Reform of the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002

Submission to the Consultation Regulation Impact Statement

Department of Transport and Main Roads

Queensland Government

Contents

Glossary and abbreviations

2032 Games	Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games
AHRC	The Australian Human Rights Council
AS	Australian Standard
ARG	Accessibility Reference Group (ARG) The Transport and Main Roads ARG, established in 2014, is a consultative forum with disability sector, industry and government stakeholders. Meetings occur to discuss matters relating to improving the Queensland passenger transport experience and reducing barriers for the customer using public transport. Key disability and accessibility stakeholders provide valuable input and feedback on passenger transport services, products, infrastructure and initiatives across the network.
Consultation RIS	Consultation Regulatory Impact Statement
DDA	*Disability Discrimination Act 1992*
Digital licence	An App developed by TMR that allows Queenslanders to securely store their driver licences, photo identification cards and recreational marine licences digitally on their mobile devices.
DITRDC	Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications
DRT	Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) is broadly recognised as a flexible shared ride transport option, with a flexible route and timetable that operates OnDemand travel. It is designed to bring together people who live near one another and want to travel at the same time in places or at times when buses and trains are not available. It is typically used where there is not enough passenger demand for a traditional public transport service, such as a fixed bus service, and provides reliable first- and last-mile services to improve customer access to mass transit routes. TMR anticipates DRT use will grow.
GoldLinQ	The contracted operator for the Gold Coast Light Rail system.
IITE	Information Technologies in Education
Light rail vehicles	Light rail vehicles are essentially 'trams'. At this stage, Queensland has one light rail system which operates on the Gold Coast.
MaaS	Mobility as a Service - MaaS is the combination of public and private transportation services accessed via an application which provides personalised journey planning, booking and payment. It enables individual mobility budgeting through single payment or subscription models, it offers choice and dynamic travel options and it provides a platform to incentivise and influence behaviour to better optimise the network.
MSQ	Maritime Safety Queensland MSQ is a branch of the Department of Transport and Main Roads within the Customer Services, Safety and Regulation Division. Its role is to protect Queensland's waterways and the people who use them—providing safer, cleaner seas.

NDIS	National Disability Insurance Scheme
NGR trains	New Generation Rollingstock Trains - 75 NGR trains are being progressively upgraded and returned to service by 2024.
NZ	New Zealand
ODT	On-Demand Transport
ONRSR	Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator
NCC	National Construction Code
NGR Commission of Inquiry	New Generation Rollingstock Train Commission of Inquiry The NGR Commission of Inquiry was established in 2018 to determine why the new generation rollingstock trains purchased for Queensland did not comply with the relevant disability legislation. The NGR Commission of Inquiry was led by Mr Michael Forde, Commissioner. 24 recommendations were handed down all of which the Queensland Government accepted and implemented.
NGR PWG	New Generation Rollingstock Project Working Group The project working group consisting of disability sector representatives used for consultative processes for the accessible design and upgrade of the NGR trains.
NSCV	National Standards for Commercial Vehicles.
ONRSR	Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator
PA	Public Address
PDO	TMR Program Delivery and Operations branch (PDO) - PDO is the branch responsible for planning and delivering value-for-money transport infrastructure programs and projects, ensuring the safe management of TMR assets
Personalised transport	Personalised transport refers to taxi, ride-booking (rideshare) and limousine services in Queensland.
PTIM	Public Transport Infrastructure Manual The Translink PTIM applies best practice planning and design principles to public transport infrastructure. It defines the elements of good public transport facilities, helps with evaluating existing facilities and should be used as a design tool when developing new infrastructure within the Translink network. The manual is relevant to developers of public transport infrastructure, those planning public transport provision and development assessment. The manual includes modal chapters across bus, rail, light rail, and ferry, as well as supporting access infrastructure such as park ‘n’ ride.
Premises Standards	Disability (Access to Premises Buildings) Standards 2010
Queensland Rail	Queensland Rail is a statutory authority, whose functions include management of railways; provision of rail transport services, including passenger services; and

	construction and maintenance of rail transport infrastructure. Queensland Rail acts as a rail transport operator in Queensland.
QTMP	Queensland Train Manufacturing Program - established to meet the increasing demand for rail transport in South East Queensland over the next 10 years, seeking to build new six-car passenger trains to support population and economic growth.
RSNL	Rail Safety National Law
SST	Specialist School Transport
Smart Ticketing	Smart Ticketing is the new ticketing solution that will make choosing public transport easier by introducing new ways to plan and pay for a public transport journey. Smart Ticketing will introduce more than 14,000 new devices that will accept credit or debit cards, smartphones and smart watches in addition to go cards and paper tickets.
TAP	Translink Access Pass - a travel pass for people with a permanent physical or intellectual disability who can: travel independently on Translink services; and demonstrate that due to their disability they are unable to independently use a go card. Passholders receive unlimited travel on all South East Queensland Translink bus, train, ferry and tram services (except Airtrain)
TGSI	Tactile Ground Surface Indicator
The Whole Journey Guide (Cth)	*The Whole Journey – A guide for thinking beyond compliance to create accessible public transport journeys (Cth)* was developed by the Australian Government in response to the second review of the Transport Standards.
TMR	Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) TMR manages transport and main roads in Queensland and acts as a provider of public transport, via its TransLink Division.
TOPTS	Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Standard 2010
Transport Standards Guidelines	Guidelines: Equivalent Access under the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002 (Cth)
Transport Standards	Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002
TSS	Taxi Subsidy Scheme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WATs	Wheelchair accessible taxis
WC3	World Wide Web Consortium
WAI	Web Accessibility Initiative

Executive Summary

The Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) is committed to becoming a world leader in the provision of accessible and inclusive transport. All people have the right to access critical transport services with operating principles and purpose underpinning the DDA (Cth) and human rights statutes. This document is TMR's submission in response to the *Reform of the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002—Stage 2 Consultation Regulation Impact Statement* (Stage 2 Consultation RIS).

Accessible passenger transport services in Queensland enable people to access essential services, employment, and connections to community. TMR recognises the crucial link between the *Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002 (*Transport Standards) and other government strategies and plans that seek to deliver these customer focussed and functional outcomes for people with disability.

TMR's recommendations on the proposed reforms are subject to the provision of further detail regarding the proposed implementation of the reforms, any associated financial impacts, and any implications for the role and function of the Queensland Government.

TMR has identified three reform areas of particular complexity:

- **61. Implementation approach**: One implementation option for all reform issues is not supported by TMR due to the varied complexities across different transport modes and functions of TMR. The selection of option 3 by TMR in this response, is to enable the most flexible implementation approach and avoid unexpected ramifications that other options may present. Consideration must also be given to in-flight public transport projects, which align with the current Transport Standards and require significant lead time from initial planning phases through to detailed design and delivery.
- **1. Reporting**: In principle, TMR would support the status quo or non-regulatory options and provide compliance data on TMR owned assets to the Australian Government. However, without clear definition of the scope of reporting, frequency and intended use of the information, TMR is currently unable to confirm support for any of the options without further consultation and clarification.
- **2. Equivalent Access**: Clear guidance and a robust framework for developing equivalent access solutions will define a more inclusive process and provide operators / providers with more legal certainty of agreed solutions. TMR therefore supports the regulatory option which will provide an alternative certification mechanism and lead to a more targeted outcome for compliance and accessibility, however, significant further consultation to develop an appropriate framework is required for TMR to fully support this option.

Without extensive cost benefit analysis against each of the proposed options, it was not possible to undertake a rigorous and consistent forensic financial analysis of potential impacts within the timeframe provided. TMR is of the perspective funding will be required from the Australian Government to support the full cost of compliance with the amended Transport Standards.

Potential cost impact advice included in this submission is based on best available inputs from internal and external sources available to TMR.

Of the 61 chapters, covering 54 areas of proposed reforms under the Stage 2 Consultation RIS, TMR supports:

- retaining the status quo for one areas of reform;
- a non-regulatory approach for 18 areas of reform;
- a regulatory approach for 35 areas of reform; and
- TMR prefers option 3 for reform 61 - Implementation approach; and
- a position was unable to be confirmed for six areas of reform.

The table below represents a summary of TMRs position on each reform area.

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
61	Implementation Approach	Option 3			TMR acknowledges that a blanket approach of one implementation option for all reform issues would constrain the provisions of several reform issues. However, option 3 would be preferred if a global implementation approach is required, to maximise flexibility to meet the revised standards, with some exceptions.
1	Reporting				The Stage 2 Consultation RIS does not contain sufficient clarity for TMR to confirm a preferred option on this reform as set out in TMR's response.
2	Equivalent Access		✕		TMR supports the regulatory option, conditional upon a number of issues being addressed as set out in TMR's response.
3	Rideshare		✕		TMR supports the regulatory option. This will bring certainty to rideshare operators regarding their obligations, and to people with disability who use such services.
4	Dedicated School Buses			✕	TMR supports the non-regulatory option to enable discretionary deviation from accessible low floor school buses in selected instances.
5	Better communication of accessible features		✕		TMR supports the regulatory option. This will seek to define the term accessibility and establish a glossary of related terminology.
6	Timely provision of information			✕	TMR prefers the non-regulatory proposal, conditional upon a number of matters being

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
					clarified as set out in TMR's response.
7	Real time communication				TMR seeks further clarity from the Commonwealth on the scope of the proposed regulatory and non-regulatory options. The Stage 2 Consultation RIS does not contain sufficient clarity on the following items for TMR to confirm a preferred option on this reform.
8	Passenger location during journey			✕	TMR supports the non-regulatory option. A non-regulatory solution could provide sufficient guidance and support to digital solution providers to encourage innovative ideas that leverage on the flexibility permitted to deliver better wayfinding products and services.
9	Hearing augmentation on conveyances		✕		TMR supports regulatory option 1, for new conveyances only. Specifically, the Performance Specification for the Queensland Train Manufacturing Program (QTMP) stipulates that all cars should be equipped with a hearing loop. The regulatory option may not be appropriate for the future pipeline of rollingstock as it could limit innovation in the features of such assets. This should be clarified by the Commonwealth to ensure efficient investment in these assets.
10	Hearing augmentation: Infrastructure & Premises	X			TMR is not in a position to support the regulatory option due to limited ability to assess the impacts across all relevant infrastructure, however could support a non-regulatory

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
					approach in the future in recognition of proof of concept trials underway.
11	Print size & format		×		TMR supports the regulatory option as this change only relates to large print format documents specifically produced for customers with a visual impairment.
12	International symbol for access and deafness		×		TMR supports the regulatory sub-option 2. The regulatory option updates the Australian Standards from the 2001 version to the 2009 version, thus aligning with the latest recommendations.
13	Letter heights and luminance contrast of signs			×	TMR supports the non-regulatory option. The current standards are sufficient but TMR would welcome additional guidance under the non-regulatory option within the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or the Whole Journey Guide to provide further clarity to operators / service providers.
14	Location of signs		×		TMR supports the regulatory sub-option 2 to include provisions with supplementary options and guidance within the Transport Standards.
15	Braille embossed (printed) specifications			×	TMR supports the non-regulatory option as this will provide sufficient guidance while minimising the risk of the unintended consequences of the regulatory option.
16	Braille and tactile lettering for signage		×		TMR supports the regulatory option as it provides for labels to be positioned relevant to equipment and consistent with Braille and tactile signage

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
					excluding the non-relevant elements (for example, height from finished floor).
17	Lifts: Braille and tactile information at lift landings		×		TMR supports the regulatory option on the condition that further detail on the placement of signage and what should be provided in instances where there isn't sufficient space on the door frame for signage be provided.
18	Lifts: Audible wayfinding		×		TMR supports the regulatory sub-option 2 as it proposes a concise requirement within the Transport Standards and the provision of additional guidance within The Whole Journey Guide.
19	Lift: Emergency communication in lift cars		×		TMR supports the regulatory option but only as applied to new or upgraded lifts, to enhance communications for people with disability.
20	Lifts: Reference for lift car communication and information systems			×	TMR supports the non-regulatory option to allow for the uncertainty around emerging technologies and applications in heavy rail environments, while also enabling enhanced accessibility of general facility PA announcements for people who use hearing aids, if external audible PA announcements are currently also provided within lifts
21	Information and communication & technologies (ICT)			×	TMR supports the non-regulatory sub-option 1 which allows operators and providers to be more responsive to technological advances and resultant upgrades to Australian and other standards.

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
22	Mobile Web Systems			✕	TMR supports the non-regulatory option which provides sufficient guidance to operators and providers on accessibility for mobile web systems to assist them in ensuring their services can be accessed by people with disability, without discrimination.
23	Accessible fare system elements		✕		TMR supports the regulatory option 2, sub-option 2. Both sub-options 1 and 2 modernise the relevant provisions to ensure operators and providers can respond to new technologies while maintaining requirements for fare system elements to be accessible.
24	Doors on access paths			✕	TMR supports the non-regulatory option noting that such guidance should be adopted as mandatory for TMR infrastructure.
25	Continuous accessibility on access paths			✕	TMR supports the non-regulatory option. This would mean updating the Transport Standards Guidelines and or The Whole Journey Guide to include advice and encourage maintenance.
26	Flange gaps				TMR does not select a preferred option on this reform, noting that the regulatory and non-regulatory options are inconsistent with RSNL, as outlined in the ONRSR Way* document: *The nature of the RSNL means ONRSR is not an approver of equipment, services or processes.** Note – *The ONRSR Way* documents what type of regulator ONRSR is, how it operates and provides regulated parties and rail

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
					safety stakeholders general clarity around how ONRSR does business.
27	Resting points		×		TMR supports the regulatory option. TMR recognises that provision of flat and stable 1300 by 800-millimetre allocated spaces within resting points facilitates equitable outcomes for people with disability.
28	Requirement for handrails in overbridges and subways			×	TMR supports the non-regulatory option. TMR's internal policy dictates that design guidance pertaining to transport premises guidance is adopted as mandatory requirements for TMR infrastructure.
29	Location of fare system elements		×		TMR supports the regulatory option as it provides clarity for operators, providers and passengers about the factors that must be considered in relation to the location of fare system elements without introducing any new requirements.
30	Allocated spaces and priority seating in waiting areas		×		TMR supports the regulatory option as it will provide consistency across jurisdictions and greater certainty for customers.
31	Accessible toilet with equal proportion of left and right hand configurations		×		TMR supports the regulatory option for new facilities only.
32	Emergency call buttons in accessible toilets		×		TMR supports the regulatory sub-option 2 which will ensure the safety of all users with a disability in providing them with the freedom and independence of using all facilities on and

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
					within the public transport system.
33	Ambulant toilets		×		TMR supports the regulatory option as TMR's policy is that such guidance be adopted as mandatory requirements for TMR infrastructure.
34	Lift specifications and enhancements		×		TMR supports the regulatory option on the provision that option 3 under 'Implementation Approach' is approved.
35	Specifications for escalators and inclined travellators		×		TMR supports the regulatory option to improve the customer journey and network consistency, subject to Implementation Option 3 being supported, or with the condition it is for 'new assets only'.
36	Poles, objects and luminance contrast		×		TMR supports the regulatory option 1, sub-option 1. Sub-option 1 clarifies the existing luminance contrast requirements in the Transport Standards s2.5 (2), providing some legal certainty by defining what is meant by a background in relation to obstacles, without requiring 75mm wide contrast strips.
37	Lighting		×		TMR supports either regulatory option 2 or 3 for new installations only. The non-regulatory option is preferred for amendments to existing infrastructure. TMR further suggests consideration of colour rendering performance levels of external lighting, and the need to acknowledge in all options including those favoured by the disability sector CCTV and facial

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
					recognition imagery requirements
38	Signals and process for requesting boarding devices		×		TMR supports the regulatory sub-option 2. Having real time communication with a guard to communicate a passenger wishes to alight is important.
39	Notification by passenger of need for boarding device			×	TMR supports non-regulatory sub-option 1. TMR will continue to explore initiatives to provide such a signal device system for commuters to use from boarding points.
40	Portable boarding edge barriers		×		TMR supports the regulatory sub-option 2. Modernising the Transport Standards will provide clarity on provision and heights of portable edge ramp barriers to improve safety for people with disability and to increase their confidence in using public transport.
41	Boarding ramps and gangway definitions		×		TMR supports the regulatory option as it provides greater clarity that will support the design process.
42	Removeable gangway design – ferries		×		TMR supports the regulatory option. TMR's current arrangements are structured similarly to the proposed regulatory reform requirements, and therefore reflect minimal disruption to TMR's current practice.
43	Nominated assistance boarding points		×		TMR supports the regulatory option 1, sub option 5 to provide consistency of application for customers across the network, while allowing providers the choice to nominate an assisted boarding point (or not).

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
44	Identification of lead stops		✕		TMR supports the regulatory option because it should result in clear identification of locations of the lead stops at bus stations.
45	Pontoon boarding points on infrastructure			✕	TMR supports the non-regulatory option. Retrofitting existing pontoons as suggested in the regulatory reform option is a highly complex task due to many operational / technical variables and, in many cases, cost prohibitive.
46	Bus, tram and light rail boarding points on infrastructure		✕		TMR supports the regulatory sub-option 2 as it will provide more consistency for customers.
47	Hail-and-ride services		✕		TMR supports the regulatory option. The current Transport Standards and associated guidance materials need to be amended to clarify the application of hail-and-ride services.
48	Accessible taxi ranks		✕		TMR supports the regulatory sub-option 3 as it provides requirements for taxi ranks which are currently absent from the Transport Standards.
49	Accessible passenger loading zones on-street		✕		TMR supports the regulatory option to provide requirements for accessible passenger loading zones on-street, and therefore provide consistency for all customers across the network and across modes. TMR prefers sub-option 3 on the condition that this option provides for 1 accessible bay in instances where 5 or less bays are provided.

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
50	Accessible parking spaces in infrastructure off-street parks		×		TMR prefers the regulatory sub-option 1 however, TMR suggests an alternative regulatory option under which there would be at least one accessible car park provided regardless of the number of total car parks.
51	Grab rails on access paths			×	TMR supports the non-regulatory option as the regulatory option is too broad and may result in unintended consequences.
52	Grab rails in allocated spaces		×		TMR supports the regulatory option because based on TMR's engagement with the disability sector, the regulatory option will provide the most consistency for passengers.
53	Mobility aid movement in allocated spaces: Passive restraints			×	TMR supports the non-regulatory option.
54	Mobility aid movement in allocated spaces: Active restraints			×	TMR supports the non-regulatory option.
55	Appropriate seats on booked services		×		TMR supports the regulatory option on the condition that the issues presented in TMR's response are adequately addressed.
56	Conveyance dwell times at stops			×	TMR supports the non-regulatory reform option. Provision of advice ensuring that conveyances do not depart from stops until passengers are safely positioned would inform driver training for service providers.
57	Stairs on trains				TMR does not have a position on this proposed reform

Reform No.	Reform area	Status quo	Regulatory	Non-regulatory	Comments
58	Stairs on ferries				TMR does not have a position on this proposed reform
59	Stairs on buses				TMR does not have a position on this proposed reform
60	Doorways contrast and height			✕	TMR prefers the non-regulatory option. Luminance contrast on door frame elements will provide benefits to people with vision impairment.

Introduction

The Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) is committed to becoming a world leader in the provision of accessible and inclusive transport. Accessible public transport is critical to improving the social and economic participation of a range of groups within the Queensland community, particularly people with disability.

This is TMR's submission in response to questions posed to 'operators and providers of public transport' in the *Reform of the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002—Stage 2 Consultation* (Stage 2 Consultation RIS).

The Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport

The Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2002 (the Transport Standards) were created under the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (DDA) to remove discrimination in access to public transport services for people with disability. The Transport Standards establishes the minimum accessibility requirements that must be met by providers and operators of public transport conveyances, infrastructure, and premises. The Transport Standards is used in conjunction with the *Disability (Access to Premises – Buildings) Standards 2010 (the Premises Standard)* and the *National Construction Code (NCC) in public transport delivery in Queensland*.

Part 34 of the Transport Standards requires the efficiency and effectiveness of the Transport Standards be reviewed every 5 years by the Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications, in consultation with the Attorney-General. The reviews must consider whether discrimination has been removed as much as possible and any necessary amendments to the Transport Standards to support the removal of discrimination be made.

In accordance with Part 34 of the Transport Standards, the Transport Standards is currently under review by the Commonwealth Government. The Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications (DITRDC) is leading a process to reform the Transport Standards to ensure it remains efficient and effective, fit-for-purpose and adequately meets the current needs of Australian society. To do this, the DITRDC has split the reform process into two stages to reflect the varying complexity of issues contemplated in the reform.

Stage 1 reform

On 12 February 2021, the DITRDC published the Reform of the Transport Standards Consultation Regulation Impact Statement (Stage 1 Consultation RIS). Stage 1 identified 16 areas for reform and amendments to references to the Australian Standards contained in the Transport Standards.

TMR responded to all reform areas of Stage 1, with commentary from Queensland Rail. Overall, TMR supported regulatory change for most reform areas. Where TMR indicated a position of support for regulatory or non-regulatory change, this was preliminary and subject to further detail and transparency from the Australian Government about the proposed application, timeframes for compliance and cost impacts.

Stage 2 reform

On 15 March 2022, DITCRD released the Stage 2 Consultation RIS. The Stage 2 amendments reflect 54 areas of reform, detailed in 61 chapters, capturing all aspects of public transport provision, including conveyances, infrastructure, information, and communication. They also capture compliance matters, implementation approach and the incorporation of new transport modes to be covered by the Transport Standards.

A summary of the Stage 2 reform areas is provided in the Executive Summary section of this report.

About the Department of Transport and Main Roads

TMR plans, manages, and delivers Queensland's transport with a focus on creating a single integrated transport network accessible to everyone. All Queenslanders, regardless of where they live and work, expect to have appropriate transport choices and fair access to the transport system.

TMR's passenger transport services enable people access to crucial education, health services, employment, connections to family and friends and recreational experiences available throughout the wider community. All members of our community have the right to access critical transport services that are provided consistently with principles and purpose underpinning the DDA *(Cth)* and human rights statutes.

TMR recognises the critical link between the Transport Standards and government strategies and plans that also seek to deliver customer focussed and functional outcomes for people with disability including:

- *Australia's Disability Strategy 2021 – 2031* (ADS), which reflects the commitment by all governments for an inclusive Australian society that ensures people with disability can fulfil their potential as equal members of the community.
- the Queensland Government's *All Abilities Queensland: Opportunities for All (State Disability Plan 2017 – 2020)*, which guided how Queenslanders could work in partnership with Australian and local governments, the corporate sector, non-government and community organisations, communities, and individuals to provide opportunities for all. The Queensland Government has committed to developing a new State Disability Plan that will give effect to Queensland's commitments under the ADS.
- the Queensland Government's *Queensland: An Age-Friendly Community – Action Plan* which outlines the Queensland Government's actions towards realising its vision of building age-friendly communities that enable people of all ages to actively participate in community life.
- *TMR's Strategic Plan 2019 – 2023*, *Accessibility and Inclusion Strategy*, *Disability Services Plan 2021 – 2022 – Interim 12-month plan,* and *Disability Action Plan 2018 – 2022*. Queensland Government agencies are developing renewed Disability Service Plans that align with and support delivery of the ADS and State Disability Plan 2017 – 2020.

TMR is supportive of and committed to the Transport Standards modernisation reform process and recognises there will always be opportunity to provide greater accessibility outcomes as new and improved safety, design and technological advancements emerge.

All levels of government, the passenger transport industry and the wider community must continually adapt their products, services, and programs to deliver improved accessibility in recognition of the rights of people with disability. Specifically, TMR also recognises both the merits and challenges offered by emerging digital

technologies in respect of regulating access to public transport services. Digital technologies have potential to unlock significant value for our communities and customers, enabling the benefits of an accessible transport network to be realised by our communities.

This submission

TMR's positions in response to the proposed reforms are subject to the provision of further detail regarding the proposed implementation of the reforms, any associated financial impacts, and any implications for the role and function of the Queensland Government.

TMR recognises that the Transport Standards needs to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate continuous updates to the Australian Standards by reflecting emerging technologies and the evolution of best practice. Embedding this flexibility into the Transport Standards means that the five-yearly reviews can focus on material issues relating to accessibility, as opposed to updates to Australian Standards that happen as part of normal business practice.

The Transport Standards should also provide clear specification for standards, design outcomes, operational procedures, and regulation. The current reforms being proposed to the Transport Standards cover all aspects of the customer journey, as well as all aspects of public transport service delivery. This recognises that consistency in access and service delivery is a critical component for delivering certainty for customers and operators/providers. TMR recognises the fundamental importance of balancing consistency and certainty for customers with the capacity of operator / providers to fulfil their obligations, and the response to the Stage 2 Consultation RIS reflects this view.

Given the significance of the Transport Standards reforms, TMR considers it critical that the Australian Government seeks input from all affected parties including all levels of government, transport operators/providers, providers who supply services to the transport sector, access consultants, the disability sector, people with disability and other impacted cohorts.

This submission has been prepared with input and support from Arup Australia Pty Ltd and includes an independent disability stakeholder engagement report (**Attachment 1**).

Financial Impacts

Without extensive cost benefit analysis against each of the proposed options, it was not possible to undertake a rigorous and consistent forensic financial analysis of potential impacts within the timeframe provided. Potential cost impact advice included in this submission is based on best available inputs from internal and external sources available to TMR.

Further cost benefit analysis should be undertaken, to consider and address the potential application of the amended Transport Standards prior to the formalisation of final positions. TMR is aware the Australian Government has advised that the development of an implementation schedule will be undertaken in consultation with stakeholders subject to the outcomes from the Infrastructure and Transport Ministers' Meeting consideration of the Decision RIS in May 2023.

This level of granular financial and associated detail is required to fully realise the extent of future potential impacts on not only jurisdictional governments but also potential impacts to servicing and scheduling. Impacts to public transport services can be profound and far reaching if the application and implementation of the amended Transport Standards does not consider real-world applicability.

Consideration must be given to existing and emerging public transport infrastructure, premises and conveyances that may come into effect between now and commencement of the amended Transport Standards – or public transport infrastructure, premises and conveyances that are ‘in flight’. Any investment required for compliance will carry a significant cost and TMR will employ a prioritisation framework to deliver the investment over time and minimise expense. TMR notes that funding will be required from the Australian Government to support the full cost of compliance with an amended Transport Standard.

TMR acknowledges the financial benefits of long-term investment in transport accessibility. Any changes to public transport in Queensland, to support improvements to the Transport Standards, have potential to support greater uptake of public transport by all consumers, including people with disability and older Queenslanders. This may also facilitate greater independence and engagement with employment and education, health and community services, contributing to improved outcomes for people with disability and older Queenslanders. Over time, improvements to public transport accessibility may decrease reliance on private transport options, which are self-funded, or subsidised by state and territory transport subsidy schemes or the NDIS.

On 18 March 2022, Disability Reform Ministers discussed long-term transport policy for NDIS participants, committing to co-design across jurisdictions and with representatives of people with disability on a long-term approach to how transport supports are included in participants' plans and will work alongside accessible public transport.

SEQ2032

Transport infrastructure and services are critical considerations for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games (2032 Games), as well as for Queensland's growing population. TMR is undertaking planning activities to ensure it is well placed to provide the necessary transport networks and services, with a focus on ensuring services are accessible.

The outcome of the Transport Standards reform and implementation approach is likely to greatly impact the planning and building activities of all three levels of government. Several transport and road projects have been identified as necessary for future growth in SEQ and to support the 2032 Games operations. The Queensland and Australian Governments, as well as local government, have already committed to funding for a number of these projects.

Reform Area 61 - Implementation approach

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
There is limited understanding of how new legislative requirements will be implemented and subsequent concerns about meeting compliance dates regarding existing assets. This reform aims to provide a clear implementation framework and incorporate provisions to ensure compliance regarding existing assets.	Three options have been proposed. These are: • **Option 1**: Existing assets would need to comply with new regulatory requirements based on a new compliance schedule. Compliance target dates for individual sections of the Transport Standards would be developed with stakeholders. • **Option 2**: Existing assets would need to comply with new regulatory requirements based on a new compliance schedule. Compliance target dates for transport assets (e.g. trams, bus stops, taxi ranks, websites and digital information etc.) would be developed with stakeholders. • **Option 3**: Regulatory amendments would apply to all new assets. Existing assets would only need to comply with new regulatory requirements when certain circumstances are met, triggering compliance obligations with the new requirements.

Response to consultation questions

Have target dates for compliance in Transport Standards, Schedule 1 Target dates for compliance been successful in bringing compliance to public transport assets?

In general, TMR observes that the use of compliance date requirements in the current Transport Standards have proven problematic and have sometimes come at the expense of potential targeted improvements. For example:

- Whole of network: Establishing target dates expedited accessibility upgrades to bus stops, vehicles, and stations. However, there are still parts of our network that are not compliant with the standards due to significant costs and/or technical challenges associated with achieving compliance.
- Customer information and services: The current guidance around customer information and service provision is largely outcome focused, with limited technical specifications/requirements in the Transport Standards and associated guidelines. TMR considers it difficult to measure compliance against the 2017 date for information.

The intent of Schedule 1 in improving accessibility outcomes has been useful in guiding thinking and approaches to providing customer information and ensuring these are a priority in delivery.

What are the challenges and benefits to achieving compliance for existing assets under Transport Standards Schedule 1 Target dates for compliance?

Item	Description
Challenges	
Clear prioritisation mechanism for funding is required	Many parts of Queensland are currently in a strong growth cycle with large areas of urban expansion. This is especially true within South East Queensland. Programs for wholesale (non-targeted) upgrades to existing assets ahead of their effective design life can divert funds from expanding networks into urban growth areas, often disadvantaging vulnerable people who have located on the urban fringes due to affordability constraints.
Asset owner prioritisation	Some providers and asset owners may delay delivery of compliant upgrades due to their perception of organisational priorities and available budgets in the overall scheme of things, and as a public transport provider.
Compliance	A lack of authority or ownership of key assets owned by third parties can compromise delivery of compliant assets or upgrades.
Clear prioritisation mechanism for infrastructure is required	Careful consideration is required to ensure targeted implementation of upgrades that enable the highest level of inclusivity and provide most benefit. This is not always at the busiest stations or lines. For example, there are often higher concentrations of vulnerable people living in areas where accommodation is more affordable, but transport disadvantage is higher.
Upgrade versus expansion	Meaningful outcomes for accessibility should be the focus of the Transport Standards. However, many customers in established areas may have access to multiple mobility options, whereas customers on the urban fringe may have limited opportunity for accessible mobility; if any at all.
Costs	The cost of retrofitting is prohibitive and, in some cases, unfeasible due to the high cost and technical challenges, unless significant federal funding was received. For example, TMR was advised that the cost of updating all infrastructure signage across the SEQ network would be approximately $60 million.
Benefits	
Compliance	Compliant assets deliver a fully accessible public transport experience for customers.
Certainty	More certainty is provided for people with disability in the provision of accessible public transport facilities through achieving compliance by a given date. Certainty is delivered for providers for what is needed as well as setting goals for achieving compliance.

What is your preferred option: implementation option 1, 2 or 3? Why?

A blanket approach of one implementation option for all reform issues would constrain the provisions of several reform issues. The Stage 2 Consultation RIS does not provide sufficient clarity on the proposed regulatory timelines under implementation options 1 and 2. This means TMR is uncertain as to whether a global or tailored approach is to be progressed.

If there is only one implementation approach to be chosen for all reforms, then option 3 would be preferred as the global implementation approach to maximise flexibility to meet the revised standards. However, there are some exceptions where option 3 is only supported as it applies to new assets, including hearing augmentation on conveyances whenever a public address system is installed, and accessible toilets with equal proportion of left and right hand configurations on ferries and trains.

Consideration must also be given to emerging or new public transport infrastructure, premises and conveyances that may come into effect between now and commencement of the amended Transport Standards – or public transport infrastructure, premises and conveyances that are 'in flight'.

In Queensland, there are several major multi-billion-dollar infrastructure projects currently 'in flight' that require significant lead time from initial planning phases through to detailed design and delivery. Examples include the $6.9 billion Cross River Rail project, the $1.219 billion Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 3 project, and the $335 million accessibility upgrades to the New Generation Rollingstock. It should be noted that the Queensland Government is already adopting a co-design approach to many projects, where feasible, and ensuring early engagement with a view to delivering best practice functional accessibility outcomes and relying on the Transport Standards as the minimum standard.

Therefore, the application of the amended Transport Standards should not apply to existing assets or impose any changes to 'in flight' infrastructure projects, including those outlined above.

TMR's preferred implementation option varies for different transport modes and different functions of TMR. A summary of TMR's preferred implementation option for different modes and a justification is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 : TMR's preferred implementation approach across transport modes

Mode	Implementation Option	Justification
School buses	Option 3	The retrospective implementation option would not be feasible for school buses if they were to be required to comply with new regulatory requirements. This is due to the limited ability to be able to retrofit existing bus assets, which have an operational lifespan of 20 years. If low floor and/or other more accessible school buses were to be mandated, clear implementation milestones (for example, 50 per cent of school buses to be fully accessible by "X" date) would be useful to assist TMR in working with the private sector to ramp up production of accessible bus assets and secure funding to progressively upgrade fleet.

Mode	Implementation Option	Justification
Passenger Services (subject to the Transport Standards for the first time)	Option 3	Option 3 is preferred where an operator of a public transport service has not previously been subject to compliance with the requirements of the Transport Standards. This will provide the same approach as those operators who were originally captured by the Transport Standards, when introduced in 2002. The needs of people with disability to have easy access to all forms of passenger transport is acknowledged. Should tourist and transfer service operators and vehicles be included in the standards, option 3 will ensure that new vehicles meet these requirements, turning over the fleet over time, to ensure compliance with requirements.
Passenger Services (already subject to the Transport Standards)	Tailored approach combining all options. Refer to summary section for proposed implementation approach by reform area.	Some reform areas are better suited to Option 1 (such as areas where minor changes can be delivered in bulk across a range of asset types and owners), whereas others should align with Option 2, where upgrades of an entire facility or transport mode can occur together. Further, Option 3 provides a layered and opportunistic regulatory trigger for any major works to require compliance with the standards.
Personalised Transport Industry	Option 1	The new compliance schedule would outline bespoke compliance target dates for individual sections of the new Transport Standards and would provide flexibility for a dedicated transition approach to be developed for the training of personalised transport drivers that is fit-for-purpose.

The options do not explicitly canvas how the new regulatory requirements for staff training would apply to the personalised transport industry (taxi and rideshare) or consider the range of 'assets', or the different operating models, used in the industry.

'Assets' used by the personalised transport industry include drivers, vehicles and road infrastructure, such as taxi ranks, and other pick up/drop off locations. Rideshare drivers and vehicles affiliate with booking services as and when they are willing to provide services and generally bring their vehicles with them. Many rideshare vehicles are not dedicated and are also used as private vehicles. The number of drivers and vehicles affiliated with a service provider might fluctuate substantially over time as new drivers sign on and others leave. Some drivers might only affiliate with a single provider for a short period and others might affiliate with several providers.

In contrast, taxis are dedicated vehicles, which incur substantial fit out costs — particularly, wheelchair accessible taxis (WATs). The number of taxi vehicles in a geographical area is generally limited by the number of taxi licences issued for the area. Vehicles are generally only affiliated with a single service provider and there is less churn in vehicles comprising providers' taxi fleets. Drivers generally only affiliate with one service provider, although there is flexibility for them to work across service providers and for rideshare providers too. In Queensland, taxis continue to have exclusive access to the rank and hail market and as such have exclusive

access to taxi rank infrastructure, which are owned and maintained by local governments or private enterprise (such as shopping centres).

Where you have been unable to reach full compliance under the Transport Standards what mechanisms have you used to provide accessibility for public transport users?

Typically, the equivalent access approach has been applied, including consultation with advocates and organisations representing people with disability.

Is there sufficient clarity around when the triggers outlined in the Transport Standards section 32.1 Effect and application of these Standards are activated and when an existing asset should comply with the new requirements?

There is not sufficient clarity in the section 32.1 of the Transport Standards, and the trigger for this requirement. Further definition is required on key terms such as 'substantial refurbishment or alteration'. This could be addressed through clarification in the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or in Part 1 – Meaning of important terms in the Transport Standards.

Further detail would also be required for triggers/dates of compliance of individual assets/requirements outlined in the Transport Standards, under the different implementation options.

What impact does enforcement of target dates (or lack of enforcement) have on the success of using a schedule mechanism to reach compliance?

Target dates are important for providers to understand what is required by when, and it sets goals for providers to keep accessibility and compliance at the forefront for achieving inclusive networks. Clarity in expected implementation timing for compliance is important for people with disability.

How does this impact accessibility of public transport?

If target dates are not set this may reduce the pace of upgrades to existing assets by providers. This may result in inconsistent accessibility across a transport network.

There is limited information presented within the impact statement to appraise the impacts of each option on digital assets as they are not considered transport assets or covered under sections of the Transport Standards. Moreover, the emphasis on physical infrastructure and vehicle infrastructure may not suitably translate to digital infrastructure, particularly those which have shorter assets lives (for example, consumer facing software platforms). New TMR technology and digital solutions are implemented with the highest standard of accessible information as far as is practicable. For digital assets, the Queensland Whole of Government (WoG) Digital Services Policy Framework will also need to be considered and complied with.

Reform Area 1 – Reporting

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
No requirements currently exist as to how compliance data is to be reported under the Transport Standards, which has created disparities in the accuracy and consistency of data. The anticipated outcome of this reform aims to create a uniform national framework for collecting, analysing, and reporting compliance with the Transport Standards.	Status Quo: Continued adherence to the Transport Standards and its guidelines, which provide no specifications for reporting. Operators/providers to continue self-reporting compliance data collected. Non-Regulatory: Operators/providers to be issued guidance by the Commonwealth about the development of compliance plans and self-reporting mechanisms (for new or upgraded assets). The intention of this is to support the preparation of robust compliance plans and encourage progress reporting. The Australian Government may provide a central repository of published compliance plans and progress reports. Regulatory: The Commonwealth would establish a database and comprehensive framework for operators/providers to report and store compliance plans and data. The intention is to provide clear and simple guidance for operators/providers to report compliance data. The Australian Government would work with state and territory governments, operators, and providers to expand reporting. Three regulatory options are proposed. • Option 1: Report compliance on new or substantially refurbished or upgraded assets only • Option 2: Report compliance data on new or substantially refurbished and upgraded assets AND all assets for select sections of the Transport Standards only • Option 3: Report compliance data on new or substantially refurbished and upgraded assets AND for specific assets only

Response to consultation questions

How could the impact on you change if compliance data is reported for sections of the Transport Standards (regulatory option 2) or for whole transport assets (regulatory option 3)?

The potential impacts to TMR due to the reform primarily relate to infrequent data capture and additional administrative responsibilities.

Where TMR is a joint provider, or not an operator/provider (i.e., on a provider's behalf), this may increase the extent to which TMR is responsible for the compliance of assets. TMR's risk exposure and financial obligations relating to compliance of assets not within its control may significantly exceed expected funding allocations in the Passenger Transport Infrastructure Investment Program. There are also additional complexities, such as clear agreement of the reporting provider, and processes for reporting/resolving differing assessments of the shared asset. The additional administrative responsibilities of reporting for all state-wide passenger transport assets will be a significant impact.

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or regulatory option 1, 2 or 3? Why?

The Stage 2 Consultation RIS does not contain sufficient clarity on the following items for TMR to provide a view on this reform:

- Scope of the reporting, including defining key terms such as 'assets' or 'select sections'. The scope of assets or components to which reporting relates has a significant bearing on the appropriate form of reporting (either through a regulatory or non-regulatory mechanism).
- Inclusion of equivalent access into any proposed reporting mechanism, eroding certainty for operators/providers in respect of their obligations under the Transport Standards. It is unclear how equivalent access processes will form part of any future reporting requirement, when adopted in lieu of achieving technical compliance with the Transport Standards. Because the current DDA framework is complaints-based, the publication of non-compliance for technical matters without publication of equivalent access (or greater assurance provided through equivalent access processes) may increase the risk of complaints for industry. Absence of clear assurance provided through any equivalent access process may result in dis-benefits for the sector.
- Intended outcome of reporting, including the purpose and intent of the information. The status quo does not provide clarity on the extent of compliance, however it is unclear whether a reporting framework will result in any increase in compliance to the Transport Standards without an enforcement mechanism.
- Responsible party for reporting. TMR is responsible for coordinating transport infrastructure and services and managing transport policy and planning in Queensland. In some instances, TMR is the sole provider of transport services. However, public passenger services are generally purchased by the State of Queensland (via TMR) from service providers. This is managed through a service contract, under which the service provider is bound to perform the transport operations. Importantly, the service provider is an independent contractor. The service provider is not an agent of TMR, and TMR's information gathering powers are limited. It is unclear whether TMR would assume the responsibility for reporting on behalf of its service providers under any future reporting requirement. The role of private parties (such as landowners) is also unclear in the proposed reforms.

TMR supports either the status quo or the non-regulatory option in principle, however further clarity on reporting requirements is required for TMR to confirm a preferred option.

TMR, in principle, does not support the regulatory option for this reform. Notwithstanding, if the regulatory option was to be enacted, TMR prefers sub-option 3. This is because sub-option 3 will involve a consultative discussion with transport operators/providers to determine the transport assets and sections of the Transport Standards to which reporting would relate.

Under regulatory option 2, an additional compliance requirement would be introduced to include "all assets for select sections of the Transport Standards only". As TMR's service providers are responsible for certain assets (being conveyances and contract vehicles), this may impose additional compliance checking requirements on TMR officers to ensure compliance. This additional compliance checking would impose an administrative burden and cost that may not be efficient in respect of the intended outcome for the proposed reform.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

TMR does not believe the options provide enough clarity about reporting requirements and the intended outcome of reporting processes to properly assess the value of such a change for people with disability accessing public transport. Without a full understanding of the scope and formatting of the reporting, provision of data does not necessarily translate to meaningful insights for passengers.

TMR is supportive of customers having timely and accurate information about the accessibility of the transport network, however this information is better provided through the proposed reform area 5 as opposed to a

compliance reporting mechanism. The information that will deliver the most benefit for our customers is the accessible features of our assets that support journey planning and execution.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of any option?

Refer to Table 2.

Table 2 : Challenges with implementation for reporting reform

Reform	Challenge	Description
Regulatory and non-regulatory	**Increase in administrative costs**	Any additional reporting requirements of compliance and the extent to which each asset meets the prescriptive requirements of the Transport Standards would increase administrative costs for transport operators and providers, and these costs may be passed onto TMR. These costs could include the procurement of new digital infrastructure to meet the reporting requirements (e.g., new software and asset management systems) as well as additional training costs.
Regulatory and non-regulatory	**Inaccuracy in reporting information**	TMR has identified several potential data inaccuracies, such as: • Natural inaccuracies in detailed measurements (such as lighting lux levels). • Subjects to change as assets degrade (such as luminance contrast) or need maintenance (such as light failures or TGSI displacement). • Focus on compliance without providing additional information about accessibility beyond compliance. • Data aggregated at a scale that may not be useful to customers planning journeys (such as per cent of bus stops). • Data captured infrequently (such as annually) could be misleading to customers. • The administrative burden of reporting will be likely to have an FTE requirement.
Regulatory and non-regulatory	**Responsible party for reporting**	Further clarity is required as to who is responsible for meeting the reporting requirement, particularly where private landowners or other parties may be involved. The information gathering powers of operators/providers are limited, particularly for third-party owned assets. Where compliance with the Transport Standards is limited due to decisions or requirements of third-party asset owners, it is unclear how this would be managed within the reporting framework.
Regulatory and non-regulatory	**Treatment of equivalent access**	It is unclear how any equivalent access process or reform would be dealt with as part of the reporting requirement.

Would you provide compliance data to the Australian Government if it was discretionary?

Without clear definition of the scope of reporting, frequency and intended use of the information, TMR is unable to provide a firm view on discretionary reporting. However, in principle, TMR would provide compliance data on TMR owned assets to the Australian Government where it can reasonably be collected.

What is your experience reporting on public transport accessibility (if applicable)?

Pursuant to the service contracts between TMR and service providers, the service provider is the owner of service contract assets (contract vehicles, the depots; depot equipment and other assets). In some instances, TMR may be the owner of the transport infrastructure.

Under the service contract, the service provider must comply with the DDA legislation (DDA and the Transport Standards). The service provider must also develop, implement and comply with a Disability Action Plan (this plan must specify the steps the service provider will take to comply with the DDA legislation and the *Anti-Discrimination Act 1991* (Qld)).

The service provider must:

- make this plan available to customers free of charge
- publish it on its website
- provide details of the disability action plan to TMR
- provide compliance reports to TMR in June 2023.

Do you think compliance data on the Transport Standards should be made public? If yes, what would you use the data for?

TMR is unlikely to use any data published in respect of compliance with the Transport Standards.

Reform Area 2 – Equivalent Access

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Equivalent access processes were developed to allow operators/providers with flexibility to deliver an equivalent level of accessibility where technical compliance is difficult or unachievable. Equivalent access processes have been acknowledged to be a reasonable mechanism to deliver accessibility outcomes, however, certainty and assurance is not provided through such processes due to legal uncertainties and whether the process satisfies the full obligations under the Transport Standards.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged, and no guidance would be issued. Non-Regulatory: No amendments added into the Transport Standards, however, it is proposed that the Commonwealth implement an accessible web-based equivalent access repository, aimed to inform stakeholders of how to facilitate equivalent access in own settings through examples ranging in complexity, and centralise information for where and how equivalent access is being applied. Operators and providers would be tasked with sharing these examples. The website would incorporate a disclaimer that examples are not endorsed by governments. Regulatory: The Transport Standards be amended to include performance-based solutions like those included under the NCC. This process would involve consultation with people with disability and establish certification methods which confirm alternative solutions as fit for purpose and non-discriminatory. The Building Code Australia could be modified to fit Transport Standards by including co-design and consultation with the disability community.

Response to consultation questions:

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

In principle, TMR supports the intent of the proposed regulatory reform option for equivalent access to provide greater certainty to operators/providers, improve assurance processes and reduce the burden for managing discrimination which currently rests with complainants per the status quo.

Neither the regulatory or non-regulatory option provide clear or adequate solutions with the equivalent access processes as outlined in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS. TMR's support for the regulatory option is conditional upon the following issues with the proposed reform being adequately addressed. TMR is unclear on whether the timeframes between the Stage 2 Consultation RIS and the Decision RIS allows for further consultation as indicated and specified for this reform:

- **Equivalent access should not be a substitute for compliance**. The regulatory instrument should be designed to provide appropriate incentive for operators/providers to prioritise investment to achieve compliance instead of relying on equivalent access. The focus of the Transport Standards reform should be to achieve compliance with the technical specifications contained in the Transport Standards. Equivalent access processes should only be used in specific circumstances where compliance is unachievable due to specific factors in the environment.
- **How to determine that an equivalent access solution provides an equivalence of access sufficient to supplant the relevant specifications.** As the current framework under the DDA is complaints-based, reliance on equivalent access (where compliance with the Transport Standards cannot be achieved) needs to provide assurance to operators/providers to ensure the resulting processes are fit-for-purpose. The Commonwealth should consider providing further clarification on how operators/providers can demonstrate that equivalent access provides public transport without discrimination 'as far as possible' (the Transport Standards s33.5), and clearly define what this means in terms of a benchmark for performance solutions.
- **Desired accessible outcomes must be mandated and clearly defined, including success of equivalent access regimes.** The proposed regulatory reform option stipulates that a new certification body will be established to certify the final equivalent access solution. For the certification process to be successful, the desired outcomes of the equivalent access regime must be clearly defined and mandated. Without this definition, we are concerned that equivalent access outcomes will not provide the requisite certainty for both customers and operators/providers.
- **Further definition and clarity are required on the role and function of the certification body**, such as:
    - Powers and form of the certification body need to be defined, specifically in relation to whether the body would be state-based or nation-wide, and how they would be engaged and / or procured.
    - Composition of the certification body must be defined. For example, whether:
        - it would include a panel of physical and digital access experts and representatives from the disability community that could be called on depending on the type of equivalent access case put forward (i.e., people who are blind for Braille labels and signage, or people using mobility devices for ramps or access paths)
        - experts would be required as well as relevant industry reps (ferries vs buses).
    - Experts required, when progressing an equivalent access solution, need to be defined. This particularly impacts digital requirements as access consultants do not generally provide advice on these.
    - Timing of engagement of the certification body during the process must be determined and defined.
    - Level of agreement required to certify a regime (i.e., consensus / certification body forum) and the mechanisms available where agreement cannot be reached on a given solution must be defined. This also includes defining the expected role of the certification body in mediating any lack of agreement (potentially through providing recommendations).
    - The desired outcome of the certification regime is to deliver acceptable and regulated equivalent access outcomes in an efficient way. TMR believes that this can only occur where the approval mechanism for certification or acceptance is required. For example, a final certification mechanism may introduce risks of flaws in a committed design being accepted and the need to restart the co-design process. TMR believe this would be appropriately mitigated through a progressive certification process at hold points in the co-design process.
    - Whether there would be a mechanism available to the operator / provider should they disagree with the panel's decision.

- **Clarification of the participants to be involved in the equivalent access process.** The groups and parties to be involved in the equivalent access process need to be clarified and clearly defined as part of the regulatory instrument. This clarity and definition is required to ensure the process adequately accounts for the varying needs of people with disability to remove discrimination. In the absence of clarity, TMR considers that:
    - sole reliance on end users (overseen by the access consultant) during co-design may result in solutions that are impracticable, unfeasible and that are inconsistent with other solutions within and across transport networks. This could lead to diminished outcomes for accessibility in the short and medium term
    - participants from disability communities involved in co-design must form a representative sample of users who will interact with, or otherwise be impacted by, the object of the equivalent access process (e.g., representatives with mobility impairments, visual impairments, auditory impairments). A skewed sample of users (e.g., those with mobility impairments) may result in a solution that accounts only for the needs of the sample
    - access specialists owning the equivalent access process may result in a loss of input from disability representative participants.
- **Clarification of the role of access specialists is required for the regulated equivalent access reform.** Further clarity is required around the access specialists' responsibilities throughout planning, implementation and reporting on the equivalent access process. Reliance on access consultants to plan, implement and report on the equivalent access process could result in significant cost, time and quality impacts to project delivery, due to:
    - a shortage of accredited access specialists (exacerbated by regulation), particularly in regional / rural areas where they may be fewer accredited specialists
    - inexperience of access specialists in implementing the equivalent access process
    - services fees associated with procurement of access specialists.
- **Clear definition of what constitutes an appropriate governance process**. Fundamental to the success of the reform is the governance that oversees an equivalent access process, ensuring outcomes are appropriate and fit-for-purpose. Further definition and clarity must be provided on what constitutes an appropriate governance process.
- **Opportunities for providing 'lessons learned' from other jurisdictions for improving accessible outcomes.** The resulting regulatory instrument should enable continuous improvement across the sector for improving accessible outcomes. The regulatory instrument should consider how solutions demonstrating public transport has been provided without discrimination 'as far as possible' can be communicated to other jurisdictions to support wide adoption.

Without guidance and a robust framework like that outlined in the regulatory option and including the points above, operators and providers of published 'successful' equivalent access solutions would still lack legal certainty and without moderation, may result in promotion of poor examples and potentially poor outcomes for people with disability using public transport.

Passengers with disability or organisations representing them may be reluctant to be involved in equivalent access processes without a clear framework. Publication of consultation details and outcomes in a public repository that is open to public scrutiny may expose them to criticism and reputational damage.

This reform could be strengthened by the addition of the framework as guidance in the *Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport Guidelines 2004*, although this then may be perceived as a regulatory option.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The non-regulatory option, as described in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS, may assist similar projects in achieving compliance through an equivalent access process. This approach may not be specific to the location and application could lead to discrepancies within each jurisdiction.

Any examples provided to the web-based repository as part of the non-regulatory option would likely include the same process and evidence completed within the regulatory option. However, only providers who are proactive in providing best practice outcomes would provide examples for an Australian Government managed web-based repository.

The regulatory option would provide an alternative certification mechanism that would lead to a more targeted outcome for compliance and accessibility for people with disability, giving people with disability some ownership of the agreed outcomes. This alternative approach / process may be used by providers if, and when, specific compliance, accessibility or best practice cannot be achieved using typical prescriptive standards.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Several challenges were identified with the proposed reforms. The flow-on effects of these challenges have the potential to negatively impact public transport passengers with disability.

Refer to Table 3.

Table 3 : Challenges with implementation of reform to equivalent access

Reform option	Challenge	Description
All	**Lack of certainty offered through reforms**	Operators and providers need to know that infrastructure can be operated to effectively provide accessible outcomes. Equivalent access does not provide the requisite certainty for operators/providers or for passengers.
All	**Co-design does not always result in best practice design or operational outcomes**	Co-design does not always result in best practice design or operational outcomes (see response above) and should not be relied upon as a mechanism to address shortcomings in the Transport Standards. The equivalent access process can result in the implementation of non-uniform infrastructure, assets, and levels of assistance across transport networks. Non-uniform infrastructure, assets and level of assistance contravene universal access principles when applied beyond local boundaries (e.g., a single rail station or bus terminal).
All	**Equivalent access should provide the right incentives to achieve accessible outcomes, not just compliance**	The equivalent access process may incentivise providers / operators to implement low cost and technically straightforward solutions in favour of more costly or technically challenging solutions that would better meet customer needs.

Reform option	Challenge	Description
Regulatory and Non-Regulatory	**Financial and operational**	Additional [unspecified] performance requirements that may result from the development of the proposed process and drafting of the new standards may result in unintended consequences and impose significant financial and operational burden on operators.
Regulatory and Non-Regulatory	**General understanding of reforms**	Any new approach or changes to the Transport Standards need to be better understood by all and be efficient for delivering outcomes, otherwise there will be high risk it will not work or benefit anyone.
Regulatory and non-regulatory	**Impact of publication on consultation process**	Publication of equivalent solutions may also compromise the consultation process as some members of the disability community may be reluctant to participate in an equivalent access process that could be published without appropriate governance/certification due to the potential reputational risk.
Regulatory	**Lack of clarity in CRIS proposal**	The process outlined in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS lacks enough detail or substance to determine whether it would impact the implementation of requirements.
Regulatory	**Increased risk of complaints**	Greater visibility of equivalent access compliance without an independent certification mechanism would increase the risk of discrimination complaints.
Regulatory	**Certification**	There would be significant work in establishing and resourcing a certification body should 3rd party certification be required.
Regulatory	**Cost increases**	Additional, inefficient costs associated with the requirements for access consultants to prepare equivalent access reports.
Regulatory	**Timing impacts**	The requirement for the access consultant to prepare reports may add significant cost to a project, potentially cause delays and be a resource burden on the access consulting industry but would not necessarily improve the quality of the solution or the process.

Reform option	Challenge	Description
Regulatory	**Timing impacts**	The regulatory option also risks a bottleneck in the certification process if, as proposed, accessibility reference groups or committees were required to certify proposals. This may effectively reverse or cause amendments to proposals developed with people with disability or those representing people with disability during the co-design process. It would be more appropriate for 'as built conformance assurance' to be undertaken during consultation, with the expectation that evidence could be provided that any proposed solution provided access without discrimination.
Regulatory	**Impacts on related markets**	The resource burden on the access consulting industry and subsequent delays in the process if there are insufficient numbers of qualified consultants
Regulatory	**Effectiveness depends on the quality of input from consultation process**	If accessibility groups do not participate in, or provide quality input to consultation, the regulatory option will not be fit-for-purpose.
Regulatory	**Uncertainty from certification**	The proposed certification mechanisms or certification body is not yet known or understood, resulting in uncertainty for providers.
Regulatory	**Time impacts on projects**	Equivalent access processes add time to projects. The extent of the time impact is project-dependent and is influenced by the ability to use previously validated solutions; the level of evidence provided on suitability of solutions; and how onerous certification and peer review processes need to be to achieve compliance.
Regulatory	**Risk not adequately managed**	New performance solutions will add an extra compliance requirement. This allows a greater level of certainty for what may be accepted by the courts. However, more prescriptive requirements will limit flexibility in relying on equivalent access as a defensive strategy if no approved solution exists.
Regulatory	**Performance solutions can lead to interpretation issues**	Performance solutions are already used under the *Building Code of Australia*. Within the current Transport Standards, these solutions are uncommon and often cause interpretation issues (noting this is with a lack of independent certification). Clear specification of the performance solution is required for this to be effective.

Reform option	Challenge	Description
Non-regulatory	**Increased risk of complaints**	The visibility of equivalent access solutions published online (without moderation), as would be the case in the non-regulatory option, may increase the risk of discrimination complaints.

Have you been involved in developing equivalent access solutions? Have these been successful? Divisions within TMR have been involved in co-design solutions and equivalent access processes and consider the outcomes successful. These solutions have been identified as successful where the Australian Standards referenced in the Transport Standards are outdated, and the adoption of newer versions of the Australian Standards or other solutions have resulted in improved accessibility outcomes.

This is evidenced by TMR's co-design approach with disability and accessibility stakeholders and through the many programs, products and services delivered by TMR, including:

- Rectification works to the New Generation Rollingstock
- The establishment of TMR's Accessible Transport Network team to embed accessibility and inclusion into all facets of TMR business
- The recent establishment of the Queensland Accessible Transport Advisory Council (QATAC), chaired by retired District Court Judge Michael Forde, with membership representing accessibility, construction, government policy and law specialists – to provide strategic policy and accessibility advice on significant transport and infrastructure projects across the Queensland transport portfolio
- TMR's Accessibility Reference Group (ARG), consisting of a cross section of government, industry and disability and accessibility stakeholders, to discuss matters relating to improving the Queensland passenger transport experience and reducing barriers for customer using public transport.

Do the Transport Standards section 33.3 Equivalent access, provide sufficient clarity and guidance in relation to consultation requirements?
The Transport Standards section 33.3 does not provide sufficient clarity regarding the community consultation requirements. This should be improved as part of this reform process, and provide opportunity to model a consultation process / framework through the reform process (independent of the option adopted).

For example, Section 33.3 provides various applications that may be used to achieve compliance. Section 33.4 states operators or providers of public transport must consult with passengers with disability who use the service, or with organisations representing people with disability, about any proposal for equivalent access. As the Transport Standards sit under the DDA, the definition of disability should be used to inform the consultation undertaken with passengers with disability or organisations representing people with disability relevant to the equivalent access solution being proposed. For example, passengers who are blind or have low vision who read Braille, and advocacy organisations representing them, would be consulted in relation to an equivalent access process for Braille signage.

The proposed performance solutions process (regulatory option) involves professional certifiers signing-off alternative access proposals. What qualifications and / or attributes should certifiers possess before they undertake this work?

Certified access consultants are not legally considered 'certifiers': they simply guide and endorse providers through designs or outcomes based on their knowledge and prior practices. For buildings, the only certification 'approval' which is legally binding is believed to be approvals by a building certifier under the NCC / Premises Standards building classifications requirements. In Queensland, building certifiers must be registered with the Queensland Building and Construction Commission. Careful consideration must be given to whether building qualifications are relevant for transport infrastructure and conveyances, or whether additional specialist

qualifications are necessary. The use of professional certifiers will likely result in additional costs being incurred by all operators/providers who engage in equivalent access processes.

Infrastructure, premises, and conveyances

Design conformance assurance should be undertaken by qualified access consultants for infrastructure, premises and conveyances. Access consultants should have successfully completed the Commonwealth Certificate or Diploma of Access Consulting course at minimum.

Access consultants should also have relevant experience with the relevant topic and a good working knowledge of the Transport Standards (including with infrastructure, premises and conveyances) and successful experience working with the community, disability groups and organisations. This would be particularly important if Access Consultants are required to prepare equivalent access briefs. Access consultants should also be able to demonstrate working knowledge of transport service and operating principles to ensure co-design process and outcome takes account of credible operational scenarios (this is particularly important for conveyance design).

The new process outlined in the regulatory option proposes operators and providers could utilise their own accessibility experts to peer review the performance solution. TMR therefore assume the proposed regulatory option is an alternative solution or option and that a qualified access consultant is only engaged for projects where reports are required or where an independent expert review process is sought by the project.

Digital elements

Digital requirements are less likely to undergo an equivalent access process. However, WCAG compliance and digital accessibility more broadly, is not generally understood by access consultants or part of their skill set. According to the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI), expertise in the following areas is required for effective conformance evaluation:

- accessibility standards
- accessible web design and development
- assistive technologies
- how people with disability use the Web.

The W3C WAI, in conjunction with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE) has developed the Introduction to Web Accessibility course which is provided with the option to receive verified certification. The course covers web accessibility from a broad range of perspectives, including as it relates to access for people with auditory, cognitive, neurological, physical, speech, or visual disability. The holder of a verified certificate should have a good working knowledge and understanding of the areas identified by the W3C WAI as being necessary to undertake effective conformance evaluation.

W3C WAI proposes combining user involvement with evaluating conformance to WCAG to ensure that accessibility is provided to users with a range of disabilities and situations. The W3C WAI also proposes multiple experts may be required to properly assess conformance.

What has been your experience applying equivalent access solutions?

TMR has undertaken several equivalent access processes with the intent to achieve compliance. Some examples are provided below.

- Smart Ticketing has progressed part 1 of an equivalent access process to comply with the Transport Standards s24.1, which relies solely on direct assistance. The requirement under AS1428.2 (1992) clause 28, requires fare gate barriers to be at least 1200mm from the coin or ticket slot and supported by direct assistance provided by the operator at the fare gates. The equivalent access solution is sound and will be successful once fully implemented, however the lack of clear guidance on the approval process for a proposed solution has presented challenges throughout the consultation. Some people with disability and advocates for people with disability who TMR has consulted, have been reluctant to fully endorse the solution without broader consultation (including with customers not referenced in the DDA such as parents with prams) and evidence that direct assistance provided under the Transport Standards 33.3 will be available at

all times. These requirements are over and above what would be required to prove that access is being provided without discrimination. Further consultation will be undertaken during the development of Part 2 with trials with customers with disability undertaken prior to Part 2 of the solution being implemented.

- TMR identified an opportunity to improve accessibility outcomes during the design phase of a major project and found that equivalent access solutions delivered improved outcomes for people with disability. During the initial design stages of this project, the project consultant raised concerns with using outdated technical standards in the Transport Standards required to achieve compliance and suggested that using newer standards or equivalent access solutions would likely provide more accessible outcomes.

  To address this, TMR and its delivery partners, engaged with an accessibility reference group made up of organisations and advocates representing people with disability. The role of the reference group was to compare old standards with new standards (or more appropriate solutions) and develop preferred options to several identified accessibility issues across the project. The reference group, in collaboration with engineers and TMR, then discussed all operational and locality constraints associated with each issue and location, to reach a set of agreed solutions. The final agreed outcomes were then developed into best practice guidelines for ongoing future reference.

- Successful equivalent access processes were undertaken on the New Generation Rollingstock Accessibility Variation Program on car layout and Braille placement on signage. The project team engaged an Accessibility Advisor and worked collaboratively with the disability sector through a co-design process, with agreement and endorsement on the solution. It was a member of the disability sector who recommended the NGR team use an equivalent access process. Legal advice was sought to provide surety to the State on the outcome.

Would you accept alternative accessible solutions if the development of proposed solutions included adequate consultation and participation with the disability community?

The priority for operators/providers should be on compliance with the technical specifications of the Transport Standards but recognise this is not always possible. Where an alternative accessible solution would result in the best outcomes for the community, and provide sufficient certainty to the provider, such solutions would be appropriate.

TMR do, and would continue to, accept alternative accessible solutions where required subject to the following conditions:

- If the conditions outlined in section 33.3 (1)(b) were satisfied.
- Evidence was provided demonstrating the Transport Standards s33.5 was satisfied – Operators and providers must be able to demonstrate that equivalent access provides public transport without discrimination ‘as far as possible.
- Evidence was provided demonstrating:
    - a broad range of relevant stakeholders were properly consulted on the specific elements of the equivalent access case, and there was evidence of adequate participation
    - that all equivalent access criteria outlined in section 33.3 (1)(b) has been considered by those stakeholders and the outcome of the consultation against those criteria recorded
    - all feedback/evidence was analysed and evaluated.

Do you currently use the equivalent access provision provided in the Transport Standards: section 33.3 Equivalent access?

Yes. TMR is currently progressing an equivalent access case according to section 33.3 to comply with the Transport Standards 24.1.

Transport standards and principles

Reform Area 3 – Rideshare

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
There is misperception surrounding the responsibilities and legal requirements rideshare providers and operators must comply with due to the unclear definitions of conveyances and public transport services under the Transport Standards and the Disability and Discrimination Act 1992. The anticipated outcome of this reform must clearly define rideshare services as a public transport service by strengthening definitions in the Transport Standards and ensuring compliance with stipulated requirements to prevent discrimination. The outcome should also ensure that all public transport services currently existing and entering the market must adhere to responsibilities outlined under the Transport Services, and without inhibiting innovative solutions to meet accessibility needs of prospective riders.	Status Quo: Continued adherence to the Transport Standards. No requirements or definitions would be amended or removed, and no guidance would be implemented. Non-Regulatory: A guidance and education campaign would be enacted to provide direction on compliance with regulations, and a guidance chapter would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide. This guidance would provide a range of advice to operators and providers, and advice would be available to spread awareness toward rideshare accessibility. An education campaign would be implemented to target the rideshare sector. Regulatory: The Transport Standards are amended to ensure rideshare services is defined as transport service providers under the Transport Standards. This amendment would aim to ensure rideshare services are required to meet taxi fit for purpose requirements existing currently. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide revised to elaborate on advice and to reflect regulatory amendments. Amendments to the Transport Standards would be drafted to ensure accurate definitions and applicable taxi-travel fit for purpose requirements are met: • Amend the definition of public transport and list of conveyances in the Transport Standards to ensure rideshare is explicitly covered by the Transport Standards. • Amend the requirements that currently apply to ‘taxis’ to ensure they are fit for purpose in application to rideshare conveyances.

Response to consultation questions

What has been your experience accessing rideshare services?

TMR is unable to respond to this query, as it would be better answered by a user/passenger of rideshare services.

How would your experience change if the Transport Standards were amended to explicitly include rideshare services, including the vehicle fleet and booking platforms and rideshare providers complied with those requirements?

The regulatory environment is unclear to rideshare operators. There is uncertainty as to their minimum requirements regarding compliance with the DDA, as well as an apparent lack of certainty among rideshare providers as to whether the DDA applies to them and who in the delivery chain is responsible for compliance. If the Transport Standards were to explicitly include rideshare services, several things could potentially occur:

- Changes to the training courses currently required by TMR for all drivers in relation to their discrimination obligations, including training to meet existing requirements for driving a wheelchair accessible vehicle
- Increase in costs due to the need to develop a wheelchair accessible fleet
- Challenges to booking entities to establish a pool of wheelchair accessible vehicle drivers to provide an equivalent response time, when booking entities have little control over the number of conventional vehicles and drivers affiliated to them (directly affecting the relative response time of the different vehicle types).

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports a regulatory approach. This will bring certainty to rideshare operators regarding their obligations, and to people with disability who use such services. Notwithstanding, TMR does have concerns that the approach taken under the proposed regulatory response would not improve accessibility of rideshare (or taxi services). Principally, it is not clear that the proposed changes are sufficient to meaningfully clarify the position of rideshare services under the Transport Standards, or that the benefit of reassuring people with disability that these services will be accessible and capable of meeting their needs will be realised under the current proposals.

However, the key benefit of a regulatory approach is that it would demonstrate equal responsibility for service to all passengers by the two dominant sectors in Queensland's personalised transport industry (taxis and rideshare) and address the failure of rideshare providers to operate accessible services. Regulatory requirements would also ensure equivalence of means of redress for passengers who are discriminated against. That is, there would be clear parameters for passengers to be able to identify discrimination based on the Transport Standards that are equivalent between the different personalised transport sectors.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Taxis and rideshare companies should have equivalent anti-discrimination obligations for the provision of accessible services. This is because taxis and rideshare companies are providing very similar services and regulating such obligations will ensure their delivery within the industry.

The current regulatory provisions under the Transport Standards for taxis are ineffective, poorly targeted and are likely to be less effective for rideshare operators because of the use of vehicles for both private and public passenger services. Consequently, any fit-for-purpose regulatory requirement will need to entail more than extending the existing taxi requirements. There are several key policy items that need to be considered as part of the regulatory option. TMR in principle supports the regulatory option, though considers these must be addressed appropriately to deliver a fit-for-purpose regulatory instrument that delivers meaningful accessible outcomes for customers.

The current Transport Standards requirement is for response times to be the same for accessible vehicles as for other vehicles, but arguably this is not engaged if there are no accessible vehicles. The nature of the proposed regulatory instrument may not support reducing wait times for people with disability whether that be taxi and rideshare. This is consistently noted as a matter of concern in the five yearly reviews of the Transport Standards.

A regulatory environment may not improve this as many rideshare vehicles are not dedicated and are also used as private vehicles; consequently, the number of rideshare drivers and vehicles affiliated with a service provider might fluctuate substantially over time as new drivers sign on and others leave – with their vehicles.

Any desire to extend disability discrimination to rideshare providers may need to consider also stipulating a requirement to provide accessible services, noting this would be problematic for small providers who operate a single vehicle. Clarity is therefore required for the definition of a 'Rideshare Provider'.

A regulatory environment may also stunt innovation in the rideshare space, hampering the rideshare industry and impacting economic growth and employment opportunities for drivers. This may eventually lead to the industry exiting the Australian market.

The digital aspect of the rideshare model also requires further consideration. As rideshare models require use of digital booking systems, and support only digital or account-based transactions, discrimination arises when those who do not or cannot use smart devices or credit/debit cards are unable to access the service.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Under the current operating model for rideshare in Queensland, the challenges for implementation under the regulatory approach are:

- Booking and payment systems requiring upgrade to allow those users who are unable to use smart phones to access the service, resulting in significant cost impacts
- Challenges in ensuring a certain proportion of the fleet or shift are disability compliant, potentially adversely impacting the profitability of drivers and therefore reducing number of overall drivers.
- The booking entity has very little control over the composition of the fleet, including what is available for hire at any time. If the provision were extended to the booking service provider rather than the driver and booking entities would be required to source vehicles and drivers for less profitable work, there would be a resulting cost impact.
- Casual rideshare owner drivers may not fully comply with the expense of additional obligations such as tactile/Braille door signage and adequate doorway contrast.

If the non-regulatory option is chosen, continued inconsistency regarding the vehicles available for people with disability may occur.

TMR recommends that Commonwealth-led consultation with ridesharing and taxi services and owner/drivers is undertaken to gain depth of understanding on these issues to ensure that the outcome is capable of being implemented.

Does a lack of clarity about whether rideshare services, such as Uber, are required to comply with the Transport Standards, contribute to people experiencing discrimination?

There is significant research globally that supports the position that current rideshare services have contributed to discrimination with rideshare operators accused of charging a ‘wait’ fee on disabled passengers who need extra time to board the vehicle and drivers refusing rides to disabled persons based on their need for mobility aids and/or service animals.

The term 'rideshare service’ requires definition – noting that Uber does not provide ridesharing services, as it is a platform that connects customers to rideshare services. It is not clear whether the Transport Standards requirements fall to the rideshare platform or rideshare drivers.

Reform Area 4 – Dedicated school buses

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
School buses, under the previous versions of the Transport Standards, are exempt from certain requirements for buses, which has created disparity and disenabled people with disability and their families from retaining the same access to education and mobility. The achieved outcome of this reform is to amend or eliminate dedicated school bus exclusions that disadvantage people with disability.	Status Quo: Continued adherence to current Transport Standards or Guidelines text, exemptions remain in the Transport Standards. Non-Regulatory: New guidance would be provided for school bus operators/providers available under the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide. This guidance would exist to provide context, expanded informative material and examples on potential equivalent access solutions. The material would further aim to raise awareness to operators and providers as to the exemptions and areas a school bus must comply with. Guidance will extend to emphasise school bus services should not be used to offer other public transport services unless compliant with the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide better accessibility for students with a disability on dedicated school buses. The reform sees all or some dedicated school bus exemptions removed from the Transport Standards; this would remove the distinction between other and school buses. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or the Whole Journey Guide would be reviewed and amended to reflect new requirements. • Option 1: seeks to remove dedicated school bus exemptions related to the following sections 3.2, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8, 9.1, 9.4, 9.7, 9.9, 9.11, 10.1, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 11.7, 12.1, 12.4, 12.6, 14.1 and 14.4 – removing the distinction between other and school buses. • Option 2: seeks to provide principles for dedicated school buses. This sees high floor dedicated buses (those fitted with a hoist) as continuing to be exempt according to sections 3.2,8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8, 9.1, 9.4, 9.11, 11.7 and 14.1. An accessible high floor dedicated school bus must meet section 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 9.7, 9.9, 10.1, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5, 11.6, 12.1, 12.4, 12.6, 14.4.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR sees a future state for dedicated school buses to be fully accessible and believes that this can be achieved in most school operating environments. TMR supports the non-regulatory option to enable discretionary deviation from accessible low floor school buses in selected instances.

TMR has recently completed a strategic review of its bus fleet policies that reaffirmed TMR's commitment to accessible school buses. TMR is committed to ensuring that replacement vehicles for all contracted school routes should be accessible, except where defined parameters make them unsuitable. These defined parameters include instances where the geographical operating environment makes the safety and reliability of low floor vehicles highly challenging and in many cases, unachievable.

The school transport task is highly varied, from services in highly populated, dense urban areas to services in highly remote areas which cover long distances on individual routes. In some cases, the speeds, distances, and terrains being covered by contracted school services make them less suited to a low floor fleet. For example, services operating along gravel roads or at unacceptable gradients are not suitable to a low floor accessible vehicle. However, school services operating in semi-urban or regional town environments may be perfectly suitable for low-floor accessible vehicles. School buses that operate in rural areas with hilly terrain and dirt present more challenges as the operating environment is more dangerous and TMR wishes to sponsor a safe student traveling outcome at all times.

If a non-regulatory option was progressed, TMR would need to move towards a position where accessible school buses become the default for all contracted school bus routes except when there is:

- Unjustifiable hardship due to a price premium, a need for another bus due to capacity differential, or lost business (TMR would need to evaluate these factors on a case-by-case basis, with the default position being approval of accessible vehicles noting that in some instances multiple accessible vehicles may be required to replace high floor vehicles to deliver the same passenger carrying capacity)
- Significant charter, community or freight/critical supplies work requiring a high floor bus
- A significant proportion of bus stops, curb infrastructure, access paths and/or general operating environment is not accessible; and/or
- Excess capacity on Specialist School Transport (SST) that may be used as an acceptable solution for accessible buses.

In order to move forward with this position TMR would require additional funding for:

- The increased cost of purchasing accessible school buses (TMR currently funds a fleet of approximately 1850 high floor school buses). If more accessible buses (for example, low floor, low entry or high floor with hoist) were to be encouraged or mandated in the Queensland school bus fleet, additional funding would be required to cover the higher costs of purchasing such vehicles.
- The additional number of accessible low floor vehicles that TMR may be required to fund. TMR currently funds new high floor school buses with a seating capacity of 57 seats for a purchase price of up to $380,000. Low floor accessible buses used on TMR funded urban routes have an average seating capacity of 46 seats and cost more than $500,000. In some instances, additional low floor accessible school buses may need to be funded to replace high floor school services in order to provide the same carrying capacity; and
- Any additional operating costs associated with accessible school buses (TMR's existing contract payment are based on high floor vehicles; bus servicing is more expensive on low floor vehicles due to their design).

It is also important to note that any transition to 100 per cent accessible school buses would need to be gradual and implemented as existing fleet reaches its maximum age. The transition to 100 per cent accessible school buses can only occur on a progressive basis as existing fleet retires.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Clarity is sufficient in both non-regulatory and regulatory options, however, the increased costs incurred by bus operators in rural areas to implement those solutions may result in operators withdrawing from the market and services being removed. To move forward with fully accessible school buses, TMR would need to secure an increased budgetary envelope for school bus fleet investment to provide industry with certainty that assistance is available to facilitate the transition.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

TMR agrees with the challenges detailed in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS. To move forward with a sensible and pragmatic non-regulatory option, TMR would require additional funding and would be required to change its business rules and processes (see section 4.1).

It is also important to consider that many service providers are small businesses with single bus operations. Retrofitting buses and reduction in capacity would have a significant impact on the operator's business which will be further increased if the service provider also uses the same vehicle to conduct charter activities. TMR would need to work carefully with its existing contracted operators to explore replacing high vehicles with low floor accessible vehicles and provide extensive funding assistance.

Due to the flexible nature of school bus routes in rural areas, which change to accommodate students moving into and out of areas, boarding points for school bus services are not fixed and are rarely suitable for disability access. Significant infrastructure commitment would be required to enable low floor wheelchair accessibility on rural roads.

Similarly, TMR's contract payment rates for school service providers currently cover the cost of operating high floor school buses. If more accessible buses were to be introduced onto school services, new payment rates would need to be developed to accurately reflect the cost of operating these services. Additional funding would be required if the operating costs of these services are higher, and if a greater number of vehicles is required to service the same number of passengers (once again see 4.1).

Most importantly any changed regulatory requirements would need to be prospective and only apply to new vehicles. Buses operating on school services in Queensland have an operating life of 20 years before they are eligible for replacement and there is limited scope for the retrofitting of existing vehicles to meet regulatory requirements if they were to be retrospective.

In your experience, does your school transport system adequately meet the needs of children with disability?

a) **What impact does this have on your child and your family?**

b) **How could the school transport system be improved?**

c) **Do dedicated school bus exemptions in the Transport Standards result in discriminatory outcomes for students with disability?**

TMR currently provides transport for students with disability through a mix of SST minibuses, taxis and general school services. SST is funded through and administered by DoE and delivered by TMR. These services meet the needs of children with disability; however, they are separate from the general school transport bus fleet. Dedicated SST bus services are currently contracted by TMR until the end of 2023 pending a national decision on the future delivery of SST and the NDIS.

Moving towards a non-regulatory option for dedicated school buses to be fully accessible will result in a more equitable outcome for families living with a child with disability and ultimately a more accessible school bus eco-system. The challenge is adoption of a pragmatic approach to the transition from high floor to accessible and also a recognition that a fully accessible school bus fleet cannot be guaranteed due to unique geographical/operational constraints.

Which exemptions (if any) should be removed to remove for dedicated school buses?

TMR's preference is that exemptions should be removed for dedicated school buses, however a non-regulatory option should be progressed that provides TMR the decision-making authority to deliver accessible school buses

into operating environments where they are suited. For the avoidance of doubt, TMR would only support removal of exemptions on the basis that there is no blanket rule and TMR retains flexibility to introduce high floor vehicles where the operating environment mandates.

TMR holds the necessary network planning, operational and contract management expertise to work with contracted bus operators and the community to make these decisions. The key change is that TMR would transition to a position where accessible school buses become the default for all contracted school bus routes, and TMR would need to consider the routes dynamics before deviating from that position.

This option can only progress if adequate funding is made available to upgrade and maintain the school bus fleet to meet the new requirements (see 4.1). If the operating environment is not suitable for low floor accessible buses, then TMR would proceed with high floor vehicles. It is important that this flexibility is maintained.

How do you ensure that students with disability are able to travel to and from school using accessible public transport:

a) in metropolitan areas?

b) in rural / regional areas?

For both metropolitan and rural/regional areas, TMR investigates all available transport options to assist eligible students. At the current time dedicated SST buses are used along with taxi and rideshare to accommodate passengers with disability. In metropolitan areas, there is also an option to use accessible buses operating on urban routes.

Should the non-regulatory option progress TMR would need to change its operating practices to focus on the rollout of fully accessible school buses and introduce processes to ensure they are introduced safely and in line with existing replacement profiles.

Information, communication, and wayfinding

Reform Area 5 – Better communication of accessible features

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Inadequate national consistency regarding the definition of accessibility and what accessibility amenities / features can be supplied, and which of those should be communicated to the public. The achieved outcome aims to ensure people with disability can make informed decisions when planning, undertaking, and adjusting their journey on public transport.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged as to communication of accessible features. No further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would be updated to include guidance regarding the communication of accessibility terminology and features by operators and providers. Guidance would include incorporating nationally consistent terminology which is applicable across various modes of public transport and can be easily comprehended by people with disability according to personal requirements and, a baseline list which highlights accessible features. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide new requirements for defining accessibility terminology and the communication of accessible features. Final details of nationally consistent terminology would be developed through a consultation process with key stakeholders. Guidance would be provided in the Transport Standards and/or the Whole Journey Guide on accessibility terminology.

Response to consultation questions

Which option do you prefer: the status quo, the non-regulatory or the regulatory option?

TMR supports the regulatory option and does not consider that the status quo achieves the objectives of the Transport Standards. The Transport Standards in its current form does not sufficiently contemplate journey planning because it simply requires information to be accessible to all customers. Where this is not possible, the current Transport Standards require this information be provided by way of direct assistance.

The regulatory option seeks to define the term accessibility and establish a glossary of related terminology. TMR believes harmonising terminology across jurisdictions can support:

- implementing traveller information standards across all the whole of customer journey
- seamless passenger travel between jurisdictions and provide greater confidence to people with disability to plan travel outside of home jurisdictions.

- independent travel for people who identify as having a disability or impairment and enable them to make more informed travel plans and decisions. It will ensure support and information needed to complete their journey with safety, confidence and dignity is accessible.
- operators and providers in minimising administrative overhead associated with producing and disseminating information and
- operators and providers in marketing their capabilities in a universal language understood across agencies.

The non-regulatory option provides government an approach to work across agencies to standardise terminology used in the specific environment while minimising the regulatory burden of both operator (in auditing the compliance) and regulator (in assessing/confirming the compliance). However, the discretionary adoption of the guidance between operators and providers may not result in realisation of the intended outcome of the reform. Variation in the extent to which non-regulatory guidance is adopted will not result in a harmonised definition of accessibility and related terms within and across jurisdictions. The non-regulatory option will therefore only yield the benefits outlined above to the extent that the guidance is adopted. This lack of consistency may lead to discrimination in access to public transport.

The methods/channels through which information on accessible features is communicated is not addressed by the proposed regulatory and/or non-regulatory options for this reform area. TMR requests guidance on how to ensure this information is presented in the most accessible way possible and in a way that satisfies the needs of a diverse range of customers. Additional guidance is sought around where and when this information should be included or presented (e.g., all signage at a minimum, or in every piece of communication on a certain station/stop).

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

This reform is currently limited to the consideration of what features should be included in a definition of accessibility, and therefore communicated to customers. The scope of this reform is insufficient, and it should be expanded to provide greater certainty on how and when these accessible features must be communicated. For example, the reform should provide greater clarity around compliance requirements for communicating accessibility features in scenarios such as unplanned lift outages or during time of disrupted/degraded operations.

The regulatory and non-regulatory options also do not consider the accessibility of adjoining public areas and private property that may be used to access transport premises and infrastructure. For example:

- footpaths around a transport premises may be in disrepair and not accessible
- construction and other transient activities (e.g., repairs) on and around areas adjoining may impact accessibility to and from transport premises and infrastructure

Information that a station is accessible (based on its features) may in fact be incorrect when considering any impediments to access from adjoining areas. However, that provision of information around accessibility of adjoining areas to the premises may not be feasible.

The non-regulatory approach does not provide sufficient clarity to ensure people with disability can access public transport without discrimination. Where accessibility is clearly defined in a nationally consistent way, and the communication of accessible features is clearly defined, this reform would greatly assist people reliant on accessible options, understand and plan how they can interact with public transport.

Terminology alone does not remove discrimination. Rather, it is the implementation of the accessible features (within and beyond the localised conveyance or premises context) that determines the level of discrimination people requiring accessibility needs (i.e., a station may have a lift for mobility but if it is placed at a point that is a long walk to get to then that is a form of discrimination).

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Refer to

Table 4.

Table 4 :Challenges to implementing the communication of accessible features reform options.

Reform area	Challenge	Description
Regulatory **Non-regulatory (if guidance adopted)**	**Agreed terminology/definitions**	It may be challenging to achieve desired terminology/information consistency across different networks and transport modes, noting there are a multitude of different products/features that have been implemented by operators and agencies over time that may deliver varying “degrees” of accessibility. Balancing the desire for consistency vs ensuring accuracy and completeness of information will require some flexibility when applying agreed terminology. Negotiation of standard terms across agencies at all levels of government can take time.
Regulatory	**Accuracy/currency of accessibility features**	The proposed scope for the regulatory option includes a requirement to provide information on accessibility features across infrastructure, premises, and conveyances. Providing accurate/up-to-date information on conveyances could be particularly challenging in a live operational environment where vehicles/rollingstock are not dedicated to a specific route/service each day and there is currently no easy way for the specific accessibility features of a particular vehicle/carriage/vessel to be communicated to a customer in advance of travelling. It is assumed that the current practice of using service notices to advise customers of temporary unavailability of accessibility features at premises/infrastructure (e.g., lift outage due to maintenance or repair) would still be deemed appropriate under the proposed changes, as updating all existing communication materials would not be feasible due to cost/time/system limitations.
Regulatory **Non-regulatory (if guidance adopted)**	**Information provision – digital and physical communication channels/tactics**	The proposed non-regulatory and regulatory options do not prescribe the formats/channels where this information needs to be made available. Guidance outlining best practice (e.g., in the Whole Journey Guide) would be helpful for operators and providers. However, TMR believes retaining a degree of flexibility will help operators and providers to determine optimal means of presenting information in account of their specific technical capabilities and limitations. Incorporating this flexibility into the regulatory option will be critical for success.

Reform area	Challenge	Description
Regulatory **Non-regulatory (if guidance adopted)**	**Potential misalignment/conflict with other standards/requirements**	There may be some technical or commercial limitations to our ability to achieve alignment and consistency with third-party products which currently apply different definitions of accessibility features. This issue may be particularly prevalent if these are products from vendors that serve clients in multiple territories and countries
Regulatory **Non-regulatory (if guidance adopted)**	**Audit**	There would be significant costs/resources required to audit/verify current accessibility features in place across various physical assets on the network and digital assets/information.
Regulatory **Non-regulatory (if guidance adopted)**	**Cost to implement**	Operators and providers may incur a significant implementation cost to ensure information terminology and channels of information comply with modernised Transport Standards. Noting these implementation cost and resource challenges, the non-regulatory option would allow for operators/agencies to progressively make improvements in line with agreed best practice as budget/work programs allow. On this basis, allowing for a staged replacement approach within the regulatory approach to align with existing maintenance/upgrade/new build programs appears to be the most feasible approach.
Regulatory **Non-regulatory (if guidance adopted)**	**Implementation timeframes**	The timing of the proposed changes may not align with existing programs of work and significant projects that are also seeking to make updates to infrastructure signage/wayfinding
Regulatory **Non-regulatory (if guidance adopted)**	**Customer comprehension**	Standardisation of new terms and new iconography can take time for target groups to adapt to and understand. Customers receiving consistent accessibility terminology when they use public transport also starts further back in the product development cycle. Change communications would be required from agencies to ensure all levels of business groups are incorporating similar language – whether that be communications, customer service, infrastructure.
Regulatory **Non-regulatory (if guidance adopted)**	**Legacy contract terms**	Modification of existing operator contracts to encourage or mandate new terminology may impact the speed at which either option is implemented

Reform area	Challenge	Description
Regulatory **Non-regulatory (if guidance adopted)**	**Technical feasibility**	Technical challenges in adding new metadata to data sets of public transport assets may be challenging depending on the technology used to manage this currently.

The implementation costs in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS appear to be significantly understated given the scope and scale of work to be undertaken.

In your experience, has the communication of accessibility features been effective?

No. There is currently a lack of centralised information about the accessibility features available across the various assets on our network which limits our ability to communicate these to customers. Current customer information systems (such as journey planner) are limited in their ability to display accessibility information to customers in a way that meets their needs.

The provision of information through TMR's current communication puts the onus on customers to pre-plan their journey and understand accessibility features at individual station/ stops (information that is only available for certain locations). The requirement to pre-plan also does not support customers travelling during unplanned disruptions and often requires customers to call ahead to alert staff to their accessibility requirements and understand and arrange alternative solutions. For example, information updates regarding disruptions such as lift/ escalator outages are often delayed and passengers cannot rely on the information being correct.

How do you define the term 'accessible'?

TMR provides a broad definition of 'accessible' as contained in the TMR Accessibility and Inclusion Strategy 2020. It means people are able to use the full range of services and products that are functional and designed to allow access for all. It results in a network and services that are connected and useable by all.

In customer communications, the term "accessible" is generally used as a descriptive word to indicate a service/product/stop has one or more accessibility features available. For example, a low-floor bus; a bus stop with tactile; a station with hearing loop facilities etc.

Accessible means it is 'effective for all people', 'effective' means the intended outcome or use is achieved. The context of how this could be applied:

- Is this information accessible = can all people understand what that information is about, decide and perform an action because of the information?
- Is this entry way accessible = can all people access and use the entry way safely?
- Is this bus accessible = can all people access and use the bus safely and in the way it was intended?

What accessibility terms work for all modes to best communicate accessibility, noting that scenarios/locations can change the level of accessibility?

There are a range of terms included as examples in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS, including but not limited to; 'step free' 'independent access' and 'accessible'. TMR seeks to understand what terms are most useful and meaningful for people living with disability.

The challenges associated with formulating an agreed and unified definition of accessibility, as 'step free' has relevance for only some parts of the disability community, 'independent access' has different meanings for different customers depending on their needs. In essence, the interpretation of the term 'accessible' can vary based on the customer. The definition of 'accessible' may vary for customers depending on the incidence and/or severity of debilitation experienced at any given time (for example, hidden disabilities that only affect them on some days). Given these challenges, TMR's approach has been to focus on providing information about features that are available at specific locations to allow individual customers to make informed decisions.

Reform Area 6 – Timely provision of information

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The current Transport Standards do not specify a requirement for immediate, direct assistance if preferred communication channels are unavailable, that this assistance with obtaining information should be undertaken promptly and, currently uncommon information is not required to be quickly accessible. The outcome achieved must be to provide direct assistance if preferred information sources are unavailable, timely access to information and to have uncommon information about the transport service prematurely available.	Status Quo: The requirements remain unchanged as to the timely provision of information in Parts 27.2. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided through the Transport Standards Guidelines or through additional non-regulatory instruments. The status quo option fails to specify how direct assistance be provided if: information is not available in a preferred format and is required at the moment of inquiry; where information is to be provided in a timely manner in preferred format if not immediately required; and less commonly requested information be production-ready in anticipation of a request. The status quo options will continue to fail to meet the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice for timely information in requested format. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for the timely provision of information in requested formats. Amendments would set out how timely information or direct assistance is to be provided. The Transport Standards and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

Timely provision of information in accessible formats is fundamental to ensuring passengers with disability have equitable access to public transport.

The non-regulatory option proposes guidance for operators and providers about how to deliver information in formats that are less commonly requested. It suggests providers and operators prepare these formats in anticipation of potential requests from customers. However, this option does not include guidance about:

- what would constitute a practicable time frame for fulfilling requests
- the types of formats that may be requested (albeit infrequently)

- the information that might be requested
- what is considered reasonable in terms of providing 'direct assistance'.

Because of these limitations, a broader non-regulatory proposal is preferred, conditional upon the following issues being adequately addressed:

- Define a list of information formats requested by passengers with disability. This will likely require engaging with operators and providers to:
    - compile data showing the information formats that were requested over a given period
    - identify requests that could not be fulfilled in a timely manner, and
    - identify requests that could not be fulfilled at all.
- Offer guidance regarding the types of formats passengers may require removing discrimination (beyond those requested by operators and providers as indicated by compiled data). This may require engagement with appropriate representatives from the disability community and associated groups.
- Based on findings from the activities described by the points above, establish a list of information formats that operators and providers are expected to be able to provide.
- Define practicable timeframes for dissemination of information in each format.
- Acknowledge and provide guidance on scenarios where a type of information is never able to be supplied in a customer's preferred format, due to technical limitations or other reasons.

The guidance should also encourage operators and providers to take advantage of evolving technologies and different forms of access to information, rather than relying on print versions. For example, information provided on an accessible website (to WCAG 2.0 AA standard) can be accessed by people with disability using both assistive and adaptive technologies. The wide adoption of smart phones and other digital technology applications present further opportunity to operators and providers to implement cost effective solutions. For example, a digital solution can provide:

- Large print (variable and scalable text size)
- Audio files – spoken (may be available in multiple languages)
- Information on an accessible website accessed via screen readers (technology that translates text to speech or Braille)
- Information designed to be accessed by people who are blind and read out by a desktop screen reader also supports access to the information by people with cognitive or learning disabilities.
- Digital files
- SMS / text
- Auslan (video connection to interrupter or pre-recorded Auslan videos).

Digital solutions may also:

- facilitate consistency in the types of information formats available from operators and providers within and across transport modes (e.g., through a centralised application available to all transport providers and operators)
- be quickly updated as necessary
- be available to a wider audience
- be more cost effective for operators and providers than designing/printing a large format version or printed Braille version on request

- enable providers and operators to incorporate new or alternative information formats that better address customer needs (for example, information designed to be accessed by people with vision impairments read out by a desktop screen reader may also support access for people with learning disabilities).

The regulatory option shares similar issues with the non-regulatory option. It requires infrequently requested formats be provided in a timely manner but does not:

- define a list of information formats that must be available upon request
- explain what constitutes an acceptable timeframe for providing the information in the requested format
- clarify provision of “direct assistance” and what kind of information this requirement applies to.

The regulatory options states that "these amendments would pertain to conveyances, premises and infrastructure." TMR considers this wording is too limiting in scope and should include digital platforms. It should also include advice on what needs to be available and in which format.

Without clarity on these matters, TMR and its delivery partners’ may unknowingly be non-compliant and be exposed to potential discrimination complaints due to misalignment of expectations.

TMR requests that guidance is retained in both the non-regulatory and regulatory options if information is not able to be made available in a preferred format.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The reforms do not define ‘timely’. These omissions may result in people with disability not being able to ascertain what information format providers and operators are able to produce and when the requested information will be made available. Moreover, the proposed reforms do not define a list of information that operators and providers must or should be able to provide in a timely manner. This may result in variability in the types of formats that are available to passengers with disability within and across transport providers and operators.

These issues may undermine the capacity of this reform to address discrimination faced by people with disability when planning travel and travelling independently. The proposed reforms do not provide enough information to clarify how people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Refer to Table 5.

Table 5 :Challenges to implementation of timely provision of information reform

Challenge	Description
Costs	The requirement to provide information in any requested format in a timely manner may impose additional costs on operators and providers.
Provision of direct assistance across organisational boundaries	Under a regulatory option, there may be operational and commercial complexity in how direct assistance is managed across organisational boundaries (e.g., role of TMR as a service facilitator vs a service provider) depending on agreed definitions and expectations.

Technical feasibility of responding to all format requests	Due to technical limitations, there may be a scenario where a type of information is never able to be supplied in a customer's preferred format and direct assistance is the only suitable alternative.
Timing uncertainty	While there is no specific time period defined for "timely" provision of information in a preferred format, the need to provide information at short notice may result in transient and localised increases to workload, which may impact other aspects of service delivery relied up on by people with disability. Information that would fall under this category includes information relating to disruptions due to severe weather events or other service disruptions.

In your experience, has accessible public transport information been provided in a timely manner?

Customers have the following options to access information:

- Contact the TMR or Translink contact centre.
- Use accessibility features and materials on the TMR or Translink websites.
- Use accessibility features and materials via TMR or Translink apps.

Where a customer uses the contact centre, the majority of requests for information are resolved at the time of the call. Few requests for information in alternative formats are received through the contact centre. Information is available in a variety of languages.

Where a matter or request cannot be resolved at first contact (for example, a request for a large format/braille document), a customer case is created which triggers an investigation and call back/email response. Standard cases have a 10-day turnaround timeframe and high priority cases have a 5-day turnaround.

Some Translink service provider partners offer additional accessibility features such as the visually impaired passenger telephone services.

There are times when TMR have been specifically asked to produce information in a variety of formats (Auslan, large print, easy read etc) when the disability community is the specified target audience. These tend to be bespoke materials produced for a specific project/purpose.

Do you get requests for service-related information in formats that are not readily available? If so, how is this managed until the preferred format request for information has been fulfilled?

TMR rarely receive requests for information in alternative formats. However, on rare occasions that require this, TMR has been able to directly assist customers by providing journey planning advice and advising the expected arrival times of a service via phone or customer service staff on site. On other occasions, customers have indicated they are happy to wait until the information in their preferred format is emailed or mailed to them.

Reform Area 7 – Real time communication

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not have provisions in place to facilitate real time communication between people with disability looking to undertake a public transport journey and operators or providers. Currently, the Transport Standards part 27 entails communication requirements. However, it does not directly cover real time communication, which creates barriers for people with disability to communicate needs, receive information or plan accordingly for their journey. The achieved outcome must encompass varying methods of real-time communication between people with disability seeking assistance and providers and operators.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged as to clearly specifying requirements reflecting best practice for real time communication. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided and will continue to fail to meet the purpose of Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice for real-time communication applicable to conveyances, premises and infrastructure. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements to ensure that lines of real-time communication between staff and passengers would be available during the entirety of a public transport journey. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR seeks further clarity from the Commonwealth on the scope of the proposed regulatory and non-regulatory options. TMR recognises the merits of the regulatory and non-regulatory options, however the proposed scope is unclear as the type of assistance a passenger is expected to be able to access in real-time is not specified. It is unclear whether indirect support sought and received through help phones, call centres, onboard real-time information and next stop announcements would satisfy the requirement, or, if passengers are to have direct access to in-person assistance at any point during the journey. TMR is unable to undertake a complete evaluation of this reform area and requires clarity from the Commonwealth on the scope and definition of 'real time information'. To help inform the response, TMR also seeks insight from the Commonwealth into the forms of information or assistance that were considered during consultation with representatives of the disability community.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

While the regulatory and non-regulatory options provide examples of communication channels, they do not clearly define what constitutes real time communication, or acceptable channels for transmitting information. Adoption of the proposed regulatory or non-regulatory options in their current forms may result in variability in the type of information passengers are able to receive, the channels through which it can be transmitted and the stages of their journey that various communication channels are available. This could disproportionately disadvantage passengers with disability seeking information throughout their journey.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Provision of on-the-ground assistance is only possible in a limited number of situations and locations within and across transport modes. More broadly, the extent to which on-the-ground assistance is possible varies between transport modes and may depend on operational factors (as opposed to staffing levels). For example, a bus driver may need to prioritise operational and safety requirements over customer communications.

A regulatory approach may limit transport innovation such as automated (driver/guard less) services (rail, bus, car) and their introduction into the transport ecosystem. In such cases, direct support would be impossible, and other forms of support, such as digital solutions or call centres, must be considered.

In your experience, have you been able to effectively communicate with public transport staff and operators in real time?

Passengers can communicate in real time with the Translink contact centre at any time, however there are limitations on the levels of assistance that can be provided. For example, the Translink contact centre does not have the ability to make direct contact with on-the-ground staff to triangulate on-the-ground support. On-the-ground/on-board information provision by staff is also dependent on a multitude of factors including, but not limited to, staffing levels at stations and onboard services, the time of day, and the type of assistance requested, as well as technology limitations that mean that not all communication channels (e.g., Passenger Information Displays, automated audio announcements etc) at stops/stations/on-board vehicles) can be updated in real-time.

Are there particular points of a public transport journey where real time communication is most important? If so, what are those points?

The ability to communicate in real time is particularly important during service disruptions and other abnormal modes of transport operation (e.g., notification of cancelled/delayed services, temporary route diversions, alternative rail replacement bus services, lift/escalator outages, construction impacts on station/stop access etc). Communication in real time to passengers onboard a transport services that have been transposed to alternative destinations is essential, particularly for passengers that rely on vertical transport (and other accessible features at terminals) and assistance upon arriving at destinations (such as direct assistance to disembark).

Reform Area 8 – Passenger location during journey

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not require information to be provided during a public transport journey, it has also been identified that there is often a lack of information available in differing formats surrounding arrival and next stop information. The outcome achieved is recommended to provide next stop and arrival information amongst a larger mode of formats and to incorporate alighting information in section 27.4.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged as to clearly specifying requirements reflecting best practice for provision of location information during journey, lack of amendment in this area will allow the continued lack of clarity surrounding how and which types of information can be made available to people with disability. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided and will continue to fail to meet the purpose of Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice for the provision of location information during a public transport journey, this update would aim to ensure useful information is able to be provided in sufficient time for a person to respond and successfully alight. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for the provision of location information during a public transport journey. Two sub-options as to amendments to Transport Standards Section 27.4 exist here for visual information display of next stop. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured/amended to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why? If you prefer the regulatory option, which sub-option do you prefer? Why?

TMR supports a non-regulatory solution for this reform. It could provide sufficient guidance and support to digital solution providers to encourage innovative ideas that leverage on the flexibility permitted to deliver better wayfinding products and services.

The regulatory option could require operators to deliver scheduled services that result in restrictions on innovative initiatives within the passenger transport ecosystem (e.g., dynamic / on-demand transport).

The regulatory option may similarly place restrictions on rideshare operators, where information is generally conveyed through a third-party booking platform, hence resulting in a more challenging and complex situation that creates unnecessary barriers to providing better customer outcomes.

TMR has implemented performance-based, and customer orientated digital solutions that employ emerging information technology and creative business models to assist passengers in journey planning, with improved information on real-time locations and progress updates (e.g., Mobility-as-a-Service Apps, Journey Planner).

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

TMR does not hold a position on this item at this time.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Operators might not need to be digital solution providers to achieve compliance under this proposed reform. TMR considers that collaboration and cooperation between operators and digital solution providers is essential to ensure accurate and timely journey information. Hence, in addition to guidance of good practice under the non-regulatory option, advice or regulatory efforts could be put into place to develop a protocol for the transfer of relevant data from operators to digital solution providers.

Any approach taken for this reform area must clearly define the responsibilities between the different actors in the transport ecosystem. For example, Uber is an aggregator not a service provider, yet may provide the passenger location service on behalf of the transport service operator (i.e., the driver affiliated with the booking service). Similarly, responsibilities such as transport service operators, public transit agencies, transport brokers, public transport infrastructure owners and managers could be further defined. Without this clarity, TMR does not consider that this reform will be effective in achieving more meaningful accessible outcomes for passengers, provide clarity for operator / providers, or deliver an efficient regulatory instrument within the transport sector.

In your experience, have you been able to access arrival and next stop information when using public transport in ways the best meet your needs?

There are currently audio broadcasts on trains to provide passengers with selected journey information. However, according to some customer feedback, the content and quality of announcements can be difficult to understand and can be inconsistent.

Bus drivers do not generally make arrival or next stop announcements, as this is considered a safety issue in terms of driver distraction. This challenge could be eased with technology and facilities to create an automated communication system that is able to provide passengers with useful trip information in various formats that suit their different accessibility needs. For example, passenger-friendly audio announcements with information on next stop, arrival time, brief direction could be extremely helpful particularly for infrequent or new passengers or passengers travelling during night-time.

Reform Area 9 – Hearing augmentation on conveyances

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards section 26.2 Public address systems — conveyances covers hearing augmentation systems on conveyances for hearing aid users and references AS1428.2 (1992) Design for access and mobility, for hearing augmentation (assistive listening) systems. This AS is dated, and only requires a hearing augmentation system to cover 10 per cent of the total area of the enclosed space of a conveyance. This reform seeks to modernise the Transport Standards and associated guidelines to provide greater coverage on conveyances for people who are deaf or require hearing aids	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided and the Transport Standards will continue to fail to meet the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice for assistive listing systems on conveyances. These updates would include recommendations that references for assistive listening systems are updated to AS1428.5 (2021). Conveyances that have assistance listening systems should identify this with international symbol for deafness and assistive listening systems should cover 100 per cent of the area covered by the public address (PA) audio. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for the provision of hearing augmentation in conveyances. Amendments would include requirements that assistive listening systems comply with AS1428.5 (2021). Conveyances that have assistance listening systems should identify this with international symbol for deafness and assistive listening systems should cover 80 per cent (sub option 2) or 100 per cent (sub option 1) of the area covered by the public address (PA) audio. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports regulatory option 1, for new conveyances only. Specifically, the Performance Specification for the Queensland Train Manufacturing Program (QTMP) stipulates that all cars should be equipped with a hearing loop. The regulatory option may not be appropriate for the future pipeline of rollingstock as it could limit innovation in the features of such assets. This should be clarified by the Commonwealth to ensure efficient investment in these assets.

There are future opportunities to digitize augmentations to facilitate wayfaring through emerging digital solutions that accommodate the whole of journey customer needs. This should be considered as part of the reform process and the broader modernisation of the Transport Standards.

If you prefer the regulatory option, which sub-options do you prefer? Why?

Sub-option 1 (100 per cent of the area covered by the public address system) is preferred by TMR.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Our engagement with the disability sector has indicated that hearing loops should be built into all cars.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

No challenges are anticipated for the regulatory options. The Performance Specification for QTMP stipulates that all cars should have a hearing loop. However, TMR is uncertain whether the regulatory option will pose implementation challenges for future rollingstock.

In your experience, have hearing augmentation systems on public transport conveyances been adequately accessible?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 10 – Hearing augmentation: Infrastructure and Premises

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards currently reference outdated standards (AS1428.2 (1992)) for hearing augmentation systems and currently. There is no requirement for providers and operators to advise passengers which assistive listening devices are compatible with hearing augmentation systems in public transport premises and infrastructure. It is also acknowledged that the Premise Standards have superior references for relevant augmentation systems and should be integrated if compatible. The achieved outcome recommends changing the reference for hearing systems from AS1428.2 (1992) to AS1428.5 (2010), to incorporate section 26.1 of the Premise Standards to label the sound coverage exhibited by the device, and to notify passengers that hearing aids with telecoil are only compatible with a magnetic induction loop augmentation system.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards section 26.1 would remain unchanged. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided, the Transport Standards will continue to fail to meet the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines to provide guidance around best practice for integrating assistive listening systems in transport infrastructure and premises. This would recommend that the reference for assistive listening systems be updated from AS1428.2 (1992) to AS1428.5 (2010). Infrastructure and premises that have assistive listening systems should identify this with the international symbol for deafness and, the assistive listening systems should cover 100 per cent of the area covered by the public address (PA) system. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for assistive listening systems in transport infrastructure and premises. Amendments would include requirements that the reference for assistive listening systems be updated from AS1428.2 (1992) to AS1428.5 (2010). Infrastructure and premises that have assistive listening systems must identify this with the international symbol for deafness. The assistive listening systems must cover either 80 per cent of the area covered by the public address (PA) system (option 1) or the maximum area practicable and at least those areas in which staff assistance is available (option 2). The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide could also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

TMR supports retention of status quo. TMR is unable to support the regulatory option due to limited ability to assess the impacts across all relevant infrastructure across the whole network. TMR however could support a non-regulatory approach in the future in recognition of proof of concept trials underway – including a trial of Hearing Impaired Station Announcements to determine the feasibility and accuracy of technology solutions that can present accessible station announcement information to customers with a hearing impairment.

Reform Area 11 – Print size and format

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Section 27.3 of the Transport Standards does not specify requirements for font weight and text justification for large print. This is not best practice and does not meet the varying needs of people with disability on public transport It is recommended that the achieved outcome requires that surround text and font weight are added for large print.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided and, the Transport Standards will continue to fail to meet the purpose of Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance around best practice for print size and formatting. Guidance would encourage print size to abide by certain specification. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards s27.3 would be amended to provide additional requirements for print conveyances, amendments could include requirements incorporate font weight and text justification for large print. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide could also include guidance, encouraging that large format text meets intended outcomes to ensure font weight that is semi-bold or bold; and text that is left justified within a ragged right margin. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option as this change only relates to large print format documents specifically produced for customers with a visual impairment. As such, the requirements are a minor amendment to the existing provisions under section 27.3 of the Transport Standards; and are therefore achievable.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The proposed reform options do not address the vast range of customers impacted by print media, and do not address easy read formats for customers. Those impacted by print media include people who are:

- neurotypical
- cognitively impaired
- of low literacy
- culturally and linguistically diverse
- dyslexic

Notwithstanding, the additional specifications will be helpful to ensure alignment with requirements that better meet the needs of customers with visual impairment. However, for increased clarity, it would be beneficial to ensure that the wording in the Transport Standards is explicit that this requirement is for documents that are being specifically produced in large print format for this purpose (i.e., not all signage/communications materials) and ensure the solution is fit-for-purpose for other people impacted by print media.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The options do not represent a major change from the status quo, and TMR does not anticipate there to be a significant financial cost associated with the reforms.

What has been your experience reading signs in a public transport context? Have you been unable to read a sign due to letter height and/or formatting?

Some customers have reported that signage and wayfinding can be poor due to faded signs, small print and position.

Reform Area 12 – International symbol for access and deafness

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Transport Standards section 16.1 defers to AS1428.2 (1992) and AS1428.1 (2001) which prescribe the requirement for use of international symbols for accessibility and deafness. This reform proposes amendments to reflect more contemporary Australian Standards and to be aligned with the Premises Standards. This will assist in the harmonisation process between the Transport Standards and the Premises Standards, as called for by all stakeholder groups	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged and no further guidance will be provided. Transport Standards will continue to fail in meeting its purpose as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance around best practice for application of the international symbol for accessibility and deafness. Guidance may include recommending signage to identify accessible facilities and the presence of heating augmentation systems, and that the international symbol for deafness should be used in accordance with AS1428.1 (2009). It should also be advised that signage should consider viewing distances of passengers with specifications in reference to AS1428.2 (1992). Regulatory: The Transport Standards section 16.1 would be amended to provide additional requirements including that the international symbol for accessibility and deafness must be used to identify access paths and must be implemented in accordance with AS1428.1 (2009). The amendment would affirm that the colors prescribed in AS1428.1 (2009) are not mandatory. Two sub-options exist as to size of accessibility symbols under Section 16.1: • Option 1: The sizing of accessibility symbols must comply with AS1428.2 (1992). • Option 2: Accessibility symbols must be appropriate size when accounting for various viewing distances and provided at 60 millimetres x 60 millimetres at a minimum. The Transport Standards Guidelines and /or The Whole Journey Guide could also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance including specifications for viewing distances.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why? If you prefer the regulatory option, which sub-option do you prefer? Why?

TMR supports regulatory sub-option 2. The regulatory option proposes updating the reference to AS1428.1 (2009) to align with the Premises Standards.

Sub-option 2 also provides for a minimum size with guidance, rather than specifying size per specific distance. This allows flexibility to consider the specific context of the sign. For example, in relation to obstructions and busyness of space, rather than just distance.

This does not currently align with Part H2 of the Premises Standards which informs AS1428.2 (1992). Further coordination is required by the Commonwealth to harmonise this proposed reform with other standards and codes.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The regulatory option provides sufficient clarity.

The non-regulatory option proposes using the 2009 Australian Standard but is not explicit that the Transport Standards will need to comply with this (as opposed to the earlier 2001 version of the Australian Standard).

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

TMR does not foresee challenges with the implementation of this reform

Have you experienced any issues with the current use and identification of the international symbols for accessibility and deafness on signs?

Issues with the current provisions include challenges in determining what constitutes a facility and when the requirements should be applied. For example, the scope of the Australian Standard referenced is applicable to new building work and therefore minimal modification would not call this Standard into practice.

The regulation wording should also be considered to specify the requirement is to the standard outlined rather than the clause itself.

This reform would benefit from a focus group of people with a range of disabilities, specifically those who are deaf or hard of hearing and needing to access the facilities.

The use of the International Symbol for Access and Deafness are consistent with other accessibility documents (such as the international best practice document, ISO 21542). Thus, the application of this will provide an easily recognisable symbol for those who require it.

Reform Area 13 – Letter heights and luminance contrast of signs

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards Section 17.1 lacks clarity regarding font type and luminance for static, non-braille and tactile signs. The intended outcome aims to provide certainty in signage design which is consistent and accessible to people with disability.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards Section 17.1 remains unchanged. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided and the Transport Standards will continue to fail meeting its purpose as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide advice relating to letter heights and luminance contrast of signage. Specific guidance added may include recommendations that where signs are not provided in braille or tactile formats, they should be designed to ensure sign elements are legible, and that braille and tactile formats may not be the most appropriate for all signs, and that Sans Serif fronts or typefaces such as Arial should be used. The guidance provided would also recommend specifying the formula as to viewing distance (in meters) x 3 = letter height (in millimeters) to calculate letter height. A luminance contrast of 30 per cent between signage elements and the sign background would be recommended to be achieved. Regulatory: The Transport Standards section 17.1 would be amended to provide additional requirements. There are two regulatory options to be considered: • Option 1: The Transport Standards would require that static signs which do not incorporate braille and tactile lettering must incorporate Sans Serif font, provide characters, icons, and symbols with a minimum luminance contrast of 30 per cent to the background sign surface and, comply with AS1428.2 (1992) to ensure signs are clear and legible. • Option 2: The Transport Standards would require that static signs which do not incorporate braille and tactile lettering must incorporate Sans Serif font, provide characters, icons, and symbols with a minimum luminance contrast of 30 per cent to the background sign surface, provide a luminance contrast of no less than 30 per cent when viewed against background or surfaces within 2 meters and provide minimum letter heights (refer to below sub-options).

	• Sub-option 1: By using the Viewing Distance formula. • Sub-option 2: In compliance with AS1428.2 (1992)

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why? If you prefer the regulatory proposal, which option do you prefer? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option. The current standards are sufficient but TMR would welcome additional guidance under the non-regulatory option within the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or the Whole Journey Guide to provide further clarity to operators/service providers.

Higher luminance contrast works better for people with vision impairments. The Stage 2 Consultation RIS additional information informs '30 per cent luminance contrast' between text/symbols and sign background. However, this standard should be updated to 'minimum 30 per cent luminance contrast'.

The current Transport Standards provide guidance only on ambient or external illumination of signs, which exclude internally illuminated signs/displays. A similar requirement of 'minimum 30 per cent luminance contrast' between text and sign background indoors could be considered as an additional clause.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Yes. The proposed regulatory and non-regulatory options are sufficient to enable people with disability to access public transport without discrimination, except for the missing clause on internally illuminated signs.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

TMR has not identified any challenges that would impact the implementation of additional requirements.

Do standards outlining type and luminance contrast for static, non-braille and non-tactile signs lack clarity? What has been your experience navigating these standards?

There is a lack of clarity in the current Transport Standards on appropriate font type alternatives as well as luminance contrast requirements of internally illuminated signs.

Have you experienced difficulty reading static, non-braille and non-tactile signs in a public transport context? How did this impact your public transport journey?

Not applicable to TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 14 – Location of signs

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards lack clarity surrounding the location of signs pertaining to convenances, infrastructure and premises. The intended outcome aims to modernise Australian Standards referenced in the Transport Standards to provide improved clarity surrounding the location of signs.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards Sections 17.2 & 17.3 would remain unchanged. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance which may include recommendations around signage placement, viewing and visibility and braille and tactile formats. Regulatory: The Transport Standards sections 17.2 & 17.3 would be amended to merge requirements for location of signs including requiring that signage which is not presented in braille and tactile format to include that signs are visible from seated and standing positions, and if design of conveyances prevents strict compliance, signs are placed above head height and that if used on conveyance, destination signs must be placed above the windscreen. • Sub-option 1: Where possible signs must be placed between 1000 millimeters and 1600 millimeters from finished floor level in uncrowded areas and, above 2000 millimeters above the finished floor in areas of high patronage or crowding. • Sub-option 2: Where possible, signs are to be placed in accordance with AS1428.2 (1992). The Transport Standards guidelines and the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide could also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance including specifications for viewing distances

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? If you prefer the regulatory proposal, which sub-option do you prefer and why?

TMR supports the regulatory option, sub-option 2. This option includes provisions with supplementary options and guidance within the Transport Standards.

A key issue with the current standards is that in AS1428.2 (1992) in section 17.4 – Location of signs, the height of signs (1000 to 1600mm from ground level) does not appear to align with Figure 30 under Section 25 – Viewing Ranges (1227 to 1709mm for comfortable viewing zone) and other viewing height ranges identified in the diagram for people either sitting or standing. This discrepancy should be rectified.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The options provide sufficient clarity. Including the guidance directly in the Transport Standards will provide greater clarity.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The inconsistencies of viewing ranges described and shown within AS1428.2 (1992) noted above may present implementation challenges. This discrepancy should be addressed.

In your experience have the standards for sign location lacked clarity?

Yes. The inconsistencies of viewing ranges described and shown within AS1428.2 (1992) has resulted in a lack of clarity for transport providers and operators.

What is your experience using signs in the public transport context? Has the location of signs impacted your ability to access public transport services?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator/provider.

Reform Area 15 – Braille embossed (printed) specifications

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Section 17.6 of the Transport Standards provides minimal provisions concerning the best practice standard and complexity expected of braille and raised lettering to ensure fair and accessible public transport services are provided to people with disability.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements for information in braille remain unchanged. noted that currently the Transport Standards do not specify standard of braille expected when braille information provided and is only referenced directly in S17.6 (2) and S27.2 Guidelines. Braille provisions are implied in S27.1. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean the Transport Standards fail to meet the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance around best practice for the provision of information in braille formats, including clearly recommending standards of braille as grade 1 (uncontracted). No changes would be made to the Transport Standards; however, guidance may be inserted into the Transport Standards Guidelines. Guidance added into The Whole Journey Guide would aim to ensure information in braille format is pre-prepared for distribution and displays are in simplest braille format to ensure readability and that information or materials in more complex grades of braille are available in a timely manner. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for the format of information provided in braille, including clearly specifying the standard of braille (grade 1 (uncontracted)) expected when information is provided. The Transport Standards Guidelines would also be amended to reflect changes and provide guidance on regulatory requirements. Through the Transport Standards and the Transport Standards Guidelines, the aim is to ensure information in braille that is pre-prepared for distribution and displays are in simplest braille format to ensure readability and, that information or materials in more complex grades of braille are available in a timely manner.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why? If you prefer the regulatory proposal, which option do you prefer? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option. The non-regulatory option provides sufficient guidance while minimising the risk of the unintended consequences of the regulatory option. For example, if information is provided in the default format, Grade 1 Braille (uncontracted), but an experienced Braille reader requests an alternate Braille format, it must be provided for the readers under the regulatory option. This may result in some operators choosing not to provide print information in Braille in the first place to avoid potential extra responsibility.

The regulatory option does not make provision for an operator to provide an electronic copy of accessibly formatted publication, instead of a printed copy, if readers request the publication in another Braille grade. It also omits consideration for accessible website content to be sent to a Braille output device, or alternatively accessed using a screen reader.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

No. The regulatory option seems to confuse signage requirements under the Transport Standards 17.6 and general information (non-signage) requirements under the Transport Standards 27.1. The proposed approach, prescribing requirements for printed information relating to signage, will further confuse the issue.

The Transport Standards 27.1 could be amended for a more appropriate option as the following statement:

> *"If information is presented to passengers in Braille format, the Braille must be Grade 1 Braille (uncontracted), in accordance with the criteria set out in The Rules of Unified English Braille by the Australian Braille Authority."*

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

There are cost implications for operators who receive requests for print versions of pamphlets or other publications that are initially provided in Grade 1 (uncontracted) Braille in a different grade of Braille. Under the regulatory option, preferred Braille format is to be made available in a timely manner upon request. Preference for a different grade of Braille should not form the basis for prescriptive requirements.

The unintended consequence of this requirement could be that operators avoid providing the printed information in Braille in the first place, so they will not be required to provide the same information in a different grade of Braille on request.

What has been your experience accessing public transport information printed in braille (such as information pamphlets)?

Not applicable to TMR

Reform Area 16 – Braille and tactile lettering for signage

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards have minimal specifications as to the standard of raised lettering. Existing requirements fail to meet relevant standards and reach best practice i.e., Premises Standards and NCC Opportunity exists to clarify braille standard requirements. The intended outcome aims to specify requirements as to braille standard requirements, reflect best practice and to align with requirements as issued under the Premises Standards.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards section 17.6 Raised lettering or symbols or use of braille, would remain unchanged and no new guidance would be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be provided in the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to include best practice advice on braille and tactile signage Regulatory: The Transport Standards section 17.6 Raised lettering or symbols or use of braille, would be removed and replaced with new requirements for braille and tactile design.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option. The provisions under the regulatory reform option provide for the labels to be positioned relevant to the equipment and consistent with Braille and tactile signage excluding the non-relevant elements (for example, height from finished floor). This option aligns with the Australian Braille Authority criteria and provides for a consistent height of 1mm for both Braille and tactile text when used on the same label. The specifying reference to the latest AS1428.4.2 (2018) for additional guidance and requirements will provide greater certainty to operators/providers.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The proposed reforms provide sufficient clarity to improve access to public transport. Providing specific signage Braille / tactile requirements directly within the Transport Standards would improve the very limited and basic requirements currently stipulated. TMR considers that the regulatory option provides improved clarity, through addressing a gap in relation to the use of Braille and tactile text on instructional labels and removes inconsistencies between legislative instruments. Feedback obtained from TMR's engagement with the disability sector indicates that Braille should be included in all signage where there is written text, and that the Braille should be a direct translation from the written text.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The regulatory option removes existing challenges in relation to the use of Braille and tactile labels. The non-regulatory and status quo options will retain the challenges with Braille and tactile labels being classed as signs and therefore subject to the same requirements such as minimum and maximum distance above ground or floor surface.

Have you experienced difficulty reading braille information provided to you by a public transport operator or provider?

Not applicable to TMR as an operator / provider

Reform Area 17 – Lifts: Braille and tactile information at lift landings

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards currently lack requirements as to braille and tactile wayfinding information at lift landings, and references outdated Australian Standards. The lack of braille and tactile information presents challenges for people with vision impairments as little to no information is provided as to which landing the lift has arrived at and which way, they need to go to continue their journey. The intended outcome aims to modernise the references used in the Transport Standards to use contemporary Australian Standards references to ensure that braille and tactile wayfinding information is present at lift landings.	Status Quo: No amendments would made to the current Transport Standards relating to braille and tactile wayfinding information at lift landings. No further or new guidance would be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guideline and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice for braille and tactile information at lift landings. Guidance would align with Australian Standard references AS1428.4.2 (2018), AS1735.12 (2020), AS1428.4.2 (2018) and AS1735.12 (2020). It is advised that information on braille and tactile signs are succinct and, if street names are long, they may be abbreviated, however, should meet design requirements specified Regulatory: The Transport Standards section 13.1 would be amended to include: that lift landings on platforms must have braille and tactile signs identifying the landing; at road reserves, passenger loading areas and parking must have braille and tactile signs identifying the street or facility landing; and at over bridges, subways or concourses must have braille and tactile information identifying the level. Status quo requirements would be retained. The updated requirements under section 13.1 must comply with AS1428.4.2 (2018) and must be located as per AS1735.12 (2020) Appendix ZA.5.2. the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be updated to reflect and provide advice on updated/new regulatory requirements.

Response to Consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option on the condition that further detail on the placement of signage and what should be provided in instances where there is not sufficient space on the door frame for signage be provided.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The regulatory option provides clarity on how additional braille and tactile signage on landing door frames can support deafblind people in accessing public transport. However, additional detail should be provided for instances where is insufficient space on the doorframe for signage.

The guidance outlined in the non-regulatory option provides clarity on how additional braille and tactile signage on landing door frames can support deafblind people in accessing public transport if the guidance is adopted by providers.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The placement of braille and tactile signage on landing door frames, as outlined in the proposed guidance accompanying the regulatory option, may cause an unintended safety risk. People reaching for braille and tactile signage on an external landing doorframe may be struck by a closing automatic lift door which could cause direct injury or cause them to lose balance. Further guidance on regulatory/non-regulatory options regarding sign placement, design, and operational use is recommended to minimise this risk.

Existing lifts may not have enough room on the door frame to accommodate compliant braille and tactile signage.

What has been your experience of lift landing signs in lifts in the public transport environment?

It can be challenging for transport providers to implement external lift directory braille and tactile signage at appropriate locations at lift landings. It is expected that implementation of additional braille and tactile signage will result in similar challenges.

Reform Area 18 – Lifts: Audible wayfinding

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Currently, the Transport Standards use outdated references and are lacking in requirements surrounding audible announcements and wayfinding information. Currently, this presents challenges to people with vision or cognitive impairments as inadequate wayfinding information has been provided. The intended outcome aims to modernise the references used in the Transport Standards to ensure all passengers have adequate audible wayfinding information.	Status Quo: No amendments would be made to the current Transport Standards relating to audible announcements and wayfinding information. No further guidance would be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance around best practice for audible landing locations and wayfinding information in lift cars. Two non-regulatory options have been proposed. • Option 1: Specific guidance may incorporate that lift cars should provide the following location and wayfinding cues • Option 2: Specific guidance on that lift cars should provide succinct wayfinding information. Regulatory: The Transport Standards section 13.1 would be amended. Two regulatory options have been proposed: • Option 1: The Transport Standards 13.1 would be amended to require that lift cars arriving at platform landings must announce the platform number, and lift cars arriving at landings in road reserves, parking or passenger loading areas must announce the name of the facility or street, and lifts arriving at over bridges or concourses must announce the level and give specific directions as to exits and lifts. • Option 2: the Transport Standards section 13.1 would be amended to require that lift cars must provide succinct audio information on arriving at landings that permits passengers to confirm where they have arrived and to make basic orientation decisions. The Transport Standards Guidelines and The Whole Journey Guide would be updated to reflect on amendments and provide guidance.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option 1 or 2, or regulatory option 1 or 2? Why?

TMR supports regulatory option 2. Both regulatory options 1 and 2 seek to modernise the Transport Standards by providing users with additional audible wayfinding information. The prescriptive requirements proposed by

option 1 could benefit customers, however TMR questions whether the requirements would be practicable across premises which vary in size, function, and complexity within and across transport networks.

Regulatory option 2 proposes a concise requirement within the Transport Standards and the provision of additional guidance within The Whole Journey Guide.

It also enables providers and operators the flexibility to implement audible wayfinding solutions that account for the size, function, and complexity of the premises. The additional guidance proposed within the Whole Journey Guide would assist transport providers and operators in implementing practicable audible wayfinding solutions that address wayfinding challenges for people with disability.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The status quo and non-regulatory options do not clarify that reliance on older Australian Standards or best practice guidance for audible wayfinding in lifts may result in the stated issues not being addressed. Nor do they clarify that issues may be exacerbated through increased navigational complexity that may result from new and upgraded transport premises.

Both regulatory options provide clarity to ensure lift cars provide audible wayfinding information.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

There will be additional cost, resource impacts and technical effort to providers in upgrading or maintaining additional audio function within lifts. Installation and maintenance may result in sporadic and temporary negative impacts to customers currently relying on lifts to travel through transport premises.

What has been your experience of automated audio announcements in lifts in the public transport environment?

Some existing lifts provide no or limited audio announcements upon landing, whereas others have been upgraded to improve audible communications for wayfinding.

The Transport Standards reference lift specifications that appear to be designed more for vertical high-rise buildings with many levels as opposed to transport facilities with limited levels that spread out horizontally across several platforms. Due to the different nature and arrangement of transport facilities, this can become an issue for commuter navigation if provisions of audible wayfinding are not required.

Have you experienced a situation where you have been unable to orient yourself or determine your location correctly?

Not applicable to TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 19 – Lifts: Emergency communication systems in lift cars

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Currently, the Transport Standards use outdated references which have no requirements pertaining to the means in which deaf, hard of hearing, speech impaired or non-verbal passengers in a lift car can communicate with staff in an emergency and receive a message confirming their call. The intended outcome aims to modernise the references used in the Transport Standards to ensure all users have equal capacity to contact and communicate with staff in emergency situations.	Status Quo: No amendments would be made to the current Transport Standards relating to emergency communication in lift cars. No further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice for emergency communication in lift cars. The advice would pertain to infrastructure and premises. Specific guidance may incorporate recommendations that emergency communication systems in lift cars should comply with AS1428.5 (2010) Clause 6.4 and AS1735.12 (2020) Clause 5.4.2.5, and that non-verbal passenger can communicate in emergencies in an equivalent way to other passengers, and that upon passengers making an emergency call they receive a message or signal and this confirmation which will be verbal and should indicate a text message on screen adjacent to emergency systems and, if the communication system involves an induction loop system, the symbol should be adjacent to the microphone. Regulatory: The Transport Standards section 13.1 would be amended to require that emergency communication systems in lift cars comply with AS1428.5 (2021) Clauses 2.4 and 3.2 and AS1735.12 (2020) Clause 5.4.2.5. Specific guidance issued may incorporate recommendations that emergency communication systems in lift cars should comply with AS1428.5 (2010) Clause 6.4 and AS1735.12 (2020) Clause 5.4.2.5, and that non-verbal passenger can communicate in emergencies in an equivalent way to other passengers, and that upon passengers making an emergency call they receive a message or signal and this confirmation which will be verbal and should indicate a text message on screen adjacent to emergency systems and, if the communication system involves an induction loop system, the symbol should be adjacent to the microphone. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice on updated regulatory requirements.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option for new or upgraded lifts only. The regulatory option would enhance provisions for communication for people with disability. It will result in a need for substantial upgrades to the existing fleet of lifts and may not be achievable for or practical.

Legacy components of the built environment that contains lifts may not be able to accommodate the new technology and/or the costs are likely to be prohibitive and exceed the cost of upgrading the lift system in totality.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Both the regulatory and non-regulatory option offer sufficient clarity to enable people with disability to be able to access public transport without discrimination. Including the latest lift standard and further guidance into the Transport Standards, the Transport Standards Guidelines and the Whole Journey Guide should provide sufficient clarity to operators/providers for the requirements of provision of internal lift emergency phone communications for people with disability.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

There are significant interdependencies between this reform and the other lift reforms. These interdependencies need to be considered holistically to deliver meaningful accessible outcomes for customers. Without this holistic consideration, there are significant adverse consequences that could arise, including:

- Accessibility: upgrades to component parts may result in varying accessibility outcomes due to the outcomes implied by the reforms
- Technical: where the technical feasibility of status quo / reform of one lift reforms is no longer viable due to the outcomes of the other reforms
- Safety: upgrades to component parts instead of the system could lead to diminished safety outcomes for customers
- Financial: the cost of retrofitting existing assets is significant. The cost burden could be minimised through replacement, rather than piecemeal upgrades, with consideration to the timing of investment provided through the outcome of the Implementation Approach reform.
- Investment efficiency: TMR is currently funding investment programs relating to lift upgrades that could be made redundant under the suite of lift reforms and the outcome of the Implementation Approach reform. For example, TMR is currently funding the lift upgrades by Queensland Rail as part of the station upgrade program. Where the requirements will change for lifts, this could result in significant duplication of cost; and the incremental benefits resulting from the reforms may not exceed the cost impact.

As identified in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS, costs may be incurred to install additional visual and audio systems in lift cars however additional incremental cost for a new lift is not likely to be significant, but costs may be greater for existing assets depending on the amount of retrofitting required. Maintenance and operation budgets are unlikely to support coordinated upgrades (if required) of existing infrastructure and piecemeal upgrades are unlikely to deliver system wide outcomes and benefits.

Have you experienced difficulty contacting staff or lift operators in an emergency? Would more accessible contact methods (text, augmented hearing system) have helped?

Not applicable to TMR as an operator / provider.

What has been your, or your passengers, experience using the emergency buttons and communication devices in a public transport related lift?

TMR does not hold a position on this matter at this time.

Reform Area 20 – Lifts: Reference for lift car communication and information systems

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Currently, the Transport Standards use outdated references which do not include adequate requirements for assistive listening systems in lifts. This restricts people who are hard of hearing or who have vision impairments as they are unable to receive equal access to information whilst travelling in lifts. The intended outcome aims to modernise the references used in the Transport Standards to ensure all users have equal access to information.	Status Quo: No amendments would be made to the current Transport Standards relating to communication in lift cars. No further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or the Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice on accessible lift car communication and information systems pertaining to premises and infrastructure. The additional section would recommend that people with disability are provided the same audible information as other passengers. Regulatory: The Transport Standards section 13.1 would be amended to require that lift car communications systems comply with AS1735.12 (2020) Clause 5.4.2.5.4; that the international symbol for deafness AS1428.1 (2009) Design for access and mobility, clause 8.2.2, must be pictured where a hearing loop is provided; and that if service-related information is broadcasted in lift cars that information must also be relayed through an induction loop system as described under AS1735.12 (2020) Clause 5.4.2.5.4. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice on updated regulatory requirements.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option to allow for the uncertainty around emerging technologies and applications in heavy rail environments, while also enabling enhanced accessibility of general facility PA announcements for people who use hearing aids, if external audible PA announcements are currently also provided within lifts.

External facility PA systems (such as those located on platforms) are currently required to include an assistance listening system, such as hearing aid loops, so this should be the same for PA announcements within lifts.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Both the regulatory and non-regulatory option offer sufficient clarity to enable people with disability to be able to access public transport without discrimination. Including the latest lift standard and further guidance into the Transport Standards, the Transport Standards Guidelines and the Whole Journey Guide should provide

sufficient clarity to operators/providers for the requirements of provision of assistance listening systems within lifts.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

There are significant interdependencies between this reform and the other lift reforms. These interdependencies need to be considered holistically to deliver meaningful accessible outcomes for customers. Without this holistic consideration, there are significant adverse consequences that could arise, including:

- Accessibility: upgrades to component parts may result in varying accessibility outcomes due to the outcomes implied by the reforms
- Technical: where the technical feasibility of status quo / reform of one lift reforms is no longer viable due to the outcomes of the other reforms
- Safety: upgrades to component parts instead of the system could lead to diminished safety outcomes for customers
- Financial: the cost of retrofitting existing assets is significant. The cost burden could be minimised through replacement, rather than piecemeal upgrades, with consideration to the timing of investment provided through the outcome of the Implementation Approach reform.
- Investment efficiency: TMR is currently funding investment programs relating to lift upgrades that could be made redundant under the suite of lift reforms and the outcome of the Implementation Approach reform. For example, TMR is currently funding the lift upgrades by Queensland Rail as part of the station upgrade program. Where the requirements will change for lifts, this could result in significant duplication of cost; and the incremental benefits resulting from the reforms may not exceed the cost impact.
- Costs may be incurred to install or upgrade additional assistance listening systems in existing lift cars.

What has been your experience of verbal announcements in lift cars in a public transport related lift?

Not relevant to TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 21 – Information and communication technologies (ICT) procurement

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
There are currently no accessibility requirements for ICT procurement, which has led to an inconsistency in procurement and platforms utilised. There is opportunity to require ICT accessibility in the Transport Standards. The achieved outcome aims to require ICT accessibility in the Transport Standards.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged regarding ICT hardware, services, and software; no new prescriptive or guidance materials would be incorporated. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean the Transport Standards fail to meet the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards and The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding ICT hardware, services and software procurement; this would include advising of ICT product accessibility requirements to be considered at procurement standards and signifying technical standards. Adjustments to guidance should recommend standards for ICT procurement pertaining to infrastructure, conveyances, and premises. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Three advisory options are proposed as follows: • Option 1: Performance based requirements to ensure ICT software, hardware or services which are intended to be used by the public should be accessible to people with disability. • Option 2: Procurement of ICT should comply with AS/EN 301549 (2016) Accessibility requirements suitable for public procurement of ICT products and services. For web bases and non-web software: sub-option 1 WCAG 2.0 AA should be met; or sub-option 2 WCAG 2.0 AAA should be met. Where a conflict arises, the Transport Standards takes precedence over AS EN 301 549 (2016). • Option 3: Procurement of ICT should comply with AS EN 301 549 (2016) Accessibility requirements suitable for public procurement of ICT products and services. For web bases and non-web software: sub-option 1 WCAG 2.1 AA should be met; or sub-option 2 WCAG 2.1 AAA should be met. Where a conflict arises, the Transport Standards takes precedence over AS EN 301 549 (2016). Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to balance prescriptive and performance requirements for ICT hardware, services, and software procurement. The

	Transport Standards amendments would incorporate contemporary ICT procurement and software accessibility standards. The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or the Whole Journey Guide would be amended to reflect and provide guidance on changes. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. A series of regulatory and advisory options could be put into a RIS, five regulatory options have been provided as to the procurement of ICT products: • Option 1: Any ICT intended for public use by a public transport service operator or provider must be accessible to persons with disability. • Option 2: Procurement of ICT must comply with AS /EN 301549 (2016), unless a conflict of requirements arises, in which this Standard takes precedence. • Option 3: Procurement of ICT must comply with AS /EN 301549 (2016) with the following exceptions including that WCAG 2.0 AAA must be met unless a conflict of requirements arises, in which this Standard takes precedence. • Option 4: Procurement of ICT must comply with AS/EN 301549 (2016) with the following exceptions including that WCAG 2.1 AA must be met unless a conflict of requirements arises, in which this Standard takes precedence. • Option 5: Procurement of ICT must comply with AS/EN 301549 (2016) with the following exceptions including that WCAG 2.1 AAA must be met unless a conflict of requirements arises, in which this Standard takes precedence.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why? If you prefer the non-regulatory proposal, which option and sub-option do you prefer? Why? If you prefer the regulatory proposal, which option and sub-option do you prefer? Why?

TMR supports non-regulatory option 1. The absence of national accessibility requirements for ICT procurement has resulted in inconsistent levels of accessibility across ICT applications, products and services associated with delivery of public transport. This has caused some people with disability to not be able to fully access aspects of public transport. TMR therefore recognises the importance of accessible ICT in ensuring passengers have equitable access to public transport and generally support introduction of minimum technical accessibility requirements for ICT procurement.

While TMR acknowledges compliance with technical standards specified in the proposed regulatory options would lead to overall improvements in ICT accessibility, these options may yield unintended consequences for customers, as well as providers and operators of public transport. The rate of innovation of ICT applications, products and services would likely render the WCAG outdated, resulting in stagnation of public transport ICT solutions in comparison to those that may become available. Prescribing requirements to comply with out-of-date standards will present implementation challenges for operators and providers and in some cases may require an equivalent access process for approval of an alternate solution (for example, when meeting a newer

standard). Adoption of any of the proposed regulatory options would perpetuate the need to continually modernise ICT procurement requirements in response to developments and innovation. The interval between ICT innovation and modernisation of the procurement requirements may constrain the extent to which ICT solutions offering greater levels of accessibility are adopted by providers and operators.

Non-regulatory option 1 allows operators and providers to be more responsive to technological advances and resultant upgrades to Australian and other standards. The inclusion of Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 in AS/EN301549 (2020) ensures the basis of accessible technology is addressed for both web and mobile systems. However, additional consideration should be given to the inclusion of guidance on content accessibility to enhance the experience for all users, and to ongoing maintenance and configuration control to ensure continued access. WCAG or AS/EN 301549 conformance checks should be supplemented with useability testing to identify issues with the wording of questions and instructions, flow of visual artefacts and prompts, layout and colour choices, and navigational architecture of menus.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Regulatory options 2 and 3 propose prescribing compliance AS/EN301549 (2016) and WCAG 2.0. These relate to web systems only and do not cover mobile devices. Adoption of these options may therefore result in inconsistent levels of access between AS/EN301549 (2016) and WCAG 2.0 compliant web systems, and mobile platforms. Non-regulatory option 2 offers guidance on the same standards (AS/EN301549 (2016) and WCAG 2.0). Regulatory options 2 and 3, and non-regulatory option 2, do not provide clarity to people with disability that levels of access between web content and mobile platforms may vary as a result of their adoption.

More broadly, the status quo, non-regulatory option 2 and regulatory options 2 and 3 do not clarify that reliance on older Australian Standards may limit opportunities for using technological advances that would otherwise enhance access for people with disability.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The AS/EN301549 (2016) and WCAG 2.0 are already out of date. The Transport Standards should provide ICT procurement guidance to enable providers and operators to effectively evaluate suppliers' tender responses for compliance against requirements.

What is your experience of using the ICT related hardware, services and software (for example website, smartphone app, digital information displays, touch screen technology, ticket machines, fare gates) provided by public transport operators and providers?

Not applicable to TMR as an operator / provider

Reform Area 22 – Mobile Web Systems

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Current Transport Standards have not adequately accounted for shifts in online platforms becoming the norm for providers and operators to connect with passengers. There is a necessity for a minimum standard to be introduced to clarify compliance obligations with service providers.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged with no provisions for mobile web systems. No further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would be updated to include best practice guidance concerning WCAG requirements and the benefits of user testing when developing apps and tools. Regulatory: There are two regulatory options proposed. The first option prescribes minimum WCAG requirements for all information provided in a mobile format, including discretionary information that some systems provide. The second option prescribes minimum WCAG requirements only for information related to transport services provided in a mobile format. • Option 1: Where information is provided by an operator or provider to passengers in a mobile web format, all information must meet WCAG 2.1 AA requirements as a minimum. • Option 2: Where information is provided by an operator or provider to passengers in a mobile web format, only information related to transport services must meet WCAG 2.1 AA requirements as a minimum.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why? If you prefer the regulatory proposal, which option do you prefer? Why?

The DDA currently requires for information and services delivered via mobile web systems to be accessible. Adoption of modernised regulations for mobile web systems could further strengthen the existing requirement to meet accessibility standards for all transport-related information and services.

The proposed regulatory option could lead to overall improvements in accessibility of mobile web systems, however, TMR is concerned these options would yield unintended consequences for customers, and providers and operators of public transport.

Principally, the rate of innovation of mobile web system applications, products and services would likely render the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 AA outdated, resulting in stagnation of public transport solutions in comparison to those that may become available. Prescribing requirements to comply with out-of-date standards will present implementation challenges for operators and providers and in some cases may require an equivalent access process for approval of an alternate solution (for example, when meeting a newer standard).

Adoption of either of the proposed regulatory options may perpetuate the need to continually modernise mobile web systems requirements in response to developments and innovation. The interval between innovations in mobile web systems and associated applications, and modernisation of the mobile web system requirements may constrain the extent to which solutions offering greater levels of accessibility are adopted by providers and operators.

Therefore, TMR supports the non-regulatory option. The non-regulatory option provides sufficient guidance to operators and providers on accessibility for mobile web systems to assist them in ensuring their services can be accessed by people with disability without discrimination. This option also affords operators and providers the flexibility to remain responsive to new technologies and associated standards (through incorporation in procurement contracts, for example).

TMR prefers the non-regulatory option under the assumption that supporting guidance will be continually updated to remain aligned with the most recent version of WCAG (publication of WCAG 3.0 is expected soon) and other related standards as they are modernised.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

No. TMR believes compliance with WCAG 2.1 AA (as outlined in regulatory options 1 and 2) alone will not ensure that mobile web content is accessible for people with disability. Compliance against WCAG 2.1 AA can only address what is within its scope and thus adoption of regulatory options 1 or 2 may not address all potential considerations associated with accessibility of mobile web systems. An indication of the minimum level of accessibility functionality required in mobile web systems (such as the ability to change font size, text-to-voice functions, and accessibility feature filters) would improve clarity.

Further direction on offline requirements for mobile web systems is also required. As connectivity is not always guaranteed, guidelines around information should be stored locally for access even when connection is lost is critical, especially when using payments systems.

The non-regulatory option states ‘information provided by external third parties as opposed to directly from transport operators and providers should also consider minimal levels of accessibility as best practice’. This statement indicates information provided by external third parties may not be accessible for passengers with disability, however this is not clarified.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Adoption of either regulatory option may incur significant cost associated with audit and update of any mobile web systems to ensure compatibility with all commercially available mobile devices and operating systems. Operators and providers may also need to alter or establish configuration and content governance mechanisms to ensure content remains compliant against WCAG 2.1 AA.

The absence of clear guidance around testing and verification methodologies in the proposed regulatory and non-regulatory options could impact development and implementation of compliant mobile web systems. TMR seeks clarity and guidance from the Commonwealth on the following matters:

- What constitutes acceptable testing and verification methodologies
- How 'users' are defined for the purposes of testing, validating, and verifying mobile web systems
- How operators and providers can ensure that test participants constitute a representative sample of people with disability
- How procurement processes and polices to ensure that the ability of digital products to meet WCAG is a key procurement evaluation criterion

For many organisations, it is likely that specialist WCAG capability and the capacity of existing resources to meet WCAG compliance may not exist. It is likely that significant technology, capability, and organisational change will be required to be able to meet and maintain WCAG compliance. These issues may be particularly challenging for smaller operators with fewer resources.

Creating accessible digital platforms and validating accessibility compliance usually requires specialist development content and service design skills, along with specialist WCAG auditing skills. The required skillsets are not likely to exist within the smaller operators and most operators would rely on vendors to ensure mobile web systems and applications comply with the legislation. Engaging vendors without knowledge of how to validate and verify mobile web systems against WCAG could result in the development and implementation of tools/solutions that do not meet the modernised Transport Standards.

Have you experienced difficulties or barriers accessing or navigating a public transport mobile website or application?

TMR has received feedback from customers that text resizing on the Translink mobile application is sometimes applied incorrectly, resulting in issues with alignment of elements and text on web pages. TMR has found that some colour contrast of text to be compliant with WCAG 2.0 AA, but the colour combination of the text and background made the text difficult to read.

Customer feedback collected by the Customer Experience Branch indicates some customers experience difficulties when navigating transport websites and applications and when attempting to find relevant journey information. Further feedback has indicated that language used to convey journey information on transport websites and applications is unintuitive. Whilst this feedback may not relate directly to the current reform area, it substantiates TMR's assertion that the Transport Standards should consider factors affecting mobile web system accessibility that are outside the scope of WCAG.

Reform Area 23 – Accessible fare system elements

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards contain inadequate clarity as to specifying accessible fare system elements, which clouds the ability of transport providers and operators regarding existing or future technologies used in fare payment and validation. This lack of clarity can facilitate barriers to people with disability by creating inconsistencies and hindering confidence when looking to utilise public transport. The intended outcome aims to further specify design requirements and simplify existing and future requirements relating to the fare system elements.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged, as to the location of fare system elements. No further guidance would be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be inserted into the Transport Standards Guidelines and The Whole Journey Guide providing guidance as to best practice for fare system elements / processes to meet needs for people with disability and provide clarity, flexibility and certainty to providers and operators. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide new requirements (section 24.1, 25.2 and 25.3) addressing cover reach ranges, viewing angles, electronic notices, width of system gates and or barriers (applying to conveyances, premises, and infrastructure). The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or the Whole Journey Guide would be updated. Three regulatory options are proposed: • Option 1: Performance based with new requirements for fare and ticketing systems • Option 2: Contains prescriptive requirements and compliance with a version of AS/EN 301549. Two sub-options are presented regarding versions of AS/EN 301549 to be mandated. • Option 3: Contains prescriptive requirements and includes sub-options requiring compliance with a specific version of WCAG. Where a conflict arises, the Transport Standards take precedence over AS EN 301 549 (2016).

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why? If you prefer the regulatory proposal, which option and sub-options do you prefer? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option 2, sub-option 2. Both sub-options 1 and 2 modernise the relevant provisions to ensure operators and providers can respond to new technologies while maintaining requirements for fare system elements to be accessible.

However, option 1 may result in inconsistent interpretations of requirements as the option requires compliance with any applicable Australian standards without specifying which standards.

There are additional benefits offered by regulatory option 2, sub-option 2 through:

- addressing current challenges with the Transport Standards contained in sections:
- 17.5: through updating the 10 second display requirement to the average length of time.
- 24.1: through removing outdated, redundant requirements related to old technology, such as the requirement for 1200 mm from coin and ticket slots to the gate barrier, as required under older Australian Standards (AS1428.2 (1992)).
- providing further clarity regarding section 25.2(2) and alternative forms of payment: this reform option specification does not introduce any new requirement and ensures these forms of payment do not attract a surcharge. For example, in compliance with the Transport Standards s25.2 Translink currently provide the Translink Access Pass (TAP) to eligible customers who due to a disability are unable to tap a validator. This pass does not attract a surcharge and further to that provides free travel to the holder.
- providing consistency with AS/EN EN301549 (2020) and Queensland Government procurement practice. This reform option specification removes reliance on multiple Australian Standards that are currently used in relation to compliance for accessible fare system elements.

Any new regulatory option should include a note that the reference to a surcharge in this option does not encompass paper tickets, which may attract a surcharge to cover additional costs. Paper tickets require similar actions to tokens, cards or other standard payment forms and are not an alternative form of payment offered under the Transport Standards 25.2(2).

The status quo option would result in a retention of outdated and redundant requirements related to old technology (such as coin and ticket slots, and ticket validation display requirements). TMR does not consider this would result in improved effectiveness, efficiency, or accessibility outcomes for customers.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The status quo and non-regulatory reform options do not provide enough clarity. Relying on older, superseded Australian Standards relating to fare systems could limit opportunities for using technological advances that would otherwise enhance access. The regulatory option provides sufficient clarity to ensure fare system elements are accessible. This enables people with disability to be able to access public transport without discrimination. Further clarity is required around how the regulatory option will prevent discrimination against people who cannot or do not use smart devices, and people who cannot or do not use credit/debit cards to pay for services. Considerations for equal access for those who cannot or do not access digital connectivity must be built into systems.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Refer to Table 6.

Table 6 :Challenges to implementing accessible fare system elements reform

Reform Option	Summary of Challenge	Description of Challenge
Status quo	Passenger safety challenges from infrastructure design	Compliance with the 1200mm from coin slot to the gate barrier requirement is not feasible and presents safety issues for customers. People with disability and disability advocates, expressed concerns during consultation which included mock-ups of extended stanchions/gate arms on wide access gates, that an extension

Reform Option	Summary of Challenge	Description of Challenge
		presented a trip and collision hazard, particularly for customers who are blind or have low vision. Extended gate arms may also be a hazard for other customers who have to navigate safely around the extension, especially in high traffic areas. In addition, extending access gate arms may impede use of the access paths and circulation spaces. Our consultation with people with disability and representative organisations indicates that this is requirement is not supported.
Status quo	Passenger safety challenges related to personal safety.	The 10 second information display requirement for ticket validation presents safety issues for vulnerable customers. This is due to their card balance being displayed on screen after they have moved away. We do not consider that the 10 second information display is required based on our engagement with customers with disability. Our assessments indicate that the average time taken to validate a token/card and exit an access gate is less than 3 seconds. The time to acknowledge and move past the validator is 1-2 seconds.

Do you, or your passengers, experience difficulty or higher costs in using public transport ticketing, fare payment or fare validation systems? If so, can you provide examples?

TMR currently provides fare free alternatives for eligible passengers with disability who have difficulties with standard fare payment systems, enabling independent travel:

The TAP is available to people with a permanent physical or intellectual disability who can:

- travel independently on Translink services, and
- demonstrate that due to their disability they are unable to independently use a go card

The Vision Impairment Travel Pass (VITP) is available to customers who are blind or have very low vision and have been assessed by a relevant medical professional as legally blind.

Accessibility at stations, stops, wharves and access routes

Reform Area 24 – Doors on access paths

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The current requirements for doors on access paths in the Transport Standards section 12.1 Doors on access paths, do not specify which type of door (automatic, power assisted or manual) is best for passengers. Whilst being technically compliant with the Transport Standards, manual doors can present a barrier to people with disability. The intended outcome aims to ensure people with disability are not presented with manual doors on access paths which are difficult to use.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged, regarding automatic and power operated doors. Maintaining status quo approach will main the Transport Standards fail to meet the purpose of the requirements as stipulated under Part 1.2. No additional guidance would be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to advising that all doors on access paths, particularly accessible and ambulant toilet doors should be automatic, or power assisted. Regulatory: The Transport Standards sections 12.1 and 12.6 would be amended to include requirements as to doors on access paths. A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide advice and reflect amendments. Two regulatory options have been developed. • Option 1: The Transport Standards would be amended to require that all doors opened by passengers must be automatic or power assisted. Amendments would include requiring that any doors along access paths must not present barriers to independent passenger travel; that doors must be automatic, power assisted, or staff operated; that direct assistance may be provided at security checkpoints; that doors and gates on access paths to be opened by passengers must be automatic or power assisted; and that power assisted doors must not require constant pressure or grip/twist controls • Option 2: The Transport Standards would be amended to require that only power assisted unisex accessible and ambulant doors. Amendments to sections 12.1 and 12.6 would include requiring that any doors along access paths must not present barriers to independent passenger travel; that doors must be automatic, power assisted, or staff operated, that direct assistance may be provided at

	security checkpoints; that only unisex accessible toilet and ambulant toilet doors on access paths must be automatic or power assisted, and that power assisted doors must not require constant pressure or grip/twist controls.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why? If you prefer the regulatory proposal, which option do you prefer? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option. TMR's policy is that such guidance be adopted as mandatory requirements for TMR infrastructure. Therefore, the technical guidance will most likely be included as requirements in TMR specifications and similar documents which are then used by TMR Program Delivery and Operations branch (PDO) for delivery, operation, and maintenance of infrastructure.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Yes, the non-regulatory option would provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Challenges may exist depending on implementation approach adopted. Maintenance and operation budgets are unlikely to support coordinated upgrades (if required) of existing infrastructure and piecemeal upgrades are unlikely to deliver system wide outcomes and benefits.

Have you, or your passengers, ever been in a situation while moving through a public transport conveyance, infrastructure or premises whereby you were not able to open an unlocked manual door or had great difficulty opening the door?

Not relevant to TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 25 – Continuous accessibility on access paths

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Currently, the Transport Standards reference outdated Australian Standards, which do not align with the Premises Standards. The intended outcome aims to include advice to encourage the maintenance of continuous accessibility to and within public transport nodes. To update Australian Standards references.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements regarding continuous accessibility would remain unchanged with possible loss of the reference to AS1428.2 (1992) Clause 7. Maintaining the status quo approach will fail to address the loss of AS1428.2 (1992) Clause 7 and will fail to reach the purpose specified under Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding continuous accessibility; this would include that as a replacement for AS1428.2 (1992) guidance material will be published to compensate for lost references as per clause 7 and, Guidance material will be based on Section DP1 of the Premises Standard and the intent of AS1428.2 (1992) Clause 7. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for continuous accessibility, including standalone requirements as to continuous access on paths and an equivalent reference such as DP1 is referenced with caveats that more closely align it with Clause 7. It is noted that incorporating the text of Clause 7 will avoid the risk of Section 2.2 becoming redundant and will ensure people with disability rights are not diminished. The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide could also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option. This would mean updating the Transport Standards Guidelines and or The Whole Journey Guide to include advice and encourage maintenance TMR considers such guidance and incentives sufficient and appropriate to address the problem statement in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination. There are existing obligations already in place which provide continuous access paths for users with a disability, however both the options would stand to supplement the guidance and requirements to provide clarity and further ensure that people with disability are not discriminated against when accessing public transport.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Balancing the needs of various stakeholders (including private landowners) when designing or altering access paths may result in challenges that could impact the implementation of the regulatory and non-regulatory options. Clear guidance is required to understand where the responsibility lies to ensure the paths are maintained.

It is also important to ensure that coordination is provided, and recommendations align, to balance the need of other types of users. For example, accessibility of approaches to the premises or infrastructure for cyclists.

When using access paths that connect public transport premises or infrastructure (such as a bus stop and train platform) have you experienced any accessibility issues?

This question would be best answered through a focus group of people with a range of disabilities.

However, the following are some issues that have been noted as potential coordination points:

- Inconsistent design and application of tactile indicators,
- Aging assets and wear and tear,
- Poor signage and incorrect information,
- Interface with cycling or motorist routes,
- Connectivity of the routes (e.g., in relation to crossing point locations, etc.).

What features make a path connecting transport nodes accessible?

This question would be best answered through a focus group of people with a range of disabilities; however, features that make a path connecting to transport nodes accessible are an overall consistent design which is to the relevant standards and guidance and ensuring the path is well-maintained throughout.

Reform Area 26 – Flange gaps

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Flange gaps are not referenced under the Transport Standards, which has been acknowledged by public transport operators and providers as a significant safety hazard for all passengers using access paths and uncertainty surrounding compliance. The achieved outcome must incorporate requirements which erase uncertainties surrounding flange gaps and ensure all people are able to cross access paths.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements regarding flange gaps would remain unchanged, no non-regulatory initiatives or guidance material would be provided. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean continued lack of references or acknowledgement of level crossings with flange gaps, which will fail to address lack of clarity about compliance with the Transport Standards. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance on flange gap filler. Guidance material inserted would aim to encourage relevant transport providers and operators so that where possible, level crossings do not form part of an access path, monitor progress of research on flange gap filler sand subsequent roll out if products are successful and approved by the National Rail Safety Regulator, provide guidance material on what constitutes good design in traversing a flange gap at a level crossing and, work with local users on introducing safe equivalent access option for traversing of where a level crossing forms part of an access path level crossing without getting stuck in the gap. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to include new requirements that recognize flange gaps within access paths at level crossings, encourage use where necessary, and encourage flange gap filler products be used where available. the Transport Standards and / or the Whole Journey Guide would be updated for the two regulatory options proposed for consideration • Regulatory Option 1: The Transport Standards would be amended to introduce two elements concerning that where possible, level crossings must not form part of an access path and, where a 'flange gap filler' product or technology has been approved by the ONRSR for each mode of transport, it must be used to eliminate, or if not feasible, reduce the gap to be no greater than 40mm. • Regulatory Option 2: Where possible, level crossings must not form part of an access path, where it is only possible to have an access path at a level crossing, the flange gaps at the level crossing must comply with AS1742.7 and, where a 'flange gap filler' product or

	technology has been approved by the ONRSR for each mode of transport, it must be used to eliminate, or if not feasible, reduce the gap to be no greater than 40mm. Details on guidance material on safe crossing at level crossings would be developed and tested through a co-design and consultation process with operators and providers, the disability community, and governments. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR does not select a preferred option on this reform, noting that the GCLR network is relatively new. TMR supports improvements in the accessibility and safety of flange gaps, however the regulatory and non-regulatory options do not provide sufficient detail to guarantee the suitability of future products.

Furthermore, the regulatory and non-regulatory options would mandate / promote the use of flange gap filler products approved by ONRSR. TMR understands this reform proposal is inconsistent with Rail Safety National Law. As outlined in the ONRSR Way: *The nature of the Rail Safety National Law (RSNL) means ONRSR is not an approver of equipment, services or processes.*

Flange gaps can pose disproportionate safety risks for people who travel in mobility aids with small wheels and other smaller devices, and/or who have vision impairment. TMR does not consider the proposed non-regulatory option addresses these risks sufficiently. Provision of guidance to users of at-grade crossings is positioned as temporary a measure, however, do not consider that this acceptably mitigates the risk to users. Moreover, the guidance proposed by the non-regulatory option shifts the burden of safety responsibility onto users.

TMR would consider a regulatory approach in the future once tested solutions have been proven to work.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Both options provide sufficient clarity in what they are seeking to achieve, however the non-regulatory option does not adequately clarify that its adoption would help to ensure people with disability can access public transport without discrimination. Refer above to TMR's request for clarification around ONRSR's product approval process.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Installation of flange gap filler products and technology may incur significant capital expenditure. Inspection and maintenance of flange gap filler products and technology may incur significant cost to parties responsible for infrastructure maintenance.

What is your experience crossing tram and train tracks?

Not relevant to TMR as an operator / provider.

What alternative solutions exist to remove or reduce flange gaps and what potential impacts do those options have?

TMR is not aware of alternative solutions that remove or reduce flange gaps.

Reform Area 27 – Resting points

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards have no requirements to provide an allocated space for a wheelchair or similar mobility aid at a resting point. The current requirements accommodate people who are ambulant but prone to fatigue, but puts people using wheelchairs or similar mobility aids, and people travelling with them, at a disadvantage. The achieved outcome is to ensure that resting points are accessible and indiscriminatory towards all passengers.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements would continue to have an absence of requirements pertaining to the provision of resting points in allocated spaces. Maintaining the status quo approach will prevent the issuing of new guidance or changes to the standards, continuing with this approach will fail to reach the purpose specified under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding the provision of resting point allocated spaces. New guidance may include recommendations on specifications, location, and instruction on when resting points are to be provided. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards Part 5 would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for the provision of resting point allocated spaces; including amendments regarding when resting points are to be provided, layout and specifications and placement of access paths. The Transport Standards and / or The Whole Journey Guide could also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option. Provision of flat and stable 1300 by 800-millimetre allocated spaces within resting points facilitates equitable outcomes for people with disability. The proposed regulatory option would enable people using wheelchairs and other mobility aids to rest adjacent to the person(s) they are travelling with.

TMR proposes that the regulatory option be supplemented with guidance around means to demarcate the allocated space to third party prevent use that may block or otherwise compromise access to the space (for example, station maintainer activities, advertisement boards) and to prevent the placement of amenity artefacts such as litter bins and vending machines.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Yes, the non-regulatory and regulatory options within the Stage 2 Consultation RIS provide sufficient clarity.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Access paths and resting points, connecting public transport assets or giving access to public transport assets, are often the responsibility of local authorities or private property owners. This places them beyond the direct control of the operator or provider which may result in inconsistency to the extent the proposed requirements are applied.

Retrofitting allocated resting spaces to existing assets could also incur a significant cost.

On an access path leading to or from a public transport node have you ever experienced difficulty due to a resting point along the path not having a suitable space available for wheelchairs, scooters or similar mobility aids? How did the design of the resting point impact you and how could it be improved?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 28 – Requirement for handrails in overbridges and subways

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Many overbridges and subways do not have continuous handrails, creating a barrier to using public transport for people who use handrails for support or wayfinding. the Transport Standards section 11.2 Handrails to be provided on access paths, requires handrails along access paths 'wherever passengers are likely to require additional support or passive guidance. The Transport Standards do not specify exactly where handrails must be provided, which leads to inconsistencies in their provision within and across transport premises. The intended outcome of this reform is to provide clarity around whether and where handrails are to be provided within overbridges and subways.	Status Quo: The Transport Standard requirements regarding handrails on access paths would remain unchanged, with no amendments to Part 11. Maintaining the status quo approach will fail to address the need for support and wayfinding across over bridges and in subways and will fail to reach the purpose specified under Part 1.2 of the Transport Standard. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding over bridges and subways, this would include recommending that stair and ramp handrails should continue throughout the over bridges or subway and, that handrails do not introduce safety or accessibility concerns. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standard. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for continuous handrails on overbridges and subways, this would include introducing requirements for stair and ramp handrails to continue throughout the over bridges or subway and, that handrails do not introduce safety or accessibility concerns. The Transport Standards and / or The Whole Journey Guide could also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standard.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option. TMR's internal policy dictates that design guidance pertaining to transport premises guidance is adopted as mandatory requirements for TMR infrastructure. Therefore, the technical guidance will most likely be included as requirements in TMR specifications and similar documents which are then used by PDO for delivery, operation and maintenance of infrastructure.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

TMR is of the perspective both options provide sufficient clarity in what they are seeking to achieve,.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Depending on the implementation approach adopted, TMR anticipate there will be potentially substantial impacts to maintenance and operation budgets. As small scale-upgrades are unlikely to deliver system-wide beneficial changes, coordinated upgrades of existing infrastructure would potentially require substantial financial support.

How do you find the accessibility of overpasses or subways that do not have handrails on both or either side? Can you tell us any experiences that you may have had?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 29 – Location of fare system elements

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards contain limited clarity regarding the specific location of fare system elements, to provide guidance to operators on the correct placement of devices to ensure they are located and oriented to facilitate, and not obstruct access. Specifications relating to the location of fare system devices is sporadic and decentralized within the Transport Standards. This increases the risk that specifications are misinterpreted and that specifications are not prioritised appropriately	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged and no additional guidance would be issued. Non-Regulatory: The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide may be updated to encourage the uptake of best practice for locations of fare system elements to meet the current and future needs of people with disability and also provide clarity, certainty and flexibility to providers and operators. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to co-locate and simplify existing requirements relevant to the location of fare system elements in a new section of the Transport Standards

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option. The regulatory option provides clarity for operators, providers and passengers about the factors that must be considered in relation to the location of fare system elements without introducing any new requirements. It facilitates consistency for the interpretation of relevant requirements, as the relevant requirements are addressed in one place. It also removes reliance on outdated Australian Standards (AS1428.2 (1992)) in relation to reach ranges, drawing instead from AS/EN301549 (2020), a current standard.

This option modernises the relevant requirements at the same time, ensuring those requirements (such as those for circulation and movement spaces, reach range and viewing angles) are covered, and that fare system elements remain accessible when installed.

The non-regulatory option would also be satisfactory because this option does not introduce new regulatory changes but rather clarifies requirements. However, the non-regulatory option does not take advantage of the opportunity to utilise a modern standard.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Yes, both the non-regulatory and regulatory option provide clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination, however the non-regulatory option does not address the current issues encountered: reliance on multiple Australian Standards.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Retaining the status quo would cause inconsistencies with the interpretation of any relevant requirements, as they are currently disconnected.

Is your ability to travel independently impacted by the existing location of some fare system elements including ticket vending machines, fare validators and platform access gates? If so, can you provide details?

Not applicable to TMR as an operator / provider

Reform Area 30 – Allocated spaces and priority seating in waiting areas

Summary of Reform Area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not effectively specify the proportion and nature of allocated spaces delivering seating in the waiting room. There is an opportunity for the Transport Standards to provide clarity regarding the proportion of seated allocated spaces and the nature in a waiting room. The intended outcome is to provide clarity surrounding the proportion of seated allocated spaces and nature in a waiting room.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged as to allocated spaces in waiting areas. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean the Transport Standards fail to meet the purpose of Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding the provision of allocated spaces in waiting areas, this section may include clarity around the proportion (rounded up) of allocated spaces required in a waiting area providing seats and clarify the nature and extent of the area. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for the provision of allocated spaces in waiting areas; the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide would be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated regulatory requirements. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Responses to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option. The regulatory option will provide consistency across jurisdictions and will provide greater certainty for customers. TMR would seek to adopt the guidance proposed by the non-regulatory option as mandatory requirement for TMR infrastructure. As such, the non-regulatory option to be adequate in achieving the objective of the Transport Standards but note that discretionary adoption of the guidance across operators/providers may not result in consistent customer outcomes.

The regulatory option specifies proposed requirements however some of the wording and tables appear contradictory, making the requirements unclear. Note, the same issue is evident with the non-regulatory option; however, the impact would be less as the requirements would not be mandatory.

TMR encourages the following changes to the regulatory option be considered by the Commonwealth:

- The following reword is suggested for the third bullet point: 'If the seating consists of only a single short bench seat (e.g., suitable for approximately four people), the entire seat must be considered priority seating. Each priority seat per person must have a width of no less than of 450mm.'

- Table 3 - *Number of allocated spaces and priority seats per total number of seats*: The table includes the number of allocated spaces and priority seats required under the current percentage approach which may be confusing if the regulatory approach was adopted. A simpler approach may be to remove the current percentage approach row of the table or, alternatively, omit the table and provide examples for different seating numbers in bullet point one.
- The requirement is to clearly identify allocated spaces and priority seats for passengers with disability; however, identifying allocated spaces may make users feel segregated and impact their dignity. It may also introduce a high level of maintenance for operators (e.g., maintaining visibility and tonal contrast of line markings at thousands of bus stops throughout transport networks).

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Both the non-regulatory and regulatory options appear to provide enough clarity, though clarifying the requirements through a regulatory approach will deliver the greatest certainty for operators/providers.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Access paths and thus resting points connecting public transport assets or giving access to public transport assets are likely to be the responsibility of local authorities or private property owners. This places them beyond the direct control of the operator or provider. This can result in challenges for operators/providers in delivering compliance with this reform.

The implementation of this option could be associated with significant cost. Maintenance and operational budgets are unlikely to support coordinated upgrades of existing infrastructure. Piecemeal upgrades are unlikely to deliver system-wide outcomes and benefits. Retrofitting resting spaces to existing assets could also incur a significant cost.

For the regulatory option, the need to clearly identify allocated spaces and priority seats for passengers with disability through signage or line marking may need further consideration.

Specific challenges include:

- Signage – Priority seating for bus shelters would typically be a single bench which may make signage inappropriate.
- Community feedback – Feedback obtained from TMR's engagements with members of the disability community indicates that they would prefer TMR not to designate or mark a space where someone with a wheelchair is expected to wait (at a public transport facility).

What has been your experience or the experience of a travelling companion in obtaining an allocated space or priority seat in public transport waiting areas such as railway station platforms, airport terminals, bus stops, ferry wharfs and so on?

a) For example, are allocated spaces and priority seats free, easy to reach, in a good location and easy to identify?

b) How could this be improved (for example, through the provision of braille and tactile signs)?

c) Have you even been unable to get an allocated space in a public transport waiting areas?

Not applicable to TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 31 –Accessible toilets with equal proportion of left- and right-hand configurations

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
There are no Transport Standard provisions which require equivalent or near equivalent proportions of left- and right-hand toilets. The only similar current provision requires that accessible toilets are also provided alongside other toilets or are the only toilet in the transport vessel. The outcome achieved is for the Transport Standards to recommend conveyance toilets to have an equal or similar amount of left-and-right hand toilets.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged as to accessible toilets. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided and, the Transport Standards will continue to fail to meet its purpose as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding equal or near equal proportions of left and right-handed accessible toilets when a ferry or train set had more than one unisex accessible toilet. The guidance provided should align with the Premise Standards on this requirement wherever a train set or ferry has two or more unisex accessible toilets. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for equal or near equal proportions of left and right-handed accessible toilets when a ferry or train set had more than one unisex accessible toilet. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide could also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option for new facilities only. Providing an equal proportion of left- and right-hand configurations provides those with disabilities the freedom of feeling safe to use public transport without fear of being unable to use facilities that may not be safe or suited to their disability. Providing equal facilities helps to increase independence and inclusion.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The non-regulatory option is suggesting providing guidance at equal proportion of left- and right-hand facilities, whereas the regulatory option calls for the Standards to be amended to include this. Feedback obtained from TMRs engagement with the disability sector indicates that consistency helps people with disability plan their public transport journey. Consistency on rollingstock, with both left- and right-hand oriented toilets would be

beneficial for people with disability. The regulatory option would therefore be the most beneficial to those with a disability to ensure they would be able to use public transport without discrimination.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

There are challenges which would arise from the various options including the upgrade of existing facilities to include an equal proportion. This would also be at a financial cost and has the potential to interrupt operation of the facilities.

It is noted that this will have an impact on both existing, and future pipeline of rollingstock, and so coordination of the two will be required to ensure that the regulatory option remains appropriate.

Has the availability of toilets of your preferred orientation (left- or right-hand transfer) impacted your ability to travel on that train or ferry journey or deterred you from taking a journey? If so, how?

a) Have you ever had difficulty transferring onto a train or ferry toilet pan because it was on the less preferred side of the cubicle for you?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider. However, from our existing engagement with the disability sector, the feedback is that having both left- and right-hand orientation provides great benefits to passengers with disability.

Reform Area 32 – Emergency call buttons in accessible toilets

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Currently, no requirements exist in the Transport Standards underlining where emergency call buttons should be located to ensure people who have fallen in accessible toilets can request help. While call buttons are not required, accessible toilets often have them in accordance with AS1428.2 (1992) Clause 15.1, however, according to the specifications provided in the Australian Standard, if a person has fallen, they may be unable to reach the call button. The intended outcome aims to require that two emergency call buttons are incorporated into accessible toilet stalls to ensure if a person falls, they can reach the button to request help.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards will continue to lack specifications as to emergency call buttons in accessible toilets. No further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: The Transport Standards Guidelines and the Whole Journey Guide would be updated to provide advice on the specifications of emergency call buttons and to ensure they are reachable from sitting, standing and floor positions. Regulatory: The Transport Standards section 15 would be amended to include requiring that accessible toilets must include at least 2 emergency call buttons. Two sub-options exist as to the location of emergency call buttons: Sub-Option 1: One button to be adjacent to the pan, 900 to 12000 millimeters above finished floor and within reach of a person sitting on the pan. The other button is to be 300 to 400mm above the finished floor and 150 to 900 mm forward of the pan. Sub-Option 2: One button may share the space with the flush control adjacent to the pan according to AS1428.1 (2009). The other button must be 300 to 400mm above the finished floor and 150 to 900mm forward of the pan. The amendment would also incorporate requirements that buttons must comply with AS1428.1 (2009) Clause 13.5.4 and is to be 50 to 60 millimeters clear of any obstruction, and that emergency buttons must meet a certain luminance contrast, and that emergency call buttons must be identified by braille and tactile signs. The Transport Standards Guidelines and the Whole Journey Guide would be updated to reflect amendments and provide further guidance

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why? If you prefer the regulatory proposal, which sub-option do you prefer? Why?

TMR supports regulatory sub-option 2. Specifying the distance of emergency call buttons from the pan if a person is required to ensuring people can reach the emergency call button if they fall. Regulatory option 2 proposes further requirements around luminance contrast, freedom of obstructions and provision of tactile and Braille signage.

Adopting regulatory option 2 would help to ensure the safety of all users with a disability and provide them with greater confidence to of use facilities on and within the public transport premises and conveyances independently.

Regulatory sub-option 2 aligns with the Performance Specification for QTMP which stipulates a minimum of two emergency call buttons in accessible toilets, at differing heights.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

TMR's engagement with the disability sector indicates that having two buttons at differing heights provides a safer option if someone falls from the pan and cannot reach a high button. Therefore, the regulatory and non-regulatory options both provide enough clarity as to not discriminate against people with disability and ensure their ability to use public transport.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

It is noted that this will have an impact on both existing, and future pipeline of rollingstock and of built spaces, and so coordination will be required to ensure that suitable options to achieve this objective can be identified for both existing and new contexts.

How significant are concerns of falls and incidents while using an accessible toilet?

a) Does this concern affect your confidence to use public transport and how you plan your journey?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider. However, initial engagement with the disability sector indicates that these concerns are valid and significant, and our responses to this align with this feedback.

Reform Area 33 – Ambulant toilets

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not specify requirements for ambulant toilets located on premises and infrastructure where the Premise Standards criteria does not apply. The intended outcomes aim to require ambulant toilets on ferries, accessible rail cars, premises (except to premises to which the Premises Standards apply) and on Infrastructure.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards will continue in not providing guidance or requiring ambulant toilets in specified areas. No further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: The Whole Journey Guide would be updated to recommend installing ambulant toilets into conveyances, infrastructure and premises (except to premises to which the Premises Standards apply). Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to incorporate new requirements including where there is one or more toilets in addition to a unisex, accessible toilet, a toilet compliant with AS1428.1 suitable for a person with disability must be provided and, if only one accessible toilet exists for a person with an ambulant disability, it must be unisex and, if two or more ambulant toilets are provided, these may be gender specific. The Transport Standards Guidelines and The Whole Journey Guide will also be updated to reflect new amendments and to provide guidance.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option. TMR's policy is that such guidance be adopted as mandatory requirements for TMR infrastructure. Therefore, the technical guidance will most likely be included as requirements in TMR specifications and similar documents which are then used by PDO for delivery, operation and maintenance of infrastructure.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The regulatory and non-regulatory options provide sufficient clarity.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Challenges may exist depending on implementation approach adopted. Maintenance and operation budgets are unlikely to support coordinated upgrades (if required) of existing infrastructure and piecemeal upgrades are unlikely to deliver system wide outcomes and benefits.

Have you ever been unable to access an ambulant toilet in a public transport setting? If so, how did this impact your journey? Did this lead to you having to use a standard toilet? Did the toilet lack of grabrails or space? How did this affect you?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 34 – Lift specifications and enhancements

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Australian Standards reference for lift requirements in the Transport Standards is dated and does not take into account technological advances which improve accessibility features which are increasingly being installed as standard practice. AS1735.12 (1999) Lifts, escalators and moving walks, is now obsolete in many of its technical requirements. As a result, existing and new lifts may not have the necessary accessibility features to ensure they are fully accessible to all people with disability.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards Part 13, Lifts, would remain unchanged and no additional guidance would be issued. Non-Regulatory: The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would be updated to include best practice guidance for enhanced lift accessibility and would update the referenced Australian Standard in the guidance to AS1735.12 (2020). The guidance would pertain to premises (except premises to which the Premises Standards apply) and infrastructure except airports that do not accept regular public transport services. Regulatory: The Transport Standards section 13.1 would be amended to include the following (including any requirements retained or amended from the status quo): • Lift facilities must comply with AS1735.12 (2020). • Where any discrepancy between the requirements of AS1735.12 (2020) and technical requirements of the Transport Standards occur, the requirements of the Transport Standards take precedence.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option on the provision that option 3 for 'Implementation Approach' is approved.

TMR supports the provisions of additional lift dimensions, technologies and components but is uncertain when lift upgrades may occur without surveys completed to understand the potential scale of impacts to each lift across the network.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

There is enough clarity in the non-regulatory and regulatory options.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Unless option 3 in ' Implementation Approach' is approved, surveys will need to be completed to understand potential scale of impacts to each lift in the network to align with any new regulatory requirements approved.

What has been your experience with lifts in the public transport environment? How can accessibility in lifts be improved?

- **Have you found lifts accessible?**
- **Are buttons large enough and appropriately located to use easily?**
- **Are touch screen lift controls easy to use?**

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 35 – Specifications for escalators and inclined travellators

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The current Transport Standards lack minimum dimension requirements for escalators and travelators which can potentially disallow people with disability to utilise these services. The Transport Standards currently lack minimum dimension requirements for escalators and travellators, which can prevent people with disability from utilising these services. This lack of certainty as to specifications on dimension requirements has created uncertainty as to what a safe, accessible minimum width should be when installing escalators and travellators. The intended outcome aims to require minimum dimension requirements as to escalators and travellators.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would not include any requirement or guidance as to minimum lift requirements for escalators and inclined travellators. No further guidance will be added. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added into The Whole Journey Guide to recommend a minimum width of 850mm for escalators and inclined travellators and advise that they should not be the sole means of access. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to include requirements that escalators, inclined travelators and stairs must not be the sole means of access and, that the minimum unobstructed width of an inclined escalator or travellator must be at least 850mm. The Transport Standards and The Whole Journey Guide would be updated to reflect new amendments and provide guidance.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option to improve the customer journey and network consistency, subject to Implementation Option 3 being supported or, with the condition it is for new 'new assets only'.

Retrofitting wider escalators (and alternative accesses such as ramps or lifts) faces major technical and financial barriers. Upgrading escalators is expected to be feasible during other major works such as station upgrades but is likely unfeasible to retrofit in many instances.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

TMR considers that the regulatory and non-regulatory options provide enough clarity to improve services.

Are there any challenges (i.e. physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Retrofitting wider escalators (and alternative accesses such as ramps or lifts) faces major technical and financial barriers. The increased footprint, access requirements and customer disruptions to retrofit wider escalators may be significant or unfeasible in constrained sites.

Implementation during a major upgrade or new construction is feasible to accommodate. There will always be a cost benefit analysis that needs to be done.

What are your experiences with escalators and inclined travellators? Do you think they are useful for passengers who have a disability?

a. Have you had a negative experience with escalators or inclined travelators in a public transport environment?
b. Are you aware of any incidents or accidents caused by escalators that were too narrow?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 36 – Poles, objects and luminance contrast

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not recommend or require a process in which luminance contrast should be measured, and there is no guidance provided on acceptable contrast with poles or other obstacles. The intended outcome is to incorporate a process in which transport providers and operators can calculate luminance, through a similar method to AS1428.1 (2009) and referenced in the Premises Standards, and to pinpoint which obstacles' luminance contrast must be calculated.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged as to clearly specifying requirements reflecting best practice for luminance contrast of poles and obstacles adjacent to access paths. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided and, the Transport Standards will continue to fail to meet the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice for luminance contrast of poles and obstacles adjected to access paths pertaining to premises (except to premises to which Premises Standards apply). These updates would include recommendations that a methodology for measuring and calculating luminance contrast will be proposed and that the surfaces against which objects should luminance contrast will be identified. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for determining the luminance contrast of poles and obstacles adjected to access paths. Such amendments would include requirements for methodology for measuring and calculating luminance contrast be developed and that the surfaces against which objects should luminance contrast will be identified. The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide would also be updated to reflect and provide advice to the new requirements. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option; status quo, non-regulatory, regulatory option 1 or regulatory option 2 (including the sub-options for each)? Why?

TMR supports regulatory option 1, sub-option 1. Regulatory option 1 is selected because although people with vision impairments circulate through all public spaces, not just along access paths it's important to ensure appropriate contrast for access paths at the same time ensuring contrast used throughout public spaces doesn't cause sensory overload, and subsequently impede access. Sub-option 1 was selected because contrasting strips cannot and should not be placed everywhere, and should be placed where they will achieve their primary goal of improving visibility of objects that may otherwise cause physical harm. For example, when alighting a

bus, the sign adjacent the bus stop must contrast with any background within two metres (building wall, other signage) or when navigating through buildings.

Sub-option 1 clarifies the existing luminance contrast requirements in the Transport Standards s2.5 (2), providing some legal certainty by defining what is meant by a background in relation to obstacles, without requiring 75mm wide contrast strips. However, where required a contrasting strip may be applied in addition to this or not less than 30 percent contrast' is required, not 'full contrast'.

The proposed addition of the following provision relating to luminance contrast testing and calculation method specified in AS1428.1 (2021) is consistent with the requirements under the Disability (Access to Premises — Buildings) Standards 2010 and does not add any regulatory burden as this is a standard method currently used in Australia.

Sub-option 2 of both regulatory options (1 and 2) is not suitable as it may cause confusion due to it requiring any obstacle (pole, column, stanchion and so on) to have a luminance contrast strip at least 75mm wide. As noted in the Transport Standards Reform Chapter 51 (*Grabrails on access paths)*, poles and stanchions may be used as grabrails. Grabrails under the Transport Standards must comply with AS1428.2 (1992) which requires the design and construction of grabrails to comply with AS 1428.1. Clause 14 of AS1428.1 (2021) states grabrails shall be not less than 30mm and not more than 40mm outside diameter.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

By expanding on what is meant by a 'background' in relation to obstacles Sub-option 1 and the non-regulatory guidance provides much needed clarification of existing luminance contrast requirements in the Transport Standards s2.5 (2) which will help to improve visibility of obstructions and thus improve usability and safety in use. Consideration of amendments to the Transport Standards s 2.5 could include extending the existing luminance contrast requirements for premises and infrastructure to conveyances to achieve consistency and provide clarity for operators/providers. (See comments in Chapter 51 – Grabrails on access paths)

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Sub-option 2 of both regulatory options (1 and 2) may be difficult to implement. It would also cause confusion as it requires any obstacle (pole, column, stanchion and so on) to have a luminance contrast strip at least 75mm wide. As mentioned above, grabrails, which may include poles and stanchions, must not have a diameter greater than 40mm.

For all spaces, but the external realm, there will also be effects relating to weathering and wear. As materials get are exposed to the elements and depending on the direction of approach (and therefore the background something is seen against) or the lighting conditions, the tonal characteristics and perception of the materials will change. The introduction suggests that a slab surface (pavement) at a bus stop is unlikely to vary in colour over time. On the contrary, the colour and quality of pavements can vary over its design life due to exposure to elements and general wear and tear.

Gradual degradation of pavement colour and quality may present an issue when applying luminance contrast to objects and poles. For example, a bus stop pole or boarding point TGSIs may provide appropriate luminance contrast when first installed as new but the luminance contrast will diminish between these and pavement over time as the pavement (or TGSIs) darken. Degradation to asset function, colour and quality should be taken into consideration for current and future luminance contrasts (and possibly placed in the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide for provider consideration).

The non-regulatory option also provides guidance to this effect.

Are objects located beside access paths, such as bus stop poles, furniture or light poles, difficult to detect? What would make them easier to visually detect and what makes them harder to detect?

This question would be best answered through a focus group of people with a range of disabilities.

It is noted that contrast requirements in other accessibility documents, e.g., the international best practice document, ISO 21542, provide recommendations that align with those suggested in the option preference above, and thus it is considered that application of this will provide a sufficient level of contrast for navigation / detection.

Reform Area 37 – Lighting

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not facilitate suitable guidance with lighting designers to ensure that the needs of people with disability are met, and do not hold adequate requirements to appropriately reflect the safety requirements of varying public transport environments. Current requirements are outdated, as they do not consider data gathered since 1992. They also do not appropriately consider the unique lighting requirements for those with disabilities.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged in relation to best practice for lighting. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no further guidance is provided. the Transport Standards will continue to fail to meet the purpose of Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice for lighting design in public transport. This guidance would seek to ensure public transport environments deliver appropriate lighting solutions for the diverse and nuanced requirements of people with disability, that meet the unique safety, contextual and operational requirements for their context. The guidance would also provide a set of transport-specific technical guidelines to provide enhancements to the current regulatory requirements of the Transport Standards. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements. Amendments would be made to ensure public transport environments deliver appropriate lighting solutions for the diverse and nuanced requirements of people with disability. They would also ensure public transport environments deliver lighting solutions that meet the unique safety, contextual and operational requirements for their context. The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or the Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Sub-Options have been proposed: • Option 1: Removal of current requirements and replaced with guidance. • Option 2: New requirements referencing AS/NZS1680.2.1 (2008) and AS/NZS1158.3.1 (2020) • Option 3: New requirements referencing AS/NZS1680.2.1 (2008) and AS/NZS1158.3.1 (2020), with some additional prescriptive requirements.

	• Option 4: New comprehensive prescriptive requirements.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option; status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option 1, 2, 3 or 4? Why?

TMR's preference differs depending on the status of the installation.

For new installations, TMR supports either regulatory option 2 or 3, with an appropriate phase-in period. This would recognise and incorporate the new Australian Standards, section 20.1 and 20.2, aligning with code requirements.

For amendments to existing infrastructure (refurbishments, improvement works, replacements etc.), TMR's preferred option is non-regulatory. This would include updates to include additional guidelines to provide enhancements to lighting levels and uniformity. The non-regulatory nature of this preference will allow learnings to be captured from new installations before making it regulatory for existing installations flexibility over existing installations, where constraints may mean that recommendations are problematic to retrofit.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The regulatory and non-regulatory options provide clarity and/or additions to the recommendations that should improve lighting for people with disability.

The documents cover lighting levels, uniformity, glare, and colour temperature. However, they do not appear to cover colour rendering performance levels or external lighting provisions (in particular, balance when considering ecology/wildlife and light pollution), which is an important parameter to be specified and to ensure that this is practical in implementation.

From TMR's Transport Network Security and Resilience response that regulatory and non-regulatory options need to acknowledge current and future CCTV and facial recognition imagery requirements and not lower or interfere with other existing security systems such motion scanning and imaging, and alarm systems. From a security perspective, lighting options should also consider shadow casting effects on people wearing peaked caps/hats and hoodies.

Do you think the referenced Australian Standards are adequate to achieve the desired outcome? If not, why?

The Australian Standards cover lighting levels, uniformity, glare, and colour temperature although not specifically with reference to persons with disabilities. The recommendations do seem to align with the accessibility recommendations from other international best practice documents.

In practice, there are also some areas where there is no operator responsibility and no clear third-party responsibility. For example, in common areas adjacent to boarding, alighting and transit areas where there is public access and crowding at times. In these instances, standards are often not applied as there is no clear identified owner and cost. Clarity is therefore required to make sure that all areas within the transport network are covered.

There also needs to be consideration and guidance on how best to address lighting in areas (e.g., places for hiding, evacuation routes, etc.) when incidents (e.g., active shooter, hostile vehicle attack, explosion, etc.) occur.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

There may be challenges to retrofitting these requirements to existing installations. It would therefore be useful to clarity the application of this for both new and existing installations.

For external lighting, there is often a balance that needs to be achieved in relation to visibility and safety in after-dark hours, together with the ambience, requirements for ecology/wildlife, and light pollution. As such, it will be important to acknowledge and to provide some tangible recommendations for these instances, to ensure that this is practical in implementation, and to achieve consistency in how external lighting conditions are applied.

Further consultation would also be recommended with maintenance personnel and operators with regards to impacts of luminaire type, cost, availability, and supply, as well as suitability with existing fixture or whether reinstallation would be required.

Are there specific areas within public transport environments where you experience discomfort, feel unsafe, or find it difficult to complete a task due to the amount of lighting available? For example, read a sign or timetable, buying a ticket or communicate with staff at a service counter. If so, what do you wish was different?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Accessibility of boarding and alighting and egress of infrastructure

Reform Area 38 – Signals and process for requesting boarding devices

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not provide sufficient clarity on signals for requesting boarding assistance, so passengers can request boarding devices. There is an opportunity to modify the Transport Standards to place further provisions on the signals to ask for boarding assistance and to implement AS1428.1 (2009). Current standards provide insufficient clarity and references are outdated regarding signals for requesting boarding assistance, so passengers can request boarding devices. Existing requirements do not acknowledge face-to-face communication as a key requirement to request boarding devices. The intended outcome aims to modify the Transport Standards to place further provisions on the signals to ask for boarding assistance and to implement AS1428.1 (2009).	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements under section 8.7 would remain unchanged as to clearly specifying requirements, and no further guidance would be provided. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice processes for requesting boarding devices. Guidance added may include communication to request boarding devices be available in real time and the timing of this notification should not exceed that of other passengers requesting a vehicle to stop and, a request signal device should be provided according to AS1428.1 (2009), Clause 13.5.3 (c), Location. If electronic notification systems have audio components that require verbal interaction hearing augmentation devices should comply with AS1428.5 (2021) and, controls should comply with AS1428.1 (2009) Clause 13.5.4, and staff training is noted as essential for ensuring effective real-time communication. Regulatory: Section 8.7 of the Transport Standards would be amended to include requirements for signals and processes for boarding assistance. These amendments would include requiring that passengers are able to communicate alighting in real time, request signals which must be touched or pressed are located in allocated spaces and comply with AS1428.1 (2009) Clause 13.5.3 and, timing of notification to receive alighting assistance cannot exceed other passengers. If electronic systems have audio components, they must have audio systems which comply with AS1428.5 (2021) section 3.2, and that the force to push buttons must be in the range of 2.5 to 5 newtons, and that controls must comply with AS1428.1 (2009), Clause 13.5.4. The amendment to section 8.7 would also recommend one of two sub-options surrounding call and control buttons.

	• Sub-option 1: Call and control buttons should have an integral, continuously operating light, • Sub-option 2: Call and control buttons must have an integral, continuously operating light. The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option (including relevant sub-options)? Why?

TMR supports regulatory option, sub-option 2.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

From TMR's engagement with the disability sector, it is understood that having real time communication with a guard to communicate a passenger wishes to alight is important. Having a system that is accessible for users who are deaf is key and having a continuously operating light (as per sub-option 2) is part of this.

TMR considers that this is an area of opportunity for digital innovation. Through digital solutions like the Mobility as a Service (MaaS) App the ability to pre-request and confirm assistance of boarding devices can be captured during journey planning and confirmation of booking.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

TMR considers that the difference between physical and digital requirements need greater definition and clarity to ensure clarity for operators/providers.

Have you, or your passenger, ever had difficulties boarding a conveyance or disembarking at your stop due to an inability to request a boarding ramp?

a) **What was the nature of the fault? For example: the ramp did not arrive or was late, staff failure to communicate effectively, poorly located or broken controls?**

b) **What was the consequence?**

Engagement with the disability sector indicates that not having a continuously operating light whilst using button signal to request assistance, is a serious disadvantage and safety risk for people who are deaf.

Reform Area 39 – Notification by passenger of need for boarding device

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not have a requirement specified for advance notice or booking for passengers needing to access to a boarding device, nor for requesting boarding devices at infrastructure and in premises (rather they relate to on board conveyances). There is an opportunity to clarify the need for passengers to have flexible options when notifying operators/providers of a need for a boarding device. The intended outcome aims to update the Australian Standards reference to reflect the use of modern technology and enable people with disability to have flexible options for notifying the need for a boarding device.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged for requirements for notification by passenger of need for boarding device, and no new guidance material would be issued. The status quo approach will continue to fail in clearly defining best practice requirements and will not meet the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to include guidance as to best practice on passenger notification of a need for boarding device. Specific guidance for communication: • Sub-option 1: provision of 'real time' communication for unbooked services • Sub-option 2 that passengers may choose to book assistance on unbooked services. Regulatory: The Transport Standards s8.8 would be amended such that passengers must be able to communicate in real time their need for boarding assistance or a boarding device. Two sub options for unbooked services include: • Sub-option 1: Prior booking may be recommended but cannot be required from passengers who need boarding assistance • Sub-option 2: at unstaffed stations, there may be a need to provide advance notice. Two sub options for call and control buttons also noted. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be updated to reflect new requirements.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option (including the sub-options for unbooked services and calls and control buttons)? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory sub-option 1. TMR will continue to explore initiatives to provide such a signal device system for commuters to use from boarding points. The preferred non-regulatory sub-option for this is sub-option 1 (real time notification rather than prior booking).

While TMR would like to support a regulatory option, further investigations and clarity is needed on how a bus stop boarding point assistance signal device (as identified in the Transport Standards Stage 2 Consultation RIS) can be implemented operationally and successfully used by commuters at both small bus stops and larger bus stations.

For Queensland TMR's unmanned busway stations, due to the nature of the lead stop bus operations, commuters with a disability can contact the Busway Operations Centre from platform help phones. The staff then contacts a particular bus service for which a customer is waiting at the lead stop for their service requiring for boarding assistance. It is unclear if this process is considered 'communication in real-time' for customers needing boarding assistance or a boarding device, as referenced in the Transport Standards Stage 2 Consultation RIS.

It is worth noting that although this issue appears to be more for unmanned bus stations, the options also appear to target suburban or local bus stops. Feasibility of providing a request signal device (with an electronic touch button) at all these infrastructure locations needs further investigation.

This is an area of opportunity for digital innovation. Through digital solutions like the MaaS App the ability to pre-request and confirm assistance of boarding devices can be captured during journey planning and confirmation of booking. TMR considers:

- Integration and collaboration between transport agencies, transport service providers and new actors such as MaaS Operators is fundamental to catering for whole of journey requirements for people with disability.
- Digital innovation and solutions must be enabled with open data so regardless of the digital platform the customer chooses.
- Digital solutions are not limited to real time notification or prior booking and can accommodate both, allowing dynamic mid journey changes.
- Brisbane City Council offers a telephone call service to enhance bus accessibility on their services. This visually impaired passenger telephone service is for passengers with a visual impairment that require assistance to access a council bus service. There is an opportunity to expand this service across the entire Translink network – at a cost which has not been calculated.
- Other considerations as we move towards a high frequency network is the impact on dwell times (and therefore network capacity) of transport services that require deployment(s) of boarding devices, particularly for CityTrain services. Holistic consideration of infrastructure and conveyance design requirements may facilitate improved capacity of SEQ’s public transport networks and provision may provide other benefit streams to projects.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Clarification is required on terminology within the Stage 2 Consultation RIS options, particularly for 'communication in real-time' and if the proposed implementation of the regulatory option requires an electronic request signal device is for all network bus stops. Further clarity is also required to capture the difference between physical and digital requirements.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

As described above.

Can you describe your experience using controls to request a boarding device?

Not applicable to TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 40 – Portable boarding edge ramp barriers

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Under the current Transport Standards, only edge ramp barriers with an incline greater than 400mm are required to have barriers. This proposed reform involves updating the Transport Standards to require barriers on mobility aid devices, so that users can have heightened safety and confidence utilizing these tools. The intended outcome aims to ensure all boarding ramps have edge barriers.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue to have an absence of requirements for edge barriers on portable boarding ramps, the current status quo approach will continue to fail in clearly defining best practice requirements and will continue to not meet the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice on edge barriers on portable boarding ramps, including requiring edge barriers, providing recommended height and specs for edge barriers, and identifying existing ramps as not needing edges if fit for purpose. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to stipulate edge barrier requirements on portable boarding ramps. This would potentially mean a new section is added in Part 6 of the Transport Standards. the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide would be changed to reflect and provide guidance on new requirements. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option; status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option 1, 2 or 3? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option 2. Modernising the Transport Standards will provide clarity on provision and heights of portable edge ramp barriers to improve safety for people with disability and to increase their confidence in using public transport. Portable ramp designs providing greater safety and confidence to people across transport networks and modes support fulfilment of TMR's vision of an integrated and accessible transport network. TMR acknowledges the merits of all regulatory options for delivering on this outcome however believe regulatory option 2 best addresses the stated issue. Moreover, regulatory option 2 represents the most future proof option in account of widespread and growing adoption of larger mobility devices.

TMR believes incorporation of the following guidance as a requirement of regulatory option 2 would strengthen the safety and confidence benefits to people with disability:

> *"Edge barriers on portable boarding ramps are important safety and confidence building features for people who use mobility aids. Portable boarding ramps should therefore have edge barriers on both sides"*

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The regulatory options provide clarity to operators/providers, and passengers with disability, however, fails to acknowledge the limited reach of this reform in addressing wider considerations associated with boarding conveyances unassisted and without discrimination.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Boarding ramps with edge barriers equal or greater to 75mm may be difficult to fold and stow, particularly in space constrained conveyances.

What is your experience of using portable boarding ramps when boarding or alighting, or providing boarding assistance, from public transport? Please tell us about your experience and whether portable boarding ramps are fit for purpose.

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 41 – Boarding ramp and gangway definitions

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not currently include regulation that differentiate between the requirements of vehicle boarding points and gangways. This can be problematic as flat boarding ramps are unable to accommodate for the operating environment on moving pontoons and ferry terminal infrastructure. There is an opportunity to define and distinguish between boarding ramps and removable gangways to provide clarity on design requirements for public transport infrastructure options. The intended outcome of the reform is to further define and distinguish between boarding ramps and removable gangways.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue to have an absence of requirements for removable gangways that differentiates them from boarding ramps, the current status quo approach will continue to fail to clearly specify requirements and to meet the purpose of Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added, or amendments made to, the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to distinctions between removable gangways and vehicle boarding ramps. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: Transport Standards would be amended to stipulate a definition between removable gangways and vehicle boarding ramps. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide would also be amended to reflect the guidance.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

Under the status quo, there is no clarity between the definition of a boarding point and a removable gangway/plank, which has had impacts on planning and design. This impact is difficult to measure in scale, but the lack of clarity and consistency can result in a more complex design process.

TMR supports the regulatory option. The regulatory option is supported because it provides greater clarity that will support the design process. Better clarity of definition will also ensure the specific requirements for a removeable gangway are understood (i.e., which standards would or should apply) and incorporated when liaising between designers, planners, and operators. There is a need to clearly define the inclusion and requirement for handrails under the regulatory option to ensure safety and accessibility of customers are met.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The regulatory option provides sufficient clarity to enable indiscriminatory access to public transport.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

TMR does not anticipate any challenges to implementation of this proposed reform.

Would you be supportive of a definitional distinction between boarding ramps and removable gangways? Can you explain why or why not?

TMR is supportive of a definitional distinction between boarding ramps and removable gangways. The proposed changes will assist when liaising with designers, planners, operators and the public. As such, this will inform which standards would apply or should apply.

Reform Area 42 – Removable Gangway Design – ferries

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not currently account for and have standards for the specifications of gangways despite the unique environment in which gangways are operating in and the varieties in movement across public transport platforms. There is an opportunity to implement the Transport Standards to incorporate specifications to ensure gangways are suitable for working environments. The intended outcome is for specifications to be incorporated into the Transport Standards to ensure gangways are suitable for working environments.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue to have an absence of requirements for removable gangway design, the current status quo approach will continue to fail to clearly specify requirements and to meet the purpose of Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice with removable gangways. The guidance advice might read to include gangways as constructed in accordance with 6.16.3 Gangways of the National Standard for Commercial Vessels Part C, and would include specifications on edges, luminance contrast, handrails etc. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: Transport Standards Section 6.2 would be amended to provide removable gangway requirements. The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or the Whole Journey Guide may also be amended to contain guidance material, this would include design specifications to ensure fitness for purpose in unique operating environments. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of Transport Standards.

Response to the consultation questions

To what extent does the issue impact you?

The Maritime Safety Queensland (MSQ) branch of TMR is impacted to a moderate extent, due to MSQ being involved in the design of new ferry terminal pontoons including removeable gangways. The requirements would likely result in minimal changes to how MSQ plans and delivers this infrastructure. The design of removeable gangways must account for the weight of passengers on the vessel and the elevation of the pontoon to address freeboard heights (which have a related influence on the gradient of the gangway). The TMR design process takes various operational scenarios into account to achieve an operating environment that is suitable and safe for all users.

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option. TMR's current arrangements are structured similarly to the proposed regulatory reform requirements, and therefore reflect minimal disruption to TMR's current practice.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Both the regulatory and non-regulatory options provide sufficient clarity.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The design of removable gangways needs to consider passenger safety and accessibility needs alongside operational requirements, including the health and safety of operators. The increased weight of removeable gangways as a result of the requirements of the regulatory option may result in manual handling risks and operational delays. The design of removable gangways (i.e., gangplanks) prioritises safety, and seeks to minimise operational impacts so far as is reasonably practicable. A key factor in the design is ensuring deckhands can operate and use the removeable gangways to support safe access. TMR has incorporated feedback to inform ferry terminal infrastructure (including removeable gangways) planning and designs processes, that seeks to address these challenges.

What experience do you have boarding ferries, or providing boarding assistance, via removable gangways?

As aforementioned, TMR's MSQ branch has some experience with removable gangways, through and during the design for new ferry terminal infrastructure and through incorporating feedback and lessons into design as a result of liaising and engaging with ferry operators.

Two recent ferry terminal projects did not include removable gangways in the scope of the project, as it was assumed that this was the responsibility of operator. However, the operator’s facility did not meet accessibility requirements. In response, TMR referenced as a benchmark, ferry terminal infrastructure being delivered by Brisbane City Council (which was considered as good practice) to provide a removable gangway design solution that then achieved compliance requirements for both projects.

As a result of the outcomes of these recent projects, TMR now ensures the design of removeable gangways is incorporated into design requirements and scope of a project from outset, so that the design solution is fit-for-purpose and suitable for the working environment

Are removable gangways easily accessible?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Do you feel safe while boarding ferries via removable gangways? Please explain your circumstance and experience.

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 43 – Nominated assistance boarding points

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Due to the boarding areas being often long, spread out and heavily crowded, it has been identified that passengers seeking mobility aid or support may be unsure of where to locate these services, and therefore at risk of missing transport options. Similarly, transport employees must know where passengers requiring mobility aid may be pursuing assistance. The intended outcome aims to ensure Transport Standards require greater clarity around where passengers can receive guidance or request to utilise mobility aid devices and/or employee assistance.	Status Quo: No amendments made to the Transport Standards, guidance materials, or non-regulatory initiatives. The status quo approach will continue to fail in meeting the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice, and advice for operators/providers, as to assistance points to facilitate boarding. In the instance that independent boarding cannot be delivered, a nominated assistance point must be provided to an accessible door on a conveyance and, direct assistance procedures should be formed in consultation with people with disability. Regulatory Option 1: The Transport Standards would be amended to include a new section which must include requirements that, independent boarding is provided at all entrances to a conveyance and, where independent boarding not provided, a nominated assistance point must be provided on infrastructure or premises to which direct assistance can be provided to an accessible door and, direct assistance procedures should be formed in consultation with people with disability. • Sub-option: Proposes 5 sub-options on how to define an accessible door in coherence with Regulatory Option 1. Regulatory Option 2: Proposes an amendment to 8.8: Notification by passenger of need for boarding device, such that it must be possible for a passenger to notify the operator of the need for a boarding device; where a signal device is used it may be located on the conveyance or at the boarding point, operators/providers may choose to designate a nominated assistance point. Guidance material could be included in the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to assist in reflecting the new requirements and providing advice for operators/providers.

Response to consultation questions

To what extent does the issue impact you?

As a provider, trying to balance what is achievable versus what is the best outcome for people with disability is not always clear. Further investigations are required in working with people with disability to overcome this.

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option 1, sub-option 5. This provides consistency of application for customers across the network, while allowing providers the choice to nominate an assisted boarding point (or not). This allows providers flexibility for different infrastructure and service contexts, such as minimum boarding points versus lead stops at bus stations.

Of the sub-options in regulatory option 1, which of the proposed list of facilities should be identified or marked as accessible?

These regulatory option 1 sub-options shown in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS is to determine which onboard facilities must be 'provided' (i.e., not 'identified' or 'marked' as per question 3) if the door on a conveyance is marked as being accessible. Based on this, sub-option 5 should be provided within a conveyance if the door is marked as accessible.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

No. Further clarification is required regarding the implementation of a request signal device for commuters while waiting at the boarding point.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Yes, although TMR notes that from a bus infrastructure provider perspective further investigation would be required on what is feasible.

What does the International Symbol of Accessibility mean to you when you see it marked on a conveyance door?

Fully accessible for people with disability, including access to the appropriate accessibility components.

Reform Area 44 – Identification of lead stops

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Lead stops are complicated for people with disability to navigate and gain service recognition. There is an opportunity to provide technical guidance so that identification of lead bus stops is consistent and easily achievable for people with disability. The intended outcome is an adequate framework be developed so that identification of lead bus stops is consistent and easily achievable for people with disability.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue to have an absence of requirements for lead stop identification, the current status quo approach will continue to fail in meeting the purpose the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice, including technical specifications for people with disability to identify lead stop. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Standards to be amended to include new requirements on lead stop identification at bus stations, bus interchanges and bus zones. The Guidelines would be changed to reflect and provide guidance on new requirements. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response the consultation questions

To what extent does the issue impact you?

The lead stop at bus stations is not an issue. The main issue that may affect usage of lead stops is related to operations of buses at bus stations. Not all bus services directly pass or stop at the nominated / identified lead stop bus bay on platforms, which may result in some people waiting at the lead stop to miss their bus service. In addition to this, buses may stop two or three bays back behind the first bus and sometimes leave from the same location, which is not (and cannot be) identified with lead stop signage or Tactile Ground Surface Indicators (TGSI).

To alleviate this operational issue, TMR provides platform help phones to enable passengers with disability the ability to contact Busway Operations Centre staff who inform the relevant bus service of the need to stop at the front lead stop where a commuter will be waiting. However, not everyone uses this option, which in more critical situations (i.e., peak times) may result in the bus not servicing the lead stop bay.

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option because it should result in clear identification of locations of the lead stops at bus stations.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Yes, the non-regulatory and regulatory options in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS appear to provide enough clarity for providers to identify the lead stop at bus stations and commuters where to wait. However, the proposed reform does not address the bus station operational issues described above, which means people waiting at the lead stop may still miss their buses. This should be captured as part of the final reform.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

No. The lead is clearly identified through signage and TGSI at the lead stop boarding points, as well as communication options with staff via help phones where provided.

Were you aware that some bus stations, interchanges or zones have a 'lead stop' arrangement at which you board? If so, how were you made aware of this arrangement?

As provider of bus services and infrastructure, TMR is aware of the lead stops.

Reform Area 45 – Pontoon boarding points on infrastructure

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Pontoons are subject to the Transport Standards which require them to be 'firm and level'. This is challenging to define in practice as pontoons are often subject to varying weather conditions including strong winds or large waves which can affect stability. The intended outcome is for the Transport Standards to acknowledge the subjective environment in which pontoon boarding points are exposed to and require pontoons to accommodate for these conditions.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue to have an absence of requirements for pontoon boarding points, the current status quo approach will continue to fail in meeting the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice for ferry pontoon identification; This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards is modified to include requirements for pontoon boarding points, that require pontoons to have flat or stable surface / maximum stability to deploy gangways. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would be changed to reflect and provide guidance on new requirements. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option. Retrofitting existing pontoons as suggested in the regulatory reform option is a highly complex task due to many operational / technical variables (such as environmental factors, vessel size, and operations) and, in many cases, cost prohibitive.

TMR has responded to the importance of the design of ferry terminal infrastructure including that of pontoon boarding points through the development of modal chapter as part of Translink Public Transport Infrastructure Manual (PTIM). The PTIM was prepared in consultation with the MSQ branch of TMR and with local government so that it provides an understanding of the planning and design of ferry terminal infrastructure, bringing lessons TMR has gained through feedback with operators, passengers and through experience of project delivery.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Both the regulatory and non-regulatory option provide sufficient clarity to enable people with disability to access public transport without discrimination. Both reform options offer similar guidance for achieving access for people with disability.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

There are several technical and operational challenges that impact the status quo of achieving 'firm and level' pontoons, which are as noted in the PTIM (i.e., Chapter 8 Ferry terminal infrastructure) linked /related to the environmental factors of the waters to be crossed or traversed (tidal conditions, wave/wind climate) and the ferry vessel. These challenges or considerations include:

- Vessel stability
- Wake from passing large vessels / barges
- Varying freeboards of the ferry and pontoon
- Relative numbers of people on the ferry and waiting on the pontoon, influencing and impacting freeboard levels
- Variable loading of vessels, impacting freeboard levels

These challenges / considerations need to be adequately captured in the proposed reforms to ensure outcomes reflect best practice design and engineering. Therefore, the non-regulatory option is preferred.

The comparison of environmental factors between Moreton Bay Islands such as Coochiemudlo with the Brisbane River, illustrates the importance of considering the specific local context /conditions as well as the customer and operational needs (i.e., passenger demands, frequency of services). Further there may be other local passenger needs that may influence the design of pontoon boarding points such as how passengers use the service (e.g., use of shopping trolleys for bringing food/goods).

Have you ever felt unsteady on a ferry pontoon? If so, how could this have been prevented or improved?

TMR defers to the disability community for its response on the first part of the question. In the design process, TMR seeks to consider what is required to meet customer quality outcomes, and considerations for this is captured within the PTIM.

How would a more stable boarding environment at ferry pontoons impact your safety and confidence to travel?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider of public transport services.

In your experience as a passenger or as an operator / provider, what generally causes ferry pontoons to be unstable during boarding and alighting?

Ferries are often operating in rough environmental conditions due to weather, (I.e., wind, currents, or waves. Pontoon stability during boarding and alighting is primarily dependent on weather conditions, and the difference in pontoon and vessel freeboard. The size of the pontoon is also a factor in its stability.

Reform Area 46 – Bus, tram and light rail boarding points on infrastructure

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Bus, trams, and light rail subject to the 'firm and level' requirements within the Transport Standards that also apply to pontoon boarding points. The current requirements do not incorporate adequately or without ambiguity issues such as gradient or topographical issues. The intended outcome is for clear specifications to be developed crossfalls and gradients, or greater guidance at boarding points, and acknowledge constraints (i.e., which are locational/site specific) and provide greater direction.	Status Quo: Requirements boarding points would remain as currently in the Transport Standards, such that the status quo approach will continue to fail in meeting the purpose stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice for bus, tram and light rail boarding points. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards is modified to include new requirements for bus, tram and light rail boarding points, for example boarding points must have a flat and stable surface and a gradient no steeper than 1:40 (AS1428.1 (2009) Clause 6.5.1); camber (crossfall) no steeper than 1:40 (as per AS1428.1 (2009) Clause 10.1(d)). Two regulatory options are offered, one of which pertains to road with a gradient steeper than 1:40. Under both sub options, the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or the Whole Journey Guide would be updated to reflect new requirements and guidance for light rail, bus and tram boarding points. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

a) For the regulatory option, do you prefer sub-option 1 or 2?

TMR supports regulatory, sub-option 2. The requirement of a maximum gradient or crossfall of 1 in 40 is reflected in the technical layout drawings of the Translink PTIM. Regulatory sub-option 2 will provide more consistency for customers and will result in minimal impacts to TMR.

TMR would prefer that the boarding point gradient matches that of the road to allow safer deployment of the boarding device.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The regulatory and non-regulatory options generally provide enough clarity to facilitate accessible public transport. However sub-option 1 does not provide requirements pertaining to bus stops located on longitudinal grades steeper than 1:40. This may result in localised inconsistencies in the usability of boarding points.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The main issue for compliant grades is relative to the road gradient (i.e., longitudinal gradient), however this is somewhat addressed by the notes in the specific guidance given in Chapter 46. There may be a need to consider addressing the aspect of what might be considered a maximum allowable road grade.

Have you ever encountered a boarding point at a bus, tram or light rail stop that had too great a slope or crossfall for easy boarding?

a) If so, how did you, or the passenger, manage to board?

Not applicable for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 47 – Hail–and–Ride Services

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Hail-and-ride service boarding points are not addressed by the Transport Standards, outside of the requirements relating to surfaces and boarding areas. This means there is not a way to guarantee that any point at which a hail-and-ride service might be hailed has adequate ways for passengers with disability to board. The intended outcome is to ensure inclusivity, certifying maximum mobility aid and the identifiability of hail and ride boarding locations.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue to have an absence of clear gradient and crossfall specifications for bus, tram and light rail boarding point stops, the current status quo approach will continue to fail in meeting the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. No further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to good practice for bus, tram and light rail boarding points; This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards are modified to include requirements for bus, tram and light rail boarding points for hail and ride boarding point, for example to require boarding points to have flat or stable surfaces for boarding devices and have gradients no steeper than 1:40. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would be changed to reflect and provide guidance on new requirements including specific guidance except for dedicated school buses. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option. The current Transport Standards and associated guidance materials need to be amended to clarify the application of hail-and-ride services. TMR agrees that that these locations may not be nominated, but they must be accessible.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Yes, sufficient clarity is provided in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS to enable accessible transport. Updates to the specific guidance may be required.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Yes, the proposed guidance information states that:

> *"…passengers should understand it is their responsibility to select a boarding point that is accessible and at which a hail-and-ride vehicle can safely and lawfully stop".*

However, the passenger may not always be able to adequately identify an 'accessible' location, or one that is safe for stopping. The driver would ultimately decide whether a location was safe for stopping.

The onus should possibly be placed back on the type of vehicle used on the hail-and-ride service to ensure it can be successfully accessed whether a kerb is provided or not. This is because it is unknown where the vehicle will be hailed from along the route, which may or may not include a kerb. It would also accommodate any locations along a kerb that does not have a convenient kerb ramp or appropriate access to the roadway.

Do you use hail-and-ride services that are available in your area? If not, can you describe why?

Not relevant to TMR as an operator / provider.

What elements make a boarding point accessible?

The accessibility of boarding points varies for different passengers. To make boarding points accessible, they would need to include a flat and stable pavement available to deploy a ramp from a vehicle, appropriate access equipment (e.g., ramp) to the flat and stable pavement, appropriate circulation space and TGSIs to identify a dedicated boarding point for people with vision impairments.

Reform Area 48 – Accessible taxi ranks

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards currently lack specific requirements surrounding accessible taxi ranks. Despite section 1.18 of the Transport Standards noting taxi ranks as infrastructure and boarding points, no requirements exist within the Transport Standards as to how they should be made accessible. The intended outcome aims to provide accessibility specifications as to on-street taxi ranks to ensure passengers with mobility impairments can access services at on-street taxi ranks.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue to provide no accessibility specifications as to on-street taxi ranks. No further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to include guidance as to specifications for taxi ranks including recommending that if unloading WATs, a mobility aid user should be able to safely move from the carriageway behind the taxi to the footpath and, first and last spaces in a taxi rank should be accessible although intermediate spaces may also be made available at the discretion of the asset owner, and if one taxi rank exists it should be accessible and if a taxi rank has more than one accessible vehicle space: • Sub-Option 1: The first and last vehicle space be accessible. • Sub-Option 2: The first, second and last vehicle space be accessible. • Sub-Option 3: Where there are more than five spaces, the first and last vehicle space should be accessible. One in four spaces between the first and last should be accessible. The section inserted into the Guidelines may also give specific guidance regarding kerb ramps, bus-stops and would specify compliance with Australian Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to incorporate requirements that taxi ranks are boarding points which are required to connect to accessways, that taxi spaces within a rank must comply with AS2890.5 (2020) Clause 4.5.2 (a), (b), (c) and (f), and that kerb ramps must be placed to the rear of the taxi space and that if accessible taxi spaces are the same grade as the adjacent footpath, bollards and warning TGSI must be installed as per AS1428.4.1 (2009) Clause 2.5 and Figure 2.5 (B), and if taxi ranks have one space it is required to be accessible and if more than one space exists: • Sub-Option 1: The first and last vehicle space be accessible. • Sub-Option 2: The first, second and last vehicle space be accessible.

	• Sub-Option 3: Where there are more than five spaces, the first and last vehicle space should be accessible. One in four spaces between the first and last should be accessible. The Transport Standards Guidelines and the Whole Journey Guide would be updated to reflect the new requirements and advice issued, including specific guidance for buses, trams and light rail and ferries.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option. The regulatory option provides requirements for taxi ranks which are currently absent from the Transport Standards. The regulatory option thus provides consistency for customers across transport network and across transport modes.

For the non-regulatory and regulatory options, do you prefer sub-option 1, 2 or 3?

TMR prefers sub-option 3 of the respective requirement proposed in the regulatory option. Sub-option 3 provides a scalable design application that ensures there are accessible spaces at key points of the taxi rank (first and last), as well as along the length of the bay.

Recognising that different locations may have differing site constraints, TMR welcomes the option to adjust the positioning of accessible spaces (while still achieving the one-in-four). Flexibility of placement enables designs to be optimised in account of customer access needs and the specific constraints of the site.

TMR prefers sub-option 3 for the respective requirement in the non-regulatory option for the reasons stated above. Alignment of this chapter with chapter 49 allows for consistency in application. This is particularly important in facilities where the taxi rank and loading zone are designed or operated as one continuous zone.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The non-regulatory and regulatory options within the Stage 2 Consultation RIS provide enough clarity and offer additional recommendations to ensure people with disability can access public transport

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The additional lane width of accessible spaces may affect the footprint of taxi bays under the regulatory options. This may impact adjacent public transport infrastructure, such as paths, bus stops and/or parking spaces. Installation and placement of kerb ramps can be affected by other site constraints (for example, underground utility services).

Taxi vehicles may have front, side or rear passengers loading arrangements. The design of the accessible taxi spaces and adjacent carriageways may therefore limit the types of WAT that are able to drop off and collect people using wheelchairs and other mobility devices.

Have you, or a passenger, ever been unable to board a wheelchair accessible taxi that was waiting at an on-street taxi rank? If so, what prevented the boarding?

TMR manages a range of taxi ranks across the state however this question would be best answered through a focus group of people with a range of disabilities.

Reform Area 49 – Accessible passenger loading zones on-street

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not recognise passenger-loading zones as boarding points for mobility compatible transport. This lack of recognition has presented people with disability, particularly those who use mobility aid devices, with several accessibility and safety issues. The intended outcome aims to ensure on-street passenger loading zones are recognised as wheelchair accessible taxi and conveyance boarding points.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged, and no amendment would be introduced to provide accessibility specifications for on-street passenger loading areas. No further guidance would be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and the Whole Journey Guide to include guidance as to on-street passenger loading zones and would encourage operators and providers ensure on-street passenger zones be recognised as wheelchair accessible taxi and small conveyance boarding points with specific technical requirements. Specific guidance included may incorporate three sub-options regarding if a passenger loading zone has more than one vehicle space: • Option 1: The first and last vehicle space be accessible. • Option 2: The first, second and last vehicle space be accessible. • Option 3: Where there are more than five spaces, the first and last vehicle space should be accessible. One in four spaces between the first and last should be accessible Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to include new requirements that on-street passenger loading zones are classified as boarding points for WATs and other public transport modes, and that if a passenger loading zone has more than one vehicle space it may incorporate three sub-options: • Option 1: The first and last vehicle space be accessible. • Option 2: The first, second and last vehicle space be accessible. • Option 3: Where there are more than five spaces, the first and last vehicle space should be accessible. One in four spaces between the first and last should be accessible. The amendment would also include requiring that accessible passenger loading zones comply to AS2890.5 (2020) clause 4.5.2 (a), (b), (c) and (f), and if kerb ramps are installed, they must be installed to the rear of the space and that, if passenger loading zone vehicle spaces are the same grade as adjacent footpaths, bollards and warning TGSIs complying with AS/NZS1428.4.1 (2009)

	Clause 2.5 and Figure 2.5 (B) must be installed to the length of the same grade section. The Transport Standards Guidelines and /or the Whole Journey Guide would also be amended to reflect updated requirements and provide advice.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option to provide requirements for accessible passenger loading zones on-street, and thus provide consistency for all customers across the network and across modes.

For the non-regulatory and regulatory options do you prefer:

a) **Sub-option 1: The first and last vehicle space must be accessible.**

b) **Sub-option 2: The first, second and last vehicle space must be accessible.**

c) **Sub-option 3: Where there are more than five spaces the first and last vehicle space must be accessible. In addition, one space for every four spaces between the first and last space must be accessible.**

TMR prefers sub-option 3 on the condition that this option provides for 1 accessible bay in instances where 5 or less bays are provided. The public transport assets that TMR manages include loading zones (kiss and rides) of varying lengths. Sub-option 3 provides a scalable design application that ensures there are accessible spaces at key points of the loading zone (first and last), as well as along the length of the zone.

Recognising that different locations may have differing site constraints, the optionality to adjust the positioning of accessible spaces (while still achieving the one-in-four), allows for sensible site designs that improve customer access and minimise regulatory burden of fixed placement. Alignment of this chapter with chapter 48 on taxi ranks allows for consistency in application. This is particularly important in facilities where the taxi rank and loading zone are designed or operated as one continuous zone.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

No, further clarification regarding what is proposed for less than 5 bays needs to be provided.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

As noted in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS, installation of kerb ramps can be affected by existence of other site constraints including underground utility services.

The additional lane width of accessible spaces may also affect the footprint of loading zones under the regulatory options. This can have flow on effects on adjacent public transport infrastructure, such as paths, bus stops and/or parking spaces. It will therefore be important to ensure that this is looked at together with walking infrastructure, to balance the needs of both. Any changes to regulatory requirements will need to be coordinated with the fleet of vehicles for taxis and other common wheelchair accessible vehicles, as some vehicles will have front, side or rear loading for passengers, and may impact on design of the loading zones and adjacent carriageway. The costs of retrofitting vehicles could impact the implementation and/or the success of this change.

What is your experience of finding and using accessible on-street passenger loading zones? Are loading zones unsuitable for your needs? If so, why?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider of public transport services.

Reform Area 50 – Accessible parking spaces in infrastructure off-street parks

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Off-street parking areas associated with public transport infrastructure is unregulated under the Transport Standards, with no standards concerning the accessibility of parking spaces and access paths connecting them to building entrances. The intended outcome aims to provide specifications on the accessibility of parking spaces and access paths to entrances.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue providing no guidance or specifications concerning the accessibility of off-street parking areas. No further guidance will be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or the Whole Journey Guide to incorporate guidance as to off-street parking areas. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to incorporate new requirements including that off-street parking areas that are part of or are directly associated with public transport services must have a minimum ratio of 1:50 parking spaces where there are more than five parking spaces and: • Sub-option 1: Not required to have designated parking spaces where there is a total of no more than 5 spaces in the parking area. • Sub-option 2: Must designate all parking spaces as accessible spots where there is a total of no more than 5 spaces in the parking area. The amendment would also include requiring that accessible spaces be as close as practicable to building entrances and have accessible access paths and, that accessible parks must conform to specifications under AS/NZS2890.6 (2009). The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide will also be updated to provide new guidance.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR would like to suggest an alternative regulatory option under which there would be at least one accessible car park provided regardless of the number of total car parks. This could be revised to be, without sub-options:

> *"Off-street public parking areas that form part of, or are directly associated with, public transport services must provide one accessible parking space for every 50 parking spaces (or part thereof)".*

a) Of the sub-options proposed in the regulatory option which do you prefer?

The regulatory sub-option 1 is preferred by TMR to ensure a consistent minimum level of services across the network would be provided to all customers; given that currently at least one accessible space is required under AS2890.6.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Yes. The regulatory option is expected to provide great clarity on off-street parking areas, with the possibility of incorporating the additional guidance under the non-regulatory option.

However, given that there are existing requirements under AS2890.6 on minimum number of accessible spaces, the non-regulatory option would lead to inconsistency.

The Premises Standards does not require designation of accessible parking spaces where there are not more than five parking spaces. To avoid causing confusion by applying inconsistent standards, TMR suggests alignment of this proposed reform to the Transport Standards with the Premises Standards, along with an alternative option as suggested above.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Off-road parking facilities may not be constructed on land controlled by TMR. The requirement to provide a compliant path that connects the facilities may therefore be challenging due to potential inter-jurisdictional issues.

Would the provision of accessible parking spaces at off-streetcar parking areas associated with public transport infrastructure be of benefit?

a) **If so, how would this benefit you?**

b) **If increased accessible parking spaces were available, would you be more likely to use public transport?**

TMR expects that the provision of accessible parking spaces at off-street, car parking areas will be beneficial to a range of public transport customers across the network. This would be consistent with the existing Australian Standards, and guidance of various stakeholders (TMR and its delivery partners) on accessible parking spaces.

Accessible ‘park and ride’ is essential for those who otherwise may be unable to access public transport services. TMR works to ensure the network is as inclusive as practically possible and one of our priorities is to provide all accessible car parks as close as possible to station entries.

TMR would further explore the potential of inclusion of standards in relation to accessible passenger pick-up and set-down facilities associated with major public transport infrastructure including rail stations, tram stops, busway stations and bus interchanges. Provision of such facilities is believed to support kiss-and-ride, booked-hire, and on-demand transport transfers.

Accessibility in conveyances

Reform Area 51 – Grabrails on access paths

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards have no requirements for support grabrails along conveyance access paths, except that they must have a luminance contrast with a background by at least 30 per cent. As a result, grabrails are not consistently provided along conveyance access paths. the Transport Standards Section 2.5 Poles and obstacles requires grabrails must have a luminance contrast with a background by at least 30 per cent. As a passenger moves along an access path the background for the grabrail may change and so the requirement is not fit for purpose to ensure grabrails are the appropriate contrast. The intended outcome aims to provide nationally consistent requirements for grabrail dimensions, locations within conveyances and luminance contrast to assist passengers moving along an access path within conveyances.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged and no additional guidance would be issued. the Transport Standards would continue to have no requirements for grabrails along access paths on conveyances. Non-Regulatory: The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would be updated to include advice on luminance contrasting grabrails on conveyances. Specific guidance may recommend that grabrails are fitted in a combination of layouts and in a way that is functional for passengers through consultation with the disability community, that apart from attachment points grabrails are not able to be closer than 50mm to adjacent obstructions, and that grabrails should have a minimum luminance contrast with adjacent surfaces, attachment points or other fixed surfaces in a 2-meter radius. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to include new technical specifications for grabrails beside access paths on conveyances with accessibility requirement to ensure they meet the needs of people with disability. The new requirements would apply to buses, coaches, ferries, trains, trams and light rail. The Guidelines and the Whole Journey Guide would be updated to reflect the new requirements including specific guidance for buses, trams and light rail, and ferries.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

The reform area relates to grabrails along access paths on conveyances only and not to premises or infrastructure. As such, the proposed options apply to buses, coaches, ferries, trains, trams and light rail.

TMR supports the non-regulatory option. The regulatory option is too broad and may result in unintended consequences, as per the following.

- Australian Design Rule 58/00 (ADR 58) for buses requires a suitable number of handstraps, handrails or hand grips for the convenience and safety of passengers. While grabrail requirements for conveyances over and above those required under ADR 58 may provide additional mechanisms for stability, mandating grabrails along an access path on a conveyance may result in those grabrails impinging on the access path, thereby causing a non-compliant access path width. Further clarification is required.

- The requirement for grabrails to be provided at all locations where passengers require support or stability during boarding, alighting or transit is too broad and may result in unintended non-compliances. The issues outlined in Chapter 51 of the Stage 2 Consultation RIS provide some indication of what is considered a grabrail (i.e., it can include longitudinal handrails, grab handles suspended from the longitudinal handrails, vertical stanchions above seats, vertical stanchions at modesty panels, handles incorporated into seat squabs and luggage racks above front wheel-arches), though the current Transport Standards does not provide a definition. AS 1428.1 defines grabrail as "*a rail used to give a steadying or stabilizing assistance to a person engaged in a particular function*". Therefore, grab handles suspended from the longitudinal handrails which are commonly used, would not comply.

A modified regulatory option may be acceptable as the referenced Australian Standard should be updated. TMR notes the proposed 2009 version is already superseded by the 2021 version.

Noting Section 2.5 - Poles and obstacles is also subject to reform, extending the existing luminance contrast requirements for premises and infrastructure to conveyances will achieve consistency and provide clarity for operators/providers.

Part 11 of the current Transport Standards prescribes requirements for conveyances relating to handrails on steps, above access paths and grabrails at fixed locations where fares are paid and in allocated spaces. As noted above, extending the luminance contrast requirements in Section 2.5 of the Transport Standards to conveyances should provide a positive benefit and consistency across public transport.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Neither option clearly outlines what constitutes a compliant grabrail for all conveyances or considers the impacts on other factors required to ensure a compliant access path.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The regulatory option is too broad, requiring grabrails 'at all locations where passengers require support or stability during boarding, alighting or transit'. This could be interpreted to require a grabrail the entire length of an access path on a conveyance. Clear and unambiguous definition of requirements is necessary to provide certainty for operators/providers.

Requiring grabrails at all locations along an access path on a conveyance may also have the unintended consequence of those grabrails impinging on the access path and resulting in a non-compliant access path width, thereby creating a conflict between the two requirements.

TMR notes that from a whole of network approach, it would be difficult to change the existing infrastructure due to contract requirements.

Can you describe your experience with grabrails on access paths?

a) How do grabrails on access paths on conveyances affect your ability to travel due to your personal circumstances? Can you describe how important grabrails are to you?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

b) Have you ever felt unsafe where seeking support while traveling to or from your seat and the conveyance entrance? Can you provide details?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

c) Have you ever been unable to distinguish grabrails from the background along an access path on conveyances? Why was this a challenge and how could this be improved?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 52 – Grabrails in allocated spaces

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
Currently there is insufficient guidance or clarity from the Transport Standards regarding the guidelines on the layout of grabrails in allocated spaces nor that grabrails must be luminance contrasted. Both are essential to public safety and for people with low vision. The current standards for grabrail requirements are outdated and in compliance with AS1428.2 (1992). A modern Australian Standard directive also needs to be included. The intended outcome is that the Transport Standards are updated to recommend luminance contrast and varied orientations for grabrails, as well as identifying layouts permissible in allocated areas.	Status Quo: Requirements regarding grabrails in allocated spaces would remain unchanged, with no provisions pertaining to flexible arrangements of grabrails in allocated spaces nor requirements as to luminance contrast with background. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean the Transport Standards fail to fully meet the purpose stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice surrounding grabrails in allocated spaces; this would include informing that a variety of layouts is permitted in allocated spaces, including they should be luminance contrasted. This advice would pertain to buses (excluding dedicated school buses), coaches, ferries, trains, trams, and light rail. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of Transport Standards. Regulatory: Transport Standards Section 11.7 of the Transport Standards would be amended to shift reference from AS1428.2 to AS1428.1 (2009) and would require luminance contrast for grabrails of at least 30 per cent with adjacent surface or attachment point or against other fixed surfaces that are within 2m of the grabrail (as per AS1428.1 (2021). The amendments state that grabrails in allocated spaces may have various orientations. and would recommend updates to Transport Standards section 11.7 reference from AS1428.2 to AS1428.1 (2009) as referring to luminance guidelines. These requirements would pertain to buses, coaches, ferries, trains, trams and light rail. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to reflect new requirements with additional guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the regulatory option because, based on TMR's engagement with the disability sector, the regulatory option will provide the most consistency for passengers.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

From TMR's engagement with the disability sector, the feedback is that having a combination of horizontal and vertical oriented grabrails is important for people who have limited dexterity.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The challenges TMR has identified relate to the retrofitting or modification of existing infrastructure.

What are your experiences using grabrails in allocated spaces on conveyances? For example:

a) **Are they visually easy to identify?**

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

b) **How does the different layout (horizontal, vertical or angled) of grabrails impact your ability to use them?**

From TMR's engagement with the disability sector, having a combination of horizontal and vertical oriented grabrails is important for people who have limited dexterity

c) **What factors are important for accessible use of grabrails (for example location, height, diameter, length, and colour)?**

Appropriate signage and ease of finding is important for the accessible use of grabrails.

Reform Area 53 – Mobility aid movement allocated spaces: Passive restraints

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not currently detail how the movement of mobility devices in allocated spaces is contained on public transport. It also does not appropriately define 'passive restraints'. This presents a risk to people with disability travelling with mobility aids. The intended outcome would result in more defined requirements for the containment of mobility aids in allocated spaces on conveyances.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would remain unchanged and no additional guidance would be issued. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean the Transport Standards fail to meet the purpose of the requirements stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice surrounding passive mobility aid restraints; this guidance would potentially read to include clarity surrounding passive restraints specific to buses, trams and light rail, and ferries, including a definition of a passive restraining system. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to deliver more refined requirements for containment of mobility aids in allocated spaces and define passive restraint systems. This would include new requirements for buses, trams and light rail for mobility aids. The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance on new regulatory requirements for buses, trams and light rail and ferries. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option because it seems to provide improved guidance; thereby providing greater clarity than the status quo.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Both options provide enough clarity to meet the objective.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The challenge identified by TMR is that modifying existing infrastructure and assets is difficult and costly. The application to existing assets and interdependency with the Implementation Approach must be considered as part of the reforms.

What experiences have you had with wheelchair or scooter safety in allocated spaces on buses, trams, light rail and ferries?

a) **Have you, or your passenger, ever slid or toppled? If so, could you describe the experience?**

No such incident noted.

b) **Have you, or your passenger, ever had difficulty manoeuvring into an allocated space due to the location or design of restraints systems? Could you describe the experience and outcome?**

No such incident noted.

c) **Have you ever been deterred from using public transport due to safety concerns related to mobility aid safety?**

Not relevant to TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 54 – Mobility aid movement in allocated spaces: active restraints

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards need to incorporate technical requirements surrounding active restraints on conveyances and elaborate on their status as mandatory. The lack of active restraints has been identified as a clear safety issue, which could be hazardous to passengers using a mobility device. The intended outcomes are that the Transport Standards will make amendments to reference technical standards, pinpoint when active restraints are compulsory and clearly define active restraints.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements continue to have an absence of requirements for mobility aid restraints on conveyances. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean the Transport Standards fail to meet the purpose of the requirements stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice surrounding mobility aid restraints; this guidance would potentially read to include clarity surrounding active restraints, provide awareness to operators and passengers etc. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of Transport Standards. The proposal would include guidance that passengers and operators should be aware that active restraints should be used where safety belts are compulsory. Active restraints should be operator employable as a default. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to deliver new requirements for mobility aid restraints in allocated spaces; including conforming to AS/NZS105442.1 (2015) at a minimum for active restraints; specifying in which context these restraints will be mandatory and provide a clear definition within the standards. The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance on new regulatory requirements. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. The proposal would include new technical requirements that, if safety belts are compulsory under legislation in a conveyance, active restraints must be fitted. Active restraints should be operator employable as a default, rather than passenger deployable. It would also define active restraining systems.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option as it provides a level of important advice for public transport providers, operators and customers who rely upon the use of mobility aid devices which is currently absent from the Transport Standards. This would mean updating the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey

Guide to include advice and encourage maintenance. TMR considers this sufficient and appropriate to address the problem statement in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS. TMR considers efforts to enhance greater understanding and awareness of requirements increases opportunities for consistent application.

TMR encourages training to include information about the operator's incident management plans for vehicle breakdowns and other incidents or emergencies; customer service skills; transporting people with disability; workplace health and safety responsibilities including an explanation of their duty of care; company policy including refusing travel, customer service and so on. On occasion, TMR also writes to contracted bus operators about the importance of driving safely when transporting people using mobility aid devices.

TMR has developed guidance material for passengers using mobility aid devices to help them understand how to travel safely on public transport. The brochure, *Wheelchairs and Mobility Scooters A guide for safe travel in Queensland*, publicly available on TMR's website, provides clarity on what devices are appropriate for use on public transport (dimensions and so on), information about Transport Standards requirements and the use of devices once on-board public transport (by each mode).

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

Both the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide a greater level of clarity in key areas to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination. Both options address a gap for people with disability using mobility devices, where passengers are required by legislation to have safety belts provided. However, the regulatory option at this time is not considered necessary as the effectiveness of active restraints in public transport conveyances where they are mandatory meet Australian Design Rules and Australian Standards.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

TMR has identified the following challenges:

- Not all mobility aid devices have anchorage points (for example scooters). This would need to be taken into consideration during design and procurement
- Weight limitations on mobility aid devices and passengers would also need to be taken into consideration.
- There is an increasing variety of mobility aid device designs and models on the market. Active restraints systems that are not able to be applied universally to fit all mobility devices undermines the fundamental intent of their installation.
- TMR may be requested to fund installation of active restraint system(s)

What has your experience been using restraints on public transport?

a) **Did you feel safe?**

b) **Did you feel comfortable?**

c) **As an operator and / or provider do you know how use the restraint properly?**

d) **If you, or your passenger, have ever been involved in an incident whilst actively restrained, could you provide details?**

In response to question c), TMR is aware active restraints for mobility aids are used in long distance coaches, buses used to transport students with disability and wheelchair accessible taxis. All operators and drivers of these conveyances are required to be trained.

Reform Area 55 – Appropriate seats on booked services

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not currently reflect best practice for modern online booking processes which allow passengers to choose their own seats, as current systems hold these accessible seats until last. The definition of accessible is also unclear.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements remain unchanged as to booking accessible seats. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean the Standards fail to meet the purpose stipulated under Part 1.2 and fails to account for changes in booking practices and technologies since 2002. Non-Regulatory: A section would be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding booking seats appropriate to a passenger's needs; guidance would recommend that passengers with disability should be able to book seats located in parts of the conveyance which fit travelling needs and, that operators adapt booking policies which are able to appropriately accommodate seating needs of a passenger with disability. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for booking seats appropriate to passenger's needs. Amendments would require that passengers with disability must be able to book seats located in parts of the conveyance which fit travelling needs. They will also require that operators adapt booking policies which are able to appropriately accommodate seating needs of a passenger with disability. The Transport Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated regulatory requirements. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: Status Quo, Non-regulatory or Regulatory? Why?

TMR in principle supports the regulatory approach, however, does not consider sufficient clarity is contained within the proposed reforms to provide a firm position.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

This reform area links to journey planning and the display of 'accessible information' to the customer. The ability to book seats that are appropriate for customers travelling needs varies from service mode. Although seating

may appear as available on trains, it does not necessarily mean those seats will be available at time of travel due to a variety of reasons.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

The proposed reform requires better definition of ‘booked services’ and ‘booked seats’. The ability to ‘plan, book and pay’ with an application may trigger compliance requirements on services that do not exclusively offer reserved seating. This would impact the workability of implementation into the future. Consideration of these impacts should be considered by the reform proposal.

Technology solution could possibly show 'real-time' or ‘near real-time’ availability of seating on scheduled public transport services. This would empower customers to make informed travel decisions. New service offerings like On-Demand Transport (ODT) and Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) provide the ability to book seats suitable to customer needs. However, their limited-service offering does not offer widespread coverage.

What is your, or your passengers, experiences in booking appropriate seats on public transport?

- **Were appropriate seats available?**
- **Was there a need to negotiate an appropriate seat?**
- **Was the eligibility process fair and accommodating? Please provide detail.**

Every ODT vehicle has capacity to carry customers with disabilities. Each ODT vehicle has one accessible bay allocated for customers with a disability. When a customer makes a booking, they can select the need for this bay.

Should another customer require the use of this bay once it has been allocated, the ODT service will automatically allocate a different vehicle (that has a free accessible bay) to this customer.

Reform Area 56 – Conveyance dwell times at stops

Summary of reform options

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards do not incorporate any requirements for conveyances to remain stopped until passengers are safely seated, securely located in allocated spaces, or are a safe distance away from the moving vehicle or vessel. This poses a hazard for people with disability who may have sensory or mobility difficulties and as such travel more slowly than others. There is an opportunity to implement a requirement into the Transport Standards recommending that conveyances remain stopped until people with disability have time to sit and secure themselves.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue to have an absence of requirements as to conveyance dwell times at stops. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean the standards fail to fully meet the purpose of the Transport Standards as stipulated under Part 1.2. Non-Regulatory: The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide be amended to include advice regarding departure from stops until passengers with disability are secure or safely positioned in allocated spaces or have safely alighted. This advice would pertain to conveyances where the driver has a clear line of sight to priority seats, allocated spaces, and access paths. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended with a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for dwell times at stops. This would include requiring conveyances to remain still at stops until passengers with disability are safely seated in allocated spaces / seating or have safely alighted. The Transport Standards Guidelines and The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to new regulatory requirements. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory or regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory reform option, which would only apply to bus services. Provision of advice ensuring that conveyances do not depart from stops until passengers are safely positioned would inform driver training for service providers. This would also preserve operational judgement and performance whilst maintaining frequency of service such that supporting people with disability does not cause significant disruption for passengers.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory option/s provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The additional specifications in the non-regulatory option regarding dwell times will result in improved outcomes for passengers with disability, as it informs driver training requirements to ensure passengers will be provided time to embark and disembark safely.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

It would be almost impossible to have services running on time if a mandatory dwell time is inserted, as per the regulatory option. Translink routes are already timed in a safe manner based on historical run time analysis, from real time information, so all routes have some form of dwell time in their run time. While these routes may change over time, contracts are administered based on an on-time adherence

TMR does not consider that there are significant challenges to implementation of the non-regulatory reform option, as the embarking and disembarking of passengers falls under the responsibility of service providers in their training of drivers.

Have you, or your passengers, ever been in a situation where a conveyance has departed or moved off before being seated or were safely in an allocated space? If so, can you describe what happened?

Not relevant for TMR as an operator / provider.

Reform Area 57 – Stairs on trains

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards have inadequacies in for trains, ferries, and buses. The current requirements in the Transport Standards for internal stairs in trains often unattainable due to space constraints and geometry, and stairs are not always modality specific. The intended outcome aims to incorporate luminance contrast provisions for handrails, stair geometry conditions will be renewed, and stairs will be made modality. Lastly, Australian Standard references will be amended to AS1428.1 to reflect more contemporary conditions.	Status Quo: The Transport Standards would continue to have an absence of requirements pertaining to specifications of internal stairs on trains. Maintaining the status quo approach will continue to fail in providing specifications for achievable geometry and, fail to reach the purpose specified under Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding internal stairs on trains, light rail, and trams as to specifications of internal stairs, handrails etc. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide modality specific requirements internal stairs on trains. This option includes updates to Australian Standard references and handrail requirements for all conveyances (except dedicated school buses and small aircraft). The Transport Standards Guidelines and/or The Whole Journey Guide would be amended to includes new requirements. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

TMR does not have a position on this proposed reform.

Reform Area 58 – Stairs on ferries

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards have no specific requirements for internal ferry stairs, however, are inclusive of modalities, and the references which are utilised lack relevancy. Ferries are more comprehensively regulated under the National Standards for Commercial Vehicles (NSCV). The outcomes achieved aim to incorporate provisions for handrail luminance contrast, stair geometry requirements that coexist with NSCV, and for stairs to be modality specific. The Transport Standards will also be updated to NSCV 2018 and AS1428.1 (2009).	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements would continue to have an absence of requirements pertaining to specifications of internal stairs on ferries. Maintaining the status quo approach will continue to fail in providing specifications for achievable geometry and, fail to reach the purpose specified under Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added, or amendments made to include guidance in the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding internal stairs ferries as to specifications of internal stairs, handrails etc. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. For stair riser and going geometry, three sub-options. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide new requirements on ferries as to specifications of internal stairs, handrails etc. The Guidelines could also be amended to reflect and provide advice to update the guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. For stair and step risers and going three sub-options related to dimensions are noted.

Response to consultation questions

TMR does not have a position on this proposed reform.

Reform Area 59 – Stairs on buses

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The Transport Standards have requirements for internal stairs on buses, but these are not for internal or entry stairs. Stair handrail requirements have also been identified is inadequate for disability access, and AS1428.1 and AS1428.2 are outdated and will need to be replaced by contemporary references. The intended outcomes must incorporate standards for step geometry that are able to coincide with industry standard, handrail requirements will need to be updated surrounding geometric measurements and luminance contrast. the Transport Standards will also update references to Australian Standards to AS1428.1 (2009).	Status Quo: The Transport Standards requirements would remain unamended for specifications of internal stairs. Maintaining the status quo approach will continue to fail in providing specifications for achievable geometry and, fail to reach the purpose specified under Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added / amendments would be made to the Transport Standards Guidelines and /or / The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding internal stairs on buses as to specifications of internal stairs, handrails etc. Guidelines could also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide updated requirements for stairs on buses including accessibility features, such as specifications of internal stairs, handrails and to adhere with Australian Standards. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

TMR does not have a position on this proposed reform.

Reform Area 60 – Doorway contrast and height

Summary of reform area

Summary	Policy actions
The current Transport Standards do not address luminance contrast and minimum height requirements of conveyance doors, impacting the ability of some people with disability to maintain orientation aid and safety.	Status Quo: Section 12.4 of the Transport Standards remain unchanged for luminance contrast and height clearance of conveyance doors. Maintaining the status quo approach will mean no regulatory and/or guidance materials will be issued. Non-Regulatory: A section could be added to the Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide to provide guidance as to best practice regarding luminance contrast and height clearance of conveyance doors. This would recommend luminance contrast for solid and glazed doors, a minimum height for conveyance doors to reduce the risk of a passenger striking the upper door frame and updates to luminance contrast to achieve at least 30 per cent. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards. Regulatory: The Transport Standards would be amended to provide a balance of prescriptive and performance requirements for luminance contrast and height clearance of conveyance doors. This would include requirements for luminance contrast for solid doors and glazed doors, minimum height for conveyance doors to reduce the risk of a passenger striking the upper door frame. References from AS1428.2 (1992) to (AS1428.1 (2009) would also be updated. The Transport Standards Guidelines and / or The Whole Journey Guide would also be restructured to reflect and provide advice to updated guidance. This outcome would align with Part 1.2 of the Transport Standards.

Response to consultation questions

To what extent does the issue impact you?

The issue stated in the Stage 2 Consultation RIS is not clear enough for TMR to provide a response to this question.

What is your preferred option: status quo, non-regulatory option, or the regulatory option? Why?

TMR supports the non-regulatory option. Luminance contrast on door frame elements will provide benefits to people with vision impairment. However, TMR questions the appropriateness of the doorway height requirement proposed by the regulatory option.

The proposed regulated height of 1980mm is approximately one standard deviation above the 99th percentile male stature (note: this is not corrected for footwear). This requirement would therefore benefit a very small number of people, especially when accounting for the proportion of people above with stature greater than one standard deviation above the 99th percentile who also have vision impairment. The costs associated with implementation of this requirement are not commensurate with the magnitude of benefit that would be achieved.

TMR in principle supports this requirement for new assets but recognises that doorway dimensions may be subject to engineering constraints associated with the conveyance.

Do the non-regulatory and regulatory options provide enough clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination?

The regulatory and non-regulatory options provide sufficient clarity to enable access to public transport for people with disability.

Are there any challenges (i.e., physical, technical, operational, etc.) that could impact the implementation of the requirements of any option?

Installation of luminance contrast strips may incur significant cost. Inspection and replacement of luminance contrast strips may incur labour cost.

What is your experience of locating doors on conveyance access paths and at entrances? Have you, or your passengers, ever mistaken a part of a conveyance for a door, or a door as part of the conveyance?

No instances noted.

Have you, or your passengers, ever mistaken a gap between conveyances for a door? If so, can you describe the experience?

No instances noted.

Have you, or your passengers, ever found an external or internal door on a conveyance to be too low? Have you, or anyone ever struck their head because of this?

No instances noted.

Attachments

- Attachment 1 Engagement Report – Queensland disability sector's perspective on the Stage 2 DSAPT (RIS)
    - Refer to attached document

Engagement Report – Queensland disability sector's perspective on the Stage 2 DSAPT (RIS)

QDN

QUEENSLANDERS WITH DISABILITY NETWORK

NOTHING ABOUT US WITHOUT US

QDENGAGE

Submitted to Department of Transport and Main Roads, Queensland Government, May 2022

Contents

About Queenslanders with Disability Network (QDN)

Queenslanders with Disability Network (QDN) is an organisation of, for, and with people with disability. The organisation's motto is "nothing about us without us". QDN operates a state-wide network of over 2,000 members and supporters who provide information, feedback, and views from a consumer perspective to inform systemic disability policy and disability advocacy.

About QDeNgage

We work with organisations to help make services, products, and workplaces more accessible and inclusive for everyone. Many businesses and government entities want to know how to be more inclusive of customers and employees with disability so they can deliver quality, accessible services, and products. QDeNgage connects organisations with specialist consultants who bring professional expertise and lived experience of disability to provide practical business solutions. Our consultants are QDN members who are engaged by organisations to develop strategies and implement plans to create a culture of inclusivity. This engagement report forms part of a QDeNgage piece of work.

QDN value statement

QDN believes that:

- All people with disability have a right to a place in the community and have contributions to make to the community. This is as empowered, free citizens who are as valued, present, participating and welcomed as members of a dynamic and diverse society.
- The place of people with disability in the community is not just about people with disability having a house in the community. Core to this is that they are welcomed in the community as ordinary citizens

where they are genuinely given opportunities to contribute and actively participate. People with disability need to be in communities where their individuality, their talents, and their lived experiences of disability are recognised and acknowledged.

- Culturally and historically, people with disability are not afforded the same value, opportunities, or access to community life.
- Any inclusion in community for people with disability is conditional and vulnerable to withdrawal.
- Many people with disability in Queensland are excluded from the most basic experiences of ordinary lives.
- Current exclusionary practices are unacceptable and must be challenged.
- These issues affect not only people with disability but the whole community.
- The responsibility is shared. It lies within government (federal, state, and local) and the community at large, to ensure that people with disability have a place and are resourced to belong in community.

Introduction: project background and method

This engagement report forms the final part of a QDeNgage piece of work with the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR). The objective of this project was to extract knowledge and coordinate input from the Disability sector in Queensland to provide an overall perspective of the Stage 2 Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport (DSAPT)[1] Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS) policy reform areas of most significance and prominence to people with disability in Queensland.

This project recruited, supported, and consulted with 12 people to contribute to the consultation. The recruits included a combination of TMR's Accessibility Reference Group (ARG) membership, made up of individual and organisational representatives each with a working knowledge of transport standards and how they apply to their disability cohorts and QDN members, who are people with disability who have strong comprehension of transport legislation and advocacy matters. The recruitment aimed to represent a broad cross section of consumers and consumer representation, including representing people with intellectual, neurological, physical, and sensory disabilities.

Project engagement included hosting 4 X 2hr focus groups[2], related to each key area of the Stage 2 Consultation Regulation Impact Statement (RIS), namely:

- Focus groups 1 & 3: review key changes within
    - Part 2: Information, communication, and wayfinding
    - Part 3: Accessibility at stations, stops, wharves and access routes
- Focus Group 2 & 4: review key changes within
    - Part 4: Accessibility of boarding and alighting and egress of infrastructure

[1] DSAPT or the Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport were formulated under the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 and came into operation on 23 October 2002. The Standards establish minimum accessibility requirements to be met by providers and operators of public transport conveyances, infrastructure, and premises. The Standards consider the range of disability covered by the DDA and apply to most public transport premises, infrastructure, and conveyances. See: https://www.disabilityaccessconsultants.com.au/dsapt/

[2] The original project scope was to host 2 X 4-hour focus groups, however, to meet project deliverables and people's availability, as many QDeNgage consultants work in paid employment during the day, it was necessary to host 4 X 2-hour focus groups.

- Part 5: Accessibility in conveyances

This included the pre-engagement technical briefing and survey, for distribution prior to the engagement and identifying and providing appropriate supports to engage including language support and providing avenues for knowledge sharing beyond the focus group through one-to-one conversations and surveys as required.

The final part of the project was to consolidate the feedback into this report to TMR, **including identifying areas of reform of greatest significance to the disability community and the preferred policy option** (Status Quo, Regulatory, Non-regulatory Option) of each reform and a rationale for that decision.

Overall feedback

All focus groups were almost unanimous that in each reform area, the regulatory policy option was seen as the only way to achieve change and improvements to the DSAPT. Maintaining the status quo and non-regulatory options were not seen as a permanent way to achieve change in disability transport standards: "We all saw what happened when there was a voluntary take-up of housing standards. Nothing!" – focus group participant.

The report incorporates the feedback and preferred policy options of the focus group participants. It includes 10 overall observations applicable throughout the RIS and more specific feedback on sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the RIS.

Introductory observations applicable throughout the RIS

Forum participants made the following observations that were applicable throughout the Consultation RIS:

- Exemptions for Premises Standards are not accepted: Forum participants believe Premises Standards are an equal and complementary standard to Transport Standards and that this forms the view of the public and therefore Premises Standards should not be exempt from the DSAPT
- A provision to review standards at regular intervals should be included, to ensure the standards keep pace with advancements to assistive technology
- Any exceptions to meeting Standards should be time-framed and followed up by an enforceable requirement to meet standards at the point at which the exception timeframe has expired. Exceptions allow liberty to the operator at the expense of the person with disability, and impose or prolong a barrier against fair and equal access
- The non-compliant to compliant timeframe should be specified to no more than 8 months total followed by an enforceable requirement to meet the standard at the point at which the non-compliant timeframe has expired
- The rule for when to impose a prescriptive requirement should be determined by evaluating whether options that do not include specificity impose a safety risk
- Genuine co-design with inclusion of people with all disability types must occur before investment in the solution has commenced. Real time/ testing trials will avoid previous examples such as the NGR rolling stock from reoccurring and make evident what works and what does not and will help to design and refine solutions

- Exemptions for school buses not accepted – Children with disability need appropriate and accessible transport to achieve the same opportunities in life through education. To exclude school buses is to create a discriminatory barrier. Children deserve the same opportunities in life as adults. Contracting out public services to an education department does not make the service private nor remove the responsibility to meet the human rights of all children, as accessible transportation equals access to education
- Fare systems should be co-designed and tested by people with all disability groups/types
- Way-finding audio information at boarding/disembarking and decision points should include information about surrounding areas and attractions to assist visitors as well as people with disability navigating from transportation to destination
- Uniformity or consistency in the placement of signage and Tactile Ground Surface Indicators (TGSIs) would be a welcome improvement to predictability and ease of navigation
- It was noted by an access consultant attending the forums that legally the word "shall" was more appropriate than "should" or "must", as it was a way to ensure regulatory standards were not made optional

Part 2: Information, Communication and Wayfinding

5. Better Communication of Accessibility Features

Overall, participants supported the Regulatory option as it gives the public a nationally consistent compliance benchmark. If the benchmark is not achieved the public has a stronger case in complaint or advocacy. Guidance is useful but it is harder to sustain a complaint against failure to provide products that meet the guidance benchmark. Also, jurisdictions and operators may choose to introduce their own variations to what is only guidance. This would nullify the usefulness of the information to the degree that the variations introduced inconsistencies.

Participant comments:

The standards were set 20 years ago. Technology levels have changed, and the standards don't meet people with disability.

Standards must change to fit these requirements.

People with disabilities are not a homogenous block. A facility that is very accessible for a person who was able bodied but Deaf might be inaccessible to a person who had a mobility or vision impairment and vice versa.

6. Timely provision of information

A regulatory option is strongly supported as it gives right of complaint for non-compliance. Also, it would seem to be the only lawful option. Article 21 of the Convention of Rights of Persons with Disabilities binds States:

> *Article 21*
>
> *Freedom of expression and opinion, and access to information*

States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that persons with disabilities can exercise the right to freedom of expression and opinion, including the freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas on an equal basis with others and through all forms of communication of their choice, as defined in article 2 of the present Convention, including by:

(a) Providing information intended for the public to persons with disabilities in accessible formats and technologies appropriate to different kinds of disabilities in a timely manner and without additional cost.

Participant comments:

Websites are not accessible for visuality

Persons with disability need to look at websites prior to travel to see if public transport is accessible otherwise stranded.

Communication styles are okay for people without cognitive impairment, but this is missing for people with Cognitive Impairment.

7. Real time communication

The regulatory option accompanied by explanatory guidance was supported by forum participants. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

Participant comments:

This needs to be provided for all hours of operation of service.

This needs a real person available if real time information can't be provided.

8. Passenger location during journey

The regulatory option accompanied by explanatory guidance is supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

Of the two sub-options Sub-option 2 is preferred. People who are Deaf or hard of hearing may be otherwise in robust health and disinclined to occupy priority seats. These passengers have an existing right to information on location and this can be fulfilled through being able to view passenger information displays from any seat. Many rail and light rail carriages currently have displays that meet this criterion, as do some buses and ferries.

Participant story:

Recently I caught a train, and no assistance was available. I tried to hit an assistance button and got no response - security advised it was non-operational. Security told guard that I was on the train. Communication is critical.

Participant comments:

It is important to ensure audio visual communication of next stop and location as a minimum. Further, it informs passengers of which door or gate will be used for alighting, which is significant for people with vision impairment.

9. Hearing augmentation on conveyances

The regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

Option 1 with an installed induction loop system providing 100% cover was supported by forum participants. Option 2 defaults to 'If a public address system is in operation'. This would permit an operator to switch off the system with impunity.

PA system announcements are an important part of a public transport journey. They include next stop announcements, service disruption and alteration announcements and public safety announcements. Of these, only the next stop announcements are easily displayed in visual format on passenger information displays. In general, the hearing augmentation, even when provided has been inadequate.

Participant comments:

Hearing aids will pick up all sounds without discrimination and so the capacity of the telecoil switch to block ambient noise while clearly hearing the message broadcast on the PA system is of great benefit. Unfortunately, this point has been lost on many operators who continue to provide audio information without a hearing augmentation option and intercoms without visual options.

10. Hearing augmentation: Infrastructure and premises

The regulatory option was supported by forum participants. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

Option 1 is preferred as it gives spatial targets for coverage of the system that must be met. Site constraints can be dealt with via Equivalent Access or Unjustifiable Hardship. It also provides sufficient clarity to ensure people with disability would be able to access public transport without discrimination.

Participant comments:

Hearing augmentation takes so little time to do and is the least done on train stations.

Audio needs to be of a high quality.

Temporary screens for COVID make it hard to hear.

Technology needs to be compatible with hearing aids.

11. Print size and format

The regulatory option was supported by forum participants. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

The Consultation RIS mentions the *Round Table on Information Access for People with Print Disabilities* (Round Table) and its *Guidelines for Producing Clear Print*[3]. This is a very highly regarded publication and should be referred to in the Guidance section of the Regulatory option.

Participant comments:

18pt San serif is suitable for documents.

It is hard to access hard copy large print material as well as a time lag.

People already have a right to general information about transport services in Section 27.1. Section 27.3 provides specifications for large print.

12. International Symbol for Access and Deafness

The regulatory option was supported with considerable reservation by forum participants. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

Updating references to harmonise with the Premises Standards is supported. Neither sub-option in the Regulatory option is satisfactory. Further work is required to identify appropriate sizes for symbols. The work should account for illumination, viewing distance and movement of the symbol (e.g., located on a conveyance's accessible entrance door) or viewer (e.g., moving in a crowd along an access path or observing a platform from a moving conveyance).

Participant comments:

Symbol size required by the DSAPT is regarded by many as inadequate.

People with low vision or cognitive disabilities benefit from having larger symbols prominently displayed.

It must be an inclusive symbol.

13. Letter heights and luminous contrast of signs

A regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. However, the regulatory options offered are not fully supported as neither delivers a satisfactory outcome.

Looking further afield to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) *Standards for Transportation Facilities*[4] adopted by the U.S. Department of Transportation (2006) gives an acceptable minimum for sign letters and characters in Table 703.5.5.

The Round Table *Guidelines for Producing Clear Print*[5] are recommended as a good source for advisory or regulatory specifications for legibility. The only challenge in moving to a larger minimum letter height

[3] https://printdisability.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/round_table_-clear_print_guidelines-PDF.pdf
[4] https://www.access-board.gov/files/ada/ADAdotstandards.pdf
[5] https://printdisability.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/round_table_-clear_print_guidelines-PDF.pdf

would be a decrease in the amount of information available per unit area of each sign. This is not a major issue. A phased replacement of existing signs would have a small to modest budgetary impact.

The current DSAPT requirements for letter heights on signs are inadequate for most people who have less than 'normal' visual acuity. At 2 m distance a 6 mm high letter is hardly legible for many (as is present at many bus stop timetable signs currently in Southeast Queensland). This Section of the DSAPT needs reform to give appropriate character sizes at various distance for people with poor or low vision. Contrast of text and characters also needs revision.

Participant comments:

More research is required in this area to reach an adequate standard for accessibility.

Glossy sign surfaces make the sign illegible. Matt finish for sign surfaces must be a requirement.

14. Location of signs

A regulatory option was generally supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

Sub-option 1 is preferred over sub-option 2. Many signs, particularly in conveyances, may need to be placed on available surfaces and in proximity to the facility or feature they identify. Sub-option 2 lacks the flexibility to allow this. The regulatory option was preferred but would benefit from advice or requirement to locate wayfinding signs both prior to and at decision points. People should be informed of a change of direction prior to reaching it to permit passenger flow at peak times. Advice should also be provided regarding locating signs so that they will not be compromised by glare.

Participant comments:

For someone with tunnel vision, it is hard to find a sign particularly if there is clutter around the sign or not being able to locate it.

At times of peak service, signs are obscured by people standing or moving. For people seated in wheeled mobility devices or people of short stature, this can mean signs are missed.

Some places do not have enough physical space which can compromise vision.

TGSIs and signage are very hard to find and placing braille signs at a higher 'line of sight' for visually impaired is not going to make visual access more likely.

15. Braille embossed (printed) specifications

The regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. Of note is the welcome guidance on timely provision of braille in contracted format and on when to prepare braille copy for public distribution.

Participant comments:

Current DSAPT requirements for the provision of braille copy are entirely inadequate.

Materials they are using to stick on, wears out so needs to be high quality.

16. Braille and tactile lettering for signage

The regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. It was felt options provide ample clarity for manufacturers, installers, and readers of braille / tactile signs.

Participant Comments:

Current DSAPT specifications are largely ignored or dealt with through Equivalent Access processes that allow compliance with the Premises Standards.

Premises standards are better than DSAPT standards concerning braille signage. DSAPT standards create confusion for readers and add cost to the production of signs for operators and providers.

17. Braille and tactile information at lift landings

A regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. The regulatory option provides ample clarity for manufacturers, installers, and readers of braille / tactile signs. Braille and tactile wayfinding signs are already being installed on lift door frames or adjacent to lift landing controls and doors. This has not been a technical challenge and adds minimal cost to operators and providers.

Participant comments:

People with vision impairment and particularly people with both vision and hearing impairment are often left without tactile wayfinding cues. Braille / tactile signs on lift door frames provide important cues and confirm that they are entering the correct lift and have arrived at the correct destination.

Placement at lift landings needs to be consistent to be predictable for users. Need to be sure that they follow clear guidelines so they can be 'found' by the visually impaired for whom they are made.

18. Lifts: Audible wayfinding

A regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. Regulatory Option 1 was preferred as it gives designers a better understanding of the messaging required.

Voice identification of landings with brief orientation messages will benefit all passengers who are not familiar with the stop or the precinct surrounding the stop. It would give people with disability confidence to independently undertake journeys that otherwise might have been considered risky.

Participant comments:

When changing platforms changing lifts can be disorientating – directions are needed for navigation to next transport level.

19. Lifts: Emergency communications in lift cars

A regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. The current emergency communication systems in lift cars are discriminatory. They make no provision for passengers who have hearing or speech impairments. People who have hearing impairments, are deaf or who are non-verbal are not able to use the emergency communication systems required by DSAPT through AS1735.12-1999.

Participant comments:

If stranded in a lift people either have no way of communicating their predicament, or way of hearing a response to their call, or both. As a matter of public safety this is unacceptable.

This standard is obsolete and must be replaced by a contemporary standard.

20. Lifts: Reference for lift car communication and information systems

A regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

Passengers who wear hearing aids that have a telecoil are easily able to receive messages broadcast over a PA system if there is a magnetic induction hearing loop in service and signage indicates its presence and boundaries. DSAPT currently requires these induction loops in areas covered by PA systems but makes no mention of the lifts. If the PA system is active in the lift the lift must also have a magnetic induction system that allows people who have hearing aids equipped with telecoils to receive the same information as other passengers. This is a rights issue as much as a customer service issue and accords with the Guiding Principles[6] of the DSAPT reform process.

Participant comments:

The regulatory option is clear and well considered.

21. Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) procurement

A regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

Of the five regulatory options offered Option 5 is supported. By citing AS EN 301 549-2020 and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 it incorporates success criteria for mobile technology that are missing from the now redundant WCAG 2.0. The importance of moving to WCAG 2.1 cannot be over

[6] https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/infrastructure-transport-vehicles/transport-accessibility/reform-disability-standards-accessible-public-transport-2002

emphasised given the ubiquity of mobile devices. Options in the RIS that cite AS EN 301 549-2016 and WCAG 2.0 are now obsolete and no longer fit for purpose.

Participant comments:

We must choose to ensure inclusion of access for all people with disabilities and digital mobile hearing impairments.

22. Mobile web systems

A regulatory option is supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. Of the two regulatory options provided Option 1 is preferred but not fully supported because it omits elements of WCAG 2.1 AAA that could easily be incorporated into regulation without imposing any hardship. It leaves no ambiguity over which information should be accessible. All information should be accessible.

For people with disability, the accessibility of online material, and particularly material to be accessed by mobile technologies is lacking. Apps enter service without adequate user testing, or any testing, and then fail to offer accessible service to people who have various disabilities. Knowledgeable people with disabilities will then, often at their own expense, work with transport operators and providers to rectify the many issues—if the app architecture permits the necessary amendments. App developers frequently have a poor grasp of WCAG or the rationale for accessibility. Regulation must drive the market.

Participant comments:

All parts of WCAG must be incorporated specifically as this is the only way to achieve inclusion in access for all disability types.

23. Accessible fare system elements

A regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider.

Option 3 is preferred as it gives the most accessible outcome. Of the sub-options for the preferred Standards are:

- AS EN 301 549-2020
- WCAG 2.1 AA+ with all the listed success criteria.

The current DSAPT requirements are considered dated and never fully fit for purpose by forum participants. There are now fare systems in operation that are not covered by DSAPT. Updating to contemporary standards will ensure that technologies that were undreamed of in the 1990s when the DSAPT was drafted are accessible to passengers who have disabilities.

Participant comments:

Without this upgrade, people with sensory disability are disadvantaged.

Part 3: Accessibility at stations, stops, wharves and access routes

24. Doors on access paths

A regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. Of the options, Option 1 covering all doors, rather than just toilet doors as per Option 2, is preferred as it gives the broader safe and accessible outcome.

Door closers can present significant barriers to people who have mobility impairments despite complying with relevant Australian Standards.

Recognising the difficulty faced by their customers, shopping centre managements are increasingly installing power assisted doors at public toilets. Some transport operators and providers have followed suite. These doors allow trouble free entry to people who are using mobility aids.

Participant comments:

Holding a door open while trying to simultaneously push a manual wheelchair through the door is difficult. The task is even more difficult for people using power wheelchairs or mobility scooters.

25. Continuous accessibility on access paths

A regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. Further, a regulatory requirement, DSAPT Section 2.2 already exists. To reduce a regulation to advice would be to diminish the existing rights of people who have a disability.

Passengers with disability continue to report issues of access barriers in public spaces. Many of these spaces form part, or all, of an access path connecting public transport nodes. For people who have mobility issues poorly constructed paths are the main concern. Rough surfaces, kerbs, steep kerb ramps, narrow paths, flangeway gaps, steep crossfall, inappropriately located street furniture all make access paths difficult to negotiate. People with vision impairments report that inappropriate lighting regimes, wayfinding challenges, movable street furniture and signs, uncontrolled street crossings, poorly aligned kerb ramps, cantilevered fixtures and controlled crossings with insufficient crossing times are among their challenges. People who have intellectual or cognitive impairments often find that jumbled, poorly coordinated public spaces are confusing, that wayfinding aids are absent or poorly planned, and that lighting regimes are inappropriate.

Participant comments:

Access paths need to be maintained and kept as access paths.

Need to be specific with requirements.

26. Flange gaps

This was one area of the consultation where advice to maintain the status quo was received, with the existing DSAPT Section 2.1 remaining in force. Flange gaps are dangerous. Wheelchair users have been killed on level crossings when their castor wheels became trapped in a flange gap.

By maintaining Status Quo, the Australasian Railway Authority (AWA) are obliged to find a solution that eliminates flange gaps on level crossings. The regulatory and non-regulatory options offered may see the veloSTRAIL[7] projects dropped and allow flange gaps to continue to be found on level crossings that are under the purview of DSAPT.

27. Resting points

The regulatory option was supported. Regulatory options provide a compliance benchmark that can be used in the event of complaint. Guidance is only followed at the discretion of the operator or provider. Resting points at allocated intervals and locations do not impose great costs. Greater specificity in locating and wayfinding or avoiding collision with resting points is required.

Participant comments:

People with disability need safe, accessible resting stops too.

28. Requirements for handrails in overbridges and subways

A regulatory option was supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. DSAPT Section 11.2 already requires handrails in locations such as overbridges and subways but does not specify the locations. This proposed reform removes any ambiguity on the provision of handrails on overbridges or in subways.

Handrails are very useful fixtures, providing both wayfinding and support for people as they move along an access path. Where handrails do not continue along the overbridge or subway people lose support or wayfinding assistance. At peak times when crowding and jostling occur this loss of support or wayfinding is a disincentive to undertaking a public transport journey.

Participant comments:

Handrail use in overbridges and subways will be of benefit to ambulant people who are vision or mobility impaired.

29. Location of fare system elements

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Elements may not be sufficiently visible or within an acceptable reach range or they may intrude into access paths. Elements may require actions that are not

[7] A product called veloSTRAIL has been available that is able to fill flange gaps, is safe for rail traffic up to speeds of 120 kph and is in use overseas free of accident or issue. Several trials of veloSTRAIL are currently underway or have been completed in Australia. Based on successful trials it is hoped that an application will be made to the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator for veloSTRAIL to become an approved product. This will allow flange gaps to be eliminated from the DSAPT level crossings as well as any others that the rail authority deems necessary.

physically or cognitively easy. The inclusion of AS EN 301 549-2020 is welcome as it introduces sound technical specifications that can be met by industry.

Participant comments:

Fare systems can be a challenge for many people with disability.

Fare systems when on convenyences should be located at the allocated bays that can be tapped once safely on the vehicle. They are currently located near the entrance/exit points, that can be difficult to navigate whilst getting up a ramp and having to turn corners at the same time. This challenge means many people in mobility aids avoid bus travel.

30. Allocated seating and priority seating in waiting areas

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Priority seating and allocated spaces are sometimes provided. Some operators designate a single shelter on a rail platform as the waiting area and exclude the other shelters from DSAPT. This results in all rail cars having priority seats but only a single platform shelter.

Participant comments:

The challenge is policing allocated seating areas, so they are only used for those they are created for.

31. Accessible toilets with equal proportion of left- and right-hand configurations

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. The regulatory option and associated advice are clear and welcome. Currently, all accessible toilets on board Queensland Rail's suburban fleet are left hand toilets. This includes the two accessible toilets being installed in the six car NGR train sets. The regulation and advice will be a vast improvement. Having a choice of toilet hand may mean the difference between being able to use a toilet or not for some passengers. This is recognised in the Premises Standards and should also be recognised in the DSAPT.

Participant comments:

We need both right hand and left-hand transfer support. If we don't offer both we are creating a discriminatory barrier.

32. Emergency call buttons in accessible toilets

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Of the regulatory sub-options, sub-option 2 is supported as it ensures a more accessible outcome by locating the higher call button within the adjacent wall flush control zone.

Emergency call buttons are essential installations. These must be placed so that a person who has difficulty while sitting on the pan or who has fallen to the floor can reach a call button. If no means of requesting assistance is available people are deterred from using an accessible facility and may therefore not undertake public transport journeys.

33. Ambulant toilets

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Unfortunately, the DSAPT has no requirement for ambulant toilets. Because they are not required, they are rarely if ever provided. This may deter some people from travel if they have a need for an ambulant toilet.

Participant comments:

Ambulant toilets not regulated under DSAPT – this needs to change. Two handrails are required in ambulant toilets for right and left hand/side disability access

34. Lift specifications and enhancements

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. The regulatory and non-regulatory options are clear and if followed will give good outcomes. They would be improved by stressing the need for through cars rather than turnaround cars. Through cars permit a smaller footprint and do not oblige mobility aid users to either turn through 180^{o} in the car or reverse in or out of it. An update to DSAPT that references AS1735.12-2020 is urgently required.

Annex C of AS1735.12-2020 requires verbal enunciation of touch screen buttons, which makes floor selection on a touch screen possible.

Participant comments:

For many people using large mobility aids the turnaround (single door) lift car is too small to allow a 180^{o} turn.

Touch screen lift controls pose a challenge for people who are blind or have low vision as they offer no tactile alternative for floor button identification.

35. Specifications for escalators and inclined travelators

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. The required minimum width of an access path on a moving footway must align with the minimum width proposed for escalators and inclined travelators.

Participant comments:

Old ones are unsafe for dog guides and have ripped out their paw pads.

There is a need to provide way-finding information of other options for getting upstairs or to a location without using a travelator or escalator

36. Poles, objects, and luminous contrasts

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Of the options provided, Option 1 with sub-option 1 is preferred. These give the widest possible application of a reformed Section 2.5 and are therefore the safest options.

Participant comments:

Object placements that are not well thought through in bus stops and train stations create hazardous environments for people who are blind or vision impaired and wheelchair users.

Contrast is very important for people with low vision

37. Lighting

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Therefore, regulatory option 1 'Removal of current requirements and replaced with guidance' cannot be supported as it is by default a non-regulatory option. Of the proposed regulatory options, option 3 and its sub-option 1 are supported. These appear to give the safest outcomes for passengers who have a disability while being easily achievable by operators and providers. Non uniform lighting imposes a challenge to low vision passengers in adjusting their vision between light pools. People with cognitive disabilities may interpret the deep shadows as ditches or solid objects.

Part 4: Accessibility of boarding and alighting and egress of infrastructure

38. Signals and process for requesting boarding devises

A regulatory option was supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Sub-option 2 is supported as it represents current DSAPT requirements. The group still disadvantaged by the proposed reform are Deaf people who must request assistance over a help phone system. Until technology emerges that supports communication from AUSLAN to text / voice and *vice versa* it would be best if request systems were not solely reliant on verbal interaction. The need to communicate that boarding or alighting assistance is required or that there has been a change to a prearranged destination is essential for people using mobility aids or to others who require assistance in boarding or alighting. The consequence of signal devices being poorly located, not installed or non-functional is that people are not able to request boarding assistance. They may therefore miss their service or their stop.

Participant comments:

Real time is important.

Staff training is essential.

Advertising all over the windows makes it difficult to see out of the bus.

39. Notification by passenger of need of boarding device

A regulatory option was supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. For unbooked services sub-option 1 is supported as it is the better human rights outcome and sits better with regulation. For call buttons sub-option 2 is supported as it represents current DSAPT requirements. The performance-based requirement for real time communication will hopefully capture the often-disadvantaged Deaf people who cannot request assistance over a help phone only system. Systems used must support the communication needs of all passengers, not excluding those who are non-verbal, Deaf, or hard of hearing.

Participant comments:

Too many variables in transportation timetables that are not within the passenger's ability to predict, or control make prior booking an extremely tenuous and unsatisfactory option.

There needs to be further consultation and co-design with people with disability on this topic.

40. Portable boarding ramp edge barriers

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Of the regulatory options Option 3 is supported as it cites the current Australian Standard for vehicle boarding ramps. Edge barriers wayfinding for visually impaired is very important to safety AS 3856.1 2021 acknowledges and introduces edge barriers for all. Edge barriers on boarding ramps are important safety features for people who use mobility aids. They reduce the likelihood of aids falling off the edge of the ramp while transiting over it.

Participant comments:

Currently they don't provide ramps for different devices and there is a need to be careful not to go off the edge. All ramps should provide side barriers (a lip on each side of the ramp).

Bus ramps do not have a barrier

41. Boarding ramp and removable gangway definitions

The regulatory option is supported. Status quo is not viable. The non-regulatory option is only advisory and may not be followed. Further, the non-regulatory option makes a successful complaint due to non-compliance far more difficult than it would be for a regulatory option as the onus to prove discrimination would fall upon the complainant. The regulatory option states a clear technical specification or performance specification that must be met or exceeded. The gangway must have handrails and a convex

profile for safety reasons, but these features are largely superfluous for most vehicle boarding ramps. Gangway specifications are captured in the National Standard for Commercial Vessels and in the DSAPT reform proposals. The definitional distinction is supported as it recognises the clear distinction in design and operating environment between vehicle boarding ramps and removable gangways.

Participant comments:

Moving on surfaces that are mobile such as pontoons is difficult.

Most ferries are good but the double decker ferries restrict movement – not aware of any consultation and currently there are movable gangways.

Need a longer gangway.

42. Boarding ramp and removable gangway definitions

The regulatory option is supported. Status quo is not viable. The non-regulatory option is only advisory and may not be followed. Further, the non-regulatory option makes a successful complaint due to non-compliance far more difficult than it would be for a regulatory option as the onus to prove discrimination would fall upon the complainant. The regulatory option states a clear technical specification or performance specification that must be met or exceeded.

Despite DSAPT requirements for boarding ramps, which currently includes gangways, removable gangways are constructed to conform to the National Standards for Commercial Vessels. This allows gangway gradients of up to 30 degrees, which is approximately 1:3. Steeper sections of a gangway may cause a wheelchair to tip backward as it climbs the gangway or the footplates to strike the deck as the wheelchair leaves the gangway. It is essential therefore that gangway design maintains not more than 1:8 over any section of the gangways curvature when it is deployed.

43. Nominated assisted boarding points

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Operators of rail services nominate a location on a platform at which people who require boarding assistance must wait to be identified and assisted. Accessible features include allocated spaces, priority seats and accessible toilets.

Participant comments:

Staff will sometimes insist that the door adjacent to the nominated assistance point is the only door through which people who require assistance are allowed to board. They will reference some unnamed 'law' to justify their actions if challenged and insist that they be obeyed if assistance is to be provided.

People can be crammed into an overloaded vestibule or area of one carriage while allocated spaces and priority seats are vacant in other carriages. This can leave people using mobility aids parked in vestibules with no access to the grab rails and communication devices located in the occupied allocated spaces.

There needs to be consistency in location/placement to permit predictability by user

44. Identification of lead stops

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Lead stops function well in circumstances where several buses might otherwise be pulling in or out randomly from a long platform. They give people with a disability a predictable location at which they can board. The alternative is to race up and down the station platform as buses pull into whatever space is available. For passengers who have vision impairments this is not possible as they cannot see the services pulling in. People with mobility issues may not move quickly enough to reach their service before it departs. The challenge lies in identifying the lead stop when a bus station or interchange has a single lead stop or differentiating between the lead stops when a bus station or interchange has a several lead stops.

Participant comments:

Technology will make this easier particularly where audio is required in real time/handheld devices.

This is a major issue especially at bus interchanges where buses are backed up and queues of people may obscure the presence of a wheelchair user who is unable to identify and hail the right bus.

45. Pontoon boarding points on infrastructure 250

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. People with mobility impairments have reported that certain ferry terminals with small pontoons should not be regarded as accessible.

Participant comments:

A feeling of safety and security is vital if people are to make public transport journeys.

An accessible path of travel between predestination and boarding point is critical.

46. Bus, tram, and light rail boarding point on infrastructure

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Option 2 is supported as Option 1 is non-viable. A significant number of bus stops are located on hill slopes that do not permit a boarding point of 1:40 to be practicably or safely achieved. Perhaps 30% of the nation's bus stops are impacted by topographic constraints. Open data[8] supplied by Brisbane City Council for bus stops illustrates this point.

47. Hail and ride boarding points on infrastructure

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult

[8] https://www.data.brisbane.qld.gov.au/data/dataset/brisbane-bus-stops

to successfully complain if it was not followed. A long running and successful hail-and-ride service is Brisbane's Personalised Public Transport[9] scheme. This uses wheelchair accessible taxis as conveyances and serves eight catchments. Low floor minibuses with ramps or high floor minibuses with lifts are commercially available.

Participant comments:

Currently need to wave to attract driver. People with vision impairment don't know if a bus is approaching or a truck. Also, difficult when busses come in at the same time.

Digital numbers are hard to read.

Separate consultation is needed regarding this topic.

48. Accessible taxi ranks

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Sub-option 2 is supported as it permits boarding at the first two spaces and alighting from the last space. The last space is the least likely to be occupied and is therefore the logical place to alight.

Sub-option 3 appears to limit accessibility to taxi zones with more than five spaces. This is a very poor option.

A better sub-option would incorporate elements of sub-options 2 and 3:

> The first, second and last vehicle space must be accessible. Where there are more than five spaces one space for every four spaces between the second and last space must be accessible.

49. Accessible passenger loading zones on-street

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Sub-option 2 is supported as it permits boarding at the first two spaces and alighting from the last space. The last space is the least likely to be occupied and is therefore the logical place to alight. A better sub-option would incorporate elements of sub-options 2 and 3:

> The first, second and last vehicle space must be accessible. Where there are more than five spaces one space for every four spaces between the second and last space must be accessible.

Participant comments:

Loading zones are different to parking. CBDs have very few drop off and loading points, and that is an access barrier for people with disability.

[9] https://www.brisbane.qld.gov.au/traffic-and-transport/public-transport/personalised-public-transport

50. Accessible parking spaces in infrastructure off-street carparks

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Sub-option 1 aligns with the Premises Standards requirements and would be most easily implemented. Sub-option two would appear to exclude other passengers from parking if there were five or less spaces. This might be difficult to justify. An alternative option might ask for all parking spaces to be of an accessible width if there are five or less, but not designated for the exclusive use of disability Parking Permit holders. People with disability who were obliged to drive to the transport node would have the same access to parking as other passengers.

Part 5: Accessibility in conveyances

51. Grab rails on access paths

A regulatory option was supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Grab rails along conveyance access paths provide vital support for passengers who have balance issues. They also provide general support to passengers who are standing while the conveyance is in motion.

Participant comments:

Not everyone who requires transport needs an accessibility path however they may need a grab rail such as the elderly.

Colour of grab rails is important, yellow is better for people with low vision.

52. Grab rails in allocated spaces

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. If an appropriate colour to contrast with their background grab rails in allocated spaces are easy to identify. Unfortunately, some grab rails in allocated spaces are inappropriate. These can lack contrast, be of too great diameter, too high or low, or not within easy reach.

53. Mobility aid movement in allocated spaces: passive restraints

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Bus passengers in wheelchairs and scooters have been reported tipping as buses turn or brake. Injuries sustained have varied from mild to fatal.

Incidents in trams are far less frequent than buses due to their operating environment putting less force on passengers during turns.

Participant comments:

No one has found the solution for this yet.

A universal design restraint system needs to be automatic so neither the driver nor the passenger needs to do anything.

It would be good to face either way i.e., on buses[10]*.*

54. Mobility aid movement in allocated spaces: active restraints

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Restraint systems that comply with ASNZS10542.1-2015 are readily available and well understood by operators and the public.

Participant comments:

Drivers need proper training for how to secure sash and belt.

Safety depends greatly on the application of the sash and belt. It must be correct and complete. Part of driver training is about safety of both passenger and driver. Training must be accompanied with communication and respect for capacity and recognising personal space and boundaries.

In the rare case of emergency egress from vehicle, belt cutting devices should be regulated and enforced.

55. Appropriate seats on booked services

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Appropriate seats can usually be made available at booking provided that another passenger with similar needs had not already booked them. Appropriate seating will often need to be negotiated. This should always be possible during the booking process.

Participant comments:

Status quo: 28.4 - (2) needs to stay: Operators must allocate unbooked accessible seats to other passengers to only after all other standard seats are filled.

56. Conveyance dwell times at stops

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. In some conveyances, drivers can observe all passengers, making appropriate dwell time a training and policy issue. Technical solutions are available in circumstances where operators do not have a good view of passengers. The G:Link tram has a button on the exterior of the accessible doors that holds the door open longer and alerts the driver that a passenger who has a mobility impairment is boarding[11] and requires time to reach a seat or allocated space.

---

[10] Currently mobility aid device users are required to face the rear of the bus in the allocated space. This can cause problems for people who experience inertia.

[11] https://ridetheg.com.au/%ef%bf%bcriding-the-g/mobility-access/

Participant comments:

Most incidents seem to occur in buses and involve falls by ambulant people with mobility disabilities. Drivers are on tight timetables and often driving in adverse conditions.

Disability awareness training is needed for operators. This could be led by people with disability.

57. Stairs on trains

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. If it can be achieved, sub-option 2 is supported as it has measurable dimensions. Sub-option 1 is more a suggestion open to interpretation than a regulatory option.

Participant comments:

TGSI on conveyances was an issue as it is a trip issue for some passengers, there needs to be a warning that stairs are starting/stopping, but TGSI's may not be the best way. This applies to all stairs on conveyances

Need further information and consultation on options.

58. Stairs on ferries

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. If it can be achieved, sub-option 2 is supported as it has more generous dimensions for risers and goings than sub-option 1. Sub-option 3 is more a suggestion open to interpretation than a regulatory option. It is not clear how sub-option 2 would be enforceable unless it was also incorporated into the NSCV.

Participant comments:

Stairs should not be located near designated wheelchair seating/spaces or areas.

59. Stairs on buses

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Retrofitting existing buses may introduce some costs but these are likely to be minor. Many operators have fully complied already, and these will not be affected. Design Rule 58 still takes precedence so no major structural changes will be required. The suggestions in the regulatory option will enhance stair safety and accessibility.

60. Doorway contrast and height

A regulatory option is supported as it gives measurable outcomes that permit complaint in the event of non-compliance. Non-regulatory advice may not be followed and as it is discretionary it would be difficult to successfully complain if it was not followed. Many operators are already complying with the requirements of the proposed door reforms. There would not seem to be any significant challenges.

Participant comments:

Fully glazed doors are easily mistaken for opening by people with low vision or cognitive impairments.

Incidents where people with vision impairment stepped between train carriages, mistaking the gap for an open door, have been reported.