

Author name: D. Fedczyna

Date of submission: Friday, 15 January 2016

Submission: The proposed reforms represent a significant increase in fares for those customers in which travel for the normal 5 working days of the week, and I do not agree in all the changes proposed. Namely, lifting the number of trips needing to be paid for per week from 8 to 10 is essentially a 25% increase in fares for customers using public transport during the working week only. It has long been accepted that for weekly travel (ie: in the days of paper tickets on trains), the weekly price would represent paying for 4 return journeys, making the 5th and subsequent days rail travel free. This was carried on by the Opal card requiring 8 paid journeys before free travel. The proposal takes this away and represents a significant increase to the cost of weekly travel (25%) and should not be perused. It appears this significant increase is not being made very transparent to those who will be impacted, and I imagine it will be a rude shock to weekly travelers if this was instigated.

Instead, merging the IPART proposal with this long standing benefit could be achieved by requiring the 8 most expensive journeys per week payable only. This would ensure the current loophole allowing many cheap trips early in the week to offset more expensive trips later in the week is closed.

In your online video you state that over 60% of passengers would pay less. I would be interested to see how this would apply to weekly travelers (10+ trips per week), or does the 40% who will pay more consist exclusively of this demographic? It also appears that pensioners/seniors will be hit with a price rise, and given the current climate of other economic stresses on these members of society, I think this increase to them would be absurd.

I do not know how integrated fares would work in detail (due to the variation in running cost of the various modes of transport), however the notion of integrating fares seems like an appropriate step forward and I support this part of the proposal.