

**IDAG Minutes**  
**Thursday 13 June 2024**  
**2.30pm to 4:30pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
██████████	IDAG Member (Chair)
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
Amy Edgar	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
Denise French	D&I Programme Officer
<b>Apologies</b>	
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
<b>Session 1: Manor Circus touchless push-button signage</b>	
Taha Hanif	Design Engineer
Kornelis Van Tuyl	Principal Engineer
<b>Session 2: High back seats on buses - evaluation</b>	
██████████	Safety Consultant (external TRL)
██████████	Graduate Researcher (external TRL)

➤ **Welcome and Minutes of the Last Meeting**

- Chair welcomed the group and acknowledged apologies.
- Minutes of 30 May and BSB approved.
- Mentoring scheme name – ‘The Accessibility Interchange’ overwhelming winner. ‘Inclusivity Interchange’ was the runner up.

## ➤ **Session 1: Manor Circus touchless push-button signage**

### ➤ **IDAG Clarifications**

- Why DfT are involved?
- Are TPBs were in use before 2020, are they still elsewhere and are there any lessons to be learned?
- It's understood that DfT expect you to still have the wait sign, but is there a button symbol on the sign that could be confused as a button?
- Be useful to see a TPB unit.
- Are there plans/ideas for the future to roll out more or a thought of removing the button completely?

### ➤ **TfL Clarifications**

Note: During the Zoom discussion, a TfL speaker went and fetched a unit, and showed it to the group remotely. Group was shown where existing no contact activation is located and the location of sign was clarified.

#### DfT

- TfL aim to keep the DfT involved in what we are doing from day one. We do need their advice and specialism and benefit from their input in the long run.
- Why touchless? The equipment got developed during pandemic by 3<sup>rd</sup> party. Came from industry rather than TfL or DfT.
- DfT are firm that no symbols can be added to the core unit.

#### Trials

- No trials or studies done on those already installed: Wolverhampton, Cambridge, Canary Wharf and in Wales.
- Keen to test who will touch button and who will wave in front of to activate.
- No plans to remove the button or tactile cone, lights around button will still be present.
- Want to trial to assess how it works and user interaction. Roll out of touchless will depend on outcomes of the trials.
- Plan to involve people who cannot physically push buttons rather than pandemic reasons.

#### Signage

- Seeking advice on signage for button. Signage on the button itself cannot be changed, signage to explain how to work the button is a challenge.
- Limitations – DfT want text only, they do not like symbols or pictorial diagrams, vs. TfL preference for additional pictural information. Seeking support and evidence as to whether there is a need to push back on this.
- There are no other symbols that look like a button.
- Open to suggestions from members.

### ➤ **IDAG Comments**

#### Current system

- Delighted to hear that the current system will still work – this is an addition or modification, rather than a replacement or alteration. Adding the touch free

option will benefit many, and IDAG is supportive – provided there are no plans to remove current features (was assured that this was the case).

- Audible indication is valuable to visually impaired, to assure that they have interacted with the system.
- Red lights help VI to locate button, especially at night for all.

### Signage

- It is imperative to have the sign to notify users of the touchless system.
- Strongly prefer the second option which includes an image. Image is more inclusive – and helps people who cannot understand written English, and is helpful reinforcement for those who do read English.
- Option 2 Cupped hand design works somewhat, as it is a pictural image which demonstrates the presence of a laser below, but with limitations:
  - o Image could be mistaken for a contactless payment system or Wi-Fi symbol. Could it be adapted to not look so much like this or be a clearer indication that is a laser sensor below the box for activation?
  - o The 'laser' sign could be upside down to indicate it is radiating from the box, rather than from the hand.
  - o Hand symbol may not look like a hand to all people.
  - o Would an arrow be a simpler or a symbol on the bottom right hand corner of the main box? (It was acknowledged that DFT don't like this.). Or on a small plate hanging down below although would need to be careful not to impede access to cone or damage the hands of VIPs feeling for the cone?
  - o Matt finish is better than gloss. Avoid red on black. Black text on yellow preferable.
  - o Suggest wording is amended to indicate clearly that activation is possible by either of the two options: Press button or wave below (people may not necessarily use a hand, it could be a stick)
  - o Wording could be misleading, instruction could be taken literally and waving in front of the button rather than touching the button.

### Observations from Cambridge

- A member has experience of them in Cambridge (local area) and noted that they have been installed in poor locations. Recommend that they are placed in areas that are not already affected by problems.
- Avoid putting poles on steps.
- Observations of users:
  - o Motor planning and habitual behaviour, people usually go for the button.
  - o Children enjoy it - could be a good or bad thing, depending on your perspective.

### Trial considerations

- More information available about where these are, raising awareness.
- What activates the laser - can any object work, or does it have to be a limb? Need to be clear about this.
- Maybe have the QR code next door rather than not on the box which links to more info?

- Best type of testing for this 'usability test', simple non bias testing and record live interaction, rather than tell them what you are testing. Keep it simple i.e. your task now is to cross the street, and monitor the interaction with the kit.
- Extend test groups for further feedback, e.g. day groups, hospitals/hospice/shopping centres.
- There are two DPOs in Richmond that could be useful

Links to studies/useful information shared by IDAG members

- Seek best practice in touchless sensor techniques currently in use in other countries. For example: US (Guardian Wave), Canada have another. Transport for New South Wales Worth benchmarking. Singapore have a microwave system, smaller trial but worth also visiting. Signage displayed is developed to overcome language barriers.
  - o <https://www.braums.com.au/news/2020/touch-less-push-buttons-put-control-back-into-the-hands-of-the-public>
  - o LTA to trial microwave-based 'touchless buttons' at 4 pedestrian crossings - CNA ([channelnewsasia.com](http://channelnewsasia.com))
  - o <https://www.coquitlam.ca/172/Walking>
  - o Guardian Wave Touchless Accessible Pedestrian Station - Traffic Safety Corp. ([xwalk.com](http://xwalk.com))

#### ➤ **TfL Comments**

- It is laser detected, by waving underneath, TfL feel signage is needed to indicate this.
- We do want to keep the sign as small and as non-wordy as we can. Welsh signs can be large.
- Welcomed the input from IDAG which TfL colleagues can utilise when talking to DfT.
- Agree that symbol is needed and rewording of maybe sensor as well as button to be much clearer.

Follow up

- Members are willing to be involved in the trials/testing and also willing to observe the wider testing. ( [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] )

#### ➤ **Session 2: High back seats on buses - evaluation**

##### ➤ **IDAG Clarifications**

- What is the scope specifically or is it a plan to roll out to all buses?
- Do all high-backed seats have the red button on the high seat? Button easily reached without getting out of your seat.
- Will they all have handrails or grab rails to assist with standing?

### ➤ **TfL Clarifications**

- There are some buses that have the high backs, assessment and review will inform future plans. At this stage we do not know whether there will be plans to create this as a standard spec.
- The bus safety plan specifies what we need to do. Some manufacturers have started to implement. They receive a higher score for passenger safety.
- We'd like to know and understand what the benefits are of the highbacks.
- There are no plans to retro fit, but consultation might influence specifications going forward.
- Buttons are not on the back of all high-backed seats on buses.
- One of the designs has two handgrips, another design has only one. There is also at least one grip on any seat design.
- This will be useful feedback for future standards.

### ➤ **IDAG Comments**

- High backed seats are going to benefit some, but hinder others. Suggest that a mix of seating would help, as the different styles will offer different support, larger or smaller passengers will have a preference.

#### **Positives**

- High backed seats are easier to grab when making your way down the bus, and could assist those with mobility issues.
- Buttons in the seats make it easier to reach the buttons, and reduces the risks associated with standing up on the bus to push a button.
- Safer for impact situations.
- More privacy for passengers. The privacy created by the seats could be comforting to those who struggle with wide open spaces. Also, absorption of noise on the journey.
- The wide gap between the seat headrests, does make a difference to feeling less enclosed, offering a sight line and lessen anxiety.
- Could be good for rear facing, to avoid whiplash etc

#### **Negatives**

- High back seats may impact on sight lines for driver and passengers contributing to any lowered feelings of safety. Better/different lighting might be needed. Can this be assessed?
- VI personal preference to no high seats, it is more difficult to see whether seats are occupied.
- Viewpoints are important, especially for priority seats, visibility of screens and customer information. This can be measured? High back seats shouldn't block this.
- Highbacked seat might be claustrophobic for some passengers. For example, those who have a history of abuse, may struggle feeling enclosed by another passenger, particularly – perhaps – on a night bus.
- May be difficult for passengers to identify where they are on their journey.
- Hygiene aspects of high back seats, leaning on headrests, etc. Enhanced cleaning, vandalism and privacy.

#### **Other comments and observations**

- Input from drivers and BTP about safety aspects could be useful. This feeds back to customer service.
- If overall data shows that that it is safer to have the high-backed seats, then we support it.
- Silhouette of bus seats will impact on the sense of safety or not. The fact that it narrows towards the head rest helps sightlines, and improves visibility and feelings of safety.
- The location of the seats can be relevant to what works. i.e. priority seats, etc. or use of higher back for priority might make them easier to pick out, but may also block views.
- Mixture of seating as different people will respond differently.
- $\frac{3}{4}$  height seat could offer a compromise
- Lower head rest for inner seats could help to keep sight line.
- People will adapt to using the different seats
- Particularly important that there are grab rails to get into and out of seats
- Better/different lighting might be needed depending on the seating design and layout

#### Grab rails & standards

- Grab rails needed to assist getting in and out of seats, especially when bus is moving, whether low or high backed.
- From an accessibility perspective, vertical grab rails are more commonly used than handrails.
- Angled grab rails are more ergonomic – could there be a grab rail on the back of the seats? Although it was noted that any chance of impact (head) should be taken into consideration, and mitigated if possible.
- Recommend reviewing these reports. They haven't done mass passenger testing but worth reviewing:
- <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:120:0029:0039:EN:PDF>
- It is assumed that attention has already been paid to the relevant Regulations of the Economic Commission for Europe of the United Nations (UN/ECE). <https://www.testups.com/unece-regulations/> -
- Also suggest reviewing reports from rolling stock that use high back seating.

#### ➤ Tfl Comments

- Any follow up on any further information will be welcomed and contact to relevant attendees will be made.
- No specific request for any impairment for ongoing input, would welcome any suggestions and advice at this stage.
- Really useful session, grateful of the many comments and input for us to consider.

#### Follow up

- Natalie happy to lead on this going forward – and will liaise with other members of IDAG if/when required.

#### ➤ AOB

1. **Westminster City Council cycling programme**

The Chair shared the request from Westminster City Council and will share the email. This is not a TfL project and is separate to this work and time of members is not chargeable to TfL.

2. **SharePoint access**

- Issues are ongoing. IT have been invited to session on 27 June.

3. **Election and IDAG**

- National elections shouldn't affect IDAG or recruitment.

- As long as we're not presenting personal views as TfL sanctioned we're fine.

4. **Timesheets**

- Denise/Amy will circulate new time sheet. Any hours over 3.5 hours are payable at the day rate.

>2.5 Hours	2.5-3.5 hours	Daily
£75 per hour	£250	£500

5. **Recruitment**

- Amy will notify the group when recruitment goes live. Currently with legal to see if we can go live with HR. Window will be open for four weeks. All content will be shared with the group when we go live. Ad will go to all the usual groups, comms plan is ready to launch and support the recruitment campaign.

6. **EV charging event and accessibility**

- [REDACTED] attended on behalf of IDAG and gave a verbal update.

**IDAG Minutes**  
**Thursday 27 June 2024**  
**2.30pm to 4:30pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
██████████	IDAG Member (Chair)
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
Amy Edgar	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
Denise French	D&I Programme Officer
<b>Apologies</b>	
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
<b>Session: Taxi and private hire</b>	
Rachel Buck	Principal City Planner
Alina Tuerk	Head of Transport Strategy & Planning (R&F)
Henry Smith	Graduate
Amelia Williamson	Principal City Planner, Director of Transport Strategy & Policy

➤ **Welcome and Minutes of the Last Meeting**

- Chair welcomed the group and acknowledged apologies.
- Minutes of 13 June approved. Updated with regulation details.

➤ **Session: Taxi and private hire**

➤ **IDAG Clarifications**



- How will the action plan be improved, or is it new?

➤ **TfL Clarifications**

- TfL has a dual role: it is the licencing (safety, etc) and policy-influencing role to deliver on the Mayor's Transport Strategy. The ambition of 80% of journeys being green.
- Currently undertaking quantitative studies and surveys/focus groups.
- The action plan is similar to the MTS cycling action plan.
- Focusing on where we need to work with others or influence.

➤ **IDAG Comments**

**1. Are taxis and private hire vehicles meeting disabled people's needs?**

- Most important thing is to have something tangible to assist all disabled people.
- Be curious to see the demographics of the focus groups.
- Currently onus is on the driver to ensure that people can travel but it doesn't work. Customer service is not good, staff training needs to be improved.
- The behaviour of the driver is paramount.
- Great to see this come to IDAG and appreciate that you have come at a very early stage.
- The needs of wheelchair users are hugely important. You are asking the right questions.
- Side entry vehicles are often not accessible. Rear entry is better.
- With a smaller mobility chair, it is less of an issue when travelling by taxi or PH, however with a larger mobility chair it is often not possible to travel. They are not always able to be strapped or clamped down safely.
- E-taxis (LEVC) are great, although not all drivers are aware of clamps or straps, or how to use them.
- Good that a lot can travel facing forward.
- Training is needed for drivers. They could feel more able and confident to carry chair users.
- Journey begins at time of booking or obtaining transport. Difficult to engage with driver to express needs. Drivers can terminate booking when they are aware of customer disability.
- Taxis are critical to many people, for medical treatments, work commitments, etc.
- Individuals might curtail plans if they cannot gain a taxi or PH vehicle.
- Taxi card scheme – intentions are great, but it is an old system. Application process is dated.
- Occasionally, drivers abandon journeys. It can be difficult to feed back on. Motivation to report is diminishing, and customers many not aware that they can report to TfL and not just PH operators. Challenging drivers can be traumatic and there is no way of recording this or reporting it.
- If a visually impaired person (VIP) waits 30 minutes for a PH, PHO doesn't measure this. They do not know how long it takes to assist a customer or whether they decline because of a disability. If travelling solo, there is little evidence to support claims.
- Personal experience is that 99% of the time they are great (VIP, no guide dog). Usually have good disability awareness if I explain that I'm visually

impaired and I tend to feel safer in a taxi. Obviously aware of disabled people facing refusals and poor customer service from taxis but it seems to be reported less frequently than for private hire.

- In Birmingham, for example, there is an expectation that chair users are strapped down and travel backwards. It is an unpleasant experience. London doesn't routinely enforce this and it is a more pleasant experience. In Birmingham, there is a perception that the law is forcing black cab culture toward 'anything to avoid disabled passengers'.
- Many taxis are not accessible for power chairs. Huge variation in vehicle models. Power chair users may equally avoid getting a taxi.
- Would be good to reward drivers for excellent customer care rather than penalise for bad behaviour.

**2. What kinds of trips are disabled peoples likely to choose a taxi or private hire vehicle for, and why?**

- Less likely to use, don't feel as safe. Have had some good experiences but often drivers don't know their way around or have poor communication skills.
- RNIB had more complaints about private hire cars for things like refusal of guide dogs and charging extra.
- I'm out late at night.
- Have been to the hospital.
- To avoid the underground or where a bus isn't available.
- If I have luggage.
- If they are having a bad mental health day, such as feeling depressed or high levels of anxiety, and require a less stimulating or stressful journey (providing a more sensory-neutral experience).
- If travelling with older, disabled people with mobility issues.
- Some members, but not all, find Uber and private hire more comfortable and personable.
- The more restrictions and rules on how to do things, the more likely drivers are to avoid the situation and confrontation.
- Lack of trust with PHVs. Would not expect them to be able to accommodate me and mobility scooter. More faith in Hackney carriages.
- I have had only good experiences with Black Cabs from an accessibility perspective, but have solely hailed them at a taxi rank at major train stations.

**3. If a taxi or private hire vehicle is not available, would disabled peoples feel able to make these trips by an alternative transport mode, or choose not to travel?**

- It depends. For many it will be the only choice if there is no accessible alternative. Therefore, if there's no taxi / PHV, then they can't make the journey.
- They may stay at home.
- Rather than risk not being welcomed or something going wrong using a taxi and especially a PHV, I'd attempt to find an accessible public transport route.
- If public transport options were challenging, I would be very likely to drive myself within London if possible. This feels 'safer' to me and gives me control.
- In London, walking has become more stressful for me because of new infrastructure like shared space and cycle lanes. I have taken taxis to avoid

this type of street design, but it's too expensive to do regularly. I probably visit London less because of this.

- I tend to find it's not a problem in London, but outside of London I have missed events, or things I've wanted to go to, because no taxi could be booked. It's really upsetting when that happens. I don't drive and if public transport isn't an option, then a taxi / PHV is my only other means of travel if it's not in walking distance.
- Behaviour would only change if more accessible PHVs were available, and I heard fewer negative reports from disabled people who were not granted access to pre-booked PHVs.
- Increasing number of drivers and availability to increase confidence in using private hire.

#### **4 What impacts can road access schemes (such as low traffic neighbourhoods) have on disabled customers using taxis or private hire vehicles to travel?**

- 1. Can waiting times be impacted? (for example, if disabled people live in a low traffic neighbourhood)**
- 2. Do they cause an inconvenience to journeys being made?**
- 3. Do they impact a disabled people's decision to make a journey?**

- Proposals for shifting power. More monitoring, cameras, easy methods of reporting to help direct enforcement.
- Piece of the strategy that could have most impact, the ability to address the power imbalance that consumers face.
- IDAG will offer a wide range of experiences. Members can offer subgroups with particular experience and expertise.
- Can we inform you on how you will conduct this, prioritisation, the known pain points, stakeholders, innovation, the wider eco system (the Mayor's Transport Strategy), etc.
- Timings – 2025 for the launch of strategy – any idea if it's before or after Bank junction? What are the improvements for PHVs, cyclists and access.
- Be good to see the collective research to have a better sense of it.
- ██████ had many comments and will submit these in writing.

#### **➤ TfL Comments**

- Bank junction reopens spring 2025. We aim to have the plan published earlier.
- Actions will be related to the outcome of the trials and findings.
- Thank you for everything shared so far, and promise of further feedback on session.
- Positive to see that much of what has been covered here is also requested by drivers.
- A subgroup would be welcomed to dig in deeper to develop and improve accessibility.

**ACTION:** Chair to agree with members who will take the lead. They will be supported ad hoc by other members. ██████ would be very happy to be involved. ██████ happy to support but not lead.

➤ **AOB**

**1. TfL activities**

Rail fire evacuation and Webinar changing places were attended by [REDACTED]. Participants included lots of stakeholders. There was a desire to run something internally too. Lots of engineers in attendance.

**2. Bus Garage visit to view Highbacked seats on 9<sup>th</sup> July**

- [REDACTED] has agreed to visit in the afternoon. Chair asked other members if they would also volunteer and will share details on WhatsApp.

**3. Bus Awards**

[REDACTED] volunteered to attend the Bus Awards.

**4. Kings Award**

- Congratulations to [REDACTED], WeWalk has received the King's Award and he is attending a reception with The King at Windsor Castle on 9 July.

**5. Webinar on Wednesday 8th July**

- Thanks for all who have agreed to be involved.
- Amy to put together slides, [REDACTED] to do an intro, then into Q&A.
- Will work like a Teams meeting. People will raise hand or use chat function.
- Amy can control questions in chat. [REDACTED] to chair and direct questions to members.
- 17 registered so far – share list of attendees ahead of the meeting.
- 5 IDAG members attending. Log on earlier (green room).
- See IDAG members at beginning of the session our shared collective.
- Amy proposed to put together a slide deck (pack). and share with members before session. It will include an overview of what IDAG has been involved in over the last 6 months.

**IDAG Minutes**  
**Thursday 25 July 2024**  
**2.30pm to 3:30pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member (Chair)
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
Amy Edgar	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
<b>Apologies</b>	
Denise French	D&I Programme Officer
<b>Session 1: Walking Speeds</b>	
Stuart Copeland	Engineering Leader

➤ **Welcome and Minutes of the Last Meeting**

- Chair welcomed the group and acknowledged apologies.
- Minutes of 11 June approved.

➤ **Session 1: Walking Speeds**

➤ **IDAG Clarifications**

- How the countdown plays with this project?

➤ **TfL Clarifications**

- If we were to introduce this (change timings) the countdown number would be adjusted

## ➤ IDAG Comments

### Mobility

- Happy to see work underway – stress for disabled people who cannot go at the same pass as others is a huge barrier
- We have an ageing population and population of disabled people in increasing – lots of people's mobility may be changing
- If you are going to do a trial/testing – suggested to look at demographics in location e.g. crossings near a hospital – locations where we know there are large demographic of older people
- Example crossing from Southwark station to Palestra – cannot cross in one go and have to wait in the middle island with traffic going either side which can be quite scary
- If you make people wait longer you'll have a higher percentage of people needing to cross and potentially dodge traffic may increase level of incidents
- Fallen over previously to try and cross in short time – people's frustration (in cars) urges people to feel the need to cross faster and can be extremely stressful
- Scientific American study with an average of 0.8 mtr per second
- Equity of experience data needs to be collected not just incidents
- Groups of younger disabled people should be considered
- Consider tourist attraction locations – visitors might have a negative experience e.g., families crossing roads
- Crossings in London are generally quite generous compared to outside of London – people/visitors do notice it
- Infrastructure of the crossing can affect the walking speed e.g., dropped kerbs etc.
- From a VI view there has been an increase in removal of railings which has been a huge barrier – it felt safer which the railings
- This has changed the way people have used crossings

### Visually impaired

- Countdown is really useful if you can see it
- Those who are unable to see the green man and countdown have different stresses to face
- There are groups that may prefer zebras
- RNIB research showed there wasn't enough time to cross
- Consistent feedback was crossing times
- Lots of older people may have Visual impairments and mobility impairments
- Crossing with not enough time can cause a lot of anxiety
- Consider those with invisible conditions e.g., visually impaired but not a cane user
- It might be useful also to look at other people's behaviours, so.
- In America, and places like Germany, there is a culture of not crossing the road until the green light says it's safe.

### Data

- Years of research on this – one paper looks at over 1000 peoples walking speed. There's lots of data – would advise to take the time to collect this data

- Flow of crowds need to be considered in walking in speed e.g., funnel/bottlenecks and sudden stops in walking
- Esther reference data – check as connection dropped
- Happy to support with case studies to help business case
- Need more data on the impact of people having to wait longer if ped speed is increased
- Safety of pedestrians should be paramount

Links shared:

<https://ukdataservice.ac.uk/case-study/crossing-the-road-in-time-finding-the-right-pace-for-older-adults/>

➤ **TfL Comments**

- We were specifically looking for data at crossings
- Using case studies to support the business case would be useful
- Interested in trade off between pedestrians waiting longer to cross (potentially waiting nearby cars, emissions etc)

**Action: IDAG members happy to provide case studies – Denise to pick up with Stuart.**

➤ **AOB**

1. Amy updated on recruitment almost 200 applications shortlisted down to 16
2. Amy updated on Accessibility Interchange Scheme – currently 4 senior managers interested.
3. Looking for more IDAG members for site visit to Bank to look at the SFA route – [REDACTED] volunteered.

**IDAG Minutes**  
**Thursday 8 August 2024**  
**2.30pm to 3:30pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
██████████	IDAG Member (Chair)
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG member
Amy Edgar	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
<b>Apologies</b>	
Denise French	D&I Programme Officer
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
<b>Session 1: Silvertown and Blackwall Tunnels User Charge - Consultation</b>	
Jordan Johnson, Seema Kaler	City Planning

➤ **Welcome and Minutes of the Last Meeting**

- Chair welcomed the group and acknowledged apologies.
- Minutes of 25 July approved.

➤ **Session 1: Silvertown and Blackwall Tunnels User Charge - Consultation**

➤ **IDAG Clarifications**

- Shuttle for cyclists – is it just for cyclists?
- Blue badge discounts– does it need to be London registered?
- Could people with EU/Ireland Blue Badge register?

➤ **TfL Clarifications**

- Shuttle will be just for cycles – without access to relevant documentation during the meeting - it was thought there would be approx.6 per hour



- Proposals on shuttle will come out later in the year – another team will be leading on this
- People that aren't cycling would have buses as an alternative – 21 per hour
- Don't have to be a London resident to benefit from the Blue Badge discount/exemption. All Blue Badge holders will need to register it for road user charging account
- Clarified how the NHS staff/patient discount worked – agreement that it's important to make this information as clear as possible.

## ➤ IDAG Comments

### Comms

- Have you thought about signage and communication methods and how you will communicate to tunnel users? Dartford charge may have historic data as to what worked well from a comms perspective.

### PIP and free bus pass criteria

- Have you fully thought through lower rate mobility PIP? Some may have a disability and receive PIP but not have a Blue Badge [pip\\_descriptors.pdf](#) ([ctfassets.net](#))
- Consider criteria of those that are entitled to a free bus pass
- Did you consider adding people who have a disability benefit and pensioners who don't have a blue badge
- There currently isn't a provision for some who may be relying on the benefits

### Blue Badge

- Blue badge handbook? – not sure if this still exists but it used to be sent to new blue badge user with information about where you need to register for exemptions – should ensure that this scheme is included.

### Impact of charge

- When the CC started PHV were refusing service because they don't want to pay the charge – apps don't make concessions for those who really rely on taxis
- Need to be conscious of people in the area and low-income groups and how they could be impacted – potential increase in general costs in the area
- Auto pay isn't easiest to use – different prices?
- If you accidentally drove through the tunnel – consider first offender concession?
- What was the rationale of a time limited discount?

### Care

- Carers who may not be registered – could be an extremely expensive added cost
- Social care – problem in some areas – if someone is running errands and helping a disabled person – it would be easier if there was an exemption
- Problem with social care wages – limits people be able to make necessary visits

- IDAG strongly recommended speaking to local social services to check they will be considering how such payments will be covered

#### TfL response

- Will check on EU and Ireland
- We can be clearer with the comms about blue badge and all exemptions – we will talk to marketing to make sure this is factored in
- We looked at data from DWP – lots of overlap between benefit types – the ones we've suggested
- Happy to look at other benefits type
- NHS patients – need to be undergoing certain types of treatment – you pay and then claim it back through the hospital
- NHS staff – transporting medical equipment etc. Same as congestion charge – [How to claim a reimbursement of the ULEZ charge and/or Congestion Charge for eligible NHS patients \(tfl.gov.uk\)](#)

#### ➤ AOB

- Reminder on Rotherhithe Tunnel Evacuation Exercise (2 September 2024) – if anyone interested in taking part please get back to me by next Monday the latest. [REDACTED] can attend, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are checking logistics
- We are currently updating our Understanding our diverse communities document and looking for 1-2 IDAG members to be part of the review group – this will start in September – [REDACTED]
- The consultation team are updating their stakeholder list – they currently have 4 IDAG members on there – I wanted to know if all IDAG members want to be on this list? Note responding to consultations would not be on 'IDAG time' – all members.
- Recruitment – interviewing 14 candidates for the first round of interviews

## IDAG Minutes

Thursday 5 September 2024

14:30 – 16:30

<b>Attendees</b>	
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member (Chair)
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
Amy Edgar	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
<b>Apologies</b>	
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
Denise French	Customer D&I Programme Officer
<b>Session 1 - Elizabeth Line safety mitigations</b>	
Jon Hunter	Design Lead TfL
Lawrence Dutton	Project Manager (MTREL)
Nicola Abbott	Customer Experience (MTREL)
[REDACTED]	MTR
<b>Session 2: Priority seating week 2024</b>	
Emma Bartlett	Apprentice
Sabrina Mohit	Customer Experience Manager
Tuanni Marshall	Social Media Content Manager
Audrey Bowerman	DLR
Kathryn Jones	Customer Experience Lead

### Welcome and Minutes of the Last Meeting

- Chair welcomed the group and acknowledged apologies.
- Minutes of 8 August and 22 August were signed off

## Session 1: Elizabeth Line safety mitigations

### ➤ IDAG Clarification Questions

- Have any of the accidents been manual wheelchair users?
- Do the locations/stations have SFA via the lift and if the lift is broken what are the alternative routes
- Do you have any priority for disabled people with luggage
- Policy for manual wheelchair users to use escalators, will the barriers stop them? – this info needs to be briefed to staff
- Slides mention 'likely' signpost to nearest lift – this should be vital

### ➤ TfL Clarifications

- No specific accident with wheelchair users – but some evidence of staff having to stop wheelchair users using escalators
- Two lifts go to concourse – platform – staff members present – if there was a situation where priority was needed
- If wheelchair user wanted to use the escalators there is an area they will be able to access through tensor barriers
- Agree on vital signage – awaiting final artwork
- Large amount of signage to the lift already installed – we will look at additional signage including floor markings – top and bottom of escalators

Action: Amy to share policy on manual wheelchair users using escalators

### ➤ IDAG Comments

#### Signage/Colour/Contrast

- As a VI person these barriers can be difficult – due to the colours – grey and black – colours all blend into one
- Slide 5 – looks very different with the TfL blue and clear red 'no' sign – silver is still difficult against the grey but the additional artwork/colour is welcome
- Slide 8 – black nylon – not appropriate
- Shining a light meter you will get a good idea of contrast but that will reflect the reality of the experience for someone with a visual experience as eyes & brains work differently from light meters.
- Also need to be aware that black can be mistaken for holes/a sign of absence – not just VI people – people who are neurodivergent, or have dementia etc.
- We know red and yellow are warning/danger signs – eyes and brains are trained to recognise this
- Happy to send over the research on hue and chroma
- As this is a trial, what are the variables being measured? Are we only measuring reduced accidents on elevators (which would likely need a more longitudinal trial) or immediate customer reactions to the barriers? There are multiple variables to measure and it would be good to prioritise and define success.

- Do check with other places like airports that already have these installed! What has their feedback been like?
- Image of pushchair – looks like an electric wheelchair – confusing
- There is a standardised image/symbol for a buggy
- Electric wheelchair image fine but not manual wheelchair – we shouldn't be excluding people who choose and may have trained to use escalators
- Risk level is different to usual average situation – want to be aiming for something visible as possible – safety issue
- TfL standard doesn't distinguish – talks about general contrast not in context of critical safety
- You want people to know in advance – once they're at the barrier it might be too late

### **Trial**

- Please also consider staff input in the trial.
- Week seems very short and question on time of year, why December?

### **Capacity/extra demand for lift**

- Increasing the flow of people to the lifts – extra capacity – waiting for lifts that are in high demand – if you're a disabled commuter we are forced into conflict with people with luggage
- Welcome signage about giving way to people
- Helpful to record where it works well to support the evaluation process
- Curious to know more about the modelling and how long?
- People will affect most with invisible conditions who could use the escalator without the barriers – need priority to lift
- May need more staff assistance – staff to have awareness of sunflower lanyard
- Suggestion - on slide 9 using an image of wheelchair user shouldn't be used
- Wheelchair users having to wait for lift even longer may be more likely to use escalators (for those that do)

### **Design**

- Barriers look like they are at a slight angle? May affect people who are unsteady
- No mention in slides about those with a mobility impairment but are walking – long/short term disability – might be unfamiliar and create a potential new barrier
- Is there a reason for the height – would like to know if it could be made higher? Less chance of tripping/could be used as a grab pole
- Could the tensile barrier be changed to a 'priority barrier' with the same imaging as priority seating; particularly targeting pregnant people, people with mobility impairments, older people etc.; anyone for whom the barrier is challenging, but who do not have luggage. Obviously, that would rely on that having staffing, and clearly that staff member must be able to ensure that people with luggage

are not allowed through. That signage may also be useful around priority lift usage.

➤ **TfL Comments**

- The design is currently being produced by MTR – criteria and clear guidance on contrast – we will do our best to go beyond the minimum – better than standard
- Colour is currently black (not blue) but can be changed
- We need to be open to achieve the best design
- We can change the banding colour to meet contrast standards
- We will be looking at colour and contrast – make sure that all forms of vision are aware of them
- We are doing one mass rollout
- Already seeing expected levels before barriers go in and managing this effectively
- We will be closely looking at illumination levels on the signage and barriers themselves.
- Measure of success – reduce accidents on escalators – mainly luggage items we're concerned about
- Would be good to arrange a site visit with IDAG members

**Session 2: Priority Seating Week 2024**

➤ **IDAG Clarification Questions**

- What is the timing? Is there going to be a legacy project? Are any aspects going to continue?
- Language around please offer your seat – has this been reviewed?

**TfL comments**

- PSW runs every year – usually April but moved due to pre-election
- Marketing campaigns are ongoing but increased during PSW
- Lots of outcomes of the research will influence future improvements to priority seating which are out of scope for the week itself.
- We will be reviewing the language – would welcome feedback from IDAG at the appropriate juncture.

➤ **IDAG Comments**

**Social media creative concepts**

- Best engagement is when viewer learn something from the video
- Such great data from the report – real life information will stick with people – may create conversation
- Content was confusing – create negative interaction with the viewer
- VI people cannot 'look up' to give up their seat/ and may need a seat themselves– be careful when creating comedic content that could potentially highlight this be a negative impact

- Research actually highlights that the number of people giving up their seats is better than some might think
- Campaigning on a positive message can be hard to get across but can be effective – carries people along
- Giving them the facts/data and education – capitalise on good news
- Love the travel kind campaign – upbeat and proud
- Sharing stats might incentivised people to get the percentage higher

### **Stakeholders**

- Inclusive transport forum and youth panel
- RNIB/We Walk – happy to echo message to communities – happy to share marketing contacts

### **Competition**

- Love the idea especially for that age range to ingrain the message at that age
- Great idea – use similar idea at imperial and it's really engaging
- People who are older too – not an age problem – would love to see age by age competition
- Good to know where the posters will be shared

### **Signage on DLR trains**

- IDAG happy with overall approach
- How are we measuring the effectiveness of the signage?
- Signage to be outside the window as well for customers to see as they are getting on
- Transport for Wales – included image of a person with an assistance dog
- Description comes second – e.g. action 1: no luggage here descriptor: this is a wheelchair space

### **Slide 7**

- Floor stickers good for people looking at phones – lots of multiple smaller ones so they are easier to spot .
- Floor stickers needs to contrast to the flooring
- VI person can find it easier to follow things on the floor
- KPIs for PSW?

### **➤ TfL comments**

- Winning poster to be in stations and shared on socials
- Announcing winners on IDPWD 3 December
- Struggling how we will measure the effectiveness – we will observe during PSW
- KPIs will be based on social media engagement
- Feedback from competition

### **AOB**

- PSW poster competition – [REDACTED]





## IDAG Minutes

Thursday 19 September 2024

14:30 – 16:30

<b>Attendees</b>	
██████████	IDAG Member (Chair)
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
Denise French	Customer D&I Programme Officer
Amy Edgar	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
<b>Apologies</b>	
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
██████████	IDAG Member
<b>Session 1 - Progress of central line works</b>	
Mei Sun Ho	Principal Sponsor
Sam McDonough	Senior project manager
Scott Butcher	SEL Vehicles
Ivan Gwynn	Lead Sponsor
Claire Dilnot-Smith	
<b>Session 2: Pedestrian crossing and side road junction research</b>	
Lucy Marstrand-Taussig	Principal Technical Specialist

### Welcome and Minutes of the Last Meeting

- Chair welcomed the group and acknowledged apologies.
- Minutes of 5 September approved (subject to clarification of wheelchair use on escalators)
- Recruitment update, three people have been appointed to IDAG, will share details at next meeting.

## Session 1: Progress of central line works

### ➤ IDAG Clarification Questions

- Are screens positioned so everyone can see them? People in priority seats or wheelchair spaces may not be able to move to see the screens.
- Why is flooring covering cost prohibitive when it is useful for wheelchair space/manoeuvring?
- Are photos an accurate representation, priority seats appear to be a good contrast to the standard seats? (TfL to clarify with VIP specialists not present).
- Will there be a large sign on the side panel above the space to clearly define that the area is for a wheelchair and not luggage or cycles?
- VIP members would be best to answer questions on slide 7.
- May IDAG see a photograph of signage (stickers) on emergency buttons to differentiate from the other train features, such as grab rail and emergency buttons? These will be shared with VIP colleagues not present. (ACTION) .

### ➤ TfL Clarifications

- Screens are positioned that the maximum number of people can view them. If people are seated, standing people may block the view.
- Happy to demonstrate clearly and visually the positioning. Announcements will also accompany content displayed on screens.
- Floor covering is expensive due to requirements needed to satisfy slip and fire regulations for deep tube. Deep tube fire regs are far more stringent than surface and non-deep tube. Material used on the latter do not meet performance requirements. It's not possible to paint over existing. Replacement would be necessary; this significant change would be hugely expensive.
- Signage is as big as possible, to make it clear it is a wheelchair space, however there is nothing to say that luggage or cycles cannot be placed into the place.

### ➤ IDAG Comments

- Super useful and detailed slide deck
- All agreed on the recommendations and feedback detailed on slides 2, 4 and 5.
- Understood the expense associated with adjusting the flooring and that comparisons or lessons learnt from other rolling stock may not offer solutions for deep tube. It is however such a useful function, and should be factored into new deep tube projects when practicable.
- The reasons for not opting to change flooring should be clearly documented within the EQIA and other documentation.
- It is worth noting that TfW discovered that you cannot change existing signage due to the need to comply with current regulations, but you can supplement it. Signage should help people to register that the space is for

- wheelchairs and not luggage, or cycles. ie freedom to add rather than change.
- An example of TfW wording will be shared post meeting (ACTION – completed Appendix A)
- We will consult with VIP about contrast on rails, stickers and seating. The photos you provide will be shared with them for feedback (ACTION – Forward to ██████ for comment).

➤ **TfL Comments**

- Handrails were discussed at last meeting, noted at that meeting that ‘Red’ was a preferred colour for rails in this instance.
- Further feedback from VIP members and wording from TfW welcomed
- Recommendation to documenting decisions to not change flooring welcomed.

**Session 1 Actions recap**

- Pre-read material to be shared with absent IDAG members to request VIP feedback on slide 7
- IDAG to share example of TfW wording for wheelchair space (completed appendix A)
- TfL to forward deck to IDAG members to comment on contrast on rails, stickers and seating, including TFW wording

**Session 2: Pedestrian crossing and side road junction research**

**Research Question A: Pedestrian and motor interaction focus, are cyclist and scooters to be included, they are a concern?**

➤ **IDAG Clarification Questions**

- How do you plan to control for confounding variables? There will be a significant number of external factors that could influence the findings, and it may be that another factor explains any differences in injury rate found between crossing types.
- Can factors such as traffic load, number of lanes, dual carriageways, lighting, and population density be controlled for?
- Is it possible to assess the risk of colourful crossings within the analysis? If it is not possible to segment the data in this way, then perhaps the qualitative interviews could ask about pedestrians’ experience of colourful crossings.
- Where does the Casualty data come from?
- Many cycle collisions are not reported. There may be a public perception that it is more difficult to trace the rider, compared to a car driver, hence leading to underreporting?
- Do people have to die within 28 days of the incident to be included in the statistics?

➤ **TfL Clarifications**

- There are a high levels of hit and run by motorists and it's not always possible to identify via CCTV. Many are reported even slight injuries. We can provide more data. Research would have to happen to ascertain whether cyclist collisions are recorded less than motor collisions.
- It is not known whether fatalities are recorded up to 28 days after the incident, this will need to be checked.
- Lots of video analysis is needed, ideally at least 20 of each type of crossing, to effectively measure incidents.
- The longer the cameras are up and the more that are in operation, the more effective the outcomes. We ideally want an equal number for each type of crossing, but this will depend on budget constraints.
- Number of interactions is the main focus; we will need enough pedestrians to use the crossing. We will use a selection of representative busy crossings that are recommended to us.
- We want to limit the variables, suggested 20 mph roads, London has many and will keep data robust.
- Research on colourful crossing is in progress, but it is not part of this analysis.
- Data comes from the people. We are aware that some go directly to hospital and also that there are a high percentage are not reported/recorded at all. They are listed as slight, significant and fatality. Significant can lead to fatality. It's unfortunate not to have a full picture.

## **Research Question B: What level of service do the different crossings provide?**

### **➤ IDAG Clarification Questions**

- The data from the first question would not be able to assess near misses. Would it be possible to use the video data collection to assess any difference in rate of near misses?

### **➤ TfL Clarifications**

- There will be two bits of data we will be assessing. There will be collisions recorded. But observational data will include and measure near misses.

## **➤ Research Question C: How do different protected groups experience different crossing types?**

### **➤ IDAG Clarification Questions**

- By "on site" do you mean that the interviews will be carried out at crossings? If not, it would be helpful to observe participants crossing each type of crossing, and then conduct interviews afterwards about 1) that

- particular experience, and 2) their experience of crossings more generally. On the spot responses and fresh focus on unconscious behaviour.
- Staggered crossings – wheelchair and buggy users have to use the dropped curb. Foot pedestrians tend to cut across the path of wheelchair users. The onus is placed on the wheelchair users to avoid the pedestrian, causing a lengthier crossing for them. Junctions are not designed for every user (Euston Road is a good example).
  - Observed behaviours may be misunderstood or judged differently, as something someone chooses to do, rather than is forced to do, or feel safer doing.
  - When does the tender go out? (TfL to confirm – ACTION)

#### ➤ TfL Clarifications

- Staggered crossings are a result of over engineering and prioritising traffic flow and disadvantages those who need to use the dropped kerb.
- It would be great to have wheelchair or mobility chair users in the focus group. Staggered crossings may be limited on two lane roads.
- Onsite interviews at crossings depend on tender results and methods of research proposed. Agreed that focus group might not give as rich data.
- The casualty data will include motors, cycles, and scooters interactions will be included. The term 'driver' is used in the wider sense.
- It could be useful to have IDAG involved in the research process as it progresses. (IDAG appreciated that the presenters were currently at the scoping stage.)
- Observations may be conducted by AI and recorded as data rather than judgment on decisions or chosen behaviour.

#### ➤ IDAG Comments

- [REDACTED] will be forwarding comments and feedback from RNIB post meeting.
- Please check if there are in fact any staggered crossings on two lane roads; most seem to be on four/six lane roads.
- IDAG will be willing to support offline and it can be brought back to the group. If people are available to support.

#### ➤ TfL Comments

- IDAG input would be welcomed during the research and process. Tenders will be written submissions from approved supplier pool.
- Appreciate that staggered islands are usually on wider roads. We will consider this observation.
- To speak to Amy to take forward any further liaison with IDAG. ACTION

### Session 2 Actions recap

- IDAG – seek further comment from RNIB ([REDACTED]) and share with TfL
- TfL – to confirm when tender is issued.

- TfL to arrange meeting with Amy to discuss further IDAG involvement in research.

## **AOB**

New WhatsApp group was set up for use for emergencies and work focus. Agreed to remove Amy now and should an emergency situation arise members can contact Amy directly or she can be added back in the group.

## Appendix A

Example of Transport for Wales signage in Wheelchair space.



## IDAG Minutes

Thursday 3 October 2024

14:30 – 16:30

<b>Attendees</b>	
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member (Chair)
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
Denise French	Customer D&I Programme Officer
Amy Edgar	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
<b>Apologies</b>	
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
<b>Session 1 - IDAG Meeting: micro mobility enforcement</b>	
Conor Brady	New Mobility
Tim Herbert	Op Policy & Analysis Tasking
Becky Upfold	New Mobility
Chris Plummer	New Mobility
Elizabeth Gaden	Sponsored Services Shared Resources
<b>Session 2:</b> [REDACTED]	
Benjamin Litterick	LU Major Projects

### Welcome and Minutes of the Last Meeting

- Chair welcomed the group and acknowledged apologies.
- Minutes of 19 September agreed.

### Session 1: Micro mobility enforcement

#### ➤ IDAG Clarification Questions

- Slide 4 – current enforcement. Confirmed that TfL has no control over items left on land not owned by TfL.



- No reference to dockless that are not ebikes, is this because the current dockless is only ebikes? Should we be prepared if they are reintroduced? Santander bikes are also heavy and difficult to move. Is there the flexibility to respond in the future?
- Are we moving to a more rigorous method of enforcement because the soft touch hasn't worked? How will the enforcement be delivered? What are the resources, can the public be involved in reporting?
- Will there be an attempt to foster a cross-borough London enforcement? Public do not know the difference between land that is or is not owned by TfL. Any thoughts on the distinction and how things will work in practice?
- What did the operators push/start hack solve?
- Learning from the past. Larger organisations continued despite the enforcement because they could afford to replace A boards, tables etc., small business suffered more. Is Enforcement sufficient enough, i.e. a nuisance for businesses or a real deterrent?
- Should users of bikes and scooters also be penalised? Education of users? What about geo-tracking to cut usage?

➤ **TfL Clarifications**

- We are currently talking about TLRN and TfL private land. TLRN is the highway network, TfL is land around a station, depot, space outside emergency exits.
- Number of users has grown rapidly, and how we enforce and engage with operators need to be reviewed. Efforts need to be focussed particularly on footways and access routes (stations, private land, public transport).
- Enforcement has focused on static things placed temporarily, without permission, such as advising boards, tables, and chairs (café) which can be obstructive.
- There are no current dockless non-electric. We are focussing only on ebike, specifically rental. They are heavy, difficult to move and larger than ordinary bikes. If dockless non-ebike hire was reintroduced, we'd need to revisit.
- A London wide approach aims to create a more consistent micro mobility landscape across London. This enforcement approach is because the mode has become so popular it has been difficult to keep up with the growth.
- Public engagement: i.e. 'Fix My Street' approach, where people can upload pictures, will still be available.
- Engagement with operators will be critical as they will need to instruct their users on behaviour and how to use.
- Resources: still being worked on. Likely to be existing uniformed officers, who enforce laws on obstructions. Primary role is to capture evidence, notes and photos. There may be opportunities to use CCTV and other means. In the event of court action, it's advantageous to have reports from trained teams. There may be a possibility of public reporting, photographic evidence and written statements are extremely useful.
- Geofencing may be an option. All ebikes will have a GPS for tracking and know what land it is on. Have publicly accessible maps to inform where they can be used/left that can be shared with users.

- Bike unsolicited use, a fix was found for one operator, but there is another issue being circulated on Tik-Tok.
- There are two key e-bike operators i.e. a small number of businesses. When it comes to expectation of deterrent, this feeds into the bigger picture of monitoring and responding approach. We are at early stages, and we will continually monitor and review and after a year we may be in a better place to report and EqIA.
- Operators can monitor location via tracking. They should be taking the right measures to rectify and move the obstruction. Monitoring how they respond to this in the first few months, and review next year.

➤ **IDAG Comments**

- Presentation is very informative.
- IDAG is in favour of enforcement. Members support the approach outlined.
- Understand that this is at an early stage, and TfL is piloting this approach to enforcement. However, IDAG is keen on the sharing and learning aspect and a ripple effect being seen across London boroughs.
- Operators have the power to engage with users and implement options to control use.
- Passing on the responsibility onto the operators makes complete sense. Maybe use of 'carrots', similar to PSW, will encourage good use by the public, especially young people? Incentivise rather than penalise. TfL for the soft messaging, operators for the hardline.
- Engagement with the Youth Panel is a great idea, it will help both operators and the public, which could bleed into awareness of street furniture in general. Educating behaviour may have greater tendency for funding and resources.
- Buses are never fully accessible. But could say, for example, wheelchair-accessible buses.

➤ **TfL Comments**

- Support acknowledged.
- We will check our terminology and ensure we use the correct language.
- Social media messaging will be reviewed.
- We will be engaging with youth groups (TfL Youth Panel) for guidance on how to build awareness.
- Appreciate the feedback and comments from members to help us understand and shape our plans.

Session 2: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**AOB**

- Colourful crossings
  - IDAG are supportive of TfL's decision.
  - Agnes recently reviewed EQiA
- ITF
  - [REDACTED] to represent, thanks to [REDACTED] for volunteering.
- 1:1s – members to complete poll if not already done: Completed.
- Rotherhithe tunnel visit for evacuation exercise.
  - [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to feedback to organisers to highlight IDAG advise.
  - Advice is probably more likely to be relevant to Silvertown project, there are elements that cannot be changed at Rotherhithe.
- Denise to combine Tracker EqIA drop box and sharepoint details.

- Law firm support – outside of IDAG, re incident on Glasgow Underground.
  - [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] to lead and make first contact to determine support required and take forward outside of IDAG. Denise to link up (ACTION)
- Members to email ideas for icebreakers for the AwayDay - to [REDACTED].
  - Timings to start at 10.30 to 16:30, ([REDACTED] may need to leave a little earlier due to train times. Guest speakers to join earlier sessions).
  - [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] have held 2-3pm in diary.
  - Amy will share info on new members shortly

## IDAG Minutes

Thursday 17 October 2024

14:30 – 16:30

<b>Attendees</b>	
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member (Chair)
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
Denise French	Customer D&I Programme Officer
Amy Edgar	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
<b>Apologies</b>	
[REDACTED]	IDAG Member
<b>Session 1 - Emergency Voice Communications project</b>	
Robbie Allen	Assistant Project Manager, CDS PMs
Jamie Boyd	SRC Infrastructure Senior Engineer (lead) (Fire Engineer)
Ernie Jarvis	SRC Infrastructure Senior Engineer
Matt Hutsun	Project Manager, CDS PMs
Barry West	SRC Infrastructure Senior Engineer
<b>Session 2: Guidance for disabled taxi drivers</b>	
Darren Crowson	Policy Manager, TPH
Daniela Craciun	Licensing Admin Officer

### Welcome and Minutes of the Last Meeting

- Chair welcomed the group and acknowledged apologies.
- Minutes of 3 October agreed.

### Session 1: Emergency Voice Communications project

### ➤ IDAG Clarification Questions

- What are the access challenges for the current designs of auto phones?
- What is the repositioning mentioned on slide 9?
- Who are the internal stakeholders – does it include disabled members?
- PRMs terminology is okay for engineers but requires clarification, do you mean only people of reduced mobility or do you mean others who might have assistance dogs, etc?
- Can you confirm that this is only about emergency help points within stations, in addition to whatever is front of house, and they will only be used if there is an emergency and provide an area for someone to wait within a refuge site?
- How many are being installed?
- Is there a dedicated person on each platform, who deals with the emergency?
- How did you come to decide to use help points?
- How do you anticipate linking with people who cannot speak to communicate and receive communication?
- How can we reassure a user that they have been heard, a flashing light for deaf passengers, or those without speech?
- Is there a screen showing near the emergency point?
- Is there going to be illuminated and unilluminated signage, will this be on the floor or wall, and how often is it repeated?

### ➤ TfL Clarifications

- Auto phones access challenges: the original assets for this scenario, they are hard to use (for staff also) and initiated the review. Everyone needed more accessible means to communicate in an emergency.
- The project team recently undertook further surveys and Jamie has produced some blanket statements to add.
- PRM is a broad statement that includes anyone from persons in wheelchairs, mothers with prams, someone with visible and invisible disabilities, or mobility restrictions. It is used widely in engineering terms, we use it for consistency across the business and is used in our Engineering standards.
- Internal stakeholders = wider fire engineering team, ops team (oversees staff and operatives), and customer experience teams (signage advice) network contingency planning, for different scenarios.
- There are no disabled stake holders, and no group currently exists. We are pushing for this. Stakeholders includes fire service, to ensure standards are applied, they are the only external entity we have consulted with.
- Slide 9 – front of house help points: lays outside of our scope, we are trying to cover the process from platform to refuge. A space for them to engage with the equipment. Requirements are for people to be in a protected space within 4 minutes. Anything that isn't within a protected space is out of scope. i.e. a help point on an exposed platform. Area must be fire protected and safe to use.
- The improvements are specifically for the refuge areas. We will be enhancing existing facilities in lobbies, where lifts are currently used as passenger lifts, and there are a few 'back of house' lifts where we are installing new facilities.
- There will be escape route dedicated evacuation lifts. Some are accessible through escape doors; some will double up as customer lifts.

- About three lifts within eight stations are currently passenger evacuation lifts and are utilised by passengers at front of house locations. We are ensuring that every lobby to these lifts has an EVC/help point, and an EVC in the lobby at every floor.
- Primary evacuation, ensuring that everyone has an evacuation or escape route. There would be a dedicated person,
- Help points have an emergency button – alert goes to staff in station control centre, if call unanswered it auto redirects to LU central response centre (emergency scenarios), it will also connect to emergency response services (fire services).
- Some passenger help points have a ‘fire button’ also if they push the green emergency button, members of staff have sight of the person who has activated.
- Customer familiarity decided the location and type of help point. Part of our CAT1 standards require us to have the pill-shaped PHP in any front of house locations. Green boxes are familiar, but we wanted to maintain consistency by using smaller pill shaped PHPs.
- There will be clear marking of safe areas and cctv coverage. The person in the control room will be able to see the customer who has activated. Refuge points will have signage specific to emergency refuge point. Lighting above will also trigger in an emergency.
- Some areas have T loops, but this does need to be address by operations or network contingency. This is important and useful feedback, beneficial for us to take to the relevant teams.
- Signage above the refuge points say CCTV is in action, but there are no screens at the moment, just two-way verbal communications.
- We can certainly look at producing signage within EVC points that would be suitable and reassuring hearing impaired passengers, and to avoid possible information overload or confusion which could be caused by too much signage or information.
- Repeater signage, non-illuminated, will be at approximately 1.18m on the walls. Illuminated signage will be every 15 metres, determined by route or station whether it is wall or floor. We cannot say how many there are and it does vary between stations and the varied routes.

#### ➤ **IDAG Comments**

- We are really pleased that you are taking steps to make stations more accessible although we do have some observations as to how you could make them even more inclusive and accessible.
- Communications need to go beyond verbal. Different groups require different means and require multiple ways of reassurance, e.g. for hearing impaired a light switching from red to green to indicate staff awareness of passenger location and that help is coming.
- Need to focus on key information, avoid information overload.
- If a person needs to use a refuge point this is usually due to a disability.



- Sharing experience of recent evacuation exercises - there are studies of signage for VIP. Photo luminescent signage slows passengers, bright luminescent or led signage can be useful for VIP.
- Ceiling signage appears very high, consider placing the same height as the EVC and do not require VIP passengers to look or reach above the help point itself. Also consider using VAD (Visual alarm devices), especially visible under the effects of smoke for hearing impaired and tactile signage – braille is useful - 499 stipulates this.
- It is good that you are using repeater signage. Highly recommend use of LED lit, uniform signage. A 1999 study of 7 different types of emergency lighting, simulating different types of signage and walking performance of users: [Emergency lighting and wayfinding provision systems for visually impaired people: Phase of a study - M.S. Wrigbt, G.K. Cook, G M B Webber, 1999 \(sagepub.com\)](#)
- Power assisted doors often fail in an emergency scenario. Studies have shown that there needs to be an easy way for disabled people to open doors in the event of power failure. The force needed to open doors should be less than 60 newtons.
- Ensure any videos you are planning are fully accessible, audio descriptions, captions, etc.
- The ideas are great and good to see this being reviewed.
- With earlier involvement we may not have recommended using help points due to the perception that they are notoriously unreliable, reports are available on performance. Confidence needs to be gained that these are going to work.
- It needs to be distinguished that these particular help points are different and dependable. In an evacuation situation passengers may assume that the help point would be to report an emergency, not to raise awareness of the need for assistance.
- Refuge points need to be fully accessible (including turning space) and no barriers to buttons (i.e. bars or columns). An example of inaccessible is the secondary Westminster refuge point, positioned on a corner.
- Definition of PRMs s being phased out for a reason- it isn't always a helpful acronym. For example, it does not include the full spectrum of disabled people such as those with non-visible disabilities. Buggies, etc are not usually PRM classified. Need to be sure that everyone understands what you mean by PRM.
- External stakeholders are key to getting the message out about the changes in evacuations. IDAG can give you contacts of organisations that can assist outside of TfL, i.e. RNIB, AGUK, TPT, etc.
- Contact Denise / Amy to continue offline and [REDACTED] for further discussions about signage.

#### ➤ TfL Comments

- The two-way communication beyond verbal and acknowledgement that staff are aware and are responding is something that does need to be addressed.
- Information points do include a sign that CCTV is active, but acknowledge that this does not address the non-verbal communication. This is something we can

look at and work with you to improve signage to cover a broader disabilities including VIP, neurodivergent people and people with dementia.

- TfL to review language use to cover disability.
- Any suggestions welcome to help with customer experience and familiarity of the help/assistance points.
- Next steps outside of this meeting.

## **Session 2: Guidance for disabled taxi drivers**

### **➤ IDAG Clarification Questions**

- Would be interesting to understand the purpose of the guidance, what is the objective: encourage diversity, support them to overcome barriers?
- Language needs to be more open and supportive; it sounds quite legal. Unless this is the intention? Is it early stages?
- How many taxi drivers on your books have adapted vehicles?
- What information have you used from your groups to feed into your documents?
- Thinking of a disabled driver who is unable to assist a disabled passenger, how could you navigate this? Do these people get exemptions of the need to assist? There is a possible conflict here in relation to legal requirements.

### **➤ TfL Clarifications**

- This is an attempt to clarify the situation. Original links from website have dropped away, and resources aren't readily available.
- The purpose is guidance for drivers plus attracting more diversity. The ways people engage with us have changed. The guide we hope will help drivers gain confidence to report issues, support them and give them courses for action.
- There was an employment tribunal recently between TfL and a taxi driver, and there was no policy document. It was unusual because TfL do not directly employ drivers.
- We have no record of drivers with adaptive vehicles - we have only engaged with those that have come to us.
- The document has not been shared with the groups listed in the pre-read material.
- There are drivers who are exempt, and drivers can apply to TfL for that. They will have to evidence that they can present to passengers. They could still join ComCab or Taxi Card however it would restrict assistance.
- Has this been through legal yet? TfL is a service provider? Clarity on reasonable adjustments.

### **➤ IDAG Comments**

- It is a good document as it stands, but further development will make it more useful to drivers.

- The tone of the guide could be perceived as quite intimidating and doesn't encourage engagement. It currently reads like a legal document, and these are required records. This format could be discouraging prospective and current drivers in sharing their disability, or changes in their health which mean they might benefit from adaptations. Would TPH allow them/encourage them to share this information? Drivers need to be confident that the process will protect them which improves their safety and the safety of passengers. Could build driver network to support each other – like an employee network.
- Too focused on exemptions rather than inclusions.
- Existing drivers should also be aware of this guidance, that there is support out there for them if and when they need it.
- A high percentage of accidents occur with older drivers who have AMD or glaucoma, who may not report this to the DVLA. How will you encourage them to share this information with you?
- It needs to be clearer on why you need the information you are asking for and how it is used. It's important that people know what the implications of sharing information, changes in circumstances or disclosing information.
- It needs to be more accessible for dyslexia and other impairments. Easy read, etc.
- Be more illustrative and open, how we can help you, contact us to see how we can help you. Offer alternative 'hoops' for people, i.e. when they are waiting for required information, i.e. Off the record discussions, to encourage confidential 'chats', this engagement will be more open to remove fear of reprisals (legal or losing their job).
- It could be worth to speaking to colleagues in HR whose remit is about diversity and avoid any language that might sound hostile.
- EHRC provide excellent guidance on reasonable adjustments.
- Being medically fit is different from being disabled and the distinction between medical assessments is not clear. The document states that disabled passengers can be medically fit and this needs to be moved up front to avoid discouraging potential applications.
- There is a perception that medical assessment can discriminate against disabled people. Existing or potential drivers need to be assured that being disabled is not necessarily a barrier to being a driver.
- Disabled passengers are often turned away by drivers who say they can't assist, say because of a bad back, but are not exempt. This needs to be covered in this or separate guidance, to protect both driver and passengers.
- There needs to be a process to ensure that drivers and passengers are matched appropriately to fulfil the service required. To repeatedly send a driver on a job that they couldn't fulfil could in itself be discriminatory.
- Guidance on what existing or potential drivers can do to become a driver would be much shorter, concise, and appealing. Drivers may need extra help and support because they are not earning and assessments, etc take a long time.
- There may be the need for three separate guidance documents, one for internal use in TfL, one for the driver which is reassuring and gives clear guidance (and be much shorter than this proposed guide) and one for the taxi companies that employs the drivers.

- The DVLA Group 2 medical standards referenced in the document, is for large lorries and buses, due to the size and length of time occupational drivers spends at the wheel. The length of time could apply to taxi drivers, but the vehicle size and weight doesn't. Drivers will need more information on why this standard applies rather than Group 1.
- Medicals for C1D1 licence (trucks to 7.5 T only and Minibuses 19 - 25 seats) would seem to be more appropriate.
- Some interactions don't seem quite right in the document. Either need to ramp it down quite a lot because there is no backing or gain that backing. For instance, circumstances where adapted vehicles can and cannot be used, or adaptations that can and cannot be transferred, this needs further explanation. If there are adaptations that are out of scope, that would also be useful to know
- Vehicle assessors usually assess vehicles for personal use vehicles, suggest speaking to adaption companies such as Motability or Access to Work - their rules could be relevant here too.
- Consider what evidence you really need. If someone has acquired a recent need, NHS systems are slow and evidence (from GP or NHS consultants for instance) have associated fees. Evidence of personal independence payments or other relevant assessments already completed are quicker.
- For some disabilities it could be difficult to get the required evidence, i.e. type licences have adaptations listed and could this be sufficient evidence.
- 'Accessible facilities', be clear on what you mean, for instance, if this is toilets or building access.
- There might also be people who use driving aids and are not actually considering or have registered themselves disabled.
- It would be useful to collect data on disabled drivers. Record what drivers need, for instance a driver who has recently become disabled may need extra support.
- Worth producing a document to cover TfL now, and adapt with iterations.

#### ➤ **TfL Comments**

- Thanks so much for the feedback, this is useful and we will update the document.

#### **AOB**

- Away day to note
  - Emma Staines, Director of Customer and Mark Evers, Director of Customer Insight Strategy and Experience, are joining for the afternoon to provide an brief update and meet new members.
  - New members joining us – official start date end of November. Do not share confidential or sensitive information.
  - Photo's new head shots will be taken on the day. All to attend 11 to 3pm
  - [REDACTED] joining us later, after her radio interview (congratulations!).