

Here is my submission, arranged as per 15 questions in section 1.5

1----Assessment criteria is reasonable, but there is scope for consistency to also be used. It may not be for all details like fare bands, but it maybe for principles, such as when discounts apply. With a consistent fare policy, then indeed technology should follow for policy implementation.

Its hard to prioritise criteria, since they are related. Encouraging the greater use of public transport is probably the most important, but this use should be efficient. This will be easier if fares are logical/consistent, and increased use should increase revenue. However, regarding efficiency, note that there are often not viable choices. For example some people may only have access to a bus, and it maybe hard to properly compare & value any mode choice that does exist; will bus or train be faster/cheaper/cleaner/etc?

Although fares should be logical, technology means that individual=trip fares do not need to be as predictable or stable as was the case historically. Congestion Avoidance should be an explicit criteria, as determined by 6 or 12 month blocks of opal usage data for modes and opal entry/exit points. This data should be publicly shared to justify fare changes. However, large changes should be avoided unless there is long data justification history, since yes equity and affordability are quite important.

Availability/Frequency, noted in 2.3.3, may need greater emphasis to indeed encourage greater use of public transport. In particular, public transport access needs to be spread more fairly across all of Sydney. It seems that areas of similar population densities do not have the same service; eg Western Sydney has a poorer service compared to other areas. If it doesn't, please provide data that shows equitable service, but if true then a criteria for fares should be to increase transport equity. Equity seems important for matters d, e and f of the 9 in Box 1.1

2----There is some value in greater integration, since it is likely to make more trips viable, and it may reduce congestion for parking when only one mode is used. Full integration is not attractive since it seems to shift ferry costs to trains. Also, its often not necessary, since as noted only about 10% of journeys involve multiple modes. This figure maybe lower than what it could be, since people may walk/cycle/drive to connect with one mode like a train.

To help facilitate more integration, and a better service as per

other assessment criteria, here some other suggestions that should be explored:

2a--Peak is currently defined by time, but it could also, or alternatively, be based on congestion & frequency as noted in 1 above. Both timetables and transport vehicles could warn a passenger that a peak service is being used, and of course signs at Opal entry/exit points could do likewise. This facilitates efficient, predictable service, since if/as congestion changes, fares can also change which may then reduce congestion or help fund a better service. This approach would allow some Sunday Ferry travel to be considered a peak period.

2b--Peak & Off peak are really only 2 time bands; at least one more time band could be introduced, again to spread/share congestion/cost better/fairly; this could be called Shoulder. Based on existing times, Peak could be as per response 9 below.

2c--Service Availability/Frequency should be another factor that determines whether or not a Peak, Shoulder, or Offpeak fare applies. Why should someone waiting 30min or more, even in peak hour, for a bus pay the same fare as someone waiting only 15min or less? For example, high frequency Metrobus services may have peak fares that other services may not.

3---The fully integrated journey example in Figure 4.4 is better, but it could be improved to be fairer for people who cannot use multiple nodes. Although it may encourage people to, for example, use a bus to get to a train station for an evening city trip, there may not be a bus service late at night to go home, and equity is important as per section 2.3.4 Some better alternatives maybe:

3a--A passenger pays the larger fare (eg train to city) but then only 25% of any other mode (eg 25% of \$3.50 and not \$2.10 if 2 bus trips are used at either end of train trip)

3b--More fare bands should be introduced, and priced to help fund this journey integration. More bands helps address other issues like parking, but still leaves many single mode passengers paying for a service they do not use. Hence, if such passenger's Opal card records say 10 consecutive trips in only 1 mode, then they could get a credit, again also funded by revenue from more bands.

3c--Provide Opal only access to railway station car parks, with remote=Internet access to current capacity so a driving passenger knows if car park is available.

4---Since ferries are relatively expensive, and all routes are less than 20km and often near expensive real estate, then it does not seem fair to fully integrate ferry fares. Sunday Opal data suggests ferry service demand may grow significantly in weekdays if there is 100%= full fare integration. Bus services at times may not exist or are relatively infrequent, so again they seem

distinct. Hence keep fares distinct for different modes, but with similar principles triggering fare changes within a mode (eg off peak), and only fully integrate fares for a single multimode journey, since every journey has a maximum a to b distance (even for multiple transfers/stops) and direct distance should be a key fare criteria for every mode.

5---The comparisons suggest long distance fares should be increased, at least with more fare bands, but real estate prices and the desire to decentralise (ie reduce urban congestion) may mean increases need to be minor/gradual. Increases maybe offset by using point to point distances for all mode bands, including trains, which is also good for fare structure consistency.

6--Increasing bands means the fare change at the band boundary should decrease, which should mitigate any advantages/disadvantages. Perhaps simpler/patterned fare band changes will help, but technology should make it easy to check fare before travelling. Even with technology, it seems simpler to determine/understand a fare when its based on distance bands than on the actual kms travelled. Also, people may have an incentive to walk/cycle to the next stop, which would have a health benefit.

7--A flat fare for inner Sydney is not good... if there, then why not Parramatta & other local cities in greater Sydney? Hence flat fares/zones is not a good strategy.

8--Yes for consistency(4.3.3)/fairness Shoulder & Off Peak where viable should exist on other modes, especially time does not need to be the only criteria. The 625 bus between Parramatta & Pennant Hills is a good example, compared to say M60 bus, which always seems more congested even in peak hour. Hence the 625 could be flagged as a Shoulder Service even in Peak Hour. It would be simpler=better to have consistent % discounts across multiple modes, so Shoulder could be a 15 or 20% discount, and Off Peak could be a 30 or 40% discount. As per page 36, there is scope to increase long distance bus fares; this along with congestion & frequency criteria should facilitate fairer fares that maintain total revenue.

9--As above, Opal data should be used to help define what is Peak, Off Peak, and in between these 2 the suggested Shoulder definition. Peak times should be shorter (eg perhaps only 730 to 830am, and 5-6pm), with the differences to existing times defined as Shoulder times.

10--Using regularly congested Town Hall station as an example, the introduction of congestion criteria & Shoulder means that a

passenger entering the CBD in the afternoon current Peak time could see & pay a Shoulder fare at the exit gate, since its likely the passenger arrived on an empty train. A passenger leaving at the same time sees & pays Peak at entry gate, since both train & station are congested, but a Saturday passenger only pays Off Peak.

11--Where possible, travel is planned for off peak, but this is not always possible, for example due to the plans of other people. A greater difference may help more people change plans, but this does not seem to be a priority given its difficult to determine impact. However, the drop in off peak quality/service can be significant, so significant fare discounts are fair & important.

12--Work patterns and locations are changing, so it maybe harder to commute enough to get to caps; so far I do not recall reaching weekly cap but I may have a few, rare daily caps. It does not seem fair that the only loyalty discount is for a weekly frequent user; at least Travel 10 bus tickets gave a discount no matter when a ticket was used. Perhaps spending thresholds in certain times should result in credit to the Opal card with the spending, so this could be a weekly, monthly, quarterly, annual public transport personal target/challenge! Certainly the 1hour transfer/side trip option is good. Schemes like those noted for New York or Hong Kong may also be beneficial.

13--If I was confident that I would need to travel lots in a week then yes I would try use more short trips early in the week, but this may not be possible.

14--With the Shoulder definition, another option maybe that after 8 trips, a Peak trip is charged Shoulder (or Off Peak), so that if there is no credit for spending thresholds for other passengers, then perhaps the extra peak fare income could encourage more Saturday travel by a \$2.50, or perhaps \$5, cap fare.

15--It seems fair/reasonable to charge a bit more for peak travel; eg 50 cents or \$1more. \$2.50 is already a cheap fare, but it should stay for all seniors given coming pension restrictions. With \$2.50 for off peak, charging extra for peak use seems fair.