

Much of the draft report analysis attempts to make a link between the positive externalities generated by an additional public transport but there is also layered on top of such analysis notions of fare capping for multiple trips in a week on the grounds of affordability, or trips in excess of 8, 10, or 12 each work providing additional externalities of some kind.

On my reading of the report I can see no reason why trips in excess of whatever number are any better or worse than trips below that number. Accordingly my submission would be that if the current discount for a weekly travel is removed then an adjustment should be made to the price of all trips.

There is also no evidence in the report to support the assertion that raising the price of a weekly commute for a full time worker by 30% or more will have no effect on the amount of public transport utilised by such a person. Use of public transport rather than making use of a car is influenced by the total cost per week rather than by the fare on the fifth or subsequent day.

The notion of caps being an equity or affordability measure is not well argued in the report. A wealthy person in Mosman making multiple bus trips in a week over short distances arguably is not deserving of a larger subsidy than a western Sydney worker commuting each day to the city.

If there is a current problem with shorter, cheaper journeys being the base for the 8 journey cap then the cap should be changed so that the 8 or whatever most expensive journeys are charged in full with the remainder treated as being in excess of the cap.

Regards

Ross Clare

Changing the fare basis from a fare for each type of transport (train, bus or ferry) to a fare for each journey based on distance is likely to lead to additional usage of buses for short distances, leading to congestion or the need for additional services with less people walking relatively short distances at the end beginning or end of longer journeys.