

Submission
No 65

INQUIRY INTO OPERATION OF THE POINT TO POINT TRANSPORT (TAXIS AND HIRE VEHICLES) ACT 2016

Organisation: Taxi Drivers Benefit Association NSW Inc 1701522

Date Received: 31 May 2020

NSW Parliament Legislative Council
PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE NO. 6 – TRANSPORT AND CUSTOMER SERVICE
**Inquiry into the operation of the
Point to Point Transport (Taxis and Hire Vehicles) Act 2016**

Submission From the Taxi Drivers Benefit Association NSW Inc 1701522

Dear Madam Chair

We taxi drivers at TDBA NSW Inc welcome the opportunity to contribute to any Parliamentary action that may lead to an improved taxi industry.

We in the taxi industry have been making submissions and trying to reform and improve the taxi industry in NSW for both the taxi operatives and the public. We have been doing this since the Allan Cook review of 2004, and so far nothing much has happened, or at least what has happened has been for the worst.

There is provision within the act to review the whole issue of “rideshare”. Uber has been the trailblazer for the rideshare inroads into the taxi industry. Uber has been the pioneer and is the primary pathogen of the taxi market. So for simplicity we prefer to call Uber and other ‘uber clone’ RS parasites generically as ‘Uber’

The point is this, we don’t need Uber or RS in NSW at all. The public was quite adequately serviced by taxis and other established passenger transport services before any RS was introduced. In fact there was an excess of at least 1500 taxis in metropolitan Sydney prior to the 2016 P to P Uber reforms.

All that has happened is that the public passenger service has deteriorated from a fully qualified professional driver with a full sized regulated safe car, to a three quarter sized unregulated less safe vehicle, and an amateur part time unqualified unskilled driver, of dubious background taking passengers, especially young ladies, often on a one on one essentially private journey. Is it any wonder that there have been molestation and even rapes, not to mention some bashings of RS drivers.

So it is not safer for passengers of RS cars, in relation to driver behavior, or driver skill in traffic. The cars are not safer and the drivers are not safer. What does the government expect when they abandoned forty years of carefully compounded precautions and regulations. The only way to return to the safety standards that both passengers and drivers previously enjoyed is get rid of rideshare. The truth is the public is much safer in every way with professional taxi drivers.

The experiment has failed. How do you expect to keep twenty thousand undisciplined amateur drivers under control? It is ridiculous, the only simple and good answer to the question of passenger safety, is get rid of Uber.

In the taxi industry, a regulatory model is one where they are strict limits on entry into the market and conditions placed on operation, as well as a mandated fare structure.

Allan Cook [Author of the TAXI INDUSTRY INQUIRY 2004], Examined the question of TAXI REGULATION

He looked at several instances of deregulation and concluded that they don't work.

You get distorted and uneven services. That means some areas have poorer service, and passengers lose consistent quality. *It also meant that while some fares went down, trips outside main traffic areas decreased dramatically and there was a much higher rate of failed trips*

And

*However, this needs to be weighed against the evidence that many of those who have the greatest need to use the service, namely the aged, the disabled or those that live away from direct traffic routes **receive a poorer, more expensive service in a deregulated market – or no service at all***

IPART has observed that:

In a deregulated market, conditions in the rank and hail markets make it difficult for passengers to select higher quality or cheaper taxis. This situation allows poor quality or expensive taxis to remain in business. Maintaining minimum standards and some control over fares benefits passengers directly and benefits Sydney's tourist industry and business community indirectly

He noted that most of them returned to regulated services

*Three of the six cities in the United States that deregulated market entry and fares **have re-regulated** on consumer access and protection grounds (and in response to **public demand**). Overall, profitability in the industry declined **and so did customer satisfaction.***

All jurisdictions that de-regulated have re-introduced controls over access to airports and service standards. Most jurisdictions have also maintained or re-introduced pricing frameworks.

As was noted in the Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission's (ICRC) review [of the ACT Taxi and Hire Car Industry], *many jurisdictions that deregulated during the 1990s, **have now moved to re-regulate** all or part of the operation of these services.*

The reason that taxis are regulated in the first place is not to benefit taxi operators. It is not a plot to force passengers to pay exorbitant fares. It is to balance the quality of service against fares. That means that there have to be few enough cabs for each driver to get his fill of work so that he is paid enough to make it worth his while, but enough cabs to service the market. Generally, if fewer cabs can service a market, it implies that cabs can afford to charge lesser prices. That is the equation.

This has been explained before, at the Legislative Council Inquiry in 2010.

Bright ideas about de regulation have been touted up in many places but it doesn't work. There is no real benefit in flooding the market with hundreds of amateur or semi amateur drivers. Standards drop and the market is distorted.

This Uber x and rideshare rubbish is de regulation on steroids. Not hundreds but thousands of, not even taxis, but private cars, each nibbling away at taxi bread and butter. This is the worst version of de regulation that can be imagined. Did you people really think that this would make things better? Quality has gone down, safety has gone down, there is massive traffic congestion, and we now know that Uber is not even cheaper, what is worse, millions on dollars are being sucked out of NSW. Is that a good reason to devastate and destroy the taxi industry? Many ordinary working people have been hurt, lost businesses and homes. The Parliament is responsible. This didn't work.

At the introduction of the Point to Point Transport Act 2016, it was stated that;
“Only taxis can undertake rank and hail work”

It is quite easy for politicians to foster their favorite fantasies and believe what they might find convenient to their sanguine expectations. The reality on the streets is quite different. What rank and hail work? The rank work is down 70 to 80 percent. The hail work is virtually non-existent. Less than 1% of hail work remains. The supposed trade off, the advantage for taxis from rank and hail, is substantially gone. A mere vestige remains. The advent of rideshare is nothing short of a catastrophe for cabbies. The new street hail is an I phone by the side of the road. This is really a hail disguised as a booking. On the ranks many Uber cars pick up illegally from a taxi rank or pick up at no stopping signs immediately before and after a ranks with impunity. Many ranks are much smaller or have disappeared altogether. Incidentally most RS cars do not have any signs displayed. Another widespread violation of the law. So, the rank and hail segment for taxis as an offset for Uber ‘booking’ services ? You have got to be joking.

Uber

It is widely known that Uber has a history of sending in teams of lawyers, marketing men, and lobbyists, to soften up the local administration to a jurisdiction because they know that uber x, [their main source of revenue] is illegal. This was a classic in the case of NSW, where they found a whole legislative body, dumb enough to buy their propagandist hook line and sinker. Or was there more to it than that?

What is true is that the inquiry into the prospective point to point legislation, was not whether or not to implement RS, but how to do it. A classic yes minister example ‘never have an enquiry unless you know the outcome’. Why was that?

The truth is Uber and RS did not deliver more jobs, it took work from those already working in the industry, It did not provide better services, it merely swapped professional drivers for 20,000 amateurs, and it definitely was not safer for the public. Finally it has been revealed that they are not cheaper either.

Who has benefited from the entry of Uber into NSW ? Certainly not the people and the State of NSW. The only beneficiaries are Travis Kalanick and the owners of Uber. Uber does not even pay tax in the U.S. The money goes to a tax haven offshore in Shangri-La. Yes they have a business model, so do Pirates. Pirates just seize the money on the high seas and make off with it. Uber are the modern day pirates. They penetrate a taxi market in any jurisdiction and just take out the money. What is the difference between a pirate and a privateer? A privateer is just a legalized pirate. Uber x are no longer pirates acting illegally as they were for 18 months. They are now privateers but the actions of the privateers and the effects on the taxi market are exactly the same.

Why would a body of Parliamentarians approve of a business model of international pirates that just takes money out of NSW, from a service industry that has to be performed In NSW? How does that benefit the people of NSW? Money is being drained out of the NSW economy that should be recycled into NSW. Is there not anyone in this Parliament who will stand up for Australia and the NSW economy?

How did this happen? We in the taxi industry protested for days when this was being brought in. We were brushed aside and ignored by the Parliament. The interesting Question is how did Uber winkle it's way into NSW? Were there any deals done? The State opposition has been remarkably docile on this matter. Why not ask some questions? How did an open and shut case against illegal Uber drivers collapse. Who stuffed up the evidence? Can someone ask some questions?

In 2016 the biggest mistake that this parliament has ever made was enacted, and to our amazement, was supported by all parties. Was there no one to stand up for taxi drivers? This is the most classical case of a big decision being made by people who don't understand what the implications are. The Government and the NSW Parliament had no idea what they were doing when they passed the 2016 transport Act. They did not realize that they were opening a Pandora's box, when they allowed the rideshare rats to raid the taxi market. We now have many problems that we do not need in NSW.

How many of these amateur RS rats are there? 20,000 30,000 50,000? Who knows, does the commissioner know, does anybody know? The key problem is that the government has no leverage over the average part time RS driver. They are also virtually invisible to the authorities. From our observation more than half the RS cars have no identifying sign. They are totally out of control and they can act with impunity. The laws in NSW are being broken en masse every day and there seems to be nothing done about it. It is pretty obvious that this mass of casual drivers is impossible to control.

One of the key reasons for having taxis [which are commercial and temporary vehicles] in the first place, is as a means of limiting the amount of cars required to service the transport needs of the city. Contrary to the propaganda from Uber, but no surprise to us, the rideshare tsunami, has caused traffic congestion and slower traffic movement, as has happened in every jurisdiction that rideshare has invaded throughout the world.

Upside Is it possible to have a good outcome from this enquiry? Yes it is. It is possible in five years time, to have a harmonious high quality safe personal transport service, and, at the most moderate price to customers that is necessary for the provision of that service. That is, a good safe service at a reasonable price. That is quite possible, but only if the government and it's agencies make the right fair and constructive moves to rebuild the taxi transport industry starting with this committee.

Downside Are we heading in that direction? No we are not. The move to allow rideshare into the taxi market has been a disaster. It has been devastating for taxi plate owners, operators, and drivers. It is bad for the taxi industry, the State of NSW and is actually bad for the public.

What is wrong with the NSW taxi industry? What is inherently wrong with the taxi industry is that it is controlled by Government. It is private enterprise, but not really private enterprise. The drivers are employees, but not employees. They have no minimum wage. They are small business persons with an ABN, but not a business person. Does that make sense? It doesn't to us either.

Some of the blame over a period of time, for the faults of the taxi industry, can be assigned to elements within the taxi industry, but the government must take most of the blame and all of the responsibility. The NSW is fully responsible for what has happened, and is fully responsible to correct things.

Allan Cook in the 2004 Taxi Industry Inquiry, has stated;

There are a number of complex and long-outstanding issues, which have contributed to this unproductive relationship between the Ministry of Transport and the Industry at large.

While the Ministry has a role to play in facilitating improvements in the industry, the Ministry's key role is to work in partnership with the Industry

The existing arrangements have evolved in an ad hoc way, the current approaches are outdated and must be restructured.

It is important to understand what taxis are. Livered [branded] taxis, are universal ubiquitous legitimate regulated and visible public passenger vehicles that do many things in the public interest. They provide a safety net for people requiring personal transport. If we get rid of taxis, the public and the people of NSW will lose a valuable and reliable service asset, that is always there as a back up to persons needing casual ad hoc transport, when private cars or public transport is not available. If we lose the taxi industry the people of NSW will be the losers to a far greater degree that anyone realizes. We just cannot afford to get rid of taxis.

Allan Cook said of taxis; *they are an important, fast, individualised adjunct to buses and trains and provide essential transport for people with mobility problems.*

As 'public use' vehicles, they reduce the need for 'private use' vehicles and therefore have an important role to play in reducing the safety and environmental risks associated with ever-increasing private car use.

The case for taxis

The case for regulated liveried taxis is this: In a suburb of one story houses let us say with one car for every house the street is parked out full of cars. If you have a city situation where you have 10 to 20 story buildings then the logical consequence is to have cars stacked up vertically 10 to 20 high. Obviously this is impractical and impossible. A private car wants to park 4, 8, or 12 hrs each time. So it does not work with private cars on city streets.

So what is the answer? The answer is a temporary car that can jump in and out of a given street spot. That temporary car is a taxi, handy flexible transport for city citizens and visitors. Where 1 private car wants to occupy a spot for 4 hrs+, up to 120 taxis could use that one spot to pick and drop to transport people into and out of the city. How do you distinguish what cars are allowed to do this? They must be liveried marked regulated taxis.

What needs to be understood is taxis internally cross subsidize their business from the good times on Friday and Saturday night to sustain the taxi as a business overall and offset the lean times with a bare trickle of income in the middle of the week. So that there is a taxi available for the frail aged or disabled passenger, or any unfortunate person who needs some transport at the odd place or time.

At least that was the pattern until 2016. Uber and rideshare drivers soon learnt and they can swarm in on the good times and rob the taxis of the high volume income that they need to sustain their business. The casual RS drivers can pick and chose their working time because they have no commitment to permanent full time work. They just cherry pick the low hanging fruit

This asymmetrical farrago cannot be sustained. Taxis are at a distinct unfair disadvantage of the two groups doing the same work. To say that rideshare are only peripheral booked services is just not true. They are working as taxis in all but name then having gutted the best part of the work like locusts, they then just disappear into the woodwork.

With the current Covid19 crisis, the uncommitted rideshare drivers have dropped right off. The taxi industry has soldiered on, but with the downturn, the taxi industry is on its knees.

At least 80% of Taxis are off the road. If we can take extraordinary measures in this time, can we not do something that is also unusual but necessary? That is, when things begin to pick up again, can we not reserve the taxi work for the permanent professional drivers?

Surely we can do that at least.

So what is the right intelligent move to get to the better outcome for the public and taxi operatives?

First, support the taxi industry. As we have illustrated, this is the best way to go.

There is a major significant move that will not cost the Government any money, is simple to do, and has been available for sixteen years.

In 2004 Allan Cook advocated **A co-regulatory approach**

This must involve drivers and will require the Ministry to reform its policy and consultation activities. All sectors of the industry will have to be included in this process for the Ministry to have real credibility in its new role.

A Way Forward – working collaboratively on real solutions

The industry needs leadership, transparency and participative decision-making if it is to move forward and create an ongoing culture of customer service, innovation and improvement.

There are many voices to be heard

Participative decision making is an essential prerequisite to innovation and reform.

Drivers and owner/drivers need greater representation and room needs to be made for greater competition within service delivery in key areas of the industry.

While most of the failure to achieve the best outcome can be attributed to the Government there is an internal component to that failure. That is, the networks have had a scientistic top down approach. They believe that their view, and their vested interests, represent the whole of the taxi industry. This is part of the reason why the taxi industry has not moved on.

For instance one issue that Allan Cook has recommended is that Networks-

Develop options for universal offloads within the industry to improve waiting times.

That is improve the cover jobs between networks.

It still hasn't happened.

He has also observed that Networks *have suppressed operators and drivers.*

They act in their own interests, before improving the service that would encourage more business to the immediate advantage of operators and drivers.

The critical factor to improve the industry is the input directly to the TAC from representatives of the operators and drivers at the coal face, who are more aware of issues on the street and sensitive to changes that may be happening.

That is why Allan Cook has specifically advocated driver and operator participation in the Taxi Advisory Committee the TAC. This is the critical X factor that will make the difference.

The taxi council now represents less than half the taxi fleet in Sydney, so the TAC should include The Taxi council, 13 Cabs, and representatives of Operators and Drivers Associations.

Allan Cook has concluded that;

A co-regulatory approach, between Government and Industry, is the optimum result

Commensurate with the above, the regulation be reviewed to ensure that it supports the intent and effect of the performance standards and confirms a co-regulatory framework for industry participation and operation

The Action Item

The inquiry has suggested that driver representation be included in the membership of the peak consultative body, the Taxi Advisory Committee and recognition of driver associations for other consultation processes.

This is the missing link that we have needed all along

So that the government and the bureaucrats do not continue to make mistakes, they will get a steady constant input from the coal face, from the people who are doing the job, servicing the public on the streets.

To clarify the specific answer;

Let us go back to the original problem; let us say that there is a parcels delivery company. That company has a board of management so all the representatives from the various departments bring up problems with their section and problems relating to other departments internal and external issues. The board debates and resolves solutions to the problems so the company may improve and innovate towards a better parcel service and a successful company.

Now let us consider if that company had an higher board that had to approve all decisions, and that higher board met only every 12 months, so that any decisions took a long time to be endorsed, and they often refer decisions for more consideration so that it may take years to implement some simple or urgent improvement.

This in fact, is what has happened to the taxi industry, sometimes the public service does move forward with innovations but it is at a glacial pace. The net effect of government and bureaucratic control of the taxi industry is to suppress growth and innovation.

This had already been examined and analysed by Allan Cook in the 2004 taxi enquiry

Over a very long time the regulatory framework has become distorted.

*It is not an effective structure for business innovation and growth
The results have undoubtedly impeded the development of the industry.*

AND

The Inquiry takes the view that for decades now NSW state governments of all colours have taken the wrong regulatory approach to the taxi industry.

This is particularly the case given that taxis are private businesses and do not attract the subsidies that other transport providers operating in the public sector receive.

What we need is access to private enterprise component of the equation so that the taxi industry is to act as if it is a private firm and formulate it's own business policies first, then present the solutions to the regulator/Commissioner at the Taxi Advisory Council.

Then the innovations should normally be dealt with promptly. They do not take Ten years, or Five, or Two, or even one year, to be implemented.

That is the answer to the private public conundrum. So we get a win, win, win situation.

The Minister gets to make the right decisions with the approval of the industry. The industry participants get to have a better business, and the public gets to have a better service.

All sectors working in concert together to get the positive outcome that we have outlined is possible, if the right moves are made, **and this is the right move.**

ALSO

We have been making suggestions and asking for improvements to our industry for both the operatives and the improvement of service to the public for the last twenty years.

In 2010 we participated in the NSW Legislative Council's Inquiry into the NSW taxi industry
That inquiry made 59 recommendations, to our joint recall we cannot remember one of them that was implemented.

Of particular interest to us was Recommendation 50

*That NSW Transport and Infrastructure finalize the re-establishment of a taxi advisory committee, to meet regularly and report to the Director General of NSW Transport and infrastructure on it's deliberations, and consisting of a broad range of stakeholders, by **December 2010.***

Parliamentary Action

We have participated in two major inquiries.

In the first Cook enquiry in 2004 there were 160 written submissions.

In the Legislative council 2010 enquiry there were 68 written submissions and 21 oral submissions from witnesses at the hearings.

What has the Parliament done about this? Basically nothing!

All the Members of the NSW Parliament have sat on their fat backsides and done nothing for Ten years despite 69 recommendations from the 2010 enquiry, and Sixteen years from the Allan Cook enquiry. There has been more than ample input. What more do we have to do to get some

movement from the parliament. Is something going to happen this time? Is there any one in this parliament who has the ability to think things through?

The only things that have happened have been some bright ideas whispered by some staffer to the Minister so that decisions are made by people who do not understand the taxi industry. Almost all the ministerial decisions in recent times have been wrong and to the detriment of the taxi industry. The no destinations farce, the recent decision against the advice from IPART to cancel the harbor bridge return toll compensation, and the inexplicable decision to stop IPART issuing the annual TCI figures.

These mistakes would not have been made if the TAC with driver input had been implemented as recommended in 2004.

There have been two inquiries and both have clearly recommended that a Taxi advisory committee with driver input be implemented.

Incidentally, this has been promised by both John Robertson and Gladys Berejiklian.

If this committee only does one thing it must be to get the TAC with driver input in place.

This time let us get it done.

The Bailment System is out of date. The common metropolitan bailment is method 2. It is a legacy of the industrial arrangement between The Taxi industry Association and the TWU who conveniently took opposite sides of the industrial divide in relation to the Taxi Industry (Contract Drivers) Contract Determination Award which governs a metropolitan taxi driver's method of income [administered by the Office of Industrial Relations].

This means no other parties can get into the IRC hearings and have any input.

This Method 2 implies that the agreement between the Operator and Bailee includes full holiday pay, sick leave, and other benefits. The problem is that to provide for all these extras, it costs a lot of money, and this has to be extracted directly from the driver. So this makes the pay in very expensive. So what happens is most drivers cannot afford to pay that much on the meager earnings that they are able to glean. The common practice then, is for the driver to pay much less than the official maximum rate at a casual rate agreed verbally between Driver and Operator. So there is a big difference between the market [casual] rate that 98% of the drivers drive under, and the official rate as laid down by the award.

One problem with this is that after five years of steady common agreement on a casual basis, the driver leaves one day and claims all the holiday back pay. Under the industrial law this can be enforced. First of all, regardless of the legal position, this is mendacious, and causes bitterness and mistrust between Drivers and Operators. This has caused Operators great stress and there have been protests and disputes over this matter. This is not a healthy situation.

We have put forward a method three proposal in that we recognize the reality that drivers are not employees and the normal arrangement is on a casual basis. However this brings us to the take home pay per shift. This needs to reflect an extra rate to allow for the casual rate.

This then gets us to a standard of pay. The commonwealth minimum rate is twenty dollars per hour+ Taxi drivers are getting nowhere near that. So all of these arrangements for bailment, are meaningless at this stage.

The critical thing for the health of the taxi industry, is a reasonable rate of take home pay for a driver on a shift, and that is ballpark \$20 per hr.

Unfortunately the Bailment question cannot be solved at a Parliamentary level. It is a complex internal matter. The best thing that this committee can do is recommend the TAC with the driver input. Then we may debate and resolve the issue internally.

To get to where the bailment is meaningful, we have to get the average shift take home pay up to \$20 /hr. Just to get to the block near the ballpark, we need to get rid of Uber first. We have a long way to go.

The passenger service levy

Why is the Levy \$1.10? It is a NSW Govt. tax. It is not goods or service, GST does not apply.

The levy should first be removed from general revenue and placed in a separate fund supervised by independent trustees, one of whom should be a representative of the taxi industry. Every penny collected must be made transparent.

Then it should be collected and distributed until all persons disadvantaged by the point to point legislation have been fully compensated. If this cannot be done this time, taxi owners will have to resort to class action against the NSW government. The best way, is simply and directly correct the inequities that have occurred due to government actions.

So far the payments have been inadequate. As the Government has a source of revenue from the levy, they can afford to rethink the scale of the restitution.

The impact of the legislation on the value of taxi plates has been devastating to plate owners. People have lost their houses and undergone great financial and personal stress due to these actions. People have applied for compensation and been denied just and desperately needed compensation on vague and spurious grounds. This must be looked at again. The response to the impact of the point to point reforms has been inadequate. The government initiated these sovereign risks, the government is fully responsible to correct them. This must be done, not maybe. Fix the problem, or face class action, which is better? It will be done eventually one way or another.

When the full compensation is paid back to the plate owners then the government is entitled to take the plates back because they have been paid for, in effect bought back, provided that it is a fair and equitable price. So then that will be the end of the taxi plate market in NSW, and all is fair.

Then the government can institute a Singapore style system and lease all metropolitan plates, principally to owner drivers. Why should the government go to this trouble? Because it means that the government via the regulator can control directly the number of plates on issue. [this applies to metropolitan areas not country]. This means that the regulator can adjust the right amount of plates to balance between enough taxis to service customer demand and a reasonable return for the driver.

There are two ways that the average shift can get up to \$20/hr, increase the fares, or cut down the number of taxis. By cutting down the number of taxis to just enough to satisfy demand, the regulator can increase the take home pay of drivers without the customer having to pay more. That is what we mean by having a good service at a moderate cost. By these means, the regulator can deliver a motivated financially remunerated cohort of taxi drivers to produce a good service at a moderate price.

If the Commissioner is to replace the director general as the regulator then he can head the TAC where we should be able to get some useful work done.

Currently we have not been able to talk to the Commissioner. We used to talk to the Les Wielinga the director general on a regular basis.

All that we have seen from the commission is that they make the occasional raid on taxi just to prove that they are around. We have not seen any evidence that they are doing anything in regard to Rideshare. It is quite obvious that they don't have anything like the personnel to do that. How do you control 20,30, 50 thousand drivers or how many are there? Does anyone know? Does the commissioner know how many there are? Does the commissioner know who they are? We would like to know.

A Common Greenslip

There is one matter that the parliament can handle very easily, that is to put all commercial passenger or point to point vehicles into one common greenslip category which is option 2 on the SIRA paper. This may have to be initiated from a parliamentary imperative because if left to the dominant players it is unlikely to happen.

APPS

Is a taxi booking app a good thing? Yes it is. Uber brags that they have got a good app, but it is not unique. An app is just a piece of software that many people can write. There must be 2500 computer nerds in Australia who can write an app.

There must be at least 250 who can write a good professional app. Apps are actually a dime a dozen. There are already a number of taxi apps working. One curious thing, for some years the ACCC stopped the taxi industry app, until Uber was well and truly launched. Why was that?

Yes, an app is an advantage. It is a way to get a better booking service, but we don't need to suffer from international pirates to get it.

So we can dump the pirates and keep the app.

That is, add the app to the professional taxi driver. That is the way to get the best possible service to the passenger.

In Summary

What can you do?

Exercise the opportunity in the Point to Point Transport Act 2016 to terminate the RS experiment.
Get rid of Uber

Create a Taxi Advisory Committee that includes Driver and Operator Associations.

Create a common Greenslip category for all Commercial passenger vehicles.

Make sure that all of the Passenger Service Levy is deposited into a separate fund.

Pay out all the plate owners and people who have been affected by this 2016 Act.

Put out all metropolitan Taxi plates for lease from the regulator.

Take steps to lift the average take home pay for taxi drivers to \$20/hr.

Add the app to taxis and ditch the pirates.

See that IPART reinstates the annual TCI.

Don't worry about bailment. It is an internal matter best handled at the TAC.

Faithfully

Trevor Bradley
President TDBA NSW Inc 1701522