OPERATORS

In 50 years time what would an effective public transport system look like?

Effective

Integrated with land-use
A PT system that people want to use

Contribution to government goals – economic growth/development

The most efficient and effective movement of people
Completion of the roading network
'peak-oil'/sustained high oil price →More PT?

Recognition of the benefits of PT – reduction of congestion, emissions but at a cost to individualised travel
Get the right signals to encourage a shift to PT

Maximise return on investment: Good return in line with investment – grow the off-peak
Predictable, consistent profitable patronage growth
Supportive infrastructure (certainty and commitment)
Competitive travel times
Market signals tangible costs for all modes
PT is the most popular mode choice/first choice for transport
Fully commercial operation 24/7

Accessibility to labour/employer of choice
Framework that fosters innovation requires business surety
Provide a PT system that is as convenient as the car
Attractive urban form designed for PT use
No timetable required – high frequency, many destinations
Legible network – easy to understand and use

VISION

PT is the first choice for transport

Users/retailers – bus stops instead of carparks

Target for patronage growth ??
Mutual dependency between operators, funders and users
Land use and other levers outside the PT system

Funders want VFM from their investments
Other funders from outside the PT system e.g developers have a huge impact
True cost recognised and fair allocation of these costs
Funders -public bodies, passengers, operators and developers
Systems approach/integrated
Pricing costs and benefits – externalities – BC e.g
Governance system fragmented responsibilities
Regional, central.local – commercial
Agreed plans strengthen packages – longer horizons

OPERATORS

National plans? Will?

Test cases/trials (Auckland busway)

Funding commitment examples

Retailers/business support (use their channels How? Information, evidence base.
Will the existing network be enough to deliver?
Champions VISION alignment between agencies/operators
Mode of first choice
The customer focus
Convenient – part of the network
Reliable
Affordable/competitively priced
Time competitive/time advantage
Options – prime routes only – mixture of routes
-customer focused
Target/quantity for measuring success
? comparable to PT cities
e.g 200 trips per person per year

To demonstrate what an effective PT system could be:
Cash fare high
Low cost monthly option
Ability to fine non fare payers
Promote

What is the economic value of getting a person out of a car on onto PT – needs to be quantified
Getting the market signals right

Improved boarding times
Improved frequencies

BCR calculation to include quantifiable aspects of PT benefits
RTI
Bus priority measures

Different types of buses
Fully commercial model - core routes only
- mix

Operator profitability
- long term surety of business
- Long term investment decisions

- Bus life is 15 years
- Contract life 20 years
- Long term performance based , rolling reviews i.e Melbourne
- Benchmarking/contract out small portions
- Open book/partnership
- Trade off for longer term contract

Barriers to commercial services – lack of control over:

- Fares

OPERATORS

- Network/timetable planning

But depends on what the councils goals were – impacts on integration between commercial and contracted services
Net/gross alliance contracts – depends on attitudes to risk reward and aspirations

Gross contracts provide little incentive for operators to innovate
Balance around competitive markets – risk and reward

Regulation and stability of legislative framework – provide certainty
Alliancing model – shared risk
Network maintenance – more competition because of higher turn over/shorter contracts
Need simple process
Effective PT system – optimal fleet utilisation
(Interpeak use, SuperGold)
Different market segments to target