**Transport (Compliance and Miscellaneous) (Conduct on Public Transport) Regulations 2015**

**Summary of public submissions and responses**

| **Regulation Number** | **Topic** | **Submitted by** | **Comments** | **Department response** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General comments** | | | | |
| - | Accessible transport | Public Transport Ombudsman | Supports the proposed regulations, in particular those that:   * Prohibit a person from bringing a bicycle into a metropolitan train through the first door of the first carriage * Prohibit a person from being in possession of a bicycle near the first door of the first carriage * Require a person not in a wheelchair to vacate the designated area upon request for a person in a wheelchair.   Support for the regulations given because the Public Transport Ombudsman (PTO) had a small but steady stream of complaints from consumers who experience difficulty in accessing public transport, often because of the behaviour of other travellers. But the PTO believes the complaints received represent only a small percentage of disadvantaged consumers who regularly experience difficulty accessing public transport (based on an independent survey of 53 organisations representing people who were socially, economically, intellectually or physically disadvantaged and who used public transport). | Noted. |
| - | Public consultation | Anonymous commuter | The Department should have conducted public consultation forums on the proposed regulations and invited submissions about problems on the system. | The Department advertised the draft regulations and RIS on 1 May 2015 and invited submissions in the manner required under the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1994* andthe Premier's Guidelines. |
| - | Regulation of anti-social behaviour | Anonymous commuter | Agrees there is a continued need to regulate anti-social behaviour on public transport but comments that any regulations need to be enforced. | Noted. |
| - | Regulation of conduct on public transport | PTUA | Supports the development and enforcement of appropriate regulations to ensure the safety, integrity and effective operation of the public transport system for the benefit of passengers. | Noted. |
| - | Extra offences that should be included in the regulations | Anonymous commuter | Submits that there should be regulation and enforcement around the following:   * Regulations prohibiting eating and drinking generally on public transport because this is the situation in Japan which we could emulate. * Have quiet carriages on trains, ie. no phones. The commuter believes that Victoria should attempt to follow the example of Japan. * Remove all commercial advertising on public transport and stations. * The freed up advertising space could be used to impart civility, manners and decorum to the wider commuting public. Basic information such as no feet on seats, stand for the elderly, headphone volume low, stand aside on platform and wait for people to disembark before boarding, don't leave rubbish, etc. * Require all manual labour workers in dirty work clothes to travel in rear carriages on vinyl seats which can be washed and wiped. Dirty and greasy clothes leave residue on fabric seats which affects commuters wearing business attire. * Links with schools for education programs to raise awareness of safe and correct commuting behaviour. * Drivers to [consistently] make announcements when trains are stopped between stations. In the age of modern communications they should be able to find out what the issue is and report to passengers. | These matters are noted. However, they are not matters covered by the regulations.  Public Transport Victoria (PTV) is responsible for managing agreements with public transport operators where many of the suggestions made could be dealt with.   * Prohibiting eating and drinking generally on public transport was considered as part of the review of the existing conduct regulations. However, the idea seems to have little support and it was also considered that a prohibition may create health issues in some circumstances. For example, not allowing people to consume water during summer may contribute to dehydration. In addition, not allowing eating may also cause certain medical conditions, such as diabetes, to be exacerbated in some people. * There are operational limitations to establishing mandatory quiet carriages. However, V/Line has introduced quiet carriages on some of its services and has advised that it is self-regulating as people talking on phones, etc are sometimes asked to stop by other commuters. * Noted, however this matter does not form part of the regulations. This comment has been referred to PTV for consideration. Further information about the progress of the matter may be obtained from PTV. * Noted however does not form part of the regulations. This comment has been referred to PTV for consideration. Further information about the progress of the matter may be obtained from PTV. * This constitutes discrimination and would breach relevant laws. * Noted, however does not form part of the regulations. This comment has been referred to PTV for consideration. Further information about the progress of the matter may be obtained from PTV. * This comment has been referred to PTV for consideration. Further information about the progress of the matter may be obtained from PTV. |
|  | Penalties | Metro Trains Melbourne | Metro seeks increases to fines and penalties for life-threatening offences. From Metro's perspective, the quantum of the penalties should be proportionate to the life-threatening nature of the offences, not to mention the affect that fatalities and near misses have on train drivers.  Maximum penalties for certain offences should be increased, in particular:   * Trespass – increase penalties to 70 penalty units ($10, 332.70) * Train surfing – to 70 penalty units * Pedestrians illegally crossing at level crossings – to 40 penalty units ($5,904.40) * Coupler riding – to 70 penalty units * Holding doors open – to 40 penalty units * Getting on and off a moving train – to 40 penalty units   In comparison:   * The maximum for current penalties is approx. $350 * Tullamarine Airport fines person $10,000 for entering the tarmac (which is life threatening) * The MCG fines patrons $8,000 if they enter the pitch (noting that this is not a life-threatening offence). | The maximum court penalties for the offences of trespass and train surfing are located in the Act and as such are not part of the changes to regulations being proposed as part of this package of reforms.  In relation to the other offences:   * It is proposed to increase the maximum penalty for interfering with automatic doors on vehicles to 20 penalty units ($2,952.20) and the infringement fine to 2.5 penalty units ($369.02) * It is proposed to increase the maximum penalty for pedestrians crossing level crossings to 20 penalty units ($2,952.20) and the infringement fine to 2.5 penalty units ($369.02) |
|  | Inclusion of buses and bus premises within the scope of the regulations | PTUA | A number of regulations that historically applied specifically to railway and tramway vehicles and premises are proposed to be extended to include buses and bus premises. PTUA supports this in the interests of consistency. The wording of such rules should however ensure that this extension does not inadvertently prohibit the conduct that is explicitly permitted under other regulations, eg. the riding of bicycles in on-road bus lanes. | Noted. The Department considers that there are no such inadvertent effects. |
| **Comments on specific regulations** | | | | |
| 1(d)(iii) | Objectives | BAV | **Suggestion**: inserting 'not' after 'is' in the first line of (d)(iii), so it reads 'use public transport equipment in a way that does not cause harm, or is **not** likely to cause harm, to themselves or others;'. | Agree with this suggestion. Change made to regulations in response to the comment. |
| 4 | Revocation | BAV | Is DEDJTR intending to revoke the Transport (Passenger Vehicles) Regulations 2005 as well? If not, what becomes of them? (Particularly Division 2 of Part 5 of those Regulations which dealt with driver obligations; and the dealing with lost property.) | Yes. The revocation is now included in the proposed regulations. |
| 5(1) | Definitions – authorised person (conduct) | BAV | This is a query which relates to the entire proposed regulations. The query being does DEDJTR intend for this definition to include bus drivers? The proposed regulations appear to deal with 'authorised person (conduct)' and 'bus driver' separately - for example, see proposed regulations 16(f) and 66. See comments below. This needs to be considered in detail given it is extremely important that the scope of rights or powers bestowed in bus drivers needs to be clear and unequivocal. | Paragraph (d) of the definition refers to "a person employed by a passenger transport company or a bus company who has duties in relation to the issue, inspection or collection of tickets for travel in, or the operation of, a passenger vehicle. This clearly includes bus drivers.  As a result of the comment, references to bus driver have been removed from regulations 16 and 66. |
| 6 | Liability for offences | BAV | Again does DEDJTR intend for the reference to authorised person (conduct) to include bus drivers? In any event, why doesn't this exclusion from liability for an offence under these proposed regulations not extend to employees etc of bus companies? | Yes, this is intended. The regulation has been amended to include reference to employees of a bus company from being liable for an offence for anything reasonably done in the course of their duties. |
| 10 | Creating obstructions | Anonymous commuter | Agrees there is a continued need to regulate behaviours that create obstructions or endanger others because commuter behaviour is often questionable. | Noted. |
| 11 | Carriage of bicycles | Anonymous commuter | Bicycles should only be carried in the last carriage of a train and should not be carried on trams or buses. | Noted. |
| PTUA | Supports the proposals to clarify the circumstances under which bicycles are permitted on public transport. Suggests there should be a renewed education campaign on sensible placement of bicycles on trains. The ban on using the first door of the first carriage is a reasonable compromise that maintains the right of carriage of bicycles but avoids conflict with priority facilities for people with disabilities.  Supports the rule relating to bikes on tram stop platforms but suggests clarification may be needed in relation to the meaning of a "tram stop platform". | Noted. This comment has been referred to PTV for consideration. Further information about the progress of the matter may be obtained from PTV. |
|  |  | BAV | This section needs to be considered further. There are ongoing discussions between the bus industry and PTV regarding a trial of bike racks on the outside of buses; there is also a possibility in the future of trialling a bike rack inside a bus or coach (e.g., hanging rack). This section shouldn't preclude those possibilities. | Noted. It is not intended that these regulations preclude future opportunities for the carrying of bikes on buses. |
| 11(3)(4) | Carriage of bicycles | V/Line | V/Line requests that the proposed new offence for the carriage of bicycles be amended to enable the carriage of bicycles on V/Line coaches in accordance with the current Victorian Fares & Ticketing Manual 2015 (FTM).  The proposed regulation provides for bicycles on buses to be folded and stored in a bag or cover and does not distinguish between coaches and buses and so it would apply to regional V/Line coaches. The FTM permits bicycles on V/Line coaches on "services equipped to carry bicycles", without any requirement for bicycles to be folded and stored in a bag or cover. | Agreed. Change made to proposed regulations. |
| 14 | Unauthorised entering and leaving vehicles | BAV | Again does DEDJTR intend for the reference to authorised person (conduct) to include bus drivers in this section 14? | Yes, bus drivers are authorised persons (conduct) for the purpose of the regulations. |
| 14-15 |  | Anonymous commuter | Supports the regulations relating to entering, travelling or riding public transport in an unsafe manner if they make the process more orderly. States the regulations should include more offences for other types of behaviours or AOs should at least enforce the offences already included in the regulations | Noted. No change proposed to the regulations. |
| 15(5) | Travelling in, or mounting of, places not intended for travel | PTUA | Suggests inclusion of trams within the exception regarding attaching bikes to the vehicles in order not to foreclose possible future vehicle improvements. | Noted. It is not intended that the regulations preclude future opportunities for vehicle improvements which may allow the carrying of bikes on trams. |
| 16(f) | Interference with gates and doors | BAV | Another example 'authorised person (conduct)' and 'bus driver' being used separately. Is this intentional? | Reference to bus driver removed as a bus driver is an authorised person (conduct). |
| 17 | Operating equipment or vehicle | BAV | Suggestion: Insert the words other than a bus driver, before 'without reasonable excuse', so that it reads 'A person must not, other than a bus driver, without reasonable excuse...'. | It is not necessary to change the regulations as it is understood that a bus driver must necessarily operate equipment on a bus when undertaking their duties. |
| 20 | Damage to property | Anonymous commuter | Does not believe that the regulations are strong enough with respect to damage to property because the carriages are often covered with graffiti. | Noted. No change is needed to the regulations. The penalty for graffiti It is noted that graffiti is further regulated by the *Graffiti Prevention Act 2007*. |
| 22 | Crossing railway tracks or designated tramway tracks by pedestrians | PTUA | Recommends changing the wording of r.22(2) so that gates or signals at an adjacent vehicle crossing only apply where there are no gates or signals at the foot crossing itself, in accordance with current safe working practice. Suggested the following words—  *A pedestrian must not cross or attempt to cross railway tracks or designated tramway tracks at a place*  *provided for crossing by pedestrians if—*  *(a) gates at the crossing are closed or locked; or*  *(b) warning signals or devices are operating at the crossing; or*  *(c) where no gates or warning signals or devices are present at the crossing, gates at an adjacent vehicle*  *crossing are closed or warning signals or devices are operating at an adjacent vehicle crossing; or*  *…(etc)* | There have been numerous fatalities and near misses at level crossings over the years. These have had tragic consequences for individuals, families and communities. The relevant regulation was designed to protect members of the public who cross railway lines and other potentially affected persons including persons who travel on trains and train drivers. Any proposed change to the regulation would likely be highly technical and would require careful consideration to ensure that it did not lead to unacceptable increases in safety risks.  The Department has initiated several discussions with Public Transport Victoria on this matter and proposed a number of solutions. Unfortunately, due to the connected safety concerns of passenger and vehicle crossings, along with V/Line express trains passing through some stations, an acceptable regulatory compromise has not yet been reached. Authorised officers are required to carefully consider the actions of people at these crossings before reporting matters to the Department. Also, people who feel that they have been served with an infringement notice in unfair circumstances can seek to have the matter reviewed by the Department.  It is proposed that the matter be referred to the Metro Network Development Partnership for further discussion to inform development of an agreed approach to be put to the Minister for Public Transport for approval. The Metro Network Development Partnership is the main operational management group for Metro activities, chaired by PTV with PTV and Metro Trains Melbourne membership.  Further information about the progress of the matter may be obtained from PTV. |
| 22 – 23 | Crossing tracks by pedestrians and driving across tracks | Anonymous commuter | Agrees that there is a continued need to regulate the crossing of railway tracks and designated tramway tracks by pedestrians and motor vehicles because the behaviour is dangerous.  Also agrees with the assumption that some individuals continue to take risks around level crossings and railway tracks, especially when drug and alcohol affected. | Noted. |
| 25(1) | Entering a pit between platforms | PTUA | Supports the enactment and enforcement of rules that prohibit reckless behaviour, particularly the general prohibition on entering onto railway tracks or specific designated tramway tracks.  However, 25(1) seeks to create an offence out of crossing tramway tracks that are embedded within the normal street environment. PTUA's view that existing road rules adequately address the hazard of crossing between tram stop platforms. Suggests that "tramway track" be replaced with "designated tramway track". | Stepping into pits between tram stops is a dangerous safety issue which has resulted in people twisting ankles or falling. It is considered that the Road Rules do not adequately address the safety hazard of crossing between tram stop platforms. In addition, AOs cannot enforce Road Rule offences and this is important in ensuring effective enforcement and people not putting themselves in unsafe situations. Accordingly, it is not proposed to change the regulation. |
| 29 | Sound equipment | Anonymous commuter | Agrees there continues to be a need to regulate sound and noise on public transport because it's often too noisy and many are inconsiderate of others. | Noted. |
| PTUA | Supported in the interests of passenger comfort and in light of technological evolution.  A related issue is music or radio broadcasted by bus drivers, and the use of audible advertising screens at railway stations. Many passengers find this practice a nuisance therefore supports a clarification or extension to this rule requiring a bus or tram driver or AO to cease any such broadcast on request from a passenger, regardless of prior authorisation. | In relation to music or radio on buses, in order to progress this as a possible future regulation, further evidence is required to show that more people find the playing of music on a bus a nuisance as opposed to soothing. Further discussions will occur with PTV and BAV.  This comment has been referred to PTV for consideration. Further information about the progress of the matter may be obtained from PTV. |
| 32 | Smoking | Anonymous commuter | Agrees there is a continued need to regulate smoking in public transport vehicles and at public transport premises to a significant extent but believes somewhat that current regulations prohibiting smoking on public transport vehicles and on train and tram platforms have improved passenger amenity. | Noted. |
| PTUA | Supports the principle of smoking bans on public transport vehicles, in enclosed and covered passenger spaces throughout the public transport system, etc. | Noted. |
| VicPol | Believes consideration should be given to including a prohibition on the use of personal vaporisers (ie. e-cigarettes), or the action of vaping, to provide comfort for those that perceive the use of personal vaporisers as detrimental to their environment, especially within the confines of increasingly patronised public transport. | Noted. The Victorian Government has not yet expressed a policy position on regulating e-cigarettes. It appears that the evidence is not yet clear about the potential risks and/or benefits of e-cigarettes, and there is continuing debate about the issue at a national and international level. The Department of Health and Human Services is monitoring developments and research concerning the potential risks and/or benefits of e-cigarettes. |
| 32(3) & (4) | Smoking | BAV | Subsections 3 and 4 as drafted do not 'work' for the bus industry. Whilst bus companies will be occupiers or owners of public transport premises, they do not have responsibility for the maintenance or upkeep of bus stops, including putting 'no smoking' signs on or in a bus stop, that generally resides with PTV or a local council. | The comment is noted. The obligation to put up 'no smoking signs' rests with the occupier or owner of the infrastructure; ie. the infrastructure manager. In most cases, the infrastructure manager is the local council or in some cases, PTV. |
| 35 | Feet on seats | PTUA | Supports the prohibition on placing feet on seats or other public transport furniture. However, believes that the wording can be interpreted technically in a way far broader than intended. A person also commits an offence under this rule if their feet come in contact with a seat post, the base of a pole or the bottom of the outside wall of a vehicle. The PTUA is aware of anecdotal reports that such overboard interpretations have been used over the past decade against passengers whose behaviour has not raised concern. PTUA therefore recommends that the rule includes an exception where feet make inadvertent contact with a part of the vehicle near the floor, provided the foot remains in contact with the floor. | Noted. It is considered that the regulation as currently worded does not capture persons who inadvertently place their feet on seat posts, etc. Authorised officers are instructed to only report persons placing their feet on actual seats. |
| 35 | Feet on seats | Anonymous commuter | Agrees that there is a continued need to regulate the placing of feet on furniture on public transport but that it needs more enforcement. | Noted. |
| 37 | Graffiti | PTUA | Supports the proposed change that allows for "appropriate written authorisation". This serves to codify existing practice and does not in their view dilute the ban on unauthorised graffiti.  Considers that passengers should be entitled to a normal view through transparent windows that are not impeded through the placement of advertising material placed by transport operators. | This comment has been referred to PTV for consideration. Further information about the progress of the matter may be obtained from PTV. |
| V/Line | V/Line requests that the Department considers increasing the maximum penalty for the offence of marking graffiti from 10 penalty units to 20 penalty units. This would bring the maximum penalty in line with reg.20, damage to property, and reg.21, offences in relation to burning substances on public transport or premises. The cost and impact of graffiti to V/Line can be as serious as any other property damage, leading to both expensive clean up and the need to pull rolling stock out of operation which can result in services being cancelled. | Noted. It is proposed to increase the maximum penalty for this offence to 20 penalty units in the regulations. Costs in the RIS support an increase in the maximum penalty, having regard to clean up costs of graffiti and the effect on the network. |
| 39 | Animals on PT | Anonymous commuter | Agrees there is a continued need to regulate the carriage of animals on public transport and believes there should be no animals on public transport or, that animals travel in the rear carriage if necessary. | Noted. |
| 39-40 |  | PTUA | Agrees with the proposal to broaden references to dogs with more general references to animals in the interests of fairness and consistency. | Noted. |
| 43 – 44 | Vacating seats for special needs | Anonymous commuter | Agrees that people with special needs should be given priority seating on public transport because they deserve to be seated. Also considers that most able bodied people vacate their seats for those with special needs in any case. | Noted. |
| 44 | Vacating seat for special needs person | PTUA | Supports the principle of seat priority for people with special needs. Also supports the limitation that the rule only applies where seats are unreserved and where all designated seats (to which the person with special needs has reasonable access) are already occupied by those with a special need. | Noted. |
| 45 | Vacating areas for persons in wheelchairs | V/Line | V/Line recommends that the proposed new offence for vacating seats for persons in wheelchairs be amended to refer to mobility aids rather than wheelchairs. Any such designated space on V/Line services is for mobility aids not solely wheelchairs and this amendment will ensure customers using scooters are treated equivalently to wheelchair passengers under the Regulations. | Noted. The suggestion has been catered for in the regulations. A definition of ***wheelchair*** as defined in the Road Rules (see regulation 5) has been included in the regulations and the definition captures other mobility devices. |
| PTUA | Comments that this is a reasonable extension of the priority principle that applies to designated seats. | Noted. |
| 47(1) & (2) | Unauthorised travel and seating | BAV | 1. Does unauthorised travel in proposed regulation 47(1) include failing to travel without a valid ticket? If it is, how does it relate to Regulation 6(1) of the Transport (Ticketing) Regulations 2006 which already requires passengers to travel with a valid ticket? This regulation should be more limited to special conditions like sitting in a nominated seat or compartment etc?  2. Does DEDJTR intend for the reference to authorised person (conduct) in 47(1) and (2) to refer to a bus driver? | 1. The regulation is already limited to persons who occupy compartments, sleeping berths and seats. No change to the regulations is required.  2. Bus drivers are authorised persons (conduct). |
| 66 | Request to leave vehicle or premises | PTUA | Supports the extension of certain powers of bus drivers under the PV regulations to tram drivers in the interests of consistency.  However makes the comment that drivers are currently advised not to involve themselves in confrontational situations and they should be able to summon effective police backup in emergency situations. | Noted. |
| 66(2) |  | BAV | Does DEDJTR intend for the reference to authorised person (conduct) to refer to bus driver? If not, the right in section 66(2)(b) for an authorised person (conduct) to ask a passenger to leave if they are so affected by alcohol or other substances etc should be inserted into section 66(1). | Bus drivers are authorised persons (conduct). |
| 66(3) |  | BAV | Does DEDJTR intend for the reference to authorised person (conduct) to refer to bus driver? We assume the answer is 'yes'. If not, then a bus driver will have no right to ask a passenger to leave the bus in any of the circumstances set out in proposed regulation 66(3) - failure to comply with a request to provide a valid ticket; failure to provide evidence of entitlement to hold a concession ticket; failure to have a valid fare. Assuming the answer is yes, for completeness, we note the following potential issues with the scope of Transport (Ticketing) Regulations 2006 (TTR) for sections 66(3)(a) and 66(3)(c) respectively. | Bus drivers are authorised persons (conduct). |
| 66(3)(a) |  | BAV | Assuming 'authorised person (ticketing)' under the TTR includes a bus driver, it doesn't appear that a bus driver can ask a passenger to produce a valid ticket and then ask them to leave if they don't produce it. This is because whilst under regulation 7 of the TTR an authorised person (ticketing) may make such a request, he or she can only do so when the passenger is 'travelling in or has just left' the passenger vehicle. It doesn't appear to us that either of these circumstances relate appropriately to the role of a bus driver - i.e., a passenger entering the bus is not 'travelling in', nor can the driver do much when a passenger has 'just left' the bus. | This has been rectified in the Transport (Ticketing) Amendment (Bus Driver Obligation) Regulations 2015 which were developed separately but made at the same time as the new conduct regulations. |
| 66(3)(c) |  | BAV | Assuming 'authorised person (ticketing)' under the TTR includes a bus driver, there seems to be a significant limit on the authority on a bus driver to ask a passenger to leave a bus if they 'reasonably believe' that the passenger is not holding a valid ticket, because they don't appear to have the right to ask a passenger to produce a valid ticket (See previous comment for regulation 66(3)(a)).  Again, it doesn't appear that a bus driver can ask a passenger to produce evidence of their entitlement to a concession ticket and then ask them to leave if they don't produce it, for the same reasons set out in previous comment for regulation 66(3)(a). That is, whilst under regulation 9 of the TTR an authorised person (ticketing) may make such a request, he or she can only do so when the passenger is 'travelling in or has just left' the passenger vehicle. It doesn't appear to us that either of these circumstances relate appropriately to the role of a bus driver - i.e., a passenger entering the bus is not 'travelling in', nor can the driver do much when a passenger has 'just left' the bus. | This has been rectified in the Transport (Ticketing) Amendment (Bus Driver Obligation) Regulations 2015 which were developed separately but made at the same time as the new conduct regulations. |
| **Rules proposed to be discontinued** | | | | |
| - | Students to vacate seats | PTUA | Supports discontinuing the application of the rule to primary school students, but recommends that the Department take into account wider community views on retaining the rule as it applies to secondary school students. | Noted. This view was considered as part of the review of the Conduct Regulations. However, operationally it is often difficult to distinguish between primary and secondary students. The regulation must be clear on its face and easily enforceable. Accordingly, it was considered that the regulation should be discontinued. |
| - | Exiting trams on right hand side | PTUA | Supports the discontinuance of this rule and believes this is long overdue. | Noted. |
| - | Lost property in buses and other vehicles | PTUA | Considers there should be a more limited form of the rule to include:   * An obligation for anyone finding lost property on public transport to take reasonable steps to hand it to the owner of the property, a public transport employee, an AO or police. * An obligation on public transport operators to develop and publish procedures for the retention and recovery of lost property and ensure employees act in accordance with those procedures. | Noted. Not returning lost property found is an offence under section 74 of the *Crimes Act 1958*. Generally anything relating to people finding lost property is dealt with by the police.  Public transport operators have processes and procedures in place for the handling of lost property. For example, it is a requirement for bus drivers to check their buses and hand in any lost property at the end of each shift. |
| **Comments on the RIS** | | | | |
| p.25 | RoNCs | V/Line | The RIS states that RoNCs are issued by AOs employed by PTV, MTM, YT and some bus companies. V/Line advises that it also employs AOs which issue RoNCs | Noted. |
| p.26 | FTM | V/Line | The RIS states that the FTM prohibits some passenger conduct on public transport, including the carriage of bicycles and surfboards, the use of motorised vehicles, the carriage of animals and seating and drinking on V/Line trains and coaches. V/Line advises that the FTM does not prohibit these activities for V/Line services, rather sets out conditions around such matters. | Noted. |
| p.71 | Alcohol consumption | V/Line | The RIS makes comments about alcohol being served on long haul V/Line services. V/Line advises that it ceased to serve alcohol on all train services in December 2008 and V/Line no longer holds a liquor licence. This decision was made in order to address anti-social behaviour arising from alcohol consumption. | Noted. |