

WRC Fares Policy Review
WRC Transport Committee
Workshop 2nd June 2026

[waikatoregion.govt.nz](https://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz)

Purpose of Today's Session

Provide Elected Members with:

- The scope of fares review work and the integration with the wider work programme
- An overview of the national legislative and policy context for the setting of fares and fares policy
- An overview of the issues identified by the technical work for the fares review
- **Seek direction from elected members on the broad policy direction for the fares review.** *Today we are asking you to help us choose a **direction**, not a final fare structure or policy.*
- **Not** seeking a view on the overall revenue / budget implications – That will be dealt with through annual plan / LTP processes.

Today's Workshop Agenda

- Drivers for the fares review
- Timescales and project interfaces
- Trade offs and constraints in fare setting
- Overview of the analysis
- Summary of the main issues identified and opportunity for feedback
- Alternative option 'Packages' and trade-offs – presentation and discussion.

Timeline Drivers for this review


- **National Ticketing System (Motu Move)**

- Due to be implemented nationwide **by the end of 2027**. Waikato implementation date to be confirmed closer to rollout.
- Completion of the fares review (and adoption) gives the opportunity to have an amended fare system go live with the new ticketing system (but is not required).
- WRC in close contact with the NTS team re technical implementation.

- **Regional Public Transport Plan**


- Reviewing the Fares Policy was an action arising from the 2024-34 Long Term Plan.
- NZTA guidance for RPTPs is that fare structure reviews are undertaken at least every six years.
- The current RPTP was adopted 2022. If a revised fare system were to be implemented a RPTP would need to be varied or reviewed ahead of implementation.

Process



Set the direction on the preferred overall fare policy 'mix'

Provide a recommendation on the policy components.



Where we are at in the process


- ✓ • Staff Scoping – **June 2025**
- ✓ • **Issues and Options – Oct 2025**
 - Staff Workshops + 2 Sessions with NTS team
- ✓ • Financial Modelling – Mar 2026
- ➔ • Elected Member Engagement – June 2026
- Final Reporting – Sep 2026
- Council Endorsement – End of 2026

NTS requirement that Critical Services Review is completed, signed and submitted to NZTA immediately after the council endorsement.

Context for Fare Setting

waikatoregion.govt.nz

Overview of Public Transport Funding



Fare setting – National Legislative and Policy Context

- WRC sets fares and fares policy but the LTMA sets out that decisions must be defensible, transparent, and aligned with statutory planning processes (including RPTPs).
- Affordability, mode shift, equity, efficiency and value for money are mandatory considerations under the LTMA when setting fare policy.
- The GPS signals Government expectations for public transport outcomes and funding priorities and the current GPS emphasizes higher farebox (private share) recovery and value for money. GPS reviewed every 3 years (with electoral cycle)
- National concessions (e.g. off peak SuperGold, Community Connect) are funded nationally; any additional concessions are regional policy choices (and are funded regionally)

Version as at 1 July 2024



Land Transport Management Act 2003

Public Act 2003 No 118
Date of assent 12 November 2003
Commencement see section 2

Government
Policy Statement
on land transport
2024-34

June 2024



What will change with NTS (Motu Move)?

- Multiple payment options: Customers will be able to pay on vehicle using:
 - Contactless debit/credit cards
 - Mobile wallets (e.g. Apple Pay, Google Pay)
 - Prepaid Motu Move cards
 - Or pre-purchased tickets.
- The system launched in Greater Christchurch in November 2025, introducing contactless payments on buses and ferries.
- Motu Move will be rolled out region-by-region, with full national coverage targeted by the end of 2027.
- Under current RPTP policy cash fares would be phased out in Waikato in favour of being able to pay with any contactless payment card.
- Review concessions to move towards a more consistent approach to concessions nationally.



The RPTP

waikatoregion.govt.nz

RPTPs Scope

RPTPs set fare objectives and policies.

Includes sections for the framework for fare policies, such as:

- **Principles** for fare (level) setting and review
- **Describing** fare products at a high level (e.g. for children, students, SuperGold, Total Mobility etc)
- **Defining** zone structures or distance-based approaches to charging

The LTMA **does not require RPTPs to:**

- Set exact dollar values for individual fares or lock in prices for the life of the plan
- Describe every fare product in detail



RPTP and the Scope of the Fares Review

- The relevant policy elements of this fares review will feed into the next iteration of the RPTP.
- Any changes to matters of current policy (or new policy) will need a new or varied RPTP.
- We are looking for a long-term policy direction for the RPTP as distinct from any short term measures
- But, any opportunities for ‘quick wins’ or adjustments could be implemented sooner (for example adjustments to fare levels).



What fare policies does WRC currently have?

- Enshrines *some* national / mandatory schemes in regional policy
- Creates Waikato specific fare products (**Accessibility concession and +1**)
- Deal with the **transition to NTS** (Motu Move) including eliminating cash payments
- Establishes an **integrated zonal fare system**.
- Enables **free transfers (including with rail)**
- Enables **fare capping** (but does not define the level)
- Enable **concession agreements with partner organizations** provided they are fully externally funded.



RPTP Objectives


- Objective 1: Deliver public transport services in a way that results in at least net neutral carbon emissions for the period 2025 to 2050.
- Objective 2: Deliver an integrated network of public transport services that enhances accessibility and wellbeing.
- **Objective 3: Provide a fares and ticketing system that is simple, affordable and attracts and retains customers.**
- Objective 4: Provide high quality and intuitive public information.
- Objective 5: Provide the infrastructure and services necessary for an accessible, effective, efficient and enjoyable public transport experience.
- **Objective 6: Provide public transport services that are affordable for passengers and funders.**
- **Objective 7: Develop and maintain partnerships that obtain best value for money in the delivery of transport solutions.**

A lot has happened since the last RPTP...

- The cost of delivering the same level of public transport service has increased significantly across New Zealand.
- National concession schemes changed, and then changed again.
- Current government has greater emphasis on cost recovery from PT, specifically that a higher proportion of costs must be met from private share (non-government sources.)
- Waikato fares were in effect frozen during COVID but increased sharply in 2024 and 2025.
- The fare structure for Te Huia has diverged from Bus – (child age difference, Supergold only applies off-peak and decision on 25% fares increases last week)

Bus Patronage

1 Patronage - by Date



The Review

waikatoregion.govt.nz

Scope of the Review

- Review all aspects of fares and fares policy
- Ensure alignment with NTS
- Use all available evidence (including tag-on tag-off data) to understand how the system is currently being used
- Financial / demand modelling to understand the impact of decisions of fares policy.


Analysis Explored in the Review

- Benchmarking against other PTAs
- Travel analysis for user groups
- Concessions and equity impacts
- Zonal system and geography
- Crowding and capacity
- Modal fares (Te Huia, Flex)
- Time-of-day based optimization

Fare Setting Principles

waikatoregion.govt.nz

Fares policy trade-offs




Evaluation and Issues Identification

waikatoregion.govt.nz

What is working well?

- 10% of journeys benefited from a free transfer - transfers will become more important as the Waikato transitions to a network of fast frequent direct routes
- Broadly, fares are set proportional to costs with some exceptions (explored later)
- Concession agreements with partners benefit both organisations, and bring additional fare revenue to WRC (~250k per annum from partners, plus fare revenue)



Areas Identified by the Review to Address

1. Meeting Private Share Revenue Targets

2. Optimisation of the Tariff Structure

3. Concessions and Fare Capping

There are questions at the end of each of these topics to help provoke thought and discussion. You are welcome to provide feedback on these as they arise, or towards the end of the presentation when the alternative policy pathways are presented.


1 – Private Share Revenue Targets

There are targets agreed with NZTA for increasing private share revenue. Ministerial and NZTA requirements are that PTAs actively work towards increasing their private share revenue. It is not a *requirement* that PTAs achieve targets so long as they actively doing so.

There is a policy balance which Council can adopt whilst aiming for higher private share revenue - The 'default' position in response to meeting private share targets has generally been blanket fare increases.

Fare increases only affect the portion of users who *actually pay* for services. The users that pay the most (adults) are the group where demand is most negatively impacted because they have the most exposure to price increases.

Over time (particularly with bus services) there tends to be a negative feedback loop between fares increases, patronage and potentially service levels.



1 – Working Towards Private Share Revenue Targets

	OPEX (\$M)	AGREED TARGET	TARGET REVENUE (\$M)	FARE REVENUE REQ. (\$M)
24/25	49.1	13.3%	6.5	6.2
25/26	50.4	15.6%	7.9	7.4
26/27	50.8	18.4%	9.4	8.9

- The 2025/26 Annual Plan process considered options on how to achieve NZTA's requirement to increase private share and actively work towards doing so.
- Committed fare increases were / are as follows:
 - 2024/25 = 20%
 - 2025/26 = 11.4%
 - 2026/27 = 10% for Bus, 25% for Rail
- WRC exceeded the agreed target in 2024/25 15.2% compared to 13.3%.
- WRC is only required to achieve the private share target, not exceed it so future fare increases may not need to be as high.
- Fare policy decisions will also affect the percentage fares increase.
- Council budget and rates impact considered through LTP and annual plan.

**Bus approved by council in February 2026, rail to be considered by council in May 2026.*

1 – Meeting Private Share Revenue Targets

Questions for Feedback

There are different ways to achieve the same amount of fare revenue depending on how the tariff is structured.


The focus for this session is to get your direction on how the tariff should be *structured* to achieve different outcomes rather than if the fare revenue budget / target needs to be higher or lower.

- How comfortable are you with continuing to rely primarily on uniform fare increases to meet revenue expectations?

2 - Optimisation of the Tariff Structure

This includes:


- Geographies – how we define the areas that we use to calculate how people get charged
- The fare table - How much people get charged as they move between those places
- Modes – whether we charge different fares according to the mode people use
- Time of travel – whether we charge different prices according to *when* people travel.



2 - Optimisation of the Tariff Structure

Setting of Zonal Fare Prices


- There are no principles defined in policy presently for fare setting in the Waikato (e.g. how a two-zone fare is set compared to a one-zone fare?)
- There is evidence that the **price** of travel over some of the current fare table may not be well aligned with time / distance travelled (and therefore the cost of provision).
- Recommendation to establish some **principles** for fare setting across fare zones in the next RPTP which are better aligned to the cost of provision and will help guide annual fare setting.



Number of Zones Travelled	Bee Card fare
<u>Central city zone</u>	\$1.34
1	\$2.67
2	\$4.01
3	\$5.35
4	\$6.68
5	\$10.69
6	\$13.37
7	\$16.04
8	\$20.05
9	\$24.06

2 - Optimisation of the Tariff Structure

- Fare zones provide a simpler means of charging than distance or stage based approaches.
- Some of the zones in the Waikato covering the rural area have little or no patronage in or between them, which creates unnecessary complexity.
- Opportunities to simplify the existing fare structure with negligible impact on revenue.
- Equity consideration - in rural areas people need to travel further to access essential services etc. compared to urban areas. Larger zones mean they can travel to where they need to get to for a comparable cost.




Proportion of Single Zone Trips By Zone



2 - Hamilton Zones

- Conversely in Hamilton which has nearly 80% of patronage on the network, there is little differentiation in fares.
- Pay as much for a journey to the CBD from Rototuna as from Fairfield - despite the journey being many times longer.
- The current CBD fare zone is very small - many journeys would have been walkable, or a concession may have otherwise have covered the cost.
- Potential to look at an alternative, larger Hamilton 'inner' and 'outer' zone which would need to be further developed.



2 – Modal Fares

- On-demand a 'premium product' (in certain circumstances) – booked time of travel, corner to corner transport.
- Night Flex currently services a distinct market - little overlap with times of operation for the bus network.
- Night Flex partly competes with the taxi market where fares are significantly higher but need to also consider original intent of providing a night public transport service – safe and affordable means of getting home.
- For Night Flex there is a case for fares which are higher than urban bus, (but still would remain affordable).
- Suggest staged approach, but significant price increases and to monitor demand accordingly.
- In the future if on-demand overlaps with existing services (time, geography) it is good practice for on-demand fares on those services to be *aligned* to bus to provide consistency (feeders, transfers etc).



2 - Optimisation of the Tariff Structure



Time of Day Based Optimisation

- Charging higher fares during peak times compared to off-peak can increase revenue with proportionately lower loss in passengers compared to blanket fare increases.
- A higher proportion of passengers already pay fares during peak periods
- People's responses to pricing at different times mean that **lower fares during off-peak times (weekends, public holidays) can attract proportionately more new users at a lower revenue cost.**
- Peak / off peak pricing adds complexity to the fare system — not recommended alongside fare capping.
- Lower off – peak fares can benefit those not travelling at the busiest times which can help shift workers etc.

2 – Tariff Structure

Questions for Feedback

- Do you agree with having a policy position to set out how travel between zones fares should be charged which is related to the cost of provision?
- Do you support simplifying the current zonal structure, particularly in low-use rural areas?
- Would you support changes that introduce greater fare differentiation within Hamilton if this improves revenue at the expense of simplicity?
- Do you support having tailored Te Huia fares to support revenue development on that service (which do not necessarily have a free transfer with bus services?)

3 – Concessions and Fare Capping

- WRC has schemes over and above the default national concessionary fare schemes:
 - Accessibility Concession (and plus one)
 - Free travel for Supergold card Holders in peak periods (bus only)
 - Fare capping for Youth and Adults.
- Concessions which depart from the national norm generally need to be locally funded,
- Waikato does not align with the prevailing national approach compared to other councils:
 - Waikato is unique in having a Youth fare capping product instead of flat rate discount
 - Peak Supergold discount is inconsistent with the prevailing regional tariff structure. It is also currently available on buses but not rail.

3 – Usage by user group

	Unique Cards	Journeys	Journeys Per Active Card	Average Time per Journey (minutes)	Average Distance Per Journey (km)
Adult	49,910	1,228,254	24.6	26	8.3
Youth	14,823	783,926	52.9	31	8.8
Supergold OffPeak	12,718	420,634	33.1	21	8.2
Supergold Peak	6,868	86,736	12.6	33	11.8
Community Connect	5,041	220,482	43.7	28	8.3
Partner	4,259	255,977	60.1	25	7.4
Child	3,836	139,597	36.4	24	5.9
Accessibility	2,616	300,654	114.9	28	5.3

* Shows Bee Card tag-on tag-off journeys only

Youth Travel Patterns

Youth under 18 make about a third of peak trips, but only 10% during off-peak and weekends.

Supergold Card Usage

Supergold card holders account for about 5% of journeys during peak travel periods.

Accessibility Concession Usage

The proportion of Accessibility concession trips is over 10% in off-peak times (but lower during weekday peaks.)

3 - Fare Capping vs Lower Fares

- **Currently Adults Pay for a maximum of 9 Journeys per week, and Youth 6.5 journeys per week.**
- **Only 12.6% youth journeys are currently 'capped', and only 4% of adult journeys.**
- Capping gives certainty to users. It helps with budgeting and may encourage discretionary trips (e.g. weekends are free if travel during the week)
- Setting the 'cap' level can be problematic.
- It disadvantages part time students and workers – it only applies to those who make the most trips. E.g. If you work or study 3 days per week you wont meet the cap.
- Lower fares share the same benefit amongst everyone, not just the most frequent users.

Youth Fare

- Because the concession affects only a relatively small number of youth journeys it is not costing substantial revenue -
- This is compared to adopting a flat rate % youth concession option at 25% or 50% but would cost more but which would provide wider benefits to less frequent users.

3 - Accessibility Concession

- Accessibility concession provides free travel to those who are Waikato residents and have “an impairment which means they are unable to drive.”
- Disabled people have the option of a ‘Plus One’ concession - allows a companion to accompany them for free if they need assistance.
- Despite being only 3% of active Bee Card holders, Accessibility concession holders make 8.5% of all PT journeys.
- Introduced 2019, Policy (P38) of the RPTP - but objectives of the concession are not clearly defined.
- International evidence that where implemented, free fares schemes such as the accessibility concession can support well-being.
- Review by MR Cagney found evidence of the concession supporting these types of journeys.

3 - Estimated Cost of Concessions

Concession	Indicative Maximum Cost of Revenue Foregone
Peak Period Supergold Concession	\$155,000
Accessibility Concession	\$360,000
Fare Capping Adults	\$150,000
Fare Capping Youth	\$290,000
Total	\$955,000

The total revenue foregone cost of non-national / or mandatory concessions is estimated to be nearly **\$1m** – which is **equivalent to at least a 10% fare cut/increase**.

Figures are presented here to illustrate the trade-offs.

Issue 4 – Concessions

Questions for Feedback

Note that the nature and extent, and trade-offs of concessions will be discussed and explored through the option packages.

- Do we have the right scope for our local concession products? What do we need to do less, or more of?
- Is the pricing approach right for locally initiated concessions or are other options worth exploring?
- Is fare capping still the right tool given changing travel patterns, or could lower fares be shared more evenly across all users?

Potential Policy Directions for the Review

waikatoregion.govt.nz

Potential Policy Directions

An optioneering process has been undertaken to respond to the issues.




The options have been combined into **3 themed packages** which are designed to explore trade-offs to help discuss the different policy directions. Comparing policies at a package level helps compare trade-offs between:

- **Implementation complexity**
- **Fare levels**
- **Patronage impacts**

Today we are asking you to help us choose a direction, not a final tariff or fare structure. Your feedback today directly determines the direction which is worked up in detail next.

Packages

The packages explore the trade offs between equity (demographic and geographic), patronage and complexity. For all of the packages **the total amount of revenue raised is a fixed constraint**, with overall fare levels being variable accordingly.

Equity Package 	Customer Emphasis Package 	Optimization Package 
A focus on maintaining a higher level of equity (concession products) with some optimization.	A balanced focus on emphasising patronage through new and repeat customers, and simple, easy to calculate fares. Retains some simplified concessions.	Emphasises patronage growth through price differentiation. Potentially a more complex tariff structure. Reduced scope of concession products.

+ tariff and policy elements common to all packages

RPTP Objective Alignment

- Objective 3: Provide a fares and ticketing system that is simple, affordable and attracts and retains customers.
- Objective 6: Provide public transport services that are affordable for passengers and funders.
- Objective 7: Develop and maintain partnerships that obtain best value for money in the delivery of transport solutions.

Equity Package



Priorities

- Maintains a strong focus on equity and affordability for certain groups.
- Retains more concession products, removing fare capping for youth in favor of a % discount.

Winners

- Concession users, particularly accessibility card holders and younger passengers.
- Groups for whom certainty and protection from higher fares is a priority.
- Most Students / Youth will pay less as a concession compared to fare capping depending on existing usage.

Losers

- Non-concession adult passengers, who pay higher average fares to offset concessions.
- (Very) frequent users who currently benefit from fare capping.

Key trade-off

- Higher equity comes at the cost of higher fares for others and less flexibility to optimise revenue or patronage growth.
- Fairly simple for users, but no ability to target fares to when and how people travel.

Customer Emphasis Package



Priorities

- Balances simplicity and equity.
- Retains some concessions but simplifies the overall fare structure.
- Retains fare capping at lower levels for predictability of travel costs

Winners

- Customers who value simpler more predictable fares and travel frequently.
- Daily bus users (especially commuters)

Losers

- Some concession groups receive reduced support compared to the Equity package.
- Part-time workers and students don't benefit from fare capping.

Key trade-off

- Seeks a middle ground: moderate equity support without excessive complexity.
- Does not maximise either patronage growth or equity outcomes.

Optimisation Package



Priorities

- Uses price differentiation (e.g. peak vs off-peak) to grow patronage and improve value for money.
- Removes Capping and reduces scope of concession products.

Winners

- Off-peak travellers, part-time workers, shift workers, and discretionary users.
- People who can travel flexibly and respond to lower off-peak prices.
- The system overall, through stronger patronage growth per dollar of revenue.

Losers

- Peak-period commuters, especially those travelling frequently at busy times.
- Concession users who currently have free fares will pay for travelling at the busiest times but benefit from a substantial discount at off-peak times

Key trade-off

- The strongest patronage and revenue optimisation outcomes, but (slightly) more complex fares.
- Less explicit equity support; affordability is addressed through time of travel rather than concessions.

Theme	Group	Do Minimum	Equity	Customer Emphasis	Optimization
Average Fare		As existing + approved fare increases.	Between -6.4% and -6.7%	Between -0.9% and -1.9%	Between -7.3% and -7.7%
Patronage		/	Between +4.5% and +4.8%	Between -1.2% and -0.2%	Between +6.0% and +6.2%
Concessions and Fare Capping	Accessibility	Same as Existing (100% discount)	Same as existing (100% discount)	50-75% discount (all day)	50-75% discount off-peak only
	Supergold	Off-peak Supergold discount only (to align with rail and national approach)			
	Youth	Capping @ 6.5 journeys / week	25-50% discount, no fare capping.	Capping at 6.5x journeys / week	No fare capping or discount
	Adult Cap	Capping @ 9 journeys / week	No fare capping	Capping at 7.5 – 8.0 journeys / week	
Time of Travel		No change	No	No	Off peak fares 25-50% discount vs peak.
Fare Zones		No change	Simplification of Rural Zones	Simplification of Rural Zones + Remove CBD Zone	Simplification of Rural Zones + Replace CBD Zone with Hamilton 'Inner' Zone
Zonal Fares		Same as Existing	Recalibrate bus fare table based on time travelled Separate Te Huia fare structure		
Modal Fares	On Demand	No change	Align with Zonal Fares for feeder services or those which overlap in time and place serviced. Premium fares for products which sit outside of the scope of normal fixed route services (i.e. Night Flex)		
	Rail	No change (+25% not modelled)	A Te Huia Tariff with higher fares including investigating Advanced Booking Te Huia Fares, group tickets and other products to optimise revenue and patronage. No rail – bus transfers.		

User Cost Impacts

- For illustration the figures show the estimated monthly spend for various users across the packages.
- Part time / shift workers such as Fiona and Steve do better where there is no fare capping and especially where peak off peak pricing is involved (optimisation)
- Those that travel 5 days per week in the peaks do better with fare capping.



HESITANT HARRY

AGE: 45
 OCCUPATION: Engineer
 LOCATION: Hamilton City
 TRAVEL FREQUENCY: Daily commute to city center from outer suburb
 MODES OF TRANSPORT: car, bus
 MOTIVATORS: Awareness, intuition, frequency
"Why would I?"

Estimated Monthly Travel Costs

Equity \$142 - \$160
 Customer \$105 - \$107
 Optimisation \$139 - \$140



FIRST TIME FIONA

AGE: 45
 OCCUPATION: Works part-time in retail
 LOCATION: Hamilton East
 TRAVEL FREQUENCY: Daily traveller, never considered public transport
 PRIMARY MODE OF TRANSPORT: Car
 MOTIVATORS: Safety, affordability, awareness, reliability, frequency
"It all feels a bit hard, I don't even know where to start"

Estimated Monthly Travel Costs

Equity \$85 - \$96
 Customer \$80 - \$84
 Optimisation \$63 - \$63



DABBLING DAVE

AGE: 55
 OCCUPATION: Manufacturing Manager
 LOCATION: Te Rapa
 TRAVEL FREQUENCY: Daily commute for work (work vehicle) but infrequent bus user
 MODES OF TRANSPORT: Car, bus, taxi
 MOTIVATORS: Reliability, intuition
"I never know when the next bus is or where to catch it."

Estimated Monthly Travel Costs

Equity \$142 - \$160
 Customer \$105 - \$107
 Optimisation \$139 - \$140



VULNERABLE VINNY

AGE: 90
 OCCUPATION: Unemployed
 LOCATION: Hamilton Central
 TRAVEL FREQUENCY: a few times a week
 MODES OF TRANSPORT: Bus
 MOTIVATORS: Safety, accessibility, affordability
"I like the bus but the bus doesn't like me"

Estimated Monthly Travel Costs

Equity \$0 - \$0
 Customer \$14 - \$27
 Optimisation \$14 - \$27



GOLDEN GLORIA

AGE: 80
 OCCUPATION: Retired nurse
 LOCATION: Hamilton
 TRAVEL FREQUENCY: Weekly bus user
 MODES OF TRANSPORT: Bus, train no longer drives
 MOTIVATORS: Affordability, accessibility, enjoyable, comfortable, safety
"It's important to get out, especially in winter, when it could be too easy to sit at home on my own"

Estimated Monthly Travel Costs

Equity \$0 - \$0
 Customer \$0 - \$0
 Optimisation \$0 - \$0



SHIFTWORKER STEVE

AGE: 26
 OCCUPATION: Electrician Apprentice on large construction project
 LOCATION: Ngirauwhia
 TRAVEL FREQUENCY: Daily
 MODES OF TRANSPORT: Bus
 MOTIVATORS: Accessibility, frequency, affordability
"It sucks relying on the bus but parking is too expensive"

Estimated Monthly Travel Costs

Equity \$143 - \$161
 Customer \$249 - \$253
 Optimisation \$160 - \$162



STUDIOUS SAM

AGE: 15
 OCCUPATION: High school student with part time job at supermarket
 LOCATION: Hamilton
 TRAVEL FREQUENCY: Daily
 MODES OF TRANSPORT: Bus
 MOTIVATORS: Reliability, affordability, safety
"I catch the bus with my mates so there can be a lot of us"

Estimated Monthly Travel Costs

Equity \$142 - \$160
 Customer \$105 - \$107
 Optimisation \$160 - \$162






CORPORATE CHLOE

AGE: 32
 OCCUPATION: Accountant
 LOCATION: Outskirts of Hamilton
 TRAVEL FREQUENCY: Daily
 MODES OF TRANSPORT: Bus
 MOTIVATORS: Safety, affordability, awareness, reliability, frequency
"I just need the bus to be on time, every time."

Estimated Monthly Travel Costs

Equity \$160 - \$160
 Customer \$105 - \$107
 Optimisation \$160 - \$162

Feedback

Equity Package 	Customer Emphasis Package 	Optimization Package 
<p>A focus on maintaining a higher level of equity (concession products) with some optimization.</p>	<p>A balanced focus on emphasising patronage through new and repeat customers, and simple, easy to calculate fares.</p> <p>Retains some simplified concessions.</p>	<p>Emphasises patronage growth through price differentiation.</p> <p>Potentially a more complex tariff structure.</p> <p>Reduced scope of concession products.</p>

Questions

- What is the preferred general direction / package or would the preferred package blend certain elements?
- Is there anything within each package you would like to change?
- Is there element of the review you would like to see before making final decisions?