

Q1 - Do you agree with our proposed assessment criteria for the review? Which ones do you think are the most important and why?

A1 - I think the criteria are fine. The most glaring failure in Sydney has been on the first criteria - Encourages efficient use of public transport. Consider the following scenario: I live at West Pennant Hills and work in the city or lower shore. The fare system gives me an incentive to avoid the train and use a bus. This causes increased bus congestion in the CBD and under utilisation of the rail network. It is similar with the removal of the Epping Bus overpass several years ago.

Q2 - Opal provides an integrated ticket but still charges different fares for different modes of transport. Do you see value in also making fares more integrated?

A2 - Absolutely. However, only the flag fall needs to be integrated. A differential fare system with an integrated flag fall would be world's best practice.

Q3 - There are many different options for increasing fare integration. They range from further integration for multi-leg journeys, which retains mode-specific fares but puts measures in place to remove penalties for switching modes, to full integration where fares do not differ by mode of transport, or by the number of trips made in each journey. Which of these options do you support and why?

A3 - Any fare structure has limitations. The limitations of a zonal fare structure in a polycentric city like Sydney are obvious. Differential fares by mode have certain advantages particularly in encouraging the bulk of long distance journeys onto the best mode for this purpose which where there is sufficient demand and existing infrastructure is rail. I do not support complicated rules being implemented to refund double flag falls depending on what modes are used. Apply the KISS principle and just make the flag fall consistent. Final point: It is difficult to understand the logic behind the limits on numbers of trips in a journey; they make it easier to game the system.

Q4 - If you support full fare integration, would you continue to support it if it meant that fares for some journeys, in particular, single mode journeys made in the peak had to rise? Why or why not?

A4 - Yes. Firstly, single mode journeys in peak are already quite cheap and were still cheap before the fare reductions which occurred in MyZone. Secondly, no longer would the fares prove an obstacle to the efficient delivery of services. Thirdly, higher fares would allow more money to be available to deliver public transport services.

Q5 - Sydney currently has a fairly flat distance based structure, with fares not increasing substantially over distance travelled, and not at all beyond the first 65 km for rail trips and 8 km for bus trips. Increasing fares for longer distance journeys would allow fares for shorter distance journeys to be lower. Is this something you would support?

A5 - Absolutely. The fares promote more unsustainable lifestyles, urban sprawl and are inequitable and inefficient.

Q6 - A distance based fare structure that is based on kilometres travelled, rather than grouping the distance travelled into bands would remove the fare advantages/ disadvantages that currently apply to people who live or work near fare boundaries. This has the potential to help alleviate problems with parking at some stations and would be more equitable. However, it would also be more difficult for passengers to estimate their fare in advance. Which of these is more important to you?

A6 - I would rather have discrete fare levels than continuously variable levels. The trouble with Sydney's levels is that there are too few. Abolishing travel ten fares for an electronic purse with Opal gets rid of the limitations of having many fare levels. Levels such as \$x per km or part thereof would be acceptable. The major limitation with having more fare levels or continuously variable levels is that the journey planner does not tell you the fare. If the journey planner could calculate the fares these limitations would be less important.

Q7 - Most cities that have flat fares (that is, a fare that is the same no matter how far you travel) have these fares applying to an inner ring of the city only. Would you support a flat fare in the inner part of Sydney with distance based fares applying outside this zone?

A7 - No. Such fares would violate the KISS principle. It's not clear why a number of cities do such things but political interference and living in the past seem to be major reasons.

Q8 - We consider that there is value in discounting fares in off-peak periods. Currently this is done only on the rail network. Do you think that an off-peak discount should apply to other modes as well? Would you support this even if it means that peak fares for these modes need to rise?

A8 - No. Bus services do not have high fixed costs like rail services do. Bus loadings are lower outside of peak and lower fares will cause pressure to cut services. Ferries, particularly the Manly ferry do not have strong peakiness in their loadings and for that reason should not have an off peak discount. Indeed, a sensible off peak discount for ferries would have the peak as weekends and weekdays as off peak. Such moves would violate the KISS principle so just having consistent fares is my favoured option. The other point to be made here is that having the base fare 20% higher to allow for free after 8 journeys per week as opposed to having lower fares with free only after 10 journeys per week fights against such an off peak discount. Better to lower the base fare first and remove the gimmick of a free return journey on Friday.

Q9 - Currently peak fares for trains apply between the hours of 7 am and 9 am (6 am to 8 am for NSW Train Link services) and between 4 pm and 6.30 pm, Monday to Friday with off-peak fares applying for trips where tap on occurs outside these hours. Should the definition of "peak" times be longer or shorter? Are these times also the peak times for buses, ferries and light rail services?

A9 - The current peak rail times are reasonable. For bus and ferry, see above (A8)

Q10 - Do you see value in having peak fares apply only in one direction or being replaced with a peak surcharge for journeys that enter the CBD in the morning and exit the CBD in the evening?

A10 - There is value in such things but they should be applied to the motor car first. Other than crossing the harbour, this does not occur. Therefore I do not support these moves as competition with driving would be worsened however slightly.

Q11 - Would you support fares being more expensive in the peak and cheaper in the off-peak? If they were, would you be more likely to change your travel patterns earlier or later to avoid the higher fares? Why or why not?

A11 - Current arrangements on this point do not need change except that the flag fall component needs to be consistent between modes. I suggest that only the distance component of the rail services receive an off peak discount which increases back to 40% and the flag component then receives no off peak discount however, applying the off peak discount to the flag fall of all modes is also perfectly acceptable.

Q12 - Do you receive any benefit from the current weekly and daily caps? Do you receive any benefit from the weekly travel reward? How fair do you think the current discounts are?

A12 - Not very fair. Longer distance commuters largely get the benefit of the daily cap and the weekly cap after 8 journeys fights against the need to lower the base fare for a given revenue requirement.

Q13 - Does the weekly travel reward (free trips after you pay for the first eight journeys) encourage you to use more public transport than you would otherwise? Are you more likely to make shorter bus or light rail journeys early in the week in order to access the discount sooner?

A13 - Not in the sense that I would convert trips made by other modes. And yes.

Q14 - Would you support discounted fares on more services (eg, a \$2.50 daily cap for rail, bus and light rail travel on Saturdays and Sundays) if that meant that you were unable to use free trips during peak times?

A14 - I don't think there needs to be trade of one gimmick for another. No longer allowing accessing free trips in peak times particularly the AM peak is perfectly reasonable and a way to keep the base fare low for a given revenue requirement. AM peak fares should also be removed from the daily caps including the Pensioner's cap to encourage these people to no longer travel at those times.

Q15 - Around 200,000 public transport trips are made on pensioner concession tickets every day (eg, Opal Gold). Passengers who travel on these tickets currently have no incentive to travel outside the peak when services are not as crowded. Do you support a higher peak travel charge for these products? If so, should this be combined with cheaper fares in off-peak times?

A15 - Yes but for the AM peak only. Allowing a few pensioners onto PM peak services is not as critical a problem as the peak is more spread and also lacks school students. Another issue is that the Opal price is the same as the magnetic ticket price. The price of the magnetic tickets needs to increase to encourage users onto Opal for faster boarding of services and better information being given to the planners. The same

problem applies with TravelTen's at present. One final comment is should those on the full rate of an unemployment benefit be entitled to concession and pensioner fares from day one rather than the current 3 months? This should be provided by Opal and the entitlement ought to be able to be retracted by electronic means as soon as the eligibility is no longer present.