

Author name: Anonymous

Date of submission: Friday, 5 February 2016

Submission: The original Opal prices were more than 25% dearer than the paper Quarterly ticket - in the case of my commute from Gordon to Parramatta return (by train). \$40 pw became more than \$50 pw. I reported this in the Complaints Site (December 2014 - Opal Customer Care Enquiry. Reference number 2705671) - and received an offensively dismissive reply. I don't believe my complaint was read - other than for the purpose of categorising it for one of a set of "standard" (canned) responses.

Rather than a "perverse incentive", the short trip is (in my case) simply a mechanism to keep the weekly cost to a reasonable amount.

Opal should never have been about raising additional revenue (through a 25% increase in fares) from commuters such as myself.

In the Draft changes, I note that distance (for rail) is now to be greatest point-to-point distance - rather than route distance. That should change the Gordon to Parramatta railway trip from a route distance exceeding 30km to a real distance of about 18km. That will change the fare scale - from about \$6.40 to about \$4.70 - which is an improvement - and would be acceptable except that it is also proposed that 10 trips a week should be counted (the most expensive 10 trips).

The basis of weekly (or monthly or quarterly) tickets has always been that the price is structured so that you pay for no more than 4 days (to and from a destination), and the rest is free. 8 trips is the appropriate equivalent for Opal, not 10 trips. The notion that 10 trips a week should be counted (whether they are the most expensive 10 trips or not) penalises the commuter and is contrary to past practice. This "10 trips" proposal needs to be discarded. 8 trips is the upper limit of what is acceptable.

There is an objective - somewhat like objective 3. in the Draft - to price public transport in a manner that encourages commuters (such as myself) to not drive a car to and from work. The more than 25% increase (upon introduction of Opal), and the changes proposed in this Draft, are not conducive to promoting the use of public transport over the use of a private vehicle.