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Executive summary

Commencing in early 2012 Justin Power completed research for Mercy Aged Care Services (MACS), a division of Mercy Health and Aged Care Central Queensland Limited (MHACCQL) to review current information available concerning the community transport sector and develop options/recommendations for future action by MACS in the community transport sector. MACS’ interest in this information resulted from attendance by staff members at fora facilitated in 2011 by the Home and Community Care (HACC) program and by Capricorn Enterprise. These fora raised awareness of some transport related issues existing in Rockhampton Region, and the existence of a significant community-based transport sector operating within Australia and overseas.

The work completed as per the approved work plan included:

- Background research, covering features of the road passenger transport industry, regulation, and relevant trends;
- Consultation with 24 stakeholders representing 18 organisations, to identify the services available in Rockhampton Region, perceived gaps, interest in cooperation to address gaps, and examples of solutions operating in other communities; and
- Review of the information obtained, and the development of recommendations for consideration and/or further action.

The outcomes of this study indicate that there is substantial transport infrastructure already available across the Rockhampton region. The absence of an integrated system, however, leads to variable utilisation; and means that gaps exist in transport availability and accessibility.

The stakeholders consulted indicated that these gaps included the availability or frequency of mass transit services in some areas, ineligibility for some funded community transport, lack of coordination between transport types, affordability issues for some sections of the community, and a lack of information regarding available transport alternatives.

Examples of successful responses to transport need, that target whole communities, or target groups within a community, were located.

The consultation activity provided evidence of support for cooperation between stakeholders with an interest in transport, to develop responses to gaps in availability and accessibility within the region. The discussions with stakeholders also lead to the view that, whilst significant new funds may not be readily accessible, the current social, economic, and political environment is supportive of community-based strategies that make inclusive, efficient, and efficacious use of resources.

It would appear that a unilateral expansion of involvement in transport by MACS would not be prudent in the current funding and competitive environment. There may, however, be scope for involvement in integrated solutions; either within the HAAC funded community transport sector, or as part of a whole of community response to transport need.

Further progress on transport issues within Rockhampton Region will require the emergence of an organisation, or organisations, to act as a lead agency; and to facilitate the necessary conversations with stakeholders that will develop a planned approach to identifying and responding to transport needs. Should MACS wish to pursue further involvement in transport, its reputation within the region and membership of health, social service, and business sector networks could encourage other agencies to engage in cooperative responses.
Involvement in either increased coordination of community transport for the HACC target group, or a response to broader community needs, could have benefits for existing MACS clients and for MACS itself. For example; clients would gain access to an improved suite of choices to attend to their needs. MACS would benefit from more productive use of its existing transport infrastructure, and potentially increase its total transport business in a sustainable manner.

Based on the findings, 2 recommendations for further action by MACS and MHACCQ were developed.

**Recommendation 1:** Following consideration of the findings of this report MACS and MHACCQ should determine whether increased involvement in transport within its existing HACC target market, or within the broader community, is most consistent with its mission.

**Recommendation 2:** Upon confirmation of its preferred level of involvement, MACS should engage with the stakeholders identified in this report to share information, and develop a strategy for further action to achieve a coordinated response to transport need in the Rockhampton region.
1. Introduction

Mercy Health and Aged Care Central Queensland Limited (MHACCQL) delivers aged care services through a division called Mercy Aged Care Services (MACS). MACS operates 3 residential aged care facilities in Rockhampton, located at Bethany, Leinster Place, and McAuley Place, and retirement villages located at The Range Village and Bethany Village. It also operates community aged care services at Mercy Day Therapy Centre and Palm Court Day Respite Centre in North Rockhampton. Transport services are provided to some MACS clients as part of the delivery of these services.

During 2011 attendance by some MACS staff at fora facilitated by the Home and Community Care (HACC) program, and by Capricorn Enterprise, raised awareness of some transport related issues existing in Rockhampton Region; and the existence of a significant community-based transport sector operating within Australia and overseas. As a result of this, MACS is interested in finding out more information of the scope of transport services operating within the Rockhampton Region, the gaps in transport availability, the funding available for transport services, and whether it should consider expansion of its involvement in the delivery of transport.

Following a meeting with the CEO and MACS Senior Management Team in December 2011, Justin Power was requested to develop a work plan and budget to complete a review that contains the following elements:

- A review of current information available concerning the community transport sector, including:
  - The policy, regulatory, and delivery environments,
  - The stakeholders within Rockhampton and Queensland,
  - Industry trends, operating costs and barriers to entry, and
  - Funding sources
- Consultation with stakeholders operating at a local and state level to gather information on
  - The demand for community transport services, and areas of unmet need,
  - Models of delivery in Rockhampton and other communities, and
  - The potential for partnerships to address areas of unmet need in community transport in Rockhampton
- Development of options/recommendations based on the information gathered for future action by MACS in the community transport sector.

The proposed work plan was accepted in early 2012, and this report documents the outcomes of the activities completed. It contains 2 recommendations for further action by MACS.
2. Methodology

The work plan approved by MACS included 3 phases:

- Background research,
- Consultation with stakeholders, and
- Review of the information obtained and the development of recommendations for further action.

Our background research included a review of the information gathered by MACS, information available from peak bodies, and publically available information from government and private sector sources.\(^1\)

The consultation phase included face to face and telephone interviews with 24 stakeholders\(^2\) from Rockhampton region and beyond. The 18 organisations represented by these stakeholders included Australian, state and local government departments, social service providers, community organisations, and transport operators. The interviews were conducted using an informal structure designed to elicit information covering:

- The services currently available;
- Gaps in transport services within the Rockhampton Region and the groups affected by these;
- Interest in cooperation to address these gaps;
- Other stakeholders who may be able to contribute to the discussion about transport; and
- Examples of solutions used in other communities.

Stakeholders were selected for interview based on their representation of government departments with an interest in transport, organisations that provide transport as part of their HAAC or other social service delivery, or membership of community organisations representative of particular community groups that seek to influence policy for socially excluded or transport-disadvantaged members of the community. They included stakeholders introduced by MACS, HAAC providers within the Rockhampton, and individuals recommended by participants in the consultations.

Linkages to additional information that were identified during the background research and the consultation phases were followed up prior to the analysis that is included in this report.

---

\(^1\) See Appendix 2 – Bibliography.
\(^2\) See Appendix 1 – Consultation Participants.
3. Background

What types of transport are we discussing?

This study is confined to consideration of passenger transport, particularly non-mass road transport, within the Rockhampton Regional Council (RRC) local government area (LGA). The region covers over 18,300 square kilometres.  

As is common in many other regions transport is frequently raised as a matter of concern whenever social service providers and community groups within this region discuss issues which impact on the ability of citizens to access the services they need or to participate in society. These discussions often tend to focus on the means of transport, its availability, or lack thereof; rather than considering broader issues such as the needs of the consumer that give rise to a requirement for transport. The discussions also often consider transport within the confines of ‘mass transport’ or ‘public transport’ modes such as buses and taxis.

Such a focus can limit the ability to think “outside the square” and consider solutions that might be more appropriate for individual consumers and their communities. The Transport Development and Solutions Alliance (TDSA) is a community-based membership organisation that develops policy and seeks to facilitate a collaborative response to improved transport access. It prefers to view transport problems as ‘unmet transport need’, pointing out that this need can occur in communities with existing transport infrastructure, regardless of whether this infrastructure includes publically available services or services available to specific target groups. In this context it is therefore useful to examine the components that make up the total transport system.

TDSA’s view of the total passenger transport system comprises 2 primary groups; private transport, and non-private transport. Private transport includes of motor vehicles, bicycles, walking and informal community transport. The latter represents the use of private transport to assist others in the community. Non-private transport includes de-regulated public transport (e.g. charter buses, courtesy coaches, limousines), funded community transport (e.g. HACC funded transport), non-urgent health transport services provided by Queensland Ambulance Services, and regulated public transport. The latter category includes mass transit fixed route and timetable services (such as bus and rail), and individual transit services (taxis).

Examples of all of these transport categories may be found within Rockhampton region, and the TDSA descriptions of them are used throughout this document.

Community transport

The term ‘community transport’ is sometimes used to describe all categories that are not regulated public transport or de-regulated public transport. The descriptions above place it in a more accurate context, which is transport directed to a particular target group; such as clients of the HACC program or other social services. TDSA uses the term ‘micro transit’ to refer to its preferred model of non-
mass publically available transport, in which community transport plays a valued part, that is complementary to mass transport frameworks.\textsuperscript{6} 

The Queensland Government and the Local Government Association of Queensland use the term ‘community-based transport’, to describe solutions for “transport needs for some individuals and/or groups where the private vehicle or conventional public transport systems, commercial bus services or taxis are not suitable or available options.”\textsuperscript{7} These solutions might provide access to recreation, shopping, educations medical and social services and social contact.

Transport and the HACC program

The HACC program provides services to assist frail aged and younger people with a disability, and their carers, to remain in their own home and the community. This reduces the potential or need for inappropriate admission to residential care facilities.\textsuperscript{8} In Queensland the suite of services funded by the HACC program includes three service types in which transport is a key element of delivery:

- Centre-based day care;
- Social support; and
- Transport.

The provision of transport services facilitates access to centre-based day care and social support services. The specific transport service supports the client to attend to tasks outside the home, attend activities or community centres, and participate in the community.\textsuperscript{9} It does not cover patient transport services for day surgery, chronic medical treatment, or hospital admission and discharge. The service may be provided directly using a vehicle, or indirectly through the use of vouchers or subsidies for other forms of transport.

Operational funding for the service delivery is provided direct to the service provider. Depending of the size of the organisation’s client base, or the number of services it delivers, the program also funds the purchase of cars and buses through capital funding rounds.

Other states in Australia have adopted different delivery mechanisms for transport services using HACC funding. TDSA representative Jenny Leigh provided some examples of these during the consultation activity.\textsuperscript{10} South Australia provides funds to that state’s transport authority to facilitate passenger transport networks with publically available transport options. Victoria’s approach is to use the funds to provide social support to assist access to transport, rather than separate transport services. New South Wales provides HACC transport funds to its transport department for the delivery of a group transport model for HACC clients.


\textsuperscript{10} Interview. J. Leigh. 13/03/12.
The HACC Program was jointly funded by the Australian and State governments until 1st July 2011, with each state managing its administration. Over time each state developed its own model for the use of transport funds. Under a Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreement in 2010 the Australian Government assumed direct responsibility for funding of basic community aged care services (including services currently provided under the HACC program) from 2011, and administration from July 2012. The state and territory governments will retain responsibility for operating and funding basic community care and disability services for people aged less than 65 years.11

Between now and 2015 the Australian government has committed to no substantial change to delivery mechanisms. In the interim it will undertake reviews and consultations to determine the preferred delivery structure.

4. MACS involvement in transport

MACS provides transport services for clients of its Palm Court Day Respite Centre, using HACC program funds for centre-based day care services. It also provides transport to assist clients of its Mercy Day Therapy Centre to attend appointments. MACS seeks to ascertain if it should pursue additional involvement in the transport sector.

5. Passenger transport in Queensland

Road passenger transport in Queensland is regulated, and in some cases supported with funding, by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR). In addition, Queensland has representation on the Standing Council on Transport and Infrastructure (SCOTI) which comprises Commonwealth, State, Territory, and New Zealand ministers responsible for transport, roads, marine and ports issues. This group develops national positions on particular issues relating to transport. The National Transport Commission (NTC) supports this group with regards to Australia’s road, rail and intermodal transport system.

The NTC develops and submits reform recommendations to SCOTI on transport policy and regulation, and plays a role in implementation planning and in maintain implementation of approved reforms. An example of this is the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002, developed under the Disability Discrimination Act 1992, which provide transport operators and providers with certainty about their obligations under the act. The standards specify minimum accessibility requirements for vehicles, infrastructure, and premises associated with trams, trains, buses and coaches, taxis, ferries, and aeroplanes. All new public transport systems established since 2002 must comply with the standards, whilst existing systems must progressively comply under a 30 year implementation timetable. Each state reports on the progress of implementation within its jurisdiction.

Regulation

TMR regulations for passenger transport cover the accreditation of operators, authorisation and licensing of drivers, and the registration and maintenance of vehicles used in the transport of passengers. They are consistent with the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, and include the following road transport service types:

- Taxis
- Limousines
- Community and courtesy transport
- General services (e.g. accommodation transfer, charter bus, tourist transfer)
- Long distance services
- Motorcycle tourist services

The type of operator accreditation required for a particular service can vary dependent upon:

- The characteristics of the passengers being carried – e.g. school children only, or school children and general public;

---

• The scheduling of the service – e.g. is the service provided on a route using a timetable, a regular loop, or a variable route within a corridor or zone; and
• The type and/or number of vehicles used to deliver the service.

The standards applicable to operator accreditation are concerned with:

• Capacity for operation and maintenance of the vehicles used in the services, the quality of the services to be provided;
• Ability to comply with vehicle design safety and operational requirements;
• Business management skills; and
• Ability to ensure drivers comply with the appropriate regulations.

Driver accreditation is concerned with ensuring that the driver is a suitable person to be involved in the delivery of public transport in relation to capability to safely operate the required vehicle type, the personal safety of passengers and their property, and the safety of the public. The requirement for accreditation is additional to the requirement for a driver to hold the appropriate licence to operate a particular vehicle.

The regulations also include coverage of the types of vehicles permitted for use in delivery of the various categories of passenger transport, the maximum age of vehicles, inspection requirements, and particular items of equipment or accessories required. An example of the latter is security equipment fitted to taxis.

The other states and territories each have their own regulations for passenger transport.

**Funding**

Within major population areas in south east Queensland, and regional cities, TMR funds the subsidisation of mass transit services via service contracts with accredited transport operators. TMR also funds or administers transport services for particular target groups under the following schemes:

• Taxi Subsidy Scheme subsidises taxi fares for people with a disability;
• School Transport Assistance Scheme provides assistance for transport of students to school using kilometre and fare-based structures; and
• School Transport Assistance for Students with Disabilities – provides transport support for children to attend schools with Special education programs, either via public transport or contracted minibus and taxi.

The HACC program is now funded by the Australian Government, and provides services to people who are frail aged and/or with a disability that support them to live independently in their homes. For eligible clients these services can include assistance with transport. Within Queensland, HACC transport funding is currently distributed by Queensland Health to contracted Aged Care providers who provide transport services to clients to attend specialist appointments, shopping, and social outings. These transport services can include the use of cars, buses, and taxi voucher schemes.

The Department of Veterans Affairs also provides transport assistance by way of subsidies for the travelling expenses of eligible veterans and war widows/widowers related to attendance at medical
treatment, a disability claim, and invalidity income support claim, or treatment under the *Australian Participants in British Nuclear Tests (Treatment) Act 2006*.15

Queensland Health also funds non-urgent patient transport to and from hospital sites in some health service districts. Information provided in response to MACS enquiry indicates that there are no immediate plans for this to be implemented in Rockhampton.16

---


16 Correspondence from J. Carlisle (Director, Patient Transport Reform Unit, Queensland Health) to M. Forrest (Accountant, MACS) 08/12/11.
6. Transport in Rockhampton

Population characteristics

Demographic data covering a variety of topics, including some that may influence transport disadvantage has been obtained from the Office of Economic and Statistical Research (OESR). The Rockhampton region had a population of 116,722 in 2011. The OESR projects that the population of the region will reach 138,933 by 2021, and 162,873 by 2031.

The region’s population is dispersed through the city of Rockhampton, the Capricorn Coast communities of Yeppoon and Emu Park, and inland communities such as Gracemere Mount Morgan, Marlborough, Bajool, and Stanwell. Census data for 2006 indicated that the population of 103,133 at that time was comprised of 59,943 in Rockhampton City, 6270 in Yeppoon, 3,205 at Emu Park, 5,597 in Gracemere and 2,931 in Mount Morgan. Within its area of over 18,300 square kilometres this population also includes a significant rural element, either engaged in primary production and/or preferring the lifestyle of acreage living.

A summary of comparative data for Rockhampton region, Brisbane, Mackay, Townsville, and Queensland is tabulated below.

Table 1: Comparative population data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median age</th>
<th>Rockhampton</th>
<th>Brisbane</th>
<th>Mackay</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
<th>Qld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 65+ (%)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (%)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous (%)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born overseas (%)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest disadvantage (%)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require assistance (%)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented accom (%)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As at June 2010, the population of Rockhampton region had a median age of 36.3; which was similar to the Queensland population, but higher than that of Brisbane, Mackay, and Townsville. The proportion of the population aged 65 and over was higher than the state and the other centres. Australian Bureau of Statistics data for the 2006 and 2001 census’ (completed prior to the amalgamation of the Rockhampton City, Livingstone, Mount Morgan, and Fitzroy LGA’s in 2008) indicates that the median age of the major population centres within the region is increasing.

As at the 2006 census the proportion of the Rockhampton region population identifying as indigenous was exceeded only by Townsville, whilst a relatively low proportion identified as being born overseas. The region had a much higher proportion of its population in the quintile of highest socio-economic disadvantage relative to the comparison centres, and the highest proportion requiring assistance with a profound or severe disability. At 29.5%, a relatively low proportion of the population is reliant on rental accommodation.

Rockhampton’s role as the largest population centre in the region, and as a major service centre for the hinterland of Central Queensland, provide a broad range of employment opportunities for residents. The lifestyle attractions of the Capricorn Coast, however, have enticed a significant cohort of workers employed in Rockhampton who prefer to reside at the coast.

The dispersed nature of the population and the employment opportunities in Rockhampton, contribute to a heavy reliance on personal transport within the region. Combined with a low population base, this dispersal also inhibits profitable operation of mass transit services within the region without government support.

Regulated public transport

The Rockhampton region is a service contract area, in which service contracts are required by TMR for the delivery of scheduled passenger services; that is, mass transit. The following operators are contracted for routes within this area under the qconnect urban bus service program:

- Sunbus – City, Frenchville, Glenmore, West Rockhampton, Depot Hill, University, Parkhurst;
- Young’s Capricorn Coast – Yeppoon/Emu Park/Zilzie, Keppel Sands, Cawarral and Emu Park;
- Young’s Gracemere Mt Morgan – Gracemere, Bouldercombe, Mt Morgan;
- Young’s Yeppoon and Hospital Shuttle services – Taranganba, Barlows Hill, Eden Park Estate, Club Estate/Golf Links, Yeppoon Hospital, Yeppoon Central, Keppel Bay.\(^{21}\)

Taxi services are provided by Rockhampton Cab Company in Rockhampton, Capricorn Coast Taxis Company on the Capricorn Coast, and Golden Mount Taxis in Mount Morgan.

TMR also administers the School Transport Assistance Scheme in Rockhampton using contracted bus operators, and the School Transport Assistance for Students with Disabilities scheme using taxis.

De-regulated public transport

The deregulated transport sector in Rockhampton includes:

- charter bus operators;
- Tour operators;
- Courtesy coaches operated by sports clubs and seniors organisations; and
- Limousine services.

\(^{21}\) State of Queensland, Department of Transport and Main Roads. (2012). Qconnect urban bus services. Accessed 15/04/12
There are multiple operators of each of these categories operating in the region.

Funded community transport

Australian and State government programs fund a variety of social service providers and community organisations to deliver transport for their target groups within Rockhampton region. Some of these organisations include:

- HACC providers, including AICRA HACC, Bluecare, Centacare, Life Without Barriers, Ozcare, and RSL care;
- Youth organisations such as Police Citizens Youth Club, Darumbal Community Youth Services;
- Indigenous organisations including Central Queensland Indigenous Development, Gumbi Gumbi Drug and Alcohol Awareness Centre, and Milbi.

The transport provided in this category enables clients to access the services provided by the organisation, services relevant to the program in which the client is enrolled, and to attend to personal shopping requirements, or participate in opportunities for social engagement. The contract arrangements of each organisation with its funding body specify the eligibility requirements for access to the transport service, and the purposes for which transport may be supplied.

Each organisation uses vehicles chosen to match the requirements and abilities of its clients. They may include cars, buses, and/or specially-equipped vehicles. There are examples of organisations using paid employees, or a combination of employees and volunteers, as drivers. The extent of volunteer use could be influenced by the organisation structure, the type of service provided, contract arrangement, and accreditation requirements.
7. Trends impacting on the industry

The ability of organisations such as QCTIA and TDSA, and organisations with similar objectives in other states, to maintain memberships and promote discussion of transport issues is indicative of broad interest in developing solutions to unmet transport needs in our communities. In addition, there are trends operating within Australia that may encourage more communities, such as the Rockhampton region, to develop integrated approaches to meeting these needs. These include:

- An ageing overall population, with results that will include increased numbers of people requiring assistance to travel, higher numbers of one-person households, and increased competition within a smaller workforce;
- Increasing transport running costs, particularly the fuel and labour components;
- Increased demand on government resources, requiring a continued focus on the efficiency of their allocation.
- Potential changes to the HACC model of funding for transport, which directly or indirectly represents a major proportion of funding for community transport in Australia, following the transition of responsibility to the Australian Government; and
- Increased pressures on community organisations, resulting from increasing operating costs, competition for funding, increased contractual/compliance obligations, and decreasing volunteer numbers.
8. Themes from the consultation activity

The consultation phase involved a total of 24 stakeholders, representing 18 organisations, who were interviewed to gain a local and a broader perspective on transport issues and solutions. They included:

- Individuals identified by MACS staff as stakeholders in the community-based transport sector;
- Representatives of relevant Australian, State and Local government departments;
- Representatives of transport operators in Rockhampton from the private and community sectors; and
- Other stakeholders identified by the above groups.

A list of the stakeholders involved in the consultation process is attached in Appendix 1.

An informal structure was used in the face-to-face and telephone interviews. In the case of stakeholders from within the Rockhampton region, questions were designed to elicit information concerning:

- Transport services provided;
- Gaps in transport availability and accessibility within the region;
- Organisational interest in cooperation to address gaps;
- Other stakeholders who should be involved; and
- Examples of solutions in other communities.

For other industry stakeholders the interviews were structured to obtain information about the industry, including:

- Contemporary issues;
- Regulatory requirements;
- Funding sources;
- Examples of responses to accessibility gaps in other regions.

The themes that emerged from these discussions are summarised below.

There is significant transport capacity in Rockhampton region

The consultation activity undertaken for this project was necessarily limited by time and scope. It therefore provided an overview of the transport available within the Rockhampton region, rather than a map of all transport providers. The results of this activity do, however, indicate that the region hosts a significant number and range of non-private transport resources. Whilst the resources available in the core public transport categories of mass transit (e.g. Sunbuses) and individual transport (taxis) are perhaps more obvious, those available in the de-regulated public transport, funded community transport, and non-funded community transport are impressive. Operators in these groups range in size from charter bus operators to social service organisations operating minibuses and cars, to minibuses operated by sports clubs.

Stakeholders interviewed during the consultation activity indicated that transport infrastructure operated or regulated by their organisation had varying degrees of utilisation. It became apparent that examples of underutilisation exist, particularly in the funded community transport category. The
cause of this underutilisation is often to be found in the contractual arrangements between the transport provider and their funding organisation. One example of this is school buses used to transport students under the School Transport Assistance Scheme. The vehicles used in this scheme are required to be available for service on school days, during specified hours prior to school opening in the morning, and following school closure in the afternoon. On non-school days, and during school hours, the majority of this fleet is idle.

Another example provided involves minibuses used for picking up students from school for an after-school care service. These could be used for other purposes during the rest of the day. One social service organisation representative also advised that their bus was rarely used when small numbers of aged clients were being transported as they preferred to travel in a car.

Some representatives of organisations funded by the HACC program reported that their vehicles were used to capacity, whilst others reported significant idle time for some vehicles.

The consultation activity indicates that the vehicles used by transport providers are normally selected to suit the peak load and access requirements of the provider’s client base. Whilst the usage frequency of the vehicle may be high in many instances, the average load would be less than peak capacity.

**Gaps exist in transport availability and accessibility**

The stakeholders interviewed were aware of gaps in transport availability and accessibility within the Rockhampton region. Some examples of the availability gaps mentioned include:

- Frequency deficiencies in mass transport services between the Rockhampton and regional communities, such as the Capricorn Coast and Mount Morgan, particularly outside working hours and on weekends;
- Lack of non-private transport services between Rockhampton and smaller communities, such as Bajool, and Marlborough.

The accessibility issues raised included:

- Limited availability of mass transit vehicles accessible by people with a disability;
- People with a disability may have difficulty assessing the pick-up points for scheduled mass transit from their homes, and in getting to their destination from the drop off point;
- Options for people without private transport wishing to travel to destinations that are not on mass transit routes are limited to taxis, which may not be affordable for them, or community transport, for which they may not be eligible;
- The dispersal of health, community and social services throughout the region means that disadvantaged people often have to make multiple journeys to access services, using multiple mass transit routes which can be expensive and time consuming.
- There is limited cooperation between public transport operators (regulated and non-regulated) and community groups, or between community groups regarding transport; and
- A significant cohort of transport disadvantaged residents are not eligible for community transport access due to not being members of the target demographic group, or perhaps because their need is temporary in nature.
Evidence was also offered by some stakeholders suggesting that a lack of awareness regarding the transport options available may contribute to difficulties experienced by some residents in accessing services that are available to meet their needs. Ray Thompson, representing Capricorn Coast Community Access Group, advised that a 2011 investigation by him into some issues raised regarding access to bus services within the Capricorn Coast and between those communities and Rockhampton were found to have no foundation or resulting from a misunderstanding of the services available.\(^{22}\)

The issues described above are consistent with those identified by CTSA across Queensland. CTSA also notes that gaps in transport availability and access can arise from “vertically integrated, silo-based policy development and government funded transport responses restricted to specific users (e.g. aged, youth, disabled persons)”\(^{23}\) Moreover it maintains that there is “a fundamental gap in the passenger transport paradigm, thinking and planning arising from the dominance of one model of passenger transport, that is, mass public transport.”\(^{24}\)

The mass transit model may suit urban areas with a high population density, however even in regions such as south east Queensland it requires subsidisation by government. The dispersed population base of the Rockhampton region means that it is unlikely that it will be the most efficacious or efficient model for its communities. TDSA’s position is that we need to look to a non-mass transit model across the state that operates at a level below mass transit whilst being equal and complementary to it.\(^{25}\) This model recognises that passenger transport is simply a means to an end, and focuses on the nature of the service provided, rather than the provider or the vehicle used.

**There is interest in cooperation**

Most of the local stakeholders consulted indicated their interest in involvement in a search for solutions to the gaps in transport availability or accessibility within the region. The remainder would need to seek organisational approval prior to committing to engagement in such a process. The consensus appears to be that one or more community organisations would need to act as lead agent/s to:

- Commence a comprehensive engagement process with the community;
- Map all existing transport resources;
- Identify needs; and
- Develop solutions that are suited to the unique context of Rockhampton region.

Given the early stage of this discussion in the Rockhampton Region it is not surprising that there were no volunteers to act as a lead agent. There was however recognition, particularly among representatives of service organisations and all levels of government, of the need for cooperation to put the consumer/client at the forefront of planning and responses. Stakeholders suggested that groups that should be involved in this process include:

- Community organisations, including advocacy groups;
- Social service providers;
- Existing transport providers;
- RRC;
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\(^{22}\) Interview. 26/03/12.

\(^{23}\) Leigh, J. (2010), P12
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Queensland and Australian Government representatives from departments such as Transport, Communities, FaHCSIA, Human Services, and Regional Development and Local Government.

The solutions need to be driven by the community

The stakeholders indicated that any solutions proposed as a response to transport issues within the Rockhampton region need to consider its unique demographics and geography, and involve broad participation within all communities and community sectors. As well as capturing the best possible information and skills across the regions, this approach will also encourage ownership of the solutions developed, and will also be more likely to attract the investment required to support them.

In particular stakeholders noted that the views and needs of sectors of the community who do not have access to personal transport, and for whom existing transport options may be unaffordable or inaccessible, need to be considered. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders included:

- Residents of smaller communities in the region;
- People living with temporary and ongoing disability;
- Young people in all communities;
- Unemployed people;
- Students and trainees; and
- Single mothers of young children.

There is support available to develop solutions

A number of stakeholders indicated that their organisations would be interested in assisting communities to develop solutions to transport issues.

At an industry level the consultation included discussions with representatives of the Queensland Community Transport Industry Association (QCTIA) and the Transport Development and Solutions Alliance (TDSA). MHACCQ is a member of the latter organisation. TDSA is “a Queensland state-wide, non-profit, community-based organisation committed to supporting and facilitating a collaborative response to improved transport, access and mobility.”

QCTIA’s stated objectives are “to provide industry representation, services and activities for member community transport groups which serve to alleviate transport disadvantage in the state of Queensland. We also aim to lead, guide and support our members in providing effective and efficient community transport services.” One of the stakeholders interviewed is a member of the board of QCTIA, and offered to travel to Rockhampton to share his experience with North Queensland Community Transport in Townsville.

The Queensland Transport representative indicated that his Department is interested in models that fill transport gaps within the region, and make better use of existing transport infrastructure. The Department could be able to support this development with information and advice on issues such as accreditation and the funding available. Our research also indicated that the Department was due

---
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to complete a transport survey within the region earlier this year; however this was postponed during the lead up to the recent State election. The information from this survey would be of assistance for a larger scale mapping process and needs analysis.

Rockhampton Regional Council’s (RRC) Social Plan 2010-2015 notes that transport was raised in their consultation on the key theme of ‘accessible services and facilities’. In a later stage of the engagement process for the plan “addressing public/community transport issues across the Region to enhance access to required services and participation in community life”28 was one of the suggested options to improve accessibility of services and facilities. The Council representatives interviewed were keen to support initiatives to improve access to services and facilities, and playing a role in linking key stakeholders from the communities within the region. An ongoing Rockhampton Region Social Planning group has been established as one of the strategies of the plan with key agencies as members.

A Regional Access and Equity Advisory Committee has also been established with RRC support and membership from across the region and sectors. Priority issues are brought to this committee by 3 Community Access and Equity Reference Groups established in Capricorn Coast, Rockhampton and Mount Morgan.

RRC has recently completed its first 4 year term as an amalgamated entity drawn from the previous Rockhampton, Livingstone, Fitzroy and Mount Morgan LGAs. Given the work required to attend to amalgamation issues during this initial term, it would be reasonable to suggest that the next 4 years should provide increased opportunity for the progression of integrated solutions to many issues confronting communities within the region. The recent change of government at State level may also provide opportunities to seek support for new solutions that have broad community support and benefits.

Capricorn Enterprise is the economic development and tourism organisation for the Rockhampton Region. It has established an Inclusive Communities Group, which invited a representative of LANDS to deliver a presentation on their model of community transport in late 2011. MHACCQL is a member of this group.

9. Examples of transport solutions

The models available to respond to transport needs vary depending upon the geographic and demographic features of the community and/or the scale of the target client base a proponent seeks to service. TDSA’s representative nominated 3 models in use at the moment:

- A direct model, in which the operator services a target client base, such as HACC transport, charter buses, taxis;
- An indirect model, in which clients are supported to use transport infrastructure that is already available, such as taxi voucher schemes, frequent user schemes; and
- A mixture of the above models, coordinated by a lead agency.

TDSA’s suggestion is that a community seeking to respond to transport need should begin with an indirect model, and only adopt the direct approach if existing providers will not participate in the solution, are non-existent. Such an approach will avoid the duplication of resources, capital and time.

Operating examples of each of these models are provided below.

The direct model

Townsville-Thuringowa Transport Solutions Inc (TOTTS)

TOTTS operates a direct model service under the trading name North Queensland Community Transport (NQCT). NQCT provides a 7 day service within the Townsville local government area for people who are aged, disadvantaged or living with a disability. Many of these are travelling for oncology or dialysis services, although NQCT also provides some contract transport for foster children clients of Child Safety. Secretary Allan Wynne advises that 80% of clients are aged 65 and over, and 25% of clients are eligible for HACC services.

The NQCT service is not HACC funded, however receives $150,000 per annum from Department of Communities; as well as other contract income from organisations such as Mount Isa Hospital for transport of its clients to appointments within Townsville. Operating revenue is sourced from fares ($17 pick up and return within Townsville) and membership fees. It uses 9 vehicles, including station wagons, a wheelchair accessible vehicle, and a 14 seat bus. Trips are coordinated using a Microsoft Access-based dispatching program, with clients required to book their trips 24 hours in advance.

TOTTS also provides monthly social day trips around the region for members, and a weekly drop-in social event at its headquarters.

Suncoast Transport and Care Association Inc (STAC)

STAC is funded by the HACC program, hospital transport contracts, fares paid by transport disadvantaged individuals, and donations. Originally HACC focussed, the organisation has embarked on a more inclusive approach in the last year. Chief executive, Feda Adra, advises that in October

30 Telephone interview. 09/03/12
31 Telephone interview. 09/03/2012
2011 STAC introduced a Mobility Management Model as a pilot project to respond to the needs of all transport disadvantaged people, which has lifted its annualised trip rate from 7,000 to 115,000. STACS covers the area from the Sunshine Coast to North Brisbane, as well as north to Hervey Bay for Queensland Health non-urgent patient transfer services. In partnership with other community organisations it has recently developed a ComLink Mobility satellite site at North Lakes, which is a transit lounge concept for connecting STACS transports services with those delivered by other providers so that people can complete longer journeys.

STACS delivers transport services using HACC and community funded buses and sedans. It is staffed by 26 employees and 120 volunteers. Dispatching is completed using a newly acquired system developed by Transit Computer Systems. This system reduced the staff time occupied by this task from 8-9 hours per day to 2 hours.

**LANDS Community Services (LANDS)**

LANDS operates a community transport service, called a Mobility Centre, in South Brisbane and Logan areas under the trading name TransitCare. The service has a client base of over 5,000 members who are primarily HACC eligible, although it has expanded the target group to include job seekers and its model could broaden to include integration with mass transit bus service timetables. Up to 27 agencies use the TransitCare service, and 2 agencies have taken up an offer for LANDS to broker the operation of their vehicles in exchange for transport trips for their clients.

Funding for the service is sourced from the HACC program, agency contracts, fares, and memberships.

The LANDS model uses a LANDS Planner scheduling software system to schedule pre-ordered trips for its 45 vehicles. These, mostly disability accessible, vehicles are operated by employees and volunteers. Some volunteers also provide their own vehicles. Larger disability accessible buses are hired from charter bus companies for other services such as the Flexiride Shopping Service. The scheduling system also has access to Yellow Cabs control and dispatch system to coordinate taxis for groups of 3 or more people or if wheelchair access is required.

As the LANDS Planner system has an interface that allows it to be operated over the internet LANDS claim that it is possible to set up Mobility Centres in other communities using their system. In March 2012 the Queensland Government announced that TransitCare had been provided with HACC funding of $140,000 to establish pilot Mobility Centres in Townsville and Cairns.

**Volunteering Gold Coast Transport Consortium**

Volunteering Gold Coast (VGC) was originally established with HACC funding. Its version of the direct transport model commenced with the establishment of a Gold Coast Mobility office that provided a help line and referral service to link people with unmet transport needs and existing services. With the objective of adopting a more strategic approach that would provide better use of vehicles and broader services for HACC clients VGC facilitated the establishment of the Gold Coast HACC Community Transport Consortium initially comprising 8 member organisations. This consortium then collectively tendered for the HACC transport funding for the Gold Coast.

---
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Whilst transport for HACC clients remains a core area of business, the Consortium has also attracted funding from state and local government for additional community transport projects. The Consortium now has a membership of 16 organisations, who are either funded to service HACC clients or have clients who are eligible for HACC services. Since the commencement of the Consortium 5 years ago HACC trip numbers have been increased from 30,000 to 100,000 per annum. Consortium members pool their transport services, and operate under a service agreement specifying services delivery outputs and reporting requirements. The Consortium acts as a transport broker and provides funding via bus and driver hours, taxi vouchers, and volunteer driver subsidies. The vehicles used are owned by Gold Coast Volunteers, Consortium members, and volunteers. Gold Coast Volunteers provided the scheduling services for the consortium.

The indirect model

The indirect model involves support for people to use existing transport infrastructure. A local example of this in Rockhampton is the issue of HACC-funded taxi vouchers by Centacare to its clients. These vouchers subsidise the cost of the taxi fare for clients to attend to tasks such as bill paying, shopping and social outings.

Council cabs
On the Sunshine Coast a transport levy on ratepayers funds a Council Cabs scheme. This scheme provides subsidised fixed fare weekly cab trips to local shopping centres for people who are aged, living with a disability, carers and minors under the care of eligible persons. The transport levy also funds a Flexilink service for communities with fewer alternative transport options. This service involves subsidised scheduled taxi runs connecting with existing scheduled public transport services for ongoing journeys.

Community transport directory
In the southern region of Victoria, the Commonwealth Respite and Carelink Centre has published a directory that covers transport services for all communities within the region. The information provided covers a description of scope of the transport service, vehicles used, hours of operation, eligibility requirements, and fares. A guide to all transport concessions available in Victoria is also included within the directory.

Marketing campaigns
Community transport operators in the County of Devon UK have formed a consortium to develop and run a marketing campaign called Transport for Your Community: Just Ask. Designed to promote and services of the operators, the campaign is targeted at potential passengers, potential funding sources, and volunteers. The campaign, supported by Devon County Council and sponsors, has
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35 Correspondence with Richard Patterson, General Manager, Volunteering Gold Coast. 11/04/12.
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delivered an on-line and physical directory of community transport operators, brochures, and a marketing video.

A mixture of direct and indirect

_Graham House Community Transport_
In the South Burnett region Graham House Community Transport provides a combination of direct and indirect responses to the needs of transport disadvantaged people. The elements of the model include:

- South Burnett Community Integrated Transport Service (SBCITS);
- Community Partnership Transport Service (CPTS);
- B4B Transport Solutions Project; and
- Community Transport Directory.

SBCITS is a HACC-funded service that provides linkages to existing transport services, or individual or shared transport delivered by volunteer drivers where transport is not available. This enables HACC-eligible clients to attend to activities such as shopping, bill paying, local doctors or social activities.

CPTS provides transport for non acute and non-emergency medical purposes for frail aged or young people with a functional disability who are transport disadvantaged. The service is funded on a cost recovery basis by contributions from clients.

B4B Transport Solutions provides a linkage service to assist families and isolated people to access public or community transport, or other support groups, for business, medical, and education activities.

The Community Transport Directory prepared by Graham House provides a comprehensive guide to transport options, eligibility for assistance, and timetables covering the South Burnett region and access to regional centres.

---

10. Funding support for transport

Our discussions with stakeholders indicate that opportunities to source new funding for transport initiatives are scarce. The conversations with stakeholders connected to government indicated that all levels of government are, however, interested in opportunities to maximise the efficiency and efficacy of their resource allocation. The sections below provide information on programs and organisations that may support community-based responses to transport need in Rockhampton region.

The HACC program

The HACC program remains a significant funder of community transport services in Queensland, assisting its target clients in the frail aged and people with a disability cohort. As noted in Section 3 funding is allocated to agencies to provide transport alone, or as a support to access social support and centre-base day care services. In the Volunteering Gold Coast example described in Section 9, a number of agencies have created a consortium to bid for HACC transport funds for the whole Gold Coast region.

Recent pilots of the LANDS Mobility Centre model in Townsville and Cairns have been also funded by the HACC program. These examples would seem to indicate that, whilst additional funding is not necessarily available, the program is prepared to consider proposals with broad stakeholder support that make more efficient and efficacious use of the funds and assets in a community. The recent transfer of arrangements for funding and administration of HACC to the Australian Government, and the recent change of government in Queensland, may also provide opportunities to promote alternative models that might be developed in Rockhampton region.

Queensland Transport

TMR’s passenger transport strategy includes the provision of “resources to support communities developing sustainable transport options that meet local needs.” 41 A key development strategy is support for communities to “influence decisions and processes for change, broker resources and develop local solutions to fulfil unmet transport needs.” 42 TMR department has worked with the Local Government Association of Queensland to develop guidelines for the development of community-based transport, which includes information on how local governments may be involved in the development of responses to the needs of their communities. 43
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During the consultation activity TMR’s Manager (Passenger Transport Operations) Rockhampton representative indicated that TMR was interested in involvement in community activity to develop responses to unmet transport needs within the Rockhampton region. Should it be demonstrated that an alternative model would provide a more integrated and comprehensive transport coverage this involvement could also include a review of the current allocation of TMR’s transport funding in the region.

Local Solutions Fund

The Local Solutions fund is a component of the Better Futures, Local Solutions Program administered by the Department of Human Services. This initiative is targeted at families and individuals to build work skills and provide opportunities for children. Rockhampton region is one of 10 local government areas selected for additional support, based on characteristics such as relatively high incidences of long term unemployment, generational unemployment, and young mothers. This support includes:

- New community positions and a Local Solutions Fund;
- Support for young parents;
- Compulsory participation requirements for jobless families; and
- Place-based income management.

The Local Solutions Fund has $25M available from 2012-2015 for “funding for innovative and creative solutions to increase social and economic participation in the ten local government areas.” An initial funding round has recently concluded, however additional rounds will be announced during the life of the initiative with a call for expressions of interest. These are initially assessed by a Local Advisory Committee located in each of the target LGAs. The Rockhampton Community Action Leader for this initiative has indicated that a community-based response to unmet transport needs could fall within the guidelines for this fund.

Philanthropic organisations

Philanthropic organisations are a potential source of financial support for not for profit organisations. They are usually interested in supporting discrete projects that fit with the current priorities of their grant funds, rather than ongoing programs. Some examples include:

- Queensland Community Foundation – currently focussed on capacity-building activities supporting charitable and not for profit organisations; and
- Myer Foundation – the Poverty and Disadvantage Small Grants Program has priority areas including communities experiencing social and economic exclusion, children and young
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people from impoverished backgrounds, and small discrete projects with a budget of up to $50k that meet the needs of a community.

11. Findings and recommendations

As noted in the introduction to this report, MACS is interested in finding out more information of the scope of transport services operating within the Rockhampton Region, the gaps in transport availability, the funding available for transport services, and whether it should consider expansion of its involvement in the delivery of transport.

Our research and consultation activity has identified the existence of significant transport capacity in the Rockhampton region, covering the categories of: regulated public transport, de-regulated public transport, and funded community transport. There is, however, little cooperation between transport sectors, or between operators within sectors; and varying degrees of capacity utilisation.

The stakeholders consulted indicated that there are gaps in the availability and accessibility of transport within the region. They indicated that these gaps included the availability and frequency of mass transit services in some areas, ineligibility for some funded community transport, lack of coordination between transport types, affordability issues for some sections of the community, and a lack of information regarding available transport alternatives.

There are examples available of successful responses to transport need that target whole communities, or target groups within a community. These responses can be grouped into 3 models:

- A direct approach that creates transport infrastructure, and usually targets a specific group within the community;
- An indirect approach that encourages usage of existing transport infrastructure; and
- A combination of these approaches.

The industry body TDSA recommends that communities wishing to address transport issues start with the indirect approach, and only resort to a direct approach where existing infrastructure cannot be configured to fill gaps.

Our consultation activity provided evidence of support for cooperation between stakeholders with an interest in transport to develop responses to gaps in availability and accessibility within the region. The discussions with stakeholders also informed the view that, whilst significant new funds may not be readily accessible, the current social, economic, and political environment is supportive of community-based strategies that make inclusive, efficient, and efficacious use of resources.

Further progress on transport issues within Rockhampton Region will require the emergence of an organisation, or organisations, to act as a lead agency. This agency will facilitate the necessary conversations with stakeholders that will develop a planned approach to identifying and responding to transport needs.

Based on the findings summarised above there would appear to be minimal opportunity for MACS to expand its involvement in transport on a unilateral basis. The current transition phase of the HACC program means that expansion funds from that source are uncertain until the Australian government announces its preferred delivery model from 2015. Any expansion into other transport sectors by MACs would need to be consistent with its mission. It would require funding from an alternative source, and would be subject to competition from existing operators.

The alternative option for MACS would be to act as a lead agent to facilitate a cooperative approach to meeting unmet transport needs, either within the HACC target group, or within the broader community. Both MACS and MHACCQL are highly regarded within the health, social service, and business sectors of Rockhampton region and Queensland. Their membership of local community and
business networks would also be useful in encouraging other agencies to engage in cooperative responses.

Involvement in either increased coordination of community transport for the HACC target group, or a response to broader community needs, could have benefits for existing MACS clients and for MACS itself. For example, clients would gain access to an improved suite of choices to attend to their needs. MACS would benefit from more productive use of its existing transport infrastructure, and potentially increase its total transport business in a sustainable manner.

The first suggested action in response to this report is for MACS to determine what level of involvement in transport best fits with its mission.

Recommendation 1: Following consideration of the findings of this report MACS and MHACCQL should determine whether increased involvement in transport within its existing HACC target market, or within the broader community, is most consistent with its mission.

Dependent on the level of involvement preferred, MACS will need to engage with appropriate stakeholders; to determine the next steps required to progress examination of transport issues and develop responses.

Recommendation 2: Upon confirmation of its preferred level of involvement, MACS should engage with the stakeholders identified in this report to share information, and develop a strategy for further action to achieve a coordinated response to transport need in the Rockhampton region.

MACS’ discussions with these stakeholders should provide a consensus on the goals that might be achievable, a strategy to move toward those goals, and the stakeholders willing to act as lead agents to facilitate its implementation. The tasks identified in the strategy should include;

- Mapping of existing transport infrastructure;
- Consultation activity within the community; and
- The development of integrated responses to identified needs.
**12. Conclusion**

MACS currently provides transport to HACC-eligible clients as part of its day respite and day therapy services. MACS is interested in increasing its knowledge of the transport available within Rockhampton Region, and in determining whether it should consider an expansion of its involvement in transport services.

The outcomes of this study indicate that there is substantial transport infrastructure already available across the Rockhampton region. The absence of an integrated system, however, leads to variable utilisation; and means that gaps exist in transport availability and accessibility. It would appear that a unilateral expansion of involvement in transport by MACS would not be prudent in the current funding and competitive environment. There is, however, scope for involvement in integrated solutions; either within the HAAC funded community transport sector, or as part of a whole of community response to transport need.

Should MACS decide to pursue one of these alternatives, the next step would be to engage with relevant stakeholders, which would include following up those who participated in this study.

Justin Power
May 2012
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