

CORRECTED VERSION

RURAL AND REGIONAL COMMITTEE

Inquiry into rural and regional tourism

Melbourne — 4 June 2007

Members

Ms. K. Darveniza

Mr D. Drum

Mr J. Eren

Ms W. Lovell

Mr R. Northe

Ms G. Tierney

Mr J. Vogels

Chair: Mr D. Drum

Deputy Chair: Ms G. Tierney

Staff

Executive Officer: Ms L. Topic

Witnesses

Mr W. Kayler-Thomson, chief executive, Victoria Tourism Industry Council; and

Ms B. Gove, manager, tourism and events, Victorian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

The CHAIR — I would like to welcome Wayne and Bindi to the committee. This is an all-party parliamentary committee, and the hearing of evidence today is in relation to regional and rural tourism. I have to go through the formalities, and they are that all evidence taken at the hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege, as provided in the Constitution Act 1975, and further subject to the provisions of the Parliamentary Committees Act 2003, the Defamation Act 2005 and where applicable the provisions of reciprocal legislation in other Australian states and territories. I wish to advise witnesses that any comments made outside the hearing are not protected by parliamentary privilege.

Before we start I would like you to state your name and address and the position you hold within your organisation. Evidence is being taken by Hansard and you will be able to check the transcript within the next few weeks.

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — My name is Wayne Kayler-Thomson. I am chief executive of the Victoria Tourism Industry Council of Albert Street, East Melbourne.

Ms GOVE — I am Bindi Gove, manager of tourism and events at the Victorian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Albert Street, East Melbourne.

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — We have a presentation to make it easier for you, and we would like to hand it out. That presentation includes an overview that we will present today. It will be relatively brief to allow for questions and discussion. It also includes a copy of our submission which will be formally provided tomorrow, but the submission is there for you to read today. We have also included a copy of the summary of the recent industry survey that VTIC has undertaken which you might find interesting as well.

I should preface my remarks by saying that there are other contributors to this presentation, given the roles both Bindi and I have in other organisations. Whilst the Victoria Tourism Industry Council is effectively presenting today, it also represents the Victoria Events Industry Council, which has recently been formed to represent Victoria's events industry, the Australian Regional Tourism Network which is an organisation that represents the interests of state and regional organisations across Australia, and the Australian Regional Tourism Research Centre, which is a research centre dedicated to regional tourism research based at Southern Cross University in New South Wales.

To commence I will just give you a quick overview of VTIC and what it is. It is the peak organisation for Victoria's tourism industry focused on policy, strategy, advocacy and representation, industry and business development. Its members include the various industry sector organisations that represent Victoria's tourism industry, major corporate businesses — principally major attractions — and also government agencies involved in tourism. Interestingly, VTIC is supported by the Victorian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry, which has recognised that tourism is a major driver of Victoria's economy and has therefore given its support for the various organisations that I mentioned, particularly VTIC and VEIC, by providing the resource support for the industry going forward.

What we would like to do today is really just give you first of all a quick overview of what we consider to be important when we are considering the future of rural and regional tourism, and that is the objectives that we should be trying to achieve from tourism. They are relevant regardless of where you operate tourism, but they are particularly relevant to regional tourism. Without going through the details of them, they are really about increasing visitor numbers, visitor expenditure and dispersal. The importance of mentioning those three is that they really contribute to what we call tourism yield, and at the end of the day the most important of those is visitor expenditure. While much of the data relates to numbers, and we seem to have a wealth of information about numbers, expenditure is where the rubber hits the road and where the benefits to the community flow from.

What is also important is visitor satisfaction, and we will come back to that during our presentation, and also, increasing brand equity — that is, what regional Victoria is known by in the markets we are attempting to market to. Also increasingly important is industry professionalism and the sustainability of the industry, which relies specifically on the profitability of what is primarily a private sector business activity. One of the reasons for mentioning those other organisations, particularly the Australian Regional Tourism Network and the research centre, is that we are midway through a major three-year project to identify across Australia why some destinations succeed and others do not — in other words, what are the best practice principles of destination development, destination marketing and destination management. While that project still has about 18 months to go and has involved studying three destinations in each state and territory, some common factors have already been identified as to why some destinations succeed and other do not. Principally these are the ones we have outlined to you today. I guess they give us a clue, because if we have a desire to increase and improve the sustainability and growth of regional tourism in Victoria, then we need to take account of these factors.

The first of those is that in a successful destination we would find an effective regional tourism organisation and that, regardless of the form, it is strong and is focused on the principal role, which is destination marketing. You would also find effective local organisations representing particular towns and districts, and again they would be strong organisations that are particularly focused on a core role of visitor servicing. Many of those organisations seek to get involved in destination marketing without the resources and forget about visitor satisfaction being the principal marketing tool.

What you also find is that local government is directly involved, principally providing support through policy, through planning — through strategic planning particularly — and often visitor servicing, destination development and managing the tourism destination. Often local government is criticised for lack of support, but even in Victoria if you look over the last 15 years you see the contribution by local government to tourism activity has more than doubled over that period, and in fact it contributes more collectively than the state government does to tourism marketing and tourism development. That is often not recognised, let alone the basic infrastructure which is provided and managed by local government and which visitors use. Nevertheless those areas that do succeed have the strong support of local government.

You also find, however, state government support, particularly in the economic principle of market failure or market weakness, where the state provides the leadership role in marketing the destination, principally within the state, to interstate and international markets and successfully provides a cooperative marketing base. An intangible but critical success factor is leadership, whether it be from an individual, whether it be from a group of individuals or whether it be from local government — whoever. With strong destinations that have succeeded, inevitably you find strong local leadership. That can actually wax and wane over time, and you can sometimes see successful destinations deteriorate when the leadership is not supported. You will also find that there is a very clear focus on visitor satisfaction and on business excellence to ensure that visitors go away satisfied with the experience. You also find a breadth and depth of investment in product and infrastructure to support the tourism industry.

Those critical success factors provide a clue as to how we might grow and develop regional tourism. I am not going to go into detail; I will just touch across the top of some of the issues from our submission, which goes through some of the issues that we see as impediments to the growth of regional tourism in Victoria and what might be some of the solutions to those.

We need to recognise that Victoria is now a far more competitive destination than it was 15 years ago, including many parts of regional Victoria. We are also faced with a more competitive market than we have ever had before. Some of those factors relate not just to tourism marketing by other destinations recognising the value of tourism globally but also other consumer impacts, such as people spending their disposable income on other things, the impact of low-cost air travel has pluses and minuses, and other factors that influence a more competitive market.

However, it is our belief that the time has come for a quantum leap to be taken if we are not only to sustain regional tourism but to grow it and to take advantage of the opportunity that is there. The government's 10-year tourism events plan has identified that tourism has the capacity to almost double over the next 10 years to become an \$18 billion industry. The first point we would make quite strongly is that to achieve that requires a substantial increase in government resourcing for tourism. In fact we advocate that Tourism Victoria's budget should be doubled to \$80 million a year.

It sounds a lot, but if we are looking to double tourism then we ought to be putting sufficient resources into it, because the impact of not doubling it has been that Tourism Victoria has not had sufficient marketing dollars to complete the task. It means that the government has reduced the amount of funds that are focused on international tourism and provided insufficient funds to market the brand of Victoria. Even though the Jigsaw campaign has been highly successful, it has limited the amount of funds left for regional tourism and particularly for industry development and product development.

Whilst good work has been done in using the available funds very effectively to make Victoria competitive, if we really want to grow it, we need a much bigger investment in the marketing funds that only Tourism Victoria, on the principle of market failure or weakness, can provide. It could also leverage a much greater contribution from the industry. In its own marketing activity the industry contributes far more than the government does to marketing activity and has shown over and over again that, with the leadership opportunity, it will put its cooperative marketing dollars behind the leadership that Tourism Victoria might take in its very successful campaigns. If it invested more, then the industry would invest more collectively, and we would be able to develop a more competitive industry in the future.

Effectively I have already touched on the next point — that is, that insufficient resources have been applied to industry and product development. As a result we find that the level of expenditure, particularly by national and international visitors in regional Victoria, lags behind other destinations. In our submission we provide you with some of the numbers for that. They show that in returns from interstate and international visitors, regional Victoria comes about second last compared to other states and territories. That might be partly due to the compact nature of Victoria — you can travel out and back from Melbourne in a day, whereas in other states you are probably obliged to stay overnight — but it is also a factor of insufficient growth and development of the investment in the accommodation, attractions and services in regional Victoria to encourage people to stay. That gets back to a factor of insufficient resources being applied to industry and product development.

It also applies to infrastructure. In that case we do have an excellent road network, but in recent times to our dismay we discovered that the amount of funds provided by the federal government to Victoria's road infrastructure is not consistent with the level of activity and the population size of Victoria. That needs to be improved. There are plenty of road projects around, whether they be ring-roads around Geelong, the duplication of parts of the Western Highway or other roads and developments that have an impact on touring routes and the quality of experience.

One factor that Victoria does have by way of competitive advantage is that Tourism Victoria's brand research has identified that Victoria is the no. 1 state nationally for touring by car. We need to maintain that advantage, so we need to continue to invest in our road infrastructure. We lead the way in road tourism signing, but we still need to continue to invest, all directed to encouraging people to stay longer in regional destinations.

Then there is air access. A principal advocacy role for VTIC is to advocate for increased international air access to Melbourne, and we have been reasonably successful in recent times in encouraging the federal government to take a more liberalised approach to that. But we also need to continue to capitalise on the fact that low-cost carriers take people away from Victoria as much as they bring people in, and we need to capitalise on opportunities for that. We see airlines like

Tiger Airways coming into Victoria as a major boost, and we have been right behind the opportunity.

That also applies to regional air access. Some of our remote destinations — particularly Mildura, the Albury-Wodonga area and parts of Gippsland — do need better air access, because visitors, particularly international visitors, often do not have the time to spend in road touring, therefore any quicker access we are able to make will difference into the future.

The next issue or impediment we find is in the area of skills and labour shortages. It is not unusual across all industry sectors, but is particularly more potent in regional Victoria. We find it incongruous that the state government's own organisation, OTTE, has a low priority on training for the tourism and hospitality industry, which does not seem to make sense when we have a growth industry. Employment is estimated to grow in this industry in the future, yet we give low priority to training in tourism and hospitality.

However, we also find with tourism that business participation in the industry is also low. That is a factor for the industry to address, but businesses could be further encouraged to participate in their local and regional tourism organisations and the industry organisation so they can gain the benefit of the various programs that are available to them. The industry is working quite hard to improve that.

A major impediment is investment attraction. We find that regional Victoria is lagging behind through a lack of quality investment. We know of significant projects that are frustrated and developers who have left the state to invest elsewhere because it has been too difficult to invest in Victoria. Even in the last two weeks we have been contacted by developers who have current projects that are worth over \$1 billion and are very frustrated about their ability to bring those to fruition. Regardless of what we think of the quality of those investments, it would be a significant boost, yet we are already running the risk of losing more investment.

One of the ways that we believe that needs to be improved is in access particularly to public land or locations close to national parks that are a major drawcard to Victoria. However, a better approach to attracting investment to public land would be a major step forward. We find that the lease conditions that are available for investment on public land are just not sufficient to attract investment. We need lease conditions of between 50 and 100 years to attract the sort of investment levels that I am talking about. This does not mean we need to put those investments into national parks. We have the advantage of a lot of public land and waterways that are close to national parks, that look exactly the same as national parks and that provide opportunity for us to promote investment.

For example, we find that our colleagues in Western Australia have already developed what they call a land bank, which has pre-identified locations on public land where they will encourage investment to locate. It gives them the opportunity to identify ahead of time pieces of land and types of development that they can then be prepared to treat investors with some surety rather than to run the gamut.

One of the investors that I spoke to in the last two weeks said they had a unique idea, but unfortunately they were confronted with the concept that they would have to put their idea out to public tender in order to win access. Automatically their intellectual property would be open for all to take advantage of.

Looking at the land bank-type idea, we know this has been considered within government and needs to be accelerated if we are to attract appropriate development to appropriate public land of the type that will generate tourism yield. Particularly with nature-based experiences, there are many examples elsewhere around Australia that have beaten and stolen a march on Victoria, and we are lagging behind. There is also a need to develop business excellence.

One of the factors that the industry is working on together with Tourism Victoria is to develop a tourism excellence program that is aimed at creating competitive advantage from visitor satisfaction. It is the most powerful marketing tool and if we put our resource support behind it, we believe we can develop a competitive advantage. It needs to be accelerated. If we can accelerate it through additional resource support, even though there were funds provided for in the recent state budget, if we can accelerate it by providing even more support, we have an opportunity to really provide a terrific competitive advantage.

We also want to mention nature-based tourism. Regional Victoria is blessed with a range of national parks and natural attractions of such diversity and quality that they are, without question, world class. And yet Victoria has the reputation nationally, and certainly globally, that we do not have nature-based experiences of quality. We have given up that competitive advantage to other states and territories. We need to invest in it. We need a strategy which encourages the type of investments that I mentioned before, the type of cooperative arrangements with tour operators and with the industry — attractions, accommodation and services — so that we can capitalise on the nature-based opportunity that is there. It has been talked about for a long time, it is time to accelerate the action and resourcing to ensure that we can actually develop a competitive advantage in what is actually a worldwide trend in tourism.

Finally, I would like to mention disaster relief. We have been beset by a whole range of natural disasters that have an impact on the tourism industry, principally bushfires in recent seasons. That is going to continue, those risks. We have seen many examples of where, particularly in the north-east of the state and Gippsland and the recent bushfires, suddenly visitors are no longer able to visit and the communities have realised how much they rely upon tourism.

Whilst we are generally supportive of the support that has been provided by the state government, what we are advocating for is much quicker action to return those places to the opportunity for tourism to grow more quickly. In order to do that we have advocated that there needs to be a permanent disaster relief fund established, rather than go through the process that is now followed in each bushfire season and each bushfire occurrence to go through a long process to identify what the needs of the community are and then to negotiate and put in place a relief package and then to actually implement that package, which takes far too long.

If the disaster fund is there, we know the sort of strategies that will recover tourism and they can be applied far more quickly, and we will not get the situation like we currently have in the north-east of the state of currently businesses starting to become even more frustrated because it has taken too long to provide the support that they welcomed in the first place. We would maybe like to conclude there in the interest of perhaps encouraging some further discussion.

The CHAIR — Thanks very much.

Mr NORTHE — The three organisations who have given evidence today have mentioned the potential for the aviation industry in regional areas. We all acknowledge that there probably needs to be further infrastructure. How would you see us structuring something like that given, obviously, the cheap airfares interstate, the Virgins and Tiger airlines and so forth? How can we promote aviation tourism, I guess, in regional areas given that it will probably cost more? Or have you got some other ideas on how it might be structured?

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — Unfortunately with the low-cost carriers that operate on interstate routes they have got the volume to be able to offer those sort of low prices. What it has highlighted is that the regional services look at almost a total cost recovery model and therefore it costs you a lot more to travel to Mildura than what it would do to travel up and back to Perth on one of the low-cost carrier flights. Obviously they are going to need some subsidised support.

It is a combination of the infrastructure firstly on the ground to support and then some subsidised support to encourage those services to actually operate into those places. Some of the national

carriers are prepared to look at that. We have seen many destinations now serviced by Virgin Airlines and Jetstar. They are obviously in places in New South Wales and Queensland particularly that have the capacity to achieve it but it would not have been that long ago that some of those places did not have regional air services either. Some of them have actually provided the sorts of subsidies and support and infrastructure to encourage the flights to occur. It needs a longer term investment. It is probably one of those areas of market failure or market weakness that governments should be investing in to encourage that to occur.

Mr VOGELS — I am very interested in, and I think it is a great idea, land bank. How would you envisage setting that — with local government? I think it is excellent.

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — It can work at a state government and a local government level. It is a matter of identifying on the public land estate those pieces of land it would be appropriate to attract development to, identifying what they are, making sure the planning provisions have been put in place to allow that to occur, identifying the types of development that would be encouraged and sought for those locations and then basically providing a prospectus of those opportunities, to invite expressions of interest from the private sector for the type of development we want rather than the reverse way around.

It can also apply at local government level. Local governments manage a lot of public land as well and similar approaches can be taken. I am aware of, for example, the Great Ocean Road coast committee which has taken that approach. Having responsibility for managing the caravan parks and foreshores right along the coast, they have identified opportunities where they can actually encourage private investment to some of those locations. It can apply to locals at a smaller project level, but I think at a state level we have a great opportunity in the diversity of our national parks and the easy access to them.

There are investors out there willing to invest but they are very frustrated by what they call red tape but it is really bureaucracy of working through the planning schemes and planning systems and then getting inconsistent approaches from local government and state government. Things like the rural zones that were recently established all of a sudden have knocked out investment that would have otherwise been of great benefit to the tourism industry, in an appropriate attempt to protect rural land but in the context of doing that they have also blocked out good investment that many rural communities need if they are to survive into the future.

It needs a longer term, strategic approach to it. It needs a proactive approach to identifying those opportunities, and encouraging the bureaucracy in a whole-of-government approach to make sure they get behind those priorities that government would identify. I do not think it is a political activity, I think it is one that any political party would support to get the investment in that we just do not have, which is a reason why we do not have the level of expenditure of international and interstate visitors the equivalent of what other states do. We do not have the range of quality accommodation and attractions that will sustain that sort of opportunity.

Mr VOGELS — There must be nothing more frustrating for a business than to identify an area, go through all the red tape or whatever you call it and then find the local council knocked it back and it has gone to VCAT and back there again and three years later still nothing has happened and you have spent millions on plans and everything. If you actually knew before you started, if this development is allowed here, let us get on with it and you basically sail through all the — —

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — You also attract the best investors and developers, as opposed to what often happens when someone with an idea comes along but they may not have the capital to do it. They may not be the best developer and therefore you then fight that development, maybe appropriately, on behalf of the community, as opposed to, 'What do we want? What are the best things we can attract?'. We will then attract the best investors, as I mentioned. I am not just saying that. There are many investors and developers who are turning

their backs on Victoria and have invested elsewhere — they have been able to do exactly what they wanted to do in Victoria in other places.

Mr NORTHE — If we may, I just wonder if it is pertinent could we maybe ask Wayne to give us some further information on, say, the WA example which you brought up earlier? Is there any further information we could obtain possibly to have a look at the structure over in WA?

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — Subject to them being prepared to provide it, but the principles are pretty much what I have outlined. It is not any more difficult than what I have just said basically. I know there is work going on within state government to look at a similar sort of proposal. Our view is that is an appropriate way to go and it should be accelerated and should be supported.

Ms LOVELL — I am interested in the skills shortages, something we have heard from other speakers who have presented this afternoon. I was interested to hear you say that OTTE have a low priority for tourism training given that in tourism people expect excellent service, expect people to be trained very well. One of the things I hear as I travel around the regions is people seem to think TAFE uses it as being the round hole for all their square pegs — people who do not fit into any other course are just dumped into tourism and hospitality — and it is not producing the best workforce for the industry. Do you think the current system is the right system for training people or do you think that that system can be improved?

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — No, we do not think that the current system is necessarily the right system. What happens is, as you outlined it, it accelerates the problem in the industry of retention of those people if they are able to get some training and get into the workforce — we are not actually producing the best quality staff with career opportunity.

What is required, I think, is more of a system that has a collaboration between the industry at a localised level, because what you often find as well is that those who are teaching tourism and hospitality have not had the industry experience either, so the quality of the programs may not be as good because they can get the numbers to go through it. It needs a more localised approach. It need some approaches similar to what happens in other industries, where employers are encouraged, either themselves or in clusters, to provide appropriate training, give recognition for prior learning, and accelerate development, because you have got a better chance of keeping local people in their local community if they are trained locally and they have the support of the employers in that space.

I guess one of the differences in the tourism industry in Victoria is that we are dominated by small enterprises, small business, so they need a more clustered approach to it. But there are potential examples of that. I will give you one potential example. One of our destinations, in the Daylesford area, is identifying its competitive advantages in wellness, all things wellness. I know that one of the considerations it has in its regional strategy is to identify — ‘Let’s develop a wellness college that teaches massage, alternative therapies and a whole range of things in the local area and make that a specialty college supported by the industry and supported by perhaps local government and state government to establish a competitive advantage’. That would then ensure that the businesses in that area that require the staff have ready access to them, because they are being trained in their local area, and they can develop a reputation for being the best place that you come to to get that type of skill. That is just one example of trying to relate it.

You could relate a similar thing to some of these nature-based tourism opportunities that I mentioned. Why can’t we have nature-based tourism training in local areas that actually provides the sorts of skills that are necessary? But let us not just think about the labour skills — think about the business skills. How do we encourage businesses, predominantly micro and small businesses, to be more sustainable relevant to these opportunities that I have mentioned? We need to be providing business training as well — again, I believe, at the localised area rather than too centrally.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much. Wayne, it has been unbelievably enlightening and you have been really articulate. Can I ask a couple of things. Getting back to the land bank and that philosophy, who do you think should take the lead with the necessary responsibilities with dead investment? Is it something that is driven by local government and the tourism coordinators it has? Is it something that the state government should take the lead on? Is it something that Tourism Victoria should take the lead on? The idea of building, for instance, the Otway Fly — which we have spoken about — is that there has been an opportunity there to quarantine some land and so an accommodation development has been put nearby. There is that type of thing.

What else could then flow on if we had the ability to again capture the natural beauty? And what other tourism aspects could go hand in glove with something like that? Who takes the lead in all of these areas? This is a problem that exists right around the state, that no-one seems to be quite proactive.

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — I think the state government needs to take the primary lead; it is the manager, primarily, of the public land estate. It has the primary control over the planning schemes and can put the overlays in as necessary to achieve it. It does need to work cooperatively with local government. Local government needs to act with some degree of confidence and surety. What you tend to find — as has been happening more recently, and increasingly so — is that local government will not make the decision on a planning application and will refer it to VCAT because it is too difficult to make a decision. That just makes the merry-go-round go around. But if the state government was identifying these opportunities and in collaboration with local government saying, ‘This is the piece of land that we are prepared to treat on; make sure the planning provisions are there’, you would not have that merry-go-round problem.

We need to make sure our sights are raised high, however, and that the types of investment are accommodation, attractions and services that are integrated. Using the Otway Fly as an example — yes, it does need to have accommodation associated with it; then it will attract other tour operators and other activities around it. It needs to encourage where visitors spend. Visitors primarily spend on accommodation, food and wine, basically, and shopping. So you need those integrated activities. We are not advocating that there need to be resorts, like we find in the warmer parts of Australia, but a resort of a different type that is more nature based but still has that integrated opportunity. Whether the shopping is in the local township — you certainly need the quality of accommodation.

When you look at the accommodation stock across Victoria, with some exceptions, we have a limited amount of what we will call 5-star accommodation, quality accommodation, where price is not the issue for the types of visitors we need to be attracting — whether they are international visitors or high-yield interstate visitors.

Price is not the problem; it is the quality of accommodation and experience that they expect. The demand is there for it; we need to provide that as a catalyst for the other things to occur. Then you do need to have quality attractions like the Otway Fly. That is a very good example of a quality nature-based experience. You have already seen the clustering around that of other businesses that are feeding off it, and the local community is benefiting from it as well. We do not need any better examples than that. You can go down to Tasmania and find plenty of examples, and you can go into New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory — they all have these types of developments. We do not have them here in Victoria.

The CHAIR — Everybody who has given evidence today has spoken about the need to fix up or improve our air access. In the absence of the demand that we are talking about — if the airports were better tomorrow — we may still not have the demand. Are we doing enough to integrate our rail services to give some sort of comfort to the metropolitan and also the interstate travellers in that they can in fact leave the car at home and take public transport and that they will

get picked up and shown around — that they are not going to want for their car while they are experiencing regional Victoria? Are we doing it well enough in that area?

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — I think the answer to it is that we do need an integrated approach. On the one hand there is a projection in our submission for interstate travel. You have an unfortunate problem where an interstate coach operator coming into the state is not allowed to pick up or drop off at a destination in Victoria. Backpackers use those facilities, that opportunity. We cannot do it. That is designed to protect V/Line and protect our rail network, but it just seems to be an outdated approach to over control.

You need an integrated approach. Victoria has a great advantage; it is not only a great place to tour by car because it is so accessible, but also by rail. We could reintroduce some of those quality services, making sure the connections are there at the other end. For example, I used to be a tour operator and accommodation operator as well in the Grampians area. We used to have great trouble getting people to travel — in those days, when rail was still running — by rail or public transport up to Ararat or Stawell and then being able to get out to the Grampians. There were not services available to them, and we had to work really hard to try to get those services there. We found that when they are provided, they will be used. But it needs an integrated approach — not just favouring one transport type over another.

The CHAIR — Thank you, Wayne. If there are no more questions, we had better wind it up there. Thank you very much, Wayne and Bindi for coming along. Your evidence was very succinct and clear. It left us with no uncertainty as to where we need to head. That evidence will be available for to you within approximately two weeks for you to make any typographical changes, although the context of what you have said will remain the same. Thanks again for your time.

Mr KAYLER-THOMSON — Thank you for the opportunity.

Witnesses withdrew.