



Queensland Historic Motoring Council (Inc.)  
1376 Old Cleveland Road  
Carindale Qld 4152  
Phone: 07 3260 6197 a/hours

## **QHMC Bulletin 2-2015**

### **QHMC and the Special Interest Vehicle Scheme**

Proposals to lobby for changes to the Queensland SIVS registration scheme have been discussed extensively within QHMC for a number of years. There has also been considerable communication with member clubs, as well as surveys seeking member club's views and the level of support for the proposed changes.

A considerable amount of information on this subject can be found on the internet. Unfortunately it is difficult to obtain a complete and accurate picture of the issue from this information. There is also a level of misinformation, misunderstanding and biased / uninformed comment present in some of this information which may lead readers to draw incorrect conclusions.

This document outlines the discussions, proposals and results of surveys of QHMC member clubs since late 2013. This information is provided to ensure the issues involved and the discussions that have taken place are properly communicated.

Should you have questions or require further clarification of the facts please feel free to contact me.

Regards

Christine Stevens  
PRESIDENT  
Queensland Historic Motoring Council (Inc.)

February 20, 2015

### **Contents**

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| Page 2  | Bulletin 2 of 2013 is the initial proposal provided by DTMR in late 2013.   |
| Page 4  | QHMC member survey.   |
| Page 6  | A discussion paper addressing the proposal.   |
| Page 10 | Results of the survey.  |
| Page 12 | Appendix 1 is a letter to all QHMC clubs outlining the options and results of the final vote taken by the MOCC group. It also contains an explanation of the reasons for the QHMC's vote on the matter. |
| Page 15 | Is the latest letter to all QHMC clubs.   |



## QHMC BULLETIN 2 of 2013

**To: QHMC Club Delegates and Affiliated Clubs**  
**Subject: SIVS options as presented by TMR**

30<sup>th</sup> September 2013

For many years QHMC has been participating in quarterly one-on-one meetings with management from the Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR). These meetings offered the opportunity for two-way communication between DTMR and historic motoring enthusiasts and were effective in resolving issues including those regarding the current SIV (Special Interest Vehicle) concessional registration system.

A few months ago DTMR advised that it was creating the Motoring Organisation and Car Club (MOCC) forum that would allow the department to engage with a broader range of stakeholders operating vehicles registered under the SIV scheme. As a starter only TMR put forward the following options for consideration at the recent meeting.

A topic raised at these meeting was the actual SIV scheme and questions raised about

- a. Retaining the scheme as it is.
- b. Modifying the current scheme to allow more personal use
- c. Changing to an alternate scheme such as a log Book permit System
- d. Running the current scheme and a log book system in parallel.

QHMC is also proposing a variation on option 2.  
Maintain the current scheme but allow free use on Sundays.

These options are discussed in detail in the attached document.

It must be stressed that these proposals are nothing more than discussion starters. No commitment has been made to implement these of any changes, and it is possible that there may ultimately be no change at all to the current system.

As a result DTMR has requested that MOCC Forum members conduct a survey within their own groups with the goal of establishing the current attitudes of member clubs to determine which, if any of these options would be supported, and to what extent.

Whilst there are several log book schemes operating in other states of Australia it is the Victorian system introduced in 2011 that DTMR refer to in most discussions.

Under normal circumstances, so that clubs have time to meet and discuss the issues in full, approximately three months would be allowed to conduct a survey of this type. However TMR has requested that we provide a response by October 31.

I realize that the timing is very tight and that some clubs may have difficulty in canvassing the views of their members in such a short space of time, however I would ask that you give this important issue the attention it deserves and make every effort to meet the deadline imposed on us.

We suggest that this bulletin and its attachments be emailed or posted to all members of your club and that it be discussed at your club's October meeting. Also please request that members who are unable to attend the meeting advise by proxy their votes for the options listed.

At the meeting discuss the options and vote accordingly noting the actual numbers attending and numbers of those for and against each option.

Return the information to QHMC at the earliest convenience.

If your club is unable to meet in the required time frame please advise QHMC of your intended meeting date and the number of members to be surveyed so that DTMR can be advised that other clubs (stating an actual number) will be submitting accurate returns at a later date and I can formally table the amended totals at a future meeting.

Whilst I encourage clubs to seek the views of as many members as possible, it is important to remember that it is the clubs, not the individual members of those clubs that form the membership of QHMC and it will be the club's views alone that QHMC will be taking to DTMR.

Please also remember that when considering your responses that DTMR have been clear that the cost of any administrative changes required to modify or introduce a new system could be considerable and this cost will be fully recoverable through increases in charges. The more complex the changes the more administration cost is involved and this will be recovered through increased registration fees.

I apologise for the late notice of this but the timeframe was advised by DTMR and therefore beyond the control of QHMC.

If your club is absolutely unable to comply with the deadline please let me know ASAP. In such circumstances I urge you to still go ahead and complete the survey and advise me of the results at the earliest time possible so that I may include your valued response in a final report to be tabled at the next official TMR meeting.

This matter is one of great importance to not only members of QHMC affiliated clubs but also owners of historic vehicles across Queensland. Should you have any query please do not hesitate to contact QHMC TMR Liaison Officer Rod Graydon on email [rod.qhmc@gmail.com](mailto:rod.qhmc@gmail.com) or by telephone 0417 620877 (after hours if possible) Email completed surveys may be forwarded to:- [secretary@qhmc.org.au](mailto:secretary@qhmc.org.au)

Or post a hard copy to QHMC SURVEY 1376 Old Cleveland Rd Carindale Q 4152

Regards to all,

**Rod Graydon**  
TMR Liaison

**John Trask**  
President QHMC

# QHMC SIVS SURVEY OCTOBER 2013

## URGENT RESPONSE REQUIRED

This survey is important to the future directions of QHMC and the Queensland Heritage vehicle movement in general and the QHMC committee requests that you seek the views of your membership and return the completed survey promptly.

Please remember that QHMC represents the interests of member clubs, not those of individual members of these clubs. We therefore request that you discuss these questions with as many of your members as possible, preferably in a general meeting, and provide a consensus view rather than the view of an individual in your club.

We will continue to follow up clubs that have not returned their survey until it is felt that a sufficient number of responses have been received with which to form a reliable and supportable view of the issue.

**To complete the survey please follow the guidelines here.**

Questions 1, 2, 4 and 5 – Simply circle the appropriate response.

Question 3. Please insert the number of members in your club and then the number in favour of each option next to 'For' But each member may only vote for one option.

**CLUB NAME :-** .....

**CLUB MEMBER NUMBERS;-**.....

Q1. Should QHMC act on the wants and needs of:-

- (a) The majority of member clubs
- (b) The minority of member clubs
- (c) All member clubs regardless of whether these wants and needs conflict with those of other clubs

Q.2 Is your club satisfied with the current Special Interest Vehicle Scheme registration arrangements?

Yes

No

If no please explain the reasons here

.....

Q3. DTMR has offered the following 4 schemes as options to be considered for possible future SIV registration schemes. QHMC has added Option 2b to be considered and submitted.

Please refer to the attached SIV options pages when considering the options

- (1) Retain the current SIV scheme as it is? **For.....**
- (2) Retain the current scheme but with the option to purchase an additional 20 log book days at a cost yet to be determined by TMR. **For.....**
- (2b) Retain the current scheme but the addition of free use on Sundays. **For.....**

(3) Adopt a log book scheme similar to the Victorian scheme

- with 52 days use. **For.....**
- with 90 days as per Victorian system **For.....**

(4) Running the current scheme and a log book scheme concurrently. **For.....**

Q 4. How much extra, if anything, would your members be prepared to pay per year in registration charges for these changes? (please circle a, b, c, or d.)

- (a) Not prepared to pay any extra
- (b) Up to \$50pa
- (c) \$50 to \$100pa
- (d) More than \$100pa

Q 5. Would your club be prepared to administer any new arrangements, accept responsibility for, and enforce your club member's compliance with the rules? (please circle a or b)

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

**Additional comments**

For any query please contact QHMC TMR Rep Rod Graydon by email to [rod.qhmc@gmail.com](mailto:rod.qhmc@gmail.com) or if urgent 0417 620877 (after hours is preferable)

Please return this survey ASAP to [secretary@qhmc.org.au](mailto:secretary@qhmc.org.au) or post a hard copy to QHMC SURVEY 1376 Old Cleveland Road, Carindale 4152

# QHMC SIVS SURVEY 2013

## DTMR SIV SCHEME OPTIONS

30<sup>th</sup> September 2013

Below are the SIV scheme options put forward by DTMR, including information (from DTMR) on the various schemes.

QHMC has added comments relevant to each scheme where indicated.

QHMC has also added a 2b option of extended use of the current scheme to include 'free use' on Sundays.

### **NOTE:**

All schemes are relevant to the private use of the SIV vehicle and as per the current scheme **no commercial operation for financial gain or other reward will be permitted.**

### **Option 1:- Maintain Current SIV scheme**

The current SIV registration concession scheme is both cost effective and requires low administration of the system. The scheme enables car enthusiasts the benefit of reduced rates of registration fees and CTP insurance premiums with no limitations on the number of days or distance travelled (for club sanctioned events) QHMC additional information: - The scheme offers use of a SIV vehicle for club/charitable or educational events. There are also some concessions for the use of the vehicle for ceremonial events for direct family members. There is a road testing allowance of a 15 kilometres radius from the place of garage or workshop. There is no limitation on the distance that may be travelled to attend a sanctioned event or a workshop for the purpose of work being performed on the vehicle.

Vehicles registered under the current scheme also receive discounted comprehensive insurance by many insurance companies due to the limited use available on the scheme.

### **Summary of benefits**

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Flexibility offered | Low to moderate (depends on how the operator structures the use) |
| Cost                | Low  |
| Admin               | Low  |
| Optional scheme     | No   |

### **Option 2:- Offer current SIV scheme with option to purchase additional log book days for private use.**

This option continues to offer the current SIV scheme, with the additional option to purchase an additional 20 logbook days for private use at the time of renewal only. The additional days would be required to be recorded in a log book and would add an extra premium to the registration fees.

The log book days purchased must be used within the registration period and any unused days are forfeited. Operation under this option would require registered operators to be members of a registered car club and administration of the log books (distribution, auditing, and admin) would be the responsibility of the car clubs.

QHMC additional information: - TMR has not costed the extra premium for the purchase of the additional log book days. As per the TMR information car clubs would be responsible for the distribution, auditing and general administration of the log books.

### Summary of benefits

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Flexibility offered | Low to moderate (depending on the option chosen by the operator)      |
| Cost                | Unknown (this relates to the cost of introducing the log book scheme) |
| Admin               | High  |
| Optional scheme     | Yes   |

### OPTION 2 b Free personal use on Sundays.

This option has been raised by QHMC as a viable alternative to providing additional use to the current SIV scheme.

This option would allow SIV operators to extend their Sunday use and would not be reliant on participating in a club, charitable, educational or other event sanctioned under the current SIV scheme. It is anticipated that the majority of SIV use on Sundays would still be in attending such events but the option adds flexibility when travelling to and or from such events on Sundays or simply to drive the SIV vehicle for personal use on Sundays only.

**QHMC additional information:** - *This option allows for full personal use (except for hire or reward) for the 24 hour period of Sundays. There is no need for a log book and there are no plans at this stage to suggest extending the proposal to include Saturdays or public holidays.*

*There are no additional administration matters for car clubs and it is anticipated very little if any additional administration change would be required by TMR. As this is a new proposal by QHMC enquiries would need to be made with DTMR and CTP providers about whether any increase in SIV registration or CTP costs would be required to cover the additional use.*

### Summary of benefits

|                     |                 |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| Flexibility offered | Low to moderate |
| Cost                | Low (probably)  |
| Admin               | Low             |
| Optional scheme     | No              |

### Option 3:- Implement a log book scheme

Under a logbook scheme, operators would be restricted in their use of the SIV (similar to other states SIV models) but with differing operating conditions such as, to 52 days per year for private use. All daily operations must be recorded in a log book when the vehicle is operated more than 100 metres from the garage address. Log book must be carried in the vehicle and filled out for all operations prior to each day of operation. If the trip runs past midnight, another day's use will be required.

**QHMC additional information:** - *DTMR has indicated that if a log book system was introduced to QLD it would be offered with 52 days as opposed to the 45 or 90 day log book scheme operating in Victoria. As per DTMR information in Option 2, operation under this option would require registered operators to be members of a registered car club and administration of the log books (distribution, auditing, and admin) would be the responsibility*

of the car clubs. Note that under the proposed 52 days log book scheme road testing, driving to repairers etc. would require a log book entry and would be considered a day's use.

**Note:** - Other states offering Log Book Schemes require the use of a standardised 'Club Plate' issued by the relevant transport authority. No personalised plates are permitted. This condition has not been ratified by TMR at this stage.

### Summary of benefits

|                     |      |
|---------------------|------|
| Flexibility offered | High |
| Cost                | High |
| Admin               | High |
| Optional scheme     | No   |

### Option 4:- Running the current SIV scheme and a log book scheme concurrently

This option would allow operators to select between the currently offered SIV scheme and a log book scheme (as set out in Option 3) at the time of registration or renewal, which ever suits the conditions of use during that registration period. This would be a very complex system to administer and enforce. There would be significant changes required to implement.

**QHMC additional information:** - This scheme would allow the option to choose between both the current scheme which we hope would remain the same or very close in fees to what is currently charged but the log book option may be significantly more expensive due to the fact that not all SIV vehicles would be registered under this scheme. Also the log book option presented in option 3 allows only 52 days of use.

### Summary of benefits

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Flexibility offered | Low or high depending on the option chosen by the operator   |
| Cost                | Low or very high depending on the option chosen by the operator and the uptake.  |
| Admin               | Low or high depending on the option chosen by the operator.  |
| Optional scheme     | Yes  |
| Costs               | TMR has indicated that any costs associated with changes to the system would have to be recovered from users. As an indication, the expected costs of changing to a log book system are estimated to be in the order of \$100,000 to \$200,000, with the final costs depending on the complexity of the changes required. No estimate of increased fees have been offered by TMR but it would be over the current SIVS cost of under \$200 per year. |



## **SUMMARY**

The above information is to be considered when completing the attached survey. QHMC is yet to present Option 2 B (free Sunday use) to DTMR but this will be done at the next meeting, particularly if support is given for this option.

QHMC believes that if changes are implemented that require additional expenditure, these costs must be passed on only to those users who will derive the benefit from the change. i.e. SIVS users that are happy with the current arrangements must not be required to subsidise those who want change.

**Rod Graydon**  
TMR Liaison

**John Trask**  
President QHMC

**Trevor Shields**  
Secretary QHMC.

## QHMC SURVEY RESULTS

23 - 12 - 2013

Polled 113 clubs. Total 12,947 members

Responses below include the percentage of results of respondents.

Unfortunately due to the short timeframe not all clubs responded and the actual members listed here are only those that attended meetings or responded to their club hence a great number of members did not vote BUT this is a good cross section of historic motoring vehicle clubs.

### **OPTIONS FOR SIVS IN QUEENSLAND**

- (1) Retain the current SIV scheme as it is **57.9%**
- (2) Retain the current scheme but with the option to purchase an additional 20 log book days at a cost yet to be determined by TMR **4%**
- (2b) Retain the current scheme but the addition of free use on Sundays **29.1%**
- (3) Adopt a log book scheme similar to the Victorian scheme
  - For 52 days use **For 2.1%**
  - For 90 days as per Victorian system **For 3.9%**
- (4) Running the current scheme and a log book scheme concurrently. **6%**

Q 4. How much extra, if anything, would your members be prepared to pay per year in registration charges for these changes?

- (a) Not prepared to pay any extra **87%**
- (b) Up to \$50pa **10%**
- (c) \$50 to \$100pa **3%**
- (d) More than \$100pa **0 %**

Q 5. Would your club be prepared to administer any new arrangements, accept responsibility for, and enforce your club member's compliance with the rules?

- (a) Yes 14 clubs **23%**
- (b) No 46 Clubs **77%**

### **Additional comments included:-**

Need to retain personalised number plates

Like more freedom to use the car on weekends

Road test radius increase to 30 kilometres

Need to verify potential costs increase of each option to accurately gauge interest.

Option 1 (unchanged) if 2b unsuccessful.

Proof of club membership required for registration renewal

Remove road maintenance levy from SIV rego

15k radius for road testing is too restrictive

# Appendix 1

This letter was sent to QHMC member clubs by John Trask, the then QHMC President.

It outlines the outcome of the survey conducted in late 2013 and explains the reasons for QHMC's final decision to vote to retain the SIVS system unchanged.

January 2014

Dear QHMC members,

As President of QHMC I'd like to thank all of you who took the time to respond to the recent survey about proposed changes to Queensland's Special Interest Vehicle Scheme. I'm very aware that this is a particularly emotive issue and that it's been ongoing for some time. I'm also aware that many clubs are very unhappy that this issue keeps coming up in spite of widespread opposition to change, and that it generates a significant amount of ill-will when it does.

This letter is to provide some clarification of the current discussions with the Department of Transport and Main Roads.

Firstly, QHMC did not commence formal negotiations for change or additions to the SIVS scheme, and it isn't clear where this started. However you should be aware that QHMC is only one of six enthusiast groups represented at DTMR's Motoring Organisation and Car Club meetings where this matter is being discussed. Like the other participants, we are included by invitation and have only one vote.

The current round of discussions about changes to the scheme was started by DTMR, which offered a number of options as well as some, as it turned out, very rubbery estimates of the costs involved. The survey QHMC sent out in October was based on these, and canvassed member club's attitudes to the alternatives, the expected costs and a number of other pertinent issues. Except in one case, free Sunday use, which was suggested by QHMC, the alternatives offered and the estimated cost increases you were asked to consider and vote on were provided by DTMR. The timing of the response was also dictated entirely by DTMR.

With the benefit of hindsight, the time allowed to respond was far too short to allow the formulation of a properly thought through survey and for member clubs to discuss and respond to it in a considered way. It's quite clear that some parts of the survey caused a degree of confusion in some responses and some respondents found it difficult to provide a considered response due to the approximate nature of the costings provided.

Full details of results of this survey have already been communicated to member clubs, however on the whole the majority indicated that they were happy with the current arrangements. A reasonable number showed interest in the free Sunday use option and a smaller number chose other options. Significantly though, only a relatively small number of respondents were willing to pay extra for the additional use and few clubs would accept any additional administrative work that may have resulted.

In mid-December DTMR again asked for our views on a refined set of options and some updated costings. These were as follows.

Option 1. Maintain the current arrangements with no change to costs. Registration cost \$184.40

Option 2. Extend the current scheme to include a compulsory logbook for private use. Estimated costs would be \$230.71 for 14 days and \$273.59 for 26 days. Clubs would be required to administer the scheme's operation.

Option 3. Extend the current scheme to include an optional logbook for private use. Estimated costs would be \$241.71 for 14 days and \$284.59 for 26 days. However these costs will be dependent on the uptake of this option. Clubs would be required to administer the scheme's operation.

Option 4. Current scheme extended to include private use on Sunday. Estimated total registration costs range from \$227.28 to \$304.18 depending on whether one Sunday a month or every Sunday is selected.

Option 5. Log book only. An entry would be required in the log book each day the vehicle was operated more than 100 metres from the garage address. Estimated total registration costs range from \$270.10 to \$330.85 depending on whether a 40 day or a 90 day log book is elected. DTMR will require clubs to audit and review log books on a regular basis. All clubs will have to be registered with DTMR and a set of guidelines or criteria about how a club is defined will have to be developed.

Option 6. Current scheme and a log book scheme concurrently. Conditions and requirements would be similar to option 5. Estimated total registration costs range from \$184.40 to \$339.99 depending on whether the customer chose the existing scheme or opted for a log book. Cost of the log book will also be dependent on the level of take up of this option.

### **Important notes**

- All costs are estimates based on current 6 cylinder motor vehicle registration fees and high-level estimates provided by key business areas, which are subject to change.
- Compulsory Third Party is included in the costs and has been estimated based on (the) Motor Accident Insurance Commission's indication that fees will increase proportionally (due) to the increased risk exposure, and are subject to change.
- Costings do not include any consideration of additional club costs for administering optional logbook fees.
- Logbook estimates are based on a 5000 take up rate with a cost recovery model over a five year period.
- Each option includes registration, estimated CTP, Traffic Improvement Fee, system changes and administration costs for DTMR.

It's also important to remember that DTMR advised early in the discussions that all set up and administration costs of such changes would be fully recoverable.

Unfortunately the timeframe for this response was even tighter than last time, with a deadline of December 17 being set - less than four business days in total. The Management Committee believed this to be completely unreasonable as it effectively prevented any proper consideration or discussion of the issues, or any widespread consultation with member clubs. Again, this was not the doing of QHMC.

I, and the QHMC Management Committee, felt strongly that we should not be rushed into making such an important decision and I therefore instructed the QHMC's DTMR liaison to request an

extension. However this was not granted. DTMR was insistent that the deadline be met so that a brief could be provided to the minister early in the New Year.

The other issue that shaped our response is that during discussions at a recent QHMC general meeting, it was agreed that negotiations for change had to be on the basis that any new options would be a full user pays system and that those who did not wish to participate in a changed system must not be financially, or otherwise, penalised. There were no objections to this, nor did it generate any discussion. As a result, QHMC asked for formal acknowledgement from DTMR that those who chose to stay with the current SIVS scheme would not be disadvantaged or expected to fund any change that they did not want and would not gain an advantage from. DTMR refused to provide this assurance.

As this was a key, and non-negotiable, aspect of any proposed change, the committee felt that it had no alternative but to vote to retain the existing scheme unchanged.

While the Management Committee understands that a minority of members would like more flexibility of use than the current arrangements allow, it is simply not reasonable that the majority, who don't want this change, should run the risk of financial or other detriment if, for whatever reason, DTMR decided to spread the costs over all SIVS users.

While I believe most member clubs would probably not oppose an addition to the SIVS arrangements that allowed a bit more flexibility for those who felt they needed it, I don't believe they would, or should, accept the risk of having to fund a system that they don't want, won't use and from which they would gain no advantage. Therefore I cannot in good conscience commit QHMC members, the majority of whom are happy with the current arrangements, to the potential of an unknown increase in SIVS fees in order to satisfy a few clubs that feel they want this change.

The results of this latest DTMR vote (mid-December 2013) are as follows.

| <b>Organisation</b>                         | <b>Vote</b> |
|---|-------------|
| Australian Confederation of Motor Clubs QLD | Option 3    |
| Australian Street Rod Federation Inc. QLD   | Option 3    |
| MG Car Club QLD                             | Option 1    |
| Mustang Owners Club of Australia QLD        | Option 1    |
| Queensland Historic Motoring Council        | Option 1    |
| Queensland Motorised Sports Council         | Option 4    |

At this point further discussion has ceased until sometime in the New Year. DTMR advises that the result of the latest vote will be included in a briefing paper to the minister for his consideration.

My apologies for a rather long-winded explanation of the events, however I'm firmly of the view that QHMC should be open and all members should be fully informed of such matters.

I would also take this opportunity to remind you that the QHMC is run by volunteers who give up their time to support you and your hobby. Please treat them with the respect they deserve - even if you don't necessarily agree with the outcome.

Regards,  
John Trask



---

## **QHMC Bulletin 1-2015**

### **SIVS Registration Scheme**

19<sup>th</sup> January 2015

**To:** QHMC Club Delegates and Affiliated Clubs

**Subject:** SIVS – Current QHMC Committee's position

**The following statement is to clarify the QHMC's position on amendments to Queensland's SIVS registration scheme.**

Early in 2014, the QHMC and other groups that comprise the Motoring Organisation and Car Club group that regularly meet with the Department of Transport and Main Roads, discussed the matter of changes to the SIVS scheme and the possibility of adopting an optional logbook system along the lines of that currently in use in Victoria.

DTMR investigated the proposal and produced a plan and costings for such a scheme for consideration. It was proposed to operate in conjunction with the current SIVS arrangements. This was put to a vote of all QHMC member clubs, however it failed to receive majority support and as a result DTMR decided to withdraw the proposal.

#### **Pertinent points**

The decision not to pursue the matter further was made by the 2013-2014 QHMC Management Committee. The current committee is aware of the reasons for this and is fully supportive of the decision.

The current committee is not lobbying for change to the SIVS requirements, nor is it a current topic of discussion.

The QHMC constitution is very clear that majority support is required before such matters can be pursued. Given there have been no significant changes to the issue which may alter the outcome of any discussions; there are no current plans to revisit this matter.

Any member club can have this issue reconsidered by the QHMC committee by submitting a detailed written proposal outlining the proposed changes, a business case supporting the change and an indication that, if put to a vote of member clubs, there is a reasonable prospect of achieving majority support, and how this was determined.

QHMC can provide information on the costings and mandatory requirements set out by DTMR in its proposal. The decision to take such proposals to a vote of QHMC member clubs will be entirely at the discretion of the management committee.

Regards

Christine Stevens

PRESIDENT

Queensland Historic Motoring Council (Inc.)