

ORR Accessible Travel Policy review form

Stakeholder	DPTAC
Train Operator	Merseyrail
Review start date	
Review end date	27/1/2020

ATP: Passenger Leaflet

Question	Comments
Tone: Does the leaflet have an appropriate tone? Is it friendly and welcoming in tone or is there too much reliance on legal or technical language and jargon?	Overall, the passenger leaflet reads well however, it is repetitive in places and the language used offers some scope for improvement. A suggestion is made for Merseyrail to discuss this with the Merseytravel Accessibility Forum, then consider commissioning the Plain English Campaign to proof read the document.
Motivational impact: Does the leaflet provide positive encouragement for disabled people to travel by train as a result of reading the leaflet?	Yes, but please refer to the feedback in the 'other specific points' section below as there are several areas where the leaflet's motivational impact could be improved.
Ease of use: Does the content of the leaflet provide clarity both in terms of the language used and	Yes.

<p>explanatory text? Does the leaflet have a logical and easy to follow structure?</p>	
<p>Good practice: Please highlight areas which are particularly strong and/or innovative.</p>	<p>The Assisted Travel Meeting Point approach.</p>
<p>Other specific points: Please raise any other points that you think are relevant including any areas of inaccuracy and/or omissions.</p>	<p>The statement 'We cannot assist with lifting a customer or with personal care' (p7) needs to be amended by adding the word 'you' instead of 'customer.'</p> <p>In terms of the statement that 'Staff are not able to leave the immediate station or cross public roads', how would this apply to a disabled passenger who may need support (with luggage for example), to get to their car in a station car park? Following on from this point, do any Merseyrail station car parks involve a requirement to cross a road, and if so, how would this apply in this context?</p> <p>Avoid use of the word 'alighting' – it would be better to say 'getting off.'</p> <p>Please refer to the comments in the feedback below on the Policy Document feedback with regard to the need to clarify the process for requesting a taxi to travel to an accessible station when the nearest station to a disabled person departing is inaccessible.</p> <p>It would be useful to consider promoting the Merseyrail policy of allowing a disabled passenger to purchase a ticket at the destination station, should there be a need for this (see Policy Document feedback on this point below).</p> <p>In terms of the statement that the wheelchair space cannot be reserved, how would Merseyrail meet the needs of a wheelchair-using passenger who wants to take the last train of a day and the space is already occupied (please see feedback re the same in the Policy Document section below).</p>

Overall comments on the leaflet.	Overall, the Passenger Leaflet is well-written and positive, but please note our suggestions with regard to specific areas for improvement. ,
---	---

ATP: Policy Document

Question	Comments
<p>Tone: Does the policy document have an appropriate tone, bearing in mind that it is a more formal and comprehensive description of the train operator's policy with regards to accessibility. [NB. The document should still avoid excessive use of legal or technical language, and jargon.]</p>	<p>Yes, however there is scope for improvement in terms of the language and terminology used: 'hidden disabilities' should be changed to 'non-visible disabilities'; 'disabled parking' should be changed to 'Blue Badge Holders' (and used consistently), 'disabled' toilet should be changed to 'accessible toilet.' Additionally, please refer to feedback provided in the 'other specific points' section below.</p> <p>Please also refer to the suggestions made in the same section above re the Passenger Leaflet.</p>
<p>Motivational impact: Does the content of the policy document provide positive encouragement for disabled people to travel by rail? [NB. The policy document is inherently less focussed on motivational content, but should</p>	<p>Broadly speaking, yes. However, some of the language used raises questions around whether Merseyrail have fully understood the need for the Policy Document which demonstrates their commitment to actively meeting the needs of their disabled passengers rather than simply being 'compliant.' An example of this relates to several instances of using the phrase 'DDA' towards the end of the document.</p> <p>In addition to the above, please refer to feedback provided in the final section of this response form for</p>

<p>nevertheless be written in a way that encourages of the train operator's services.]</p>	<p>further points ORR should consider discussing with Merseyrail.</p>
<p>Ease of use: Does the content provide clarity both in terms of language used and explanatory text? Does the document have a logical and easy to follow structure? Is the information provided sufficiently comprehensive and, where necessary, sufficiently detailed?</p>	<p>Yes, but, please refer to our comments in the sections below in terms of specific suggestions for improvement.</p>
<p>Good practice: Please highlight areas which are particularly strong and/or innovative.</p>	
<p>Other specific points: Please raise any other points that you think are relevant including any areas of inaccuracy and/or omissions</p>	<p>It isn't clear as to what the process is if, during the journey, a disabled person needs to ask for support to get off the train?</p> <p>Check grammar – at least one sentence has a word missing (see p6 and p15 of Policy Document for examples of this).</p> <p>Need to clarify the process by which a disabled person who requires a taxi to get to the nearest accessible station can arrange this (i.e.do they need to make their way to nearest inaccessible station then wait for a taxi to arrive to take them to the nearest accessible station?).</p> <p>'Changes in arrangements' section (p7): have Merseyrail taken into account, on an impairment specific</p>

	<p>basis, how to alert a disabled passenger in the event of a need to change platforms?</p> <p>In the 'Alterations to Facilities and Services' section (p9), what is the Merseyrail policy if an on-station accessible toilet is out of operation?</p> <p>In the 'Seats on Trains' section (p10) a statement is made that seat reservations cannot be made. DPTAC suggest that this should be reviewed in context of priority seating arrangements. In addition to this point, might it also be possible to introduce a reservation system for the wheelchair spaces on trains (see p20)?</p> <p>Assistance Dogs (p10) – might it be possible to offer a designated seat for people who use assistance dogs in order to restrict the need for a dog to have to sit / lie in the train gangway. Separately, would it be possible to offer water at platforms for Assistance Dogs, and dog-spend areas at larger stations (this is helpful in the event of delays).</p> <p>In the 'Ticketing and Fares' section (p16), does a wheelchair user need to join a queue to obtain a ticket from an accessible ticket counter, or do they just approach this? It will be helpful to clarify this point. In terms of the point made that a disabled person can purchase a ticket at the destination station, how is this communicated?</p> <p>'Wheelchair Spaces' (p20) – what would the process be if the last Merseyrail train of the day already has a wheelchair user occupying the wheelchair space and another wheelchair user wants to board the train?</p> <p>'Disabled Parking' section (p23) – Change to 'Accessible Parking.'</p> <p>Reference is made to 'DDA' in several places from p29. This needs to be re-worded to reflect the current legislative and regulatory framework.</p>
<p>Overall comments on the document.</p>	<p>Quite a lot of scope for improvement, and several suggestions for improvement have been made for Merseyrail to consider in terms of policy and operational practice.</p>

ORR suggested areas for further review

Document	Guidance Element	ORR Comment	Stakeholder Comment