

Sent: Thursday, 6 November 2008 10:39 PM

Subject: ipart rail fare submission--Fw: rail/train issues being questions/suggestions/feedback

My MP Joe Tripodi advised me that my comments are being investigated, so hopefully you are already aware of them. However, I am forwarding the comments to you to ensure you know about the points below, especially issue 3 which seems quite relevant, even though I understand submissions closed yesterday; sorry I am late due to my misunderstanding.

Furthermore, since submissions closed yesterday, I have not read the 200 page report in detail. From a scan review, I do wish to provide some additional brief comments about discounts.

1--page 11 notes "IPART maintains its preliminary view that the discount applied to weekly tickets should be constant, regardless of the distance travelled" but the complete removal of a distance factor in fare discounts is removing one incentive for people to live further away from, for example, the Sydney CBD, at a time when Sydney continues to grow and there are concerns about how we can accommodate such growth. I am also concerned about the wealth disparity noted on page 111 which is another reason why distance discounts should not be completely removed.

2--page 10 notes "the temporal aspect, which links the fare to the time of day or day of week in which travel is undertaken." Distance discounts relate to the "the spatial aspect, which links the fare charged to the location in which travel is undertaken or the distance travelled by passengers" but since distance discounts may go then I presume that only the temporal aspect discounts, such as weekly tickets, will remain. However, it seems that temporal discounts only apply to contiguous travel, and this is less likely in today's world as per the details in point 3 below to the Minister, which some stakeholders seem to have noted as per page 112. page 110 notes "IPART considered that a constant frequency discount for all tickets, regardless of the distance travelled, was more equitable, transparent and easier to understand than the current discounts which vary significantly according to the distance travelled." which again ignores the contiguous requirement of travel and is thus not equitable etc. An equitable, simpler discount principle is that the greater the \$transaction by the commuter, where the number of trips is a greater factor than the additional minor discount factor of the average distance per trip, then the greater should be the discount, and hence the incentive to use public transport. True equity & consistency demands an approach similar to the TravelTen tickets on Sydney buses.

3--Not only may it be hard to police the new return restriction for off peak travel, but it maybe difficult for commuters, especially who connect to services far away from Central. Changing lines also makes this complicated. For example, a commuter with a return off-peak from Parramatta to Fairfield could leave Fairfield at say 5pm, arrive at Granville by about 5:20pm, but then have to wait at Granville until about 7pm to correctly use proposed ticket. Commuters should to be able to both validate their ticket, and if it does not meet off-peak requirements, then they should be able to pay the difference at their destination. Otherwise the discount has to be

at least 50% so the daily cost is not more than a full fare (when a single ticket is bought for peak afternoon trip). People who are not sure of return times may choose to buy full fare return tickets, but if its desired to incent them to travel in the off peak time then a 60% discount is better. In other words, there are 2 scenarios for the commuter unsure of return time:

3a-With only 50% discount, buy a full fare and travel in morning peak if that is more convenient

3b-With 60% discount, its 'worth' possible inconvenience of morning off peak travel since even if the return trip ends up being a peak trip, the total cost is still only 90% of the full fare. This saving would help sell the introduction of a return trip travel time restriction.