should be safe to use in all weather and at all times, which means provision of effective lighting is essential;
  - the potential of physical assault is ever present, especially at night - an increase in security patrols is needed, as mention was also made of the frequenting of these facilities by the 'criminal element' in the community, to avoid the police; and
  - paths need to connect sensibly with roads to create a through-route to suitable destinations.
95. Cyclists were generally keen that a code of use be established, which included rules such as giving way when passing others, making yourself visible at night, keeping to the left, not wearing headphones whilst using a shared path and that signs stating these codes of conduct were displayed near entry points and advertised through the local media to further educate the public.
96. All users needed to treat each other with courtesy and consideration. Do the current obstructions stop wheelchair users from accessing these paths and how are those with special needs such as tandem and recumbent riders or people pushing strollers catered for on these shared facilities?
97. One cyclist suggested that these facilities should be cycleways during peak hours and shared facilities the remaining hours of the day. International research indicates that there were more cycle accidents on bikeways and shared pathways than there were on roads. Engineering improvements to bikeways is vital.

---

## MR BEN WILSON ~ VICE PRESIDENT, BICYCLE INSTITUTE OF QUEENSLAND

98. The Bicycle Institute of Queensland (BIQ) believes that there are significant health, environmental and economic benefits of cycling. They make it a method of transport which governments should be most actively encouraging at every opportunity. However, this is not reflected as a top priority commitment when one regards the percentage of monies appropriated for this in government budgets.
99. Cyclists need connecting networks. They exist. They are called roads, and they urgently need to be made safer for cyclists. However, we are realists and we understand that at this moment in time the needs of cyclists do not seem to be a priority with decision-makers.
100. There is a place for shared bikeways in a transport network, but it is unlikely that it will be efficient, safe or particularly useable by commuter or serious cyclists. The BIQ has over 1000 adult members, as well as children and families. For the efficient movement of people, a safe network is needed. It is well documented in our sources and those of the Brisbane Bicycle Plan that cyclists prefer roads but find them dangerous.
101. The future plans of the Integrated Regional Transport Plan and the Brisbane City Council's Travel Smart include a twofold or fourfold increase in cycling transportation over the next 14 years. This raises the question concerning the usage of shared facilities in the future.
102. It is inevitable that roads are where vehicles belong. Cyclists have found themselves needing to use the shared bike paths. This is because of the perception of too many motorists, that cyclists should be on the bike paths and not on the roads. Their attitude is reflected in their dangerous behaviour towards cyclists, particularly in areas where a bikeway exists. It is quite impossible for law enforcement officers to cover all the misdemeanours that occur. In situations of confrontation, the cyclist clearly has a greatly diminished capacity to engage the might of a car on the road.
103. The basis of providing shared bikeways and off-road facilities is the result of a view by many, that bikes cannot be safely accommodated on roads. It is little wonder that roads have become oriented towards motorised transport use, to the exclusion of others. However, bicycles are legally part of road traffic. It is possible that an anti-discrimination challenge of the non-provision of road space for bicycles, in accordance with national guidelines and Austroads 14 could succeed. Shared facilities require cyclists to accept that they are a second-class facility and that cyclists are being asked to share a second-class transport mode facility. Cyclists may be within their rights to challenge their exclusion from the roads, as under the *Traffic Act*.
104. Litigation risks for cyclists on shared bikeways are potentially high. When we use footpaths and bike paths, we have no legal rights. Cyclists must give way to pedestrians. Currently, the vast majority of cyclists have no third-party property cover (BIQ members and some other organisations are exceptions). When cyclists are encouraged to use off-road facilities, it could be argued that the designers of these facilities could be regarded as negligent to encourage such mixed usage and its consequential dangerous conflicts.

105. At present, negotiations are taking place between the BIQ and the Department of Main Roads, in which we are advocating on-road bikeways. However, some sections of roadways are deemed unsafe by the authorities and the suggestion is to use the off-road route. Planners are asking cyclists to share and asking us indirectly to move from a legal position where we have the rights under the *Traffic Act*, to a position on a shared bikeway where cyclists must give way to pedestrians. That legal burden should not be placed on cyclists.
106. The situation for cyclists and pedestrians alike is far from ideal. It is not a black and white situation. Many issues raised here today have no simple solutions. Hopefully, it will be apparent that cyclists are major stakeholders in cycling facilities and that we are far from satisfied with the current position of shared bike paths. BIQ acknowledges that many people such as children and slower recreational riders as opposed to commuter cyclists and faster recreational cyclists are relatively happy with shared bikeways.
107. Education and understanding of the issues of shared bikeways can be addressed for better results. All road users should be involved in a stakeholder committee and today's forum is a step in the right direction. Mention was made by Queensland Transport of the formation of a State Bicycle Committee, which was promised by the existing Government as one of its election promises. Other states have these committees and most have a state cycle unit which is designed to drive the changes recommended by the state committee. If we propose changes today, the question is who is going to drive those changes? Cyclists need a better voice and presence in the Department of Transport.
108. I conclude by endorsing the comment of the previous speaker (Helena Bond) with regard to the lack of provision of cycle parking amenities at Parliament House and I wonder what message that conveys.
109. Other points which were made in the paper submitted to the Travelsafe Committee were:
- off-road paths are always two-way which encourages head on incidents, especially when three or more users pass a point simultaneously, travelling at varying speeds;
  - off-road paths are on one side of the road only, which means half the users must cross the street twice to enter and exit the path;
  - paths are invariably poorly maintained and poorly lit;
  - paths are less direct than the existing road system and involve road crossings where cyclists must dismount; and
  - roads are public resources and should be inclusive of all road users.

---

**MR BILL MCKENNY ~ COMMITTEE MEMBER, QUEENSLAND  
MARATHON AND ROAD RUNNERS CLUB**

110. I have been an active marathon runner for some 18 years, running throughout Australia, the eastern and western coasts of Canada and on the bikeways in Boston and New York. My observations are that the issues concerning the use of bikeways here are no different to those issues experienced in other cities.
111. The Queensland Marathon and Road Runners Club has approximately 700 members. As runners, we seek to enhance our lifestyle. Recent education emphasising the importance of exercise has seen an increase in participation in activities such as running, walking and cycling. As an organisation, we would like to applaud local authorities for the construction of bikeways, which have provided a safer and cleaner environment for runners.
112. After consulting with fellow runners, cyclists and walkers, we arrived at four major areas of concern with the shared use of bikeways:
113. The narrowness of bikeways. It is understood that economics drive the size of bikeways and that also it is quite probable that no matter how wide the bikeways are, collisions will still occur. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that the wider the bikeways are, probably the safer they are.
114. Cyclists coming from behind runners. This is probably the greatest threat to our safety. Most cyclists are very courteous and use their bicycle bell to signal their approach and it is pleasing to know that legislation will enforce that all bikes are equipped with bells.
115. The lack of rules or lack of awareness of existing rules regulating behaviour on shared facilities. There is a need for rules to be expanded or adhered to. In my opinion, when runners are confronted with a cyclist they should keep to the left or move directly to the left. An education program would help to minimise these problems. Consistency in methods of demarcation of bikeways and signage used would greatly enhance the understanding and behaviour of users of these shared facilities.
116. The impact of the type of use on the behaviour of the user. With regard to runners, theirs can be a lonely sport covering long distances. Often they use that time to reflect on their day or plan the next day and so on. This can prove to be an unsafe practice as they are not wholly concentrating on their immediate environment. Also runners may run in pairs, 'sharing the pain' as it is known, or in groups, which must be extremely daunting for cyclists. Fatigue of these long distance runners and their response to a situation also must be considered. Some cyclists, on the other hand, travel at fast speeds, which narrows the reaction time between themselves and those potentially 'in the way'.
117. I believe that all shared parties on bikeways need to be aware of their fellow participants and their rights and be more responsible in their behaviour when using these shared facilities. Education should be one of the key areas in which the authorities should focus for the future.
-

The Queensland Marathon and Road Runners Club is most willing to assist in any education program that will benefit fellow runners or any other users of the bikeways.

**MRS MARGARET MIDDLETON**

118. I have been very vocal about a shared bikeway/pedestrian footpath in the area in which I live near the South East Freeway. I fully support and encourage the use of bikeways as an alternative method of transport to the car, but the safety of cyclists and pedestrians is of paramount importance.
119. Many years ago, the Brisbane City Council upgraded our footpath to accommodate recreational cyclists. Local residents did not oppose. However, without any consultation, this facility was changed to a commuter bikeway and has been extended. The subsequent increase of use of the footpath/bikeway by commuter cyclists has made this facility hazardous for local residents. Many residents are elderly and used the path to access local shops and buses.
120. There are many other factors which contribute to this facility being so unsafe. These include:
- poor signage to illustrate it is a shared facility;
  - an inefficient design of the facility; it was not intended for commuter cyclists. There are four dead-end streets in this section where five driveways cross the pathway, which makes it extremely dangerous for both cyclists and motorists. This section also contains four blind corners and two more with limited vision. The use of hairpin bends to slow bikes only increases the risk of injury to all users; and
  - this particular section of the commuter bikeway does not meet the guidelines set down for such usage. It was built before the guidelines were introduced, so they do not apply to that commuter bikeway.
121. All authorities involved in encouraging the use of bikeways have an obligation to ensure the safety of those who use these facilities. This particular section is a busy thoroughfare for pedestrian traffic and is unsuitable for commuter cyclists. An alternate route designed in conjunction with the new bus lane on the freeway might be the solution, thus ensuring the safety of cyclists and our local residents.



---

**MRS MARJORIE KUSKIE ~ REPRESENTATIVE, QUEENSLAND  
COUNTRY WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION (CALOUNDRA BRANCH)**

122. I would like to preface my remarks today by clarifying that I am speaking only on behalf of the Caloundra Branch of the Queensland Country Women's Association (QCWA), not for the whole state.
123. The coastal city of Caloundra has many pathways and bikeways that are shared by local residents and visitors alike. Children, the elderly, those exercising and those commuting all use these pathways.
124. The cement footpaths are 1.6 metres wide, which just accommodates two people. The Council is now building bikeways which are two metres wide. These are used by many people including school children who are being encouraged to use these facilities rather than the busy roads. In holiday time, the number of users increases greatly.
125. However, the wider bikeways make it easier for cyclists to ride two and three abreast, which can make things difficult for pedestrians. Also the use of bells on bicycles isn't always a satisfactory warning system, particularly when the bell is rung when the cyclist is right behind the pedestrian. A startled pedestrian is a very unpredictable animal.
126. The city fathers built these facilities but have no jurisdiction over them as they come under the *Traffic Act* and are therefore regulated by the police. On questioning a member of the police force about the relevant rules, the only example given by that officer related to a cyclist and a pedestrian coming from opposite directions. He also informed me that if a complaint was made concerning inappropriate behaviour, the police would need to witness the person or persons in the act. I have never seen a police person in the area and when one of our members of the QCWA was struck by a passing cyclist, no police person was present and witnesses did not have the time to obtain the necessary details to identify the culprit. Pedestrians are second-class citizens and must grin and bear it.
127. Notices are being erected on the bikeways, which state that cyclists must give way to pedestrians, but no-one knows exactly what that means. Recently, I was involved in an incident on the bikeway in which a young boy on a bicycle stopped by a post on the edge of the path as he saw my friend and I approaching. Unbeknown to us, he had done this not only to allow us to pass, but because he had seen four other young cyclists almost upon us. What resulted was that the four cyclists in trying to stop, crashed to the ground and there we were - five bicycles, seven people and one post, all brought to a halt in one small area.
128. There is an obvious need for a comprehensive education program in schools on the use of shared facilities. Older people may not benefit, but now is the time for young children to learn if we are to have these shared facilities.



---

## **MR GLENN SEARLE ~ REPRESENTATIVE, SAFETY INSTITUTE OF AUSTRALIA (QUEENSLAND DIVISION)**

129. As I come from an occupational health and safety background and I cycle to work twice a week and run once a week, my interests are obvious and I would begin by addressing the first point regarding the health and safety issues of the shared facilities.
130. Although I attempted to gather accident statistics, I found it difficult to gain information on the total number of accidents or where they occurred. Such information from government agencies may only be obtained through freedom of information channels and I did not have the time to pursue this. Also I believe many accidents are not reported. From talking to users of the bikeways and from my own personal experience, I will share with you the following points which were raised.
131. Beginning with 'things' judged to be hazardous on these shared bikeways, they include:
- people, and in particular children, who use walkmans, whilst using these facilities;
  - pedestrians walking across the whole width of the walkway;
  - speeding cyclists, who are approaching from behind and give no warning, or who are weaving carelessly through pedestrians;
  - dogs either restrained or not;
  - users not staying to the left, even when there is segregation indicated;
  - the condition of pathway edges - some have soft, grass covered edges, whilst others have recessed edges, which can prove difficult for the cyclist trying to steer back onto the path and also for runners who have twisted their ankles running over these edges;
  - crossover points between bikeways and roads can be dangerous for both cyclists and pedestrians. There are no signs to indicate to motorists that people cross at those points; and
  - design issues such as bollards, sharp curves, poor visibility and sharp corners leading onto footbridges all contribute to the hazards users of these facilities have to contend with.
132. What are the risks? The biggest risk of all is having collisions - with dogs, cyclists, pedestrians and with structures. To ascertain the area of highest risk is again to refer to statistical information and again this was difficult to access.
133. I was able to obtain relevant information from the South Bank Parklands, which referred to accidents which occurred in that area over a 12 month period. Their records revealed that five children had been hit by cyclists and all required hospitalisation. One collision had occurred between cyclists and in another incident a security guard was hit over the head by a bike rider as he was trying to slow the rider down.

- 
134. One area of major concern for the South Bank Parklands is the very congested area at the ferry terminal. Also mentioned were the entry and exit points to the promenade and at the rear of Kodak Beach visibility is very poor.
135. The Chairman of the Travelsafe Committee expressed his hopes that this forum would produce more answers than questions. Unfortunately, in dealing with the issue of the level of risk in using shared facilities, I have produced more questions than answers. Data is needed to answer the following questions.
- which areas have the highest rate of injuries and accidents?
  - how many near misses are there?
  - where do most near misses and accidents occur?
  - are there any black spots on bikeways?
  - how many people use the bikeways?
  - when are the periods of highest use?
  - which areas support the highest use?
  - what is the ratio of pedestrians to cyclists - recreational cyclists to commuter cyclists - in those times?
136. We have to work through these things and find solutions and it is a very difficult task. In respect of bikeways, people representing bicycle societies have suggested that the focus of bikes should be shifted to the roads and that could be one solution. However, in the short-term, if there is a piece of concrete, people will use it, irrespective of whether they are a cyclist, a walker, a rollerblader or a pedestrian walking a dog. Is there any such thing as a bike-only bike path? On my way home recently on the bike-only bike path on the South East Freeway, I counted seven pedestrians, one leashed dog and four cyclists.
137. In the short-term, many paths are shared by a great number of people and we have to find the best way to manage them so that users can work collaboratively. How will we improve safety? Risks cannot be eliminated and we have to find the best way to minimise these risks to ensure the safety of the users of these facilities.
138. We need to identify the areas of highest risk and then proceed with action to mediate or solve these problems in a staged approach. Evaluation of the implemented safety measures is imperative to ascertain whether further modifications are needed and guidelines that are recommended should be challenged to ensure that these are the best practices possible.
139. When considering accident statistics, one must also consider the fact that many users of these facilities never incur any injury or only slight injury. One acquaintance travels to work by bicycle some 3,375 kilometres annually and has not sustained any injuries. Another has commuted 2,475 kilometres annually on both road and bike path and has only sustained a fall when his pedal struck the ground on a sharp corner going up a hill and he had on one occasion a near miss with a bollard. A jogger who runs approximately 12 kilometres once a week, has never had an incident with a cyclist, another person or a dog.
-

140. Obviously, shared facilities such as South Bank and Coronation Drive have high density traffic of all types of users and some considerable thought is required to provide a safe environment for all.

---

## **MR JOHN MACPHERSON ~ REPRESENTATIVE, PARAPLEGIC AND QUADRIPLAGIC ASSOCIATION OF QUEENSLAND**

141. The first question I pose is, 'Who are the disabled?' We tend to be 'people' rather than 'the disabled'. We think of ourselves as people with disabilities, the disability being a secondary factor. We, meaning those with a permanent disability comprise about 20 percent of the Australian population and 15 percent more have a temporary disability, so a rather large proportion of our population might be classed as having a disability.
142. Why should people with disabilities have access to bikeways? There are so few places that a person with a mobility impairment can access, such as national parks and even friends' homes that the social contact experienced on these bikeways becomes a very important part of life. I am a frequent user of these bikeways for exercise purposes and for the social contact, and this access greatly improves my quality of life.
143. How can a bikeway best be constructed or how best can people behave to allow people with a disability their fair share of the bikeway? This can be achieved if we adhere to the various design standards. I would also like to include with those already mentioned the Australian Standard (AS) 1428.2 which gives gradients, path widths and many design features such as lighting requirements, which would allow people with a disability to use the bikeways without much trouble.
144. If we eliminate cracks and changes in levels of more than a few millimetres, if we have good workmanship, good design and gradients not exceeding one in 14 in the worst situation and provide resting areas at various intervals, then we will give people with low mobility the ability to travel great distance and an option to use the bikeways.
145. Regarding people's behaviour and how to react, I have my hands occupied so, unlike the cyclist I am unable to sound a bell to alert people if they are in the way. Leaving the path to avoid people or dogs is not an option for a person in a wheelchair as hitting pebbles may tip up the chair. The pathways need to be wide enough to accommodate my taking evasive action.
146. Wheelchairs can also reach speeds of approximately 30 to 40 kilometres an hour on steeper slopes. If people or dogs run out in front of me, I have very limited options. People with sensory disabilities such as those who are deaf or have impaired vision are a different situation again. Relating to vision, I myself have difficulty at night seeing other users of the bikeways, particularly under certain climatic conditions. In terms of safety, lighting of these facilities must be considered. Perhaps sensor lights powered by solar cells could be used to conserve costs and only be installed in those 'heavily used' areas.
147. A further point concerns the training of people in bikeway etiquette. The needs of people with sensory and mobility impairments must be included in such education programs as should factors such as the potential danger of a wheelchair gathering speed going down a hill. The needs of all must be considered.



**MR DES SPILLER**

148. We have a major degenerating attitude within our society today, towards legislation and those who enforce this legislation. This attitude exists also towards our fellow human beings in general. Having worked in traffic education, planning and enforcement from 1955 to 1975 and from 1980 to 1985 with the Police Department and with overseas authorities on education and training, I believe I can speak with some confidence. Perhaps if the education programs involved law enforcement personnel, attitudes towards these officers would improve and they would not be seen to be just the ogre, who intercepts, issues the ticket or makes an arrest.
149. Referring to the eight issues listed for consideration at this forum, I will begin with the concept of a shared bikeway. Shared bikeways should be a safe haven for pedestrians, including families with babies in strollers, the aged and those in wheelchairs, to enjoy the freedom of walking in an area free of traffic dangers. It is also an area for the cyclist travelling at high speeds or the cyclist learning to ride, for the rollerbladers, the skateboarders and the jogger accompanied by his/her dog.
150. The shared bikeway is frequently the only pedestrian walkway provided but is also a necessary facility for cyclists to segregate them from a high speed congested carriageway. However, as a pedestrian myself, the shared bikeway in many ways is not the safe haven and nor will it ever be under existing conditions.
151. The risk factors related to shared bikeways are very high. Shared bikeways can never be a safe reality. Pedestrians can never share bikeways under existing conditions and attitudes that are observed almost daily. Cyclists require the lateral width of a small car according to traffic engineering standards and cyclists travelling in the opposite direction require the whole width of bikeways currently in existence. Also the presence of dangerous 'drop-offs' down to rivers or the sea makes these shared facilities very dangerous to use.
152. People are also riding bicycles at night on these shared bikeways while intoxicated. It is difficult to police this behaviour and there is very little chance of identifying these people.
153. We are assured that there will be a major increase in our aged population. Many older people today will not use these shared facilities because they are too worried that they may be injured and that their injuries will be terminal. It is a shame that those who are trying to eke out the remainder of their life in good health may be denied this enjoyment.
154. It would seem that for people to share these facilities, demonstrating appropriate behaviour requires an educational program which will reach the appropriate audience. In former years, the Traffic Branch visited schools and I personally addressed in excess of 20,000 students at all schools during the period between 1955 to 1971. However, this practice was terminated in the late 1980's and has not been reintroduced. However, even with education, it will be difficult for these rules to be effectively administered.
155. The design, construction and maintenance of proposed shared bikeways must be given thoughtful consideration as it is evident that pedestrians, cyclists and the many other users of these facilities can co-exist on existing shared bikeways.
-

156. Extended bikeways are necessary for the commuting population and as these commuters travel at higher speeds than the recreational cyclist, this will not be conducive to shared usage. Where pedestrians are a concern, speed would have to be restricted, but this is difficult to police.
  
157. Rollerbladers and skateboarders should be restricted to bikeways only and away from pedestrians. Learning tracks must be established in all suburban recreational parks where cyclists and rollerbladers can learn in a safe environment. I believe that the shared facility strategy can never be a safe option.

---

**MR JON KNIGHT ~ MEMBER, CRITICAL MASS**

158. Critical Mass is a movement not an organisation. It began in San Francisco in 1992 as a response to car culture. On the last Friday of every month thousands of cyclists around the world meet and ride through city streets *en masse* proclaiming, 'We are not holding up the traffic. We are the traffic.' Critical Mass also protests the dangers of sharing roads with cars and proposes a viable, vibrant alternative to the ecological and social impacts of car culture.
159. Being a regular user of shared bikeways, I have focussed on identifying safety problems related to shared bikeways, problems associated with the planning ideology and public perceptions. I do not consider shared bikeways to be a realistic response to providing a safe and secure option for cyclists choosing to travel by bike as their primary mode of transport.
160. I believe shared bikeways are unsafe for the following reasons:
- the lack of protocols for both pedestrian and cyclist users;
  - cyclists lack an awareness of pedestrians and other cyclists, generally eye contact means safety;
  - pedestrians lack an awareness of cyclists, illustrated by their behaviour when they occupy the full width of the path and become reactionary at the surprise arrival of cyclists;
  - the variety of cyclist user groups can lead to unpleasant interactions on the pathways when there is conflict in the type of use e.g. the high speed commuter cyclist versus the recreational user;
  - shared bikeways can be too narrow to safely allow for the dynamics of interaction between the different users;
  - sharing bikeways with children who are inexperienced in dealing with path congestion, such as on the Victoria Bridge, is very difficult;
  - lighting on bikeways is often insufficient rendering them unsafe;
  - confusion over usage can make dedicated bikeways unsafe. This is equally true of shared bikeways when treated as commuter dedicated bikeways, so confusion arises for all users where the facility is a shared one. The feasibility of having shared bikeways for maximum use is fairly limited;
  - children spook cyclists by jumping out from behind things to frighten cyclists and the reverse occurs when cyclists spook pedestrians and even other cyclists;
  - dogs are a problem in that they do not understand how to behave in an area such as a shared bikeway; and
  - rollerbladers and other recreational users such as skateboarders are an inconvenience and danger for both cyclists and pedestrians.
161. Planners choose to consider shared bike paths as a solution to traffic problems involving cyclists, rather than treating cyclists as another variable in the traffic equation. Relegating cyclists to recreational corridors tends to define cycling as a marginal or unimportant transport option. Shared bikeways often do not provide serious transport links to useful places. If they
-

- 
- do, they traverse such a roundabout route that they cease to provide a useful service to any potential route-bound cyclist.
162. In order to make bikeways 'user friendly', there are many major issues of design which have to be addressed. The quality of the ride that can be provided is a significant feature in determining how many cyclists will be attracted to use the facility and hence the effectiveness of developing bike paths.
163. The choice to locate a bikeway in close proximity to the major roads, raises serious concerns about the effect of air and noise pollution on path users. This is especially bad when bikeways are adjacent to or closely connected with main arterial roads such as Coronation Drive and the Centenary Highway.
164. The following issues were expanded in a paper submitted by Jon Knight and John Hepburn.
165. Pollution. The effects of vehicular pollution, comprised of fine particulate matter and gaseous emissions, increase with an increase in cycling activity. Research findings cited in the Courier Mail on 5 February 1995 into the health effects of locating bikeways in close proximity to freeways, revealed that 'urban planners should design cycleways which were separated from busy roads by 100 metre wide forested buffer zones.' It also stated that 'Britain's Royal Commission into environmental pollution has linked traffic fumes with cardiovascular and respiratory disease, asthma, hay fever and cancers.'
166. Have the long term health effects of concentrated air pollution on cyclists been considered? Will World Health Organisation standards be met for cyclists using bike paths during peak traffic periods? If so how can this be guaranteed?
167. To partially reduce the pollution issue, it is suggested that a dense layer of native vegetation be planted between the bikeway and roads, that bikeways be located as far away as possible from busy roads and that dense layers of native vegetation should be planted on the outward side of the bikeway to further absorb gaseous pollution.
168. Traffic Flow and Safety. The bikeway from Griffith University (South East Freeway) demonstrates many of our concerns with regards to design. A number of guidelines in Austroads detail the recommended engineering design criteria for bikeways including the maximum radii of curvature of bends, maximum of gradients, minimum visibility distance, maximum height difference between mating ground surfaces and drainage and drainage grids. We suggest that planners actually ride along this path so that they can recognise it as a model of what not to do.
169. Limitations and difficulties experienced in using other bikeways in the Brisbane City Council area include:
- sharp curves e.g. the new on-ramp from Queen Victoria Bridge to Riverside bikeway underneath the expressway;
  - steep gradients e.g. the on-ramp mentioned above;
-

- 
- poor drainage; the camber of the bikeway contributes to the accumulation of sediments on the bikeway and the corners are very unsafe;
  - blind spots must be avoided; the South East Freeway bikeway has a number of these including the Stones Corner exit and the section in Tarragindi/Holland Park;
  - pedestrian access to commuter bikeways should be avoided as this limits the function of the bikeway as a commuter route;
  - cyclists should have right of way across suburban streets when on a dedicated bike path; and
  - there is a need for travel direction markers, cornering signs, caution signs and for safe curb construction.
170. Route Development. It is important to link bikeways with existing public transport infrastructure. Bikeways must link commuters with their desired destinations.
171. Bicycle Parking. Secure and effective bicycle parking facilities are an integral part of any bicycle network and greatly increase convenience for cyclists. They also play a significant role in changing public perceptions about cycling and acknowledge bicycles as a valid mode of transport. Locking bicycles to street lamps and fence posts will continue to marginalise cycling as a child's activity.
172. Path Construction Materials. As the Brisbane City Council continues its programs of recycling, it is worth considering the option of including scrap car tyres in road material. This can be used in asphalt paving or as aggregate. Both technologies have been demonstrated commercially in small-scale applications in the United States and in Europe.



---

**MR JOHN HEPBURN ~ REPRESENTATIVE, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH**

173. On commuting to Parliament House today by bike, ferry and bike, Jon and I experienced difficulties finding allocated parking facilities for our bikes at Parliament House. As we were attempting to lock our bikes to a fence, some suited gentlemen looked scathingly at us, before leaving in their limousine. The whole scenario painted quite a realistic picture of the car culture in our society today.
174. I would like to refer to the issue of the investigating and reporting on measures for the enhancement of public transport in Queensland and reducing dependence on private motor vehicles as a predominant mode of transport. Whilst shared bikeways perform an important recreational function, they do not significantly reduce the dependence on private motor vehicles as the predominant mode of transport in our society.
175. In discussing this, one must take into consideration the issue of car culture. Car culture basically describes the culture of automobile dependence, which characterises our society and the societies of many developed countries around the world. It is a belief or value system which holds automobile dependence as a given vehicle for power, prestige, achievement, freedom, mobility, sex and fun. It is closely linked with people's identity and is a fundamental part of life. It is even built into the language that we use - 'How far away is Indooroopilly?' If you are talking about transport, it is assumed that you are travelling by car.
176. Referring to Ted Radke's comments, it is interesting how car dominance really colonises our mental space. When referring to the reversing of cars from driveways onto bikeways, he has framed the problem in terms of inconvenience to car drivers, not the inconvenience to cyclists.
177. Car culture is promoted and continually reinforced at the expense of quality of life in our urban environments. How many car advertisements do you see on television and on billboards telling us to drive more, drive faster - bigger, better, faster? How many bike advertisements do you see encouraging people to cycle? Car-oriented developers limit our lifestyle choices by designing suburbs that build car dependence into people's lives. Are there any subsidies to promote cycling? I read a statistic that worldwide at least one third of an average city's land is devoted to roads, parking lots and other elements of car infrastructure. How much land is devoted to cyclists?
178. How do we reduce our dependence on cars as the predominant mode of transport? We not only need to look at alternatives like building bike paths, but we also need to look at actively breaking down the car culture. We need to redefine bicycles in the public consciousness from being a recreational toy to a highly efficient and valid mode of transport.
179. Shared bikeways should be encouraged to be used for recreational purposes. I believe that they marginalise cyclists and contribute to the perception of the bicycle as a recreational toy. A comprehensive system of dedicated commuter bikeways needs to be developed in addition to the recreational bike paths and popular destinations should be serviced by adequate parking facilities. It is quite difficult to develop such a network and to redesign our cities with an emphasis moving away from car dependence.

180. However, there are many inspiring examples around the world. There is no lack of local rhetoric about what we need to do, but what seems lacking is the political will. There is a willingness to make politically easy decisions that give immediate concrete benefits, but there is a distinct unwillingness to make politically difficult decisions that are required to achieve long-term structural and societal change.
181. I acknowledge the good work done by bicycle planners in Brisbane, but I am still left with the question: are we a society that is serious about challenging car culture? Are we serious about redefining our culture to make our urban environments livable and sustainable in the long term or do we just want to get brownie points for building lots of nice recreational pathways?

---

**MR JAMES WHELAN ~ SMOGBUSTER'S PROJECT OFFICER,  
QUEENSLAND CONSERVATION COUNCIL**

182. The Queensland Conservation Council (QCC) believes that it has a substantial issue to raise concerning the quality of air that is experienced by both cyclists and pedestrians in using shared bikeways. Our comments pertain to issues three and eight in the terms of reference, which is the contribution of design, construction and maintenance for safety on shared bikeways and the improved safety on shared bikeways, engineering, education and enforcement.
183. The QCC proposes that there are significant gains to be made in the safety of all users of these pathways by reducing their exposure to dangerous levels of air pollution. Air pollution is responsible for approximately 1,000 premature deaths a year nationally. Mortality is only one of the health impacts.
184. A study commissioned by the Brisbane City Council and undertaken by Associate Professor Rod Simpson of Griffith University, estimated that the number of people in Brisbane taking sickies is approximately 300,000. We suggest, that owing to the higher respiratory rate of cyclists and pedestrians whilst exercising on these pathways which are in close proximity to very busy motorways, they are exposing themselves to far greater pollution than the average citizen sitting at home in their backyard.
185. According to a 1995 study which was commissioned by the Brisbane City Council and verified by a study released in February 1997 by the Australian Bureau of Statistics on environmental views, concerns and issues, air quality rates as the number one environmental issue in Brisbane. This is the third consecutive study by the ABS. which identifies air quality as a leading environmental issue in Australia. 30.9 percent of the surveyed population identified air pollution as the number one environmental concern.
186. Many people in Brisbane may contest that air quality in Brisbane is better than it is in other cities. In fact, we have a worse potential for air quality than in any other major Australian city, owing to Brisbane's unique features - the Brisbane valley traps air pollution and the sea breeze off Moreton Bay holds it there, leading to recirculation of air pollutants over a number of days. Each year in Brisbane, the public health bill attributable to air pollution is approximately \$400 million.
187. Over the past 12 months in Brisbane, the QCC has been engaged as a consultative group concerning certain areas of transport. The Department of Main Roads and the Department of Transport are increasingly examining air quality impacts as part of their work. I place on the record, the most recent study for these departments by Woodward Clyde, relating to the South East Transit Project, which is a \$520 million project looking at the South East Motorway from the Brisbane CBD out as far as Logan.
188. The consultants point to the specific problems associated with particulate matter, PM10 (particles of 10 microns or less in diameter). The QCC has been asking for specific studies to be conducted on the health impacts and the exposure to particles smaller than PM10 and some work has been undertaken through the Queensland University of Technology Gardens Point campus.
-

189. Particle pollution is directly related to total mortality and, in this study, we see increases in total mortality as well as mortality from respiratory or cardiac disease of the order of 1 percent for every 10 microgram per cubic metre increase in PM10 levels. In Brisbane, our PM10 levels go between maybe 20 and 60 micrograms per cubic metre during an average year.
190. A lot of particle matter is a direct result of transport and relates to increases in hospital casualty and medical surgery visits for asthma and other respiratory conditions. It also contributes to increases in functional limitation as indicated by restricted activity data in the case of children by increased frequency of absence from school.
191. The costs to the community are substantial and we ask the Travelsafe Committee to examine further the exposure of pedestrians and cyclists to pollution.

**MR BRIAN CLARK**

192. Following James' remarks, I would like to refer to the South East Freeway. As a result of competent scientific investigation into the air quality condition on the South East Freeway and the area immediately adjacent, some serious concern has been shown by various government departments. The Department of Public Works and Housing has undertaken a two-year study on the health of public housing occupants immediately adjacent to the freeway and immediately adjacent to the bikeway which runs alongside the South East Freeway.
193. We have requested that a particular study of the bikeway running along the South East Freeway be conducted. We draw attention to the problems that any bikeway will experience when it is in a high-volume traffic corridor. There is no doubt that we are going to have to drastically change how we at least plan these commuter bikeways.
194. Some estimates of what is ingested by a cyclist have been done. A cyclist on the South East Freeway in a half-hour journey would ingest as much pollution as a normal person takes in over a whole day. In a normal trip between Griffith University and the Queensland University of Technology in a rush hour or in a high-volume period, a cyclist would be ingesting what the rest of us would ingest in one day. These are dangerous pollutants.



---

**MR KEN HORRIGAN ~ NATIONAL SERVICES MANAGER, NATIONAL  
SAFETY COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIA**

195. The National Safety Council provides a range of services for industry including fleet safety. An increasing number of people are commuting to work on bicycles, so they too become part of the fleet-safety equation. In my capacity as a manager, my aim is to look after people in the workplace which is a very important issue.
196. As a mechanical engineer and an ergonomist, I am familiar with kinetic energy and an equation of energy called half  $MV^2$ , which is half mass times velocity squared. For example, if you increase the mass by two times, you increase the energy by four times. The relative speed of people on a shared bikeway is a critical factor. The fact that you have damaging energy present in increasing rates is very important when discussing children on bicycles, dogs cavorting around and commuting vehicles moving at high speeds, all sharing the same pathway.
197. It is far better to look at the problem, ensure that you have identified it correctly, assess whether the risks are in fact substantial and implement the solutions in the right way. From a safety professional's point of view, ensure that you are addressing the right problem and assessing the risk correctly. Even when you have solutions, you cannot eliminate risk altogether. The solutions will hinge upon people following certain practices. In the workplace, we have already identified that if you want to improve safety performance, you must focus on behaviours. By using the principles of behaviour management on the roads and on bicycle paths in this case, we believe that you should be able to find a solution.
198. It is people's behaviour that you really want to change. Changes do not happen overnight, but we do get change. Behaviour causes accidents. If you change people's behaviour, you can change the accident performance. Two things influence behaviour. One is antecedents and the other is the consequence that results from a behaviour taking place. We have been discussing bike-only tracks and the fact that pedestrians use them. It is also possible for pedestrians to illegally use main roads. However, people do not do that because their risk perception would tell them that it is not a good idea.
199. People have already spoken about some of the antecedents such as training and education. Triggers and cues are the signs that you put beside the road to let people know that this is not the way to behave. Good role models can be explored. The peer pressure of cyclists and of pedestrians will make them behave in the way that people want. A good bike path environment will certainly help as well. The consequence is that it saves time and effort. That is why people use bike paths. It is convenient, comfortable and generally a nice environment. If you receive praise and recognition and are provided with positive reinforcement, you are most likely to repeat that behaviour.
200. Consequence techniques are used to effect consequences, that is, how people perceive their behaviour. Disciplinary steps could be implemented on a bike path. The network of bike paths could be signposted, have speed limits, speed cameras and police on motorcycles. What about incentive schemes, positive reinforcement and providing information? People consider three things to be important - value, immediacy and frequency. Value means whether it will be a

positive or a negative. Immediacy takes into account whether it is immediate, soon or delayed. The sooner it is, the more likely it is to reinforce the behaviour.

201. If something is positive, immediate and frequent, it is a strong reinforcer. For example, if you are going to try to slow down commuters, you will find that it will not work simply by having mild reinforcers. Strong reinforcements would be saving time, feeling good and beating the traffic and they would gain an immediate reward for that.
202. The negatives such as injuries, being reprimanded, being caught and fined are things that they might never consider. It may be infrequent, uncertain or may never occur. My recommendation is that some behavioural management must be considered, once you have determined what the rules of the game are.

**MR JURIS GRESTE ~ SECRETARY, AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF  
URBAN STUDIES, QUEENSLAND DIVISION**

203. The Australian Institute of Urban Studies is a national organisation, which operates through autonomous state divisions. We see part of our role as promoting and encouraging walking and cycling to become more widely accepted forms of transport or mobility.
204. With regards to the issue of examining safety on shared bikeways and footpaths, the issue should be seen in the broader context. I am referring to walking and cycling fitting into the whole transportation scheme of the city and not just the issue of safety on some shared routes.
205. Inevitably, the matter of funding arises. Funding and the way funds and resources are allocated is indicative of some of the values of the community. It is also indicative of some of the thinking of leaders in our communities. All these things require resources and funds. However, behind that must be a change in values and mind-set.
206. In reference to funding, as a frequent user of the Coronation Drive bike path, I can identify some risky and dangerous areas and yet I have seen no signage or any steps taken to alert people to these locations. Simplistic as it may seem, my conclusion is that funds are probably not available or not considered worthy of being allocated for that purpose.
207. To illustrate another point, when I was purchasing my third bike and essential cycling accessories recently, no-one enquired whether I could even ride a bike. An idea might be to issue a simply-worded set of road rules on the purchase of a bicycle. As a road and bike path cyclist myself, I was not aware of many of the points made by the police sergeant today. It would be very useful for a copy of relevant rules/regulations for cyclists to be readily available for purchasing.
208. Education is very important. I am aware that school curriculums are quite crammed now, but I would like to think that children can be introduced to some of the good habits and essential rules of behaviour pertaining to the use of roads and bikeways.
209. In conclusion, there is a need to consider this whole issue of the sharing of traffic surfaces/public space in the broader context of the changing times, the changing global situation and the changing Australian urban situation. It is inevitable that more people will want to walk and cycle. We must concern ourselves not only with the management of the problem as we perceive it today but also carefully plan for the future.



**MRS KATHRYN MAHONEY**

210. In August 1995, my child was killed on a bikeway. Today, I have had to reflect on all the competing needs that people have and the resources that have to be available if people are to use the tracks as they wish.
211. We had decided to have a family picnic in Kalinga Park for my elderly uncle. One of my brothers decided to bring along a bicycle for my son. I did not see any danger in Nicholas riding on a bikeway, and he had a helmet to wear.
212. Whilst eating lunch, Nicholas and his cousins removed their helmets. When everyone moved under the trees, the helmets were moved also. The boys couldn't find their helmets when they set out to go for a little ride to their 'secret place'. So they went without them. Nicholas was hit by a speeding cyclist. Speed did kill him, but many other factors played a part.
213. It is important that everyone respects each other's interests when using these shared bikeways. Nicholas was an exceptionally lovely child and probably should never have died, but I think he would like to think that if anything good came from his death, it would be that everyone who used these bikeways understood the need for the awareness of fellow users. My plea is to be aware - aware that children playing in parks may not always be behaving in a predictable way and, as a cyclist, there is a need to reduce your speed when little children are near. If you can respect the people around you and respect their needs, you will probably survive the experience.



## ***PART 3 ~ FORUM CONCLUSIONS***

214. The forum highlighted the many different types of users of shared bikeways. These are predominantly cyclists and pedestrians. Within these groups are further sub-groups such as: recreational cyclists and commuter cyclists; walkers, including people with dogs; joggers; people in wheelchairs; and people using roller skates or roller blades. Each of these user groups has distinct and sometimes conflicting needs. These conflicting needs have implications for the safety, convenience and enjoyment of shared bikeways.
215. Participants saw safety as a key concern for all users. Participants felt that one of the greatest risks to users of shared bikeways was the risk of collision with other users and subsequent injury. Delegates supplied examples of collisions and probable causes. They also identified other hazards associated with the behaviour of users and the physical design of shared bikeways that may result in collision or injury. These include but are not limited to: speeding cyclists; pedestrians walking across the whole width of the path; dogs (restrained and unrestrained); the unpredictable behaviour of young children; people with walkmans (headphones); design features such as sharp curves, bollards and poor visibility; and lack of knowledge of the rules of behaviour that apply.
216. While two deaths are known to have occurred on shared bikeways in Brisbane, little information is available on the number and severity of bikeway accidents and injuries. Accidents on shared bikeways fall outside the scope for crash reporting by the Queensland Police Service and Queensland Transport's crash database. One speaker at the forum noted that users of shared bikeways are not registered and do not display any formal identification. This makes it difficult to identify those involved in accidents. There is also no single agency that people can report accidents to, and no single collection point for accident reports. The true extent of accidents and injuries on shared bikeways is unknown. The vast majority of cyclists have no third party insurance. The forum was told that the litigation risks on shared bikeways are potentially high. Speakers at the forum suggested that cyclists on the road have rights under the *Traffic Act 1949*. However, when riding on shared bikeways, cyclists relinquish these rights and must give way to pedestrians.
217. Forum participants raised the issue that many users are confused by the signage and terminology used in connection with shared bikeways. Mr Clem Campbell MLA, the Member for Bundaberg, told the forum that many of his constituents were confused by signage on the Burnett River Bridge. The term 'shared bikeway' is used interchangeably with terms such as 'shared footpath', 'shared footways' and 'bikeways'. This has also led to confusion as to the purpose these shared facilities serve and which users must give way to others.
218. There is also confusion over who is responsible for shared bikeways, the rules of conduct that apply and who enforces these rules. Mr Ted Radke MLA, the Member for Greenslopes, stated that the shared bikeways in his constituency came under the control of different organisations and that constituents found the issue of ownership very confusing, especially when attempting to communicate with the appropriate authorities.

- 
219. Many forum participants suggested that governments did not consult with users or residents prior to developing or constructing shared bikeways. According to forum participants, the development of at least one bikeway in Brisbane has reduced the safety and amenity of local residents.
220. Delegates proposed a number of solutions to the concerns raised at the forum. These solutions related to the consultation process, the administration and design of shared bikeways and the behaviour of users.
221. Participants suggested that the public should be properly consulted by departments and local authorities about the development of shared bikeways. Identifying the needs of users and residents is a first step towards resolving problems with shared bikeways. Where bikeways traverse parks, the needs of park users should also be considered. At the forum, Mrs Kathryn Mahoney spoke of the death of her child from a collision with a cyclist travelling on a bikeway through a Brisbane park. She pleaded with cyclists to be aware that children playing in parks may not always behave predictively, and to reduce their speed when children are near. Shared bikeways may also impact on the safety of local residents. Mrs Margaret Middleton told the forum about the impact on elderly residents of a Brisbane City Council decision to use footpaths in her neighbourhood as a shared bikeway. This led to an increase in the use of the footpath/shared bikeway by commuter cyclists, and made it hazardous for elderly residents walking to local shops and buses.
222. In terms of the administration of shared bikeways, participants suggested that the authorities responsible for bikeways need to better identify themselves to users and other members of the public. Participants saw this as an important part of the complaints process.
223. Participants proposed that the design of shared bikeways was a key factor in improving safety and reducing accidents. The design features which people thought should be addressed include: path width and alignment; lighting; drainage; the design of corners and intersections; path gradients; the types of materials used in their construction; surface finish; the volumes of mixed traffic that shared bikeways can safely carry; and the travel speeds that should apply.
224. The Austroads Guide to Traffic Engineering Practice, Part 14 - Bicycles was discussed throughout the forum and provides guidance on most of these design issues. However, it is only a guideline and authorities responsible for the construction of shared bikeways are not obliged to comply with it. Many participants at the forum spoke about the need for the guidelines to be made mandatory in relation to new and existing shared bikeways. Participants also discussed the need to define the design limits beyond which shared use of common thoroughfares is unsafe, and segregated paths should be provided. The forum was told that trials of different ways of segregating cyclists and pedestrians are proposed in the Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South East Queensland (IRTP).
225. A further design issue raised at the forum involves the proximity of bikeways to major roads and exposure to very high levels of vehicle emissions. The delegate from the Queensland Conservation Council, Mr James Whelan, proposed that the Travelsafe Committee examine the exposure of pedestrians and cyclists to pollution.
-

- 
226. Participants at the forum linked many safety issues on shared bikeways to unsafe behaviour, and expressed the need for a system of rules to minimise conflict between shared bikeway users. Participants suggested that these rules or 'code of conduct' for shared bikeways should specify safe practices for passing other users, keeping to the left of shared paths and being visible at night by wearing bright clothing and fitting lights to bicycles. A number of participants also suggested that users should not wear headphones while using shared facilities.
227. Many of the issues suggested by participants to be covered by rules for shared bikeways are already covered by traffic legislation, but may not be widely known. Participants suggested that rules should be displayed near entry points to shared bikeways and promoted through the media. Education, enforcement and encouragement were considered by participants to be essential to make these rules work, although they recognised that enforcement is likely to be very difficult. There was strong support at the forum for users to be educated about the safe use of shared bikeways. It was also suggested that this education commence with children in schools.
228. The forum highlighted a widely held belief that attitudes towards shared facilities need to change. Delegates to the forum recognised that all users had rights and may need to become better sharers. A number of participants suggested that governments replace the current shared bikeway policy that gives priority to pedestrians over cyclists with an approach that gives all users equal rights.
229. The use of shared bikeways by commuter cyclists generated a significant amount of debate at the forum. A number of participants stated that shared bikeways generally do not provide serious transport links to useful places. These speakers suggested that, where the shared bikeways do exist, the indirect route that they follow diminishes their usefulness to cyclists. This prompted speakers at the forum to suggest that governments reserve shared bikeways for recreational cyclists. Some participants at the forum felt that cyclists are 'marginalised' by having shared bikeways, and that this contributes to some people's perceptions that bicycles are merely recreational toys. Cycling advocates suggested that cyclists need a comprehensive system of dedicated commuter bikeways with secure parking and shower and change facilities. This would be in addition to shared, recreational bike paths.
230. The Brisbane City Council delegate, Mr Kerry Fien, suggested that shared facilities be used as dedicated bikeways during peak hours and as shared facilities at other times. He also proposed that a warrant be established for cycling on shared facilities and applied to existing and future footways. Other participants called for governments to establish cycle networks on roads, but recognised that grafting cycling networks onto existing road infrastructure creates problems.
231. There was over-whelming support at the forum for a change in the transport priorities of governments. This change should be towards providing safer and more convenient cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. Cycling advocates told the forum that cyclists' needs have been, and continue to be, ignored by road authorities. Participants at the forum suggested that governments need to re-examine the place of cycling and pedestrian travel in the transport system.
232. Participants described Queensland's transport policies as 'car-centric' with a heavy bias towards motorised transport. Participants were cynical about government agencies that claim to promote cycling and pedestrian travel to reduce car dependence, whilst continuing to allocate
-

the majority of transport budgets to road projects that entrench this dependence. A number of speakers contrasted this approach with policies that encourage cycling and pedestrian travel in European cities. Cycling has displaced a significant proportion of car travel in these cities. The forum was told that cyclists need a better voice and presence within Queensland Transport. Mr Mark King of Queensland Transport told participants of a plan to establish a State Cycle Committee within the department to further the interests of cyclists. (After the forum, the Chairman discussed this with the Minister for Transport and Main Roads who agreed that the proposed initiative be brought forward and announced.)

---

## ***REFERENCES***

Australian Standard 1428.2

AUSTROADS, *Guide to Traffic Engineering Practice: Bicycles Part 14*, Austroads, Sydney, 1993.

*Bicycle Brisbane Plan 1995*.

Brisbane City Council, *Travel Smart*, September 1995.

Queensland Parliamentary Travelsafe Committee, *Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety*, Report No.9, Queensland, 1993.

Queensland Transport, *Integrated Regional Transport Plan for South East Queensland*, Queensland Government 1997.

Queensland. Department of Transport and Main Roads *Safe Bikeways Program*

Radke T, 'Grievances - Esher Street-Birdwood Road Bikeway', *Queensland Parliamentary Debates*, 11 July 1996, p1620.

*Traffic Act 1949 (Queensland) & Traffic Regulations 1962 (Queensland)*.

United Kingdom. Ministry of Transport *Child Pedestrian Safety in the United Kingdom: A Strategy for Reducing Child Pedestrian Casualties*, September 1996.



## **APPENDIX A ~ PUBLIC FORUM SPEAKERS AND DELEGATES**

### **SPEAKERS AT THE FORUM**

Mr Mark King	Manager, Road User Behaviour	Queensland Transport
Sgt Bruce Jackson	State Traffic Support Branch	Queensland Police Service
Mr Kerry Fien	Senior Technical Officer, Bicycle Transport Planning	Brisbane City Council
Mr Ted Radke MLA	Member for Greenslopes	
Mr Clem Campbell MLA	Member for Bundaberg	
Mr Michael Yeates	Convenor	Bicycle User Research Group
Mr Noel Turner	Technical Operations	Road Cycling Association of Australia
Mrs Donna Brennan	Representative	Brisbane Bicycle Touring Association
Mr Michael Fanning		
Ms Helena Bond		
Mr Ben Wilson	Vice President	Bicycle Institute of Queensland
Mr Bill McKenny	Committee Member	Queensland Marathon and Road Runners Club
Mrs Margaret Middleton		
Mrs Marjorie Kuskie	Representative	Queensland's Country Women's Association (Caloundra Branch)
Mr Glenn Searle	Representative, Safety Institute of Australia (Qld Division)	Department of Families, Youth and Community Care
Mr John MacPherson	Representative	Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association of Queensland
Mr Des Spiller		
Mr Jon Knight	Member	Critical Mass
Mr John Hepburn	Representative	Friends of the Earth
Mr James Whelan	Smogbuster's Project Officer	Queensland Conservation Council
Mr Brian Clark		
Mr Ken Horrigan	National Services Manager	National Safety Council of Australia
Mr Juris Greste	Secretary	Australian Institute of Urban Studies, Queensland Division
Mrs Kathryn Mahoney		

### **DELEGATES AT THE FORUM**

Mr Harry Audus	Project Engineer	Connell Wagner Pty Ltd
Ms Ruth Beach		
Mr Ian Biggs		

**DELEGATES AT THE FORUM**

Mr Graham Bilton	Traffic Operations Coordinator	Gold Coast City Council
Ms Lorraine Bird	MLA	Member for Whitsunday
Mr Noel Bird		
Cr Toni Bowler		Redland Shire Council
Mr Steve Brooke	Transport Planner	Gold Coast City Council
Mr Greg Butler	Bikeways Officer	Pine Rivers Shire Council
Ms Noreen Canaway		Queensland Conservation Council
Mr C W Clark	Chairman, Policy Working Group	National Seniors Association
Ms Verda Clayton	Recreation Development Officer	Cairns City Council
Mr Andrew Douglas	Associate	Ove Arup and Partners
Mr Ian Flint	Chief Executive Officer	Boonah Shire Council
Ms Helene Fuller		Research Office of Women's Affairs
Mr Richard Galleano	Operational Policy	Queensland Ambulance Service
Mrs Judy Gamin	MLA	Member for Burleigh
Cr Ann Glasheen	Councillor	Clifton Shire Council
Mr Ross Greenwood	Assistant Manager Parks	Logan City Council
Cr Geoffrey Hall	Councillor	Clifton Shire Council
Mr Jason Harley	Civil Engineer	Gutteridge Haskins and Davey
Mr Ron Heard		Bicycle Institute of Queensland
Cr Jenny Hill	Chairman, Transportation and Traffic Committee	
Mr Neil Horrocks		Institution of Engineers Australia
Mrs Denise Horvath		
Ms Frances Hudson	Recreation Planner	Brisbane City Council Community Recreation and Sport
Mr Daniel Humphries		Bicycle Institute of Queensland
Mr Keith Ingerman	Manager	Design Redland Shire Council
Mr David Johnston		David Johnston Engineering Pty Ltd
Mr Martin Jones	Traffic Engineer	Caboolture Shire Council
Mr Stephen Joughin	Design Engineer	John Wilson and Partners
Mr Joe Kenny		Australian Pensioners and Superannuants League
Ms Robyn Kiss	Recreation Planning Officer	Office of Sport and Recreation
Mr Douglas Lee	Traffic Engineer	Townsville City Council
Mr David Levick		
Cr Fran Lindsay		Cairns City Council
Mr Frank Loeken	Road Safety Consultant	Queensland Transport
Mr Rob Logie		
Ms Tully Mach-Tynger	Technical Officer, Bicycle Transport Planning	Brisbane City Council
Mr Derek Maine		Ipswich and West Moreton

**DELEGATES AT THE FORUM**

		Consumers Association
Mr Andrew Mason	Senior Project Officer	Queensland Transport
Mr John Mayo	Manager, Community Relations	Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association of Queensland
Ms Libby McAllister	General Vice President	University of Queensland Union
Mr Gavin McCullagh	Policy Officer	Policy Unit Department of Emergency Services
Mr John McKay	Recreation Planner	Caboolture Shire Council
Cr Randal McLellan	Councillor	Hervey Bay City Council
Mr Eric Moes		Maroochy Shire Council
Mr Andy Morison		
Mr Mike Nassan		
Mr Lindsay Nott		Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association of Queensland
Ms Sarah O'Reilly	Field Operations	Road Cycling Association of Australia
Mr Peter Oberthur		
Ms Stephanie Oldroyd	Town Planner	Gutteridge Haskins and Davey Pty Ltd
Ms Delilah Palko	Traffic and Transport Engineer	Caboolture Shire Council
Mr Louis Pavlin		
Mrs Daphne Peppel		
Ms Beth Plowman	Research and Development Officer	Queensland Transport
Cr Angus Robertson	Councillor	Maryborough City Council
Mr Jeff Ross	Manager (Special Projects)	Department of Main Roads
Mr Robert Scott		
Ms Michelle Smith	Behavioural Scientist	Queensland Transport
Mr Wayne Sweeney	Deputy Director of Engineering Services	Maryborough City Council
Ms Jacinta Toomey		
Mr Mark Trudinger		
Mr Alan White	Engineer	Mackay City Council
Cr Alan Wieden	Councillor	Kingaroy Shire Council
Mr Peter Wilkes	Road Safety Consultant	Queensland Transport
Ms Victoria Woodford	Safety Link Advisor	Older Women's Network
Mr Len Yates	Senior Transport Planner	Gold Coast City Council



## COMMITTEE MEETING ATTENDANCE RECORD

### 48<sup>TH</sup> PARLIAMENT - 2<sup>ND</sup> SESSION

MEETING DATE	GOSS	SULLIVAN	DOLLIN	HEGARTY	MITCHELL	NUNN
28 January 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
18 March 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
20 March 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
25 March 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
30 April 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6 May 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8 May 1997	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
9 May 1997	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
28 May 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
8 July 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11 July 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
16 July 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
19 August 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
26 August 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
7 October 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
9 October 1997	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓
28 October 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
30 October 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6 November 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
18 November 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
19 November 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
25 November 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
26 November 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
27 November 1997	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓
4 December 1997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3 March 1998	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4 March 1998	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
17 March 1998	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
7 April 1998	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
21 April 1998	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
23 April 1998	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
12 May 1998	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
19 May 1998	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗

*Note:* Reported in accordance with Standing Order 198 of the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly 1995.

## REPORTS OF THE TRAVELSAFE COMMITTEE

Number	Title	Tabling date
1.	Annual Report for the period 10 May 1990 to 30 June 1990	5 September 1990
2.	The need for some form of compulsory periodic inspections of passenger vehicles as an effective means of reducing road crashes and the severity of associated injuries, and the need to improve the standards of motor vehicle repairs as a means of improving vehicle and road safety	4 December 1990
3.	Road Safety Education AND Traffic Law Enforcement	4 September 1991
4.	Annual Report for the period 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991	2 October 1991
5.	Bicycle Safety	28 November 1991
6.	Achieving High Levels of Compliance with Road Safety Laws - a review of road user behaviour modification	18 March 1992
7.	Road Environment and Traffic Engineering	28 April 1992
8.	Annual Report for the period 1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992	25 August 1992
9.	Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety	15 July 1993
10.	Annual Report for the period 1 July 1992 to 30 June 1993	18 November 1993
11.	The Safety and Economic Implications of Permitting Standees on Urban and Non-Urban Bus Services	18 November 1993
12.	Local Area Traffic Management	28 April 1994
13.	Annual Report for the period 1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994	27 October 1994
14.	The Desirability of Requiring Compulsory Third Party Insurance Cover for Boats and Trailers	22 November 1994
15.	Speed Cameras: Should They Be Used in Queensland?	24 November 1994
16.	Report on Driver Training and Licensing	3 April 1996
17.	Annual Report for the period 1 July 1995 to 30 June 1996	4 September 1996
18.	Queensland's Road Toll : An Overview	28 January 1998
19.	Queensland's Road Toll : Drink Driving (Part 1)	28 January 1998
20.	Unsecured Loads	16 May 1997
21.	Annual Report for the period 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997	18 November 1997
22.	Compulsory BAC Testing	12 December 1997
23.	Brisbane's Citytrain Network - Part One - Safety of the Rail System and Infrastructure	15 December 1997
24.	Brisbane's Citytrain Network - Part Two - Passenger Security	8 May 1998

***Reports are available from the Committee Secretariat:***

<b>Address:</b>	<i>Parliament House George Street BRISBANE QLD 4000</i>	<b>Internet:</b>	<i>www.parliament.qld.gov.au</i>
		<b>Email</b>	<i>tsafe@parliament.qld.gov.au</i>
		<b>Telephone:</b>	<i>(07) 3406 7908</i>
		<b>Fax:</b>	<i>(07) 3406 7262</i>

