

Author name: Anonymous

Date of submission: Thursday, 4 February 2016

Submission: The draft report states that substitution of road for rail journeys is the sole driver of fare structure. This is an excessively narrow basis for evaluating the economic and social effectiveness of fare structures. The report is also open to criticism for failing to balance off the level of subsidy provided by both state and federal govts to road use. When these are brought to book, the overall 80% subsidy by govt of public transport costs may not seem so bad. The report also fails to deal with profitability by area. It makes the point that short distance trips are cheaper to provide. It fails to breakdown comparative profitability. For instance I have a strong hunch that bus services within 5-10ks of the CBD are revenue positive. If this is the case, why not say it as it's a good news story for public transport.

More narrowly, the govt is now in a position to provide fare relief on airport rail as it now gets 85% of surcharge revenue,, assuming wiki is correct https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Airport_Link_Company#cite_note-8, (no other way of knowing, shame on govt). Why not a surcharge the same as the rail fare from beginning of line as in other cities? So, rail fare central- airport = (say)\$5, surcharge = \$5? Patronage would go up heaps and the only losses would be to carparks, uber, taxis. It'd be great if these words led to actions. Thanks for reading