Civil and Sustainable Urban Engineering

Research Article
Volume 6(1), 2026, 208−219
https://doi.org/10.53623/csue.v6i1.1104

Identification of the Availability of Public Facilities for Persons with Disabilities at Trans Jatim Bus Stops on Corridor V

Yulia Dwi Elyana*, Nurani Hartatik

Civil Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, 17 August 1945 University of Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia

Correspondence: yuliadwi717@gmail.com

SUBMITTED: 7 March 2026; REVISED: 27 March 2026; ACCEPTED: 2 April 2026

ABSTRACT: This study aims to examine the level of accessibility of primary and supporting facilities at Trans Jatim bus stops along Corridor V, particularly in terms of compliance with standards for persons with disabilities. The study employs a field observation method by assessing several accessibility indicators, including ramps, stairs, guiding blocks, and designated wheelchair spaces. The results indicate that the overall level of accessibility remains low, with the average score falling below 50.00. Although some facilities have met the required standards, achieving scores above 50.00, the majority of bus stops do not provide accessibility features in a complete and consistent manner. Many essential facilities for persons with disabilities are either unavailable or not functioning optimally, indicating that the existing infrastructure has not fully complied with the standards stipulated in Ministry of Public Works Regulation No. 30/PRT/M/2006. These limitations have a significant impact on the mobility, independence, and safety of persons with disabilities in accessing public transportation. Furthermore, inadequate facilities may increase safety risks and reduce the overall quality of service. Therefore, improvements in infrastructure provision are necessary, supported by regular monitoring, maintenance, and stricter enforcement of regulatory standards.

KEYWORDS: Bus stop infrastructure; trans jatim corridor v; accessibility; persons with disabilities; compliance assessment; inclusive public transportation.

1. Introduction

Public transportation plays a fundamental role in supporting urban mobility, reducing congestion, and promoting sustainable development. More importantly, it serves as a critical means of ensuring equal access to mobility for all members of society, including persons with disabilities. Accessibility in public transport infrastructure is therefore not only a technical requirement but also a matter of social equity and human rights [1]. Inaccessible infrastructure can significantly limit independence, restrict participation in social and economic activities, and reinforce inequality among vulnerable populations.

In Indonesia, accessibility standards for public facilities have been formally established through Minister of Public Works Regulation No. 30/PRT/M/2006. This regulation outlines essential requirements such as the provision of ramps with appropriate dimensions and slopes,

safe and standardized stairs, tactile paving (guide blocks), and designated spaces for wheelchair users [2]. These standards are intended to ensure that public infrastructure, including bus stops, accommodates the diverse needs of users with physical, sensory, and mobility impairments.

Despite the existence of these regulatory frameworks, the implementation of accessible infrastructure remains inconsistent. Trans Jatim Corridor V, one of the primary public transportation routes in East Java, serves a significant number of daily passengers and is expected to meet inclusive design standards. However, preliminary observations indicate that several bus stops along this corridor do not fully comply with accessibility requirements, thereby limiting usability for persons with disabilities [3]. These shortcomings are often linked to inadequate planning, lack of adherence to design guidelines, insufficient maintenance, and weak monitoring mechanisms [4]. As a result, there is a noticeable gap between regulatory expectations and actual field conditions.

This gap highlights a critical problem: although accessibility policies are well-defined, their practical implementation in public transport infrastructure is still lacking. Without systematic evaluation, it is difficult to identify specific deficiencies and prioritize improvements. Therefore, a comprehensive assessment is necessary to evaluate the current condition of bus stop facilities and determine their level of compliance with established standards [5]. Based on this background, the hypothesis of this study is that the majority of bus stops along Trans Jatim Corridor V do not meet the required accessibility standards, resulting in inadequate support for persons with disabilities. Accordingly, the aim of this study is to evaluate the availability and condition of public facilities for persons with disabilities at Trans Jatim Corridor V bus stops and to measure their compliance level using a weighted assessment approach based on Minister of Public Works Regulation No. 30/PRT/M/2006. This study seeks to identify gaps between existing conditions and regulatory standards, thereby providing evidence-based recommendations to improve inclusive transportation services [6].

2. Materials and Methods

The methodology of this study was designed to provide a comprehensive and systematic evaluation of the condition of bus stop infrastructure along the Trans Jatim Corridor V, with particular emphasis on accessibility for persons with disabilities. The assessment framework refers to the technical requirements specified in Minister of Public Works Regulation No. 30/PRT/M/2006, which establishes standards for accessibility in public facilities. A quantitative descriptive approach was employed to capture the actual condition of infrastructure and to measure its level of compliance with the prescribed standards. This approach enables an objective assessment of both the availability and suitability of facilities in supporting accessibility, safety, and comfort for users with disabilities.

The study was conducted through direct field surveys combined with on-site measurements. Data collection involved structured observations using standardized survey forms to ensure consistency across all locations. Measuring instruments such as measuring tapes were used to obtain accurate dimensions of infrastructure elements, while writing tools were utilized for systematic data recording. Mobile phones were used to document field conditions through photographs, providing visual evidence to support the analysis. This methodological approach ensures that the evaluation reflects real conditions in the field and allows for direct comparison with regulatory requirements.

2.1. Research location.

This study was conducted along the Trans Jatim Corridor V in East Java, Indonesia, which connects Surabaya and Bangkalan and serves as an important transportation route supporting regional mobility. The study covered a total of 67 bus stop locations distributed along both directions of the route, namely Surabaya–Bangkalan and Bangkalan–Surabaya. The observed locations included various types of stopping points such as bus stop signs, shelters, designated bus stops, and terminal areas. All bus stops along the corridor were included in the analysis to ensure a comprehensive assessment of infrastructure conditions and accessibility performance.

2.2. Data collection

The data used in this study consisted of both secondary and primary sources. Secondary data were obtained from official documents, including the Trans Jatim Corridor V route map provided by the Ministry of Transportation, as well as technical guidelines derived from Minister of Public Works Regulation No. 30/PRT/M/2006. These documents served as the reference framework for evaluating compliance with accessibility standards. Primary data were collected directly through field observations to assess the actual condition of each bus stop. The observations focused on the physical characteristics of infrastructure, the completeness of facilities, and the extent to which accessibility features were provided for persons with disabilities. Particular attention was given to key components such as ramps, guiding blocks, stairs, and wheelchair-designated spaces. The collected data also considered aspects of user comfort and safety, allowing for a more comprehensive evaluation of accessibility conditions.

2.3. Assessment of facilities for persons with disabilities at trans jatim bus stops on corridor V.

The assessment of accessibility facilities was carried out based on Minister of Public Works Regulation No. 30/PRT/M/2006, which defines technical requirements for accessible infrastructure in public environments. Each facility was evaluated using specific variables and sub-variables that represent essential aspects of accessibility performance.

2.3.1. Guiding block.

Guiding blocks, also known as tactile paving, consist of textured tiles designed to assist persons with visual impairments by providing directional guidance and warning signals [7]. The assessment presented in Table 1 evaluates guiding blocks in terms of texture, placement, and color. Texture is examined to distinguish between linear patterns that indicate direction and circular patterns that signal caution or potential hazards, both of which are essential for safe navigation. Placement is evaluated to determine whether guiding blocks are installed in appropriate and continuous locations, such as pedestrian pathways, in front of traffic lanes, and at transitions such as stair entrances or changes in elevation. Proper placement ensures usability and continuity of navigation for visually impaired users. Color is assessed to determine whether sufficient contrast exists between the guiding blocks and surrounding surfaces, which is necessary to enhance visibility for individuals with low vision. Overall, Table 4 provides a structured framework to evaluate whether guiding blocks function effectively as navigational aids.

Table 1. Guiding block assessment.

Variable	Sub-Variable	Description
Guiding Block	Texture	Tiles with straight-line patterns indicating a clear direction of travel. Circular-pattern tiles indicating changes in conditions or potential hazards.
	Placement	Located on the pedestrian path between the bus stop and the road. Placed in front of vehicle traffic lanes. Placed in front of entrances or exits of stairs or facilities with different elevations. Used as directional guidance toward nearby public facilities.
	Color	Used as directional guidance toward nearby public facilities.

2.3.2. Ramp.

Ramps serve as alternative circulation routes for individuals who are unable to use stairs, including wheelchair users, the elderly, and persons with limited mobility [8]. The assessment criteria presented in Table 2 evaluate ramps based on several technical characteristics that determine their safety and usability. The surface texture is examined to ensure that it is non-slip and safe under various environmental conditions. The slope is evaluated to confirm compliance with maximum allowable gradients, as excessive steepness can hinder accessibility and increase safety risks. Dimensions such as path length and width are assessed to determine whether the ramp provides adequate space for movement and maneuverability. The presence of landings or bordes is evaluated to ensure that users have sufficient space to rest and safely change direction. Lighting conditions are also considered to ensure visibility, particularly in low-light situations. In addition, the presence and height of handrails are assessed to determine whether adequate support is provided for users. Table 2 therefore integrates multiple technical parameters to evaluate whether ramps meet accessibility standards and function effectively..

Table 2. Ramp Assessment.

Variable	Variable	Description
Ramp	Texture	Non-slip surface with textured patterns
	Slope	Maximum slope of 6° for outdoor ramps
	Placement	Maximum slope of 6° for outdoor ramps
	Path Length	Maximum 900 cm for a 7° slope; slopes less than 7° may exceed 900 cm
	Path Width	Maximum 900 cm for a 7° slope; slopes less than 7° may exceed 900 cm
	Landing (Bordes)	Must be flat and unobstructed, with a minimum size of 160 cm
	Lighting	Adequate lighting must be provided
	Handrail	Installed at a height of 60–80 cm

2.3.3 Stairs.

Stairs are essential elements of vertical circulation that must be designed to ensure safety, comfort, and accessibility for all users [9]. The assessment criteria shown in Table 3 evaluate stairs based on their dimensions, surface condition, and supporting features. The uniformity of riser height and tread width is assessed to ensure consistency, as variations can increase the risk of trips and falls. The condition of the stair surface is evaluated to ensure that it is not damaged, perforated, or slippery, which could compromise safety. Additional features such as handrails and visual indicators are also considered important for enhancing usability, particularly for elderly users and individuals with mobility limitations. Table 3 therefore provides a comprehensive framework for assessing whether stairs meet technical standards and support safe usage.

Table 3. Stair assessment.

Variable	Sub-Variable	Description
Stairs	Dimensions	The steps and risers must be uniform
		Riser height: 15–19 cm
		Tread width: 27–30 cm
	Texture	The surface must not be damaged or perforated
	Color	Provided on at least one side of the stairs
		Height of 65–89 cm from the floor
		Maximum width of 4 cm

2.3.4 Wheelchair space.

Wheelchair-designated spaces are critical components of accessible infrastructure, as they allow wheelchair users to access and use public facilities independently and safely [10]. The assessment presented in Table 4 focuses on spatial dimensions and supporting features. The available space is evaluated to ensure that it meets minimum requirements for maneuverability, allowing users to move and position themselves comfortably. The presence of handrails is also assessed to determine whether additional support is provided. Table 4 therefore evaluates whether the designated spaces are adequate to accommodate the needs of wheelchair users and contribute to inclusive infrastructure design.

Table 4. Assessment of wheelchair designated space.

Variable	Sub-Variable	Description
Wheelchair	Dimensions	Minimum width of 160 cm
Space	Handrail	L-shaped handrail

2.3.5. Percentage assessment of bus stop facilities for persons with disabilities.

The level of accessibility at each bus stop was determined using a percentage-based assessment of facility completeness, as presented in Table 5. This table classifies bus stops based on the proportion of required facilities that are available and meet the specified standards. A percentage value between 50.00 and 100 indicates that the bus stop satisfies a significant portion of the required criteria and is categorized as compliant, while a value below 50.00 indicates that the bus stop does not adequately meet accessibility requirements and is categorized as less compliant. This classification system provides a clear and standardized method for evaluating and comparing accessibility performance across all bus stop locations.

Table 5. Accessibility classification based on percentage of facility completeness.

Percentage of Completeness	Description
50,00% - 100%	Compliant
00,00% - 49,99%	Less Compliant

2.4. Assessment of bus stop facility weights.

The analysis of accessibility conditions was conducted by assigning equal weight to all assessed variables, based on the assumption that each facility contributes equally to overall accessibility performance. The level of compliance for each bus stop was calculated by dividing the number of facilities that meet the required standards by the total number of assessed facilities, and then multiplying the result by 100 percent. In this calculation, each facility represents the total number of accessibility features available and compliant at a given bus stop, while the total facilities represent all variables included in the assessment framework.

This method provides a quantitative measure of accessibility, enabling consistent comparison across locations and facilitating the identification of gaps in infrastructure provision.

3. Results and Discussion

This section presents and discusses the results of the assessment of Trans Jatim bus stops along Corridor V, focusing on the availability and compliance of facilities for persons with disabilities. The analysis was conducted based on field observations and weighted scoring of key accessibility components, including guiding blocks, ramps, stairs, and wheelchair-designated spaces. The findings were evaluated against the standards outlined in Minister of Public Works Regulation No. 30/PRT/M/2006 to determine the extent to which existing infrastructure supports inclusive and accessible public transportation. The results also highlight critical gaps in infrastructure provision and identify areas requiring improvement to enhance safety, comfort, and usability for all users.

3.1. Assessment of bus stop facilities on the Surabaya–Bangkalan route.

Table 6 presents the results of accessibility scoring for bus stops along the Surabaya–Bangkalan route, highlighting the current state of facilities for persons with disabilities. Each bus stop was systematically evaluated based on key accessibility features, including guiding blocks, ramps, stairs, and designated wheelchair spaces. The scoring reveals that the majority of bus stops lack essential accessibility infrastructure, with many scoring zero across multiple categories, indicating a pervasive neglect of inclusive design principles. This deficiency reflects broader challenges in urban transport planning, where the needs of persons with disabilities are often considered secondary to cost or spatial constraints [11]. Among the evaluated bus stops, those classified as “shelter” types—such as Shelter Perak East—consistently scored higher than simple “sign” stops due to the presence of ramps and partial stair facilities. However, even these higher-scoring locations do not meet the full accessibility requirements stipulated in Public Works Regulation No. 30/PRT/M/2006. For instance, although ramps are present at some stops, they frequently lack complementary safety features such as handrails, proper landings, and non-slip surfaces, which are critical to ensure both safety and usability for wheelchair users and those with limited mobility [12, 13]. A particularly concerning finding is the near-universal absence of guiding blocks, which creates significant barriers for visually impaired passengers. Tactile paths and warning surfaces are fundamental for independent navigation and for preventing accidents, particularly in busy transit environments. Without these features, visually impaired users face heightened risks, limiting their ability to use public transport safely and independently [11, 14]. Similarly, the complete lack of designated wheelchair spaces demonstrates that infrastructure planning has not fully incorporated universal design principles, underscoring the need for more proactive policy enforcement and oversight. The partial provision of ramps or stairs without fully integrated features highlights a piecemeal approach to accessibility, which can inadvertently increase safety risks rather than mitigate them. This situation illustrates the need for comprehensive planning that prioritizes inclusivity from the early stages of bus stop design and construction. Future upgrades should aim to meet regulatory standards fully, incorporating tactile guidance, ramps with appropriate gradients, handrails, and adequate landing spaces, as well as clearly designated wheelchair areas. Additionally, regular compliance monitoring and maintenance are essential to ensure that facilities remain functional and safe over time. Addressing these gaps is critical not only

for meeting legal obligations but also for promoting equitable access to public transportation, thereby enhancing mobility, social inclusion, and quality of life for all citizens [13−15]. The following illustrates a sample weighted assessment calculation for evaluating the accessibility of facilities for individuals with disabilities, using a case study of a bus stop on Trans Jatim Corridor V, namely the Trans Point stop, with a focus on the ramp facility.

$$\frac{\text{Every Facility}}{\text{Number of Facilities}} = \frac{6}{8} x\ 100\% = 67\%$$

Description: Every Facility = 6; Number of Facilities = 8.

Table 6. Evaluation of accessibility compliance at remaining Trans Jatim bus stops along the Surabaya–Bangkalan Route.

No.	Bus Stop Name	Guiding Block	Ramp	Stairs	Wheelchair Space
1	Transit Stop Point Trans Jatim	0% (Less Compliant)	75% (Compliant)	100% (Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
2	Bus Stop Bungurasih Luar	0% (Less Compliant)	38% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
3	Sign Moro Krembangan	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
4	Sign Barunawati	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
5	Shelter Perak East	14% (Less Compliant)	13% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
6	Sign Sarwajala	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
7	Sign Al-Irsyad	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
8	Sign Semampir	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
9	Sign Sidotopo 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
10	Sign Simokerto 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
11	Sign Kenjeran 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
12	Sign Tuwowo 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
13	Sign Pogot	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
14	Bus Shelter Kedung Cowek 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
15	Sign Samsat Kenjeran 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
16	Bus Shelter Tanean Suramadu 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
17	Bus Shelter IKM 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
18	Bus Shelter Mor Kepek	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
19	Bus Shelter Sendang Dajah	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
20	Bus Shelter Tengkel 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
21	Bus Shelter Burneh	43% (Less Compliant)	50% (Less Compliant)	25% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
22	Bus Shelter Bebek Sinjay 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
23	Bus Shelter RSUD Bangkalan 1	43% (Less Compliant)	25% (Less Compliant)	75% (Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)

No.	Bus Stop Name	Guiding Block	Ramp	Stairs	Wheelchair Space
24	Sign Jokotole	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
25	Sign Pendopo Alun-Alun	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
26	Shelter Mosque Agung	43% (Less Compliant)	38% (Less Compliant)	50% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
27	Sign Market Kapoh	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
28	Bus Shelter Market Senenan	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
29	Bus Shelter Stadium Bangkalan 1	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
30	Bus Shelter Office Bupati Bangkalan	43% (Less Compliant)	38% (Less Compliant)	25% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
31	Terminal Bangkalan	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)

3.2. Implications for inclusive public transport.

Table 7 presents the results of the assessment of accessibility facilities for persons with disabilities at Trans Jatim bus stops along the Surabaya–Bangkalan route. Each stop was evaluated based on four key components: guiding blocks, ramps, stairs, and designated wheelchair spaces. The results indicate that the majority of bus stops are "less compliant," with most scoring zero across all categories. This trend demonstrates that accessibility for persons with disabilities is severely limited throughout Corridor V. The absence of guiding blocks at nearly all bus stops poses a significant barrier for visually impaired users, as tactile paving is essential for safe navigation and orientation [16, 17]. Similarly, the lack of designated wheelchair spaces restricts access for wheelchair users and highlights the absence of universal design principles in current infrastructure planning [18]. Even bus stops with partial facilities, such as Bus Stop Medaeng and Bus Stop Point Trans Jatim, which scored 3.0 for ramps and 1–2.0 for stairs, still fail to achieve overall compliance. The provision of ramps without complementary features, such as handrails, proper landing areas, or non-slip surfaces, limits their usability and may increase safety risks for users with reduced mobility [19]. This pattern illustrates a fragmented approach to accessibility, where isolated infrastructure elements exist but do not form a fully functional, safe system.

Table 7. Assessment of accessibility facilities for persons with disabilities at trans jatim bus stops (Surabaya–Bangkalan Route).

No.	Bus Stop Name	Guiding Block	Ramp	Stairs	Wheelchair Space
1	Bangkalan Terminal	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
2	Kinibalu Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
3	SMKN 3 Bangkalan Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
4	Syaikhona Kholil Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
5	Simpang 3 Mlanjah Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
6	Dishub Office Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
7	Pertigaan Martadinata Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)

No.	Bus Stop Name	Guiding Block	Ramp	Stairs	Wheelchair Space
8	Perumda Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
9	Stadium Bangkalan 2 Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
10	Merlin Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
11	Bank East Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
12	Mosque Agung Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
13	Pendopo Alun-Alun Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
14	Pecinan Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
15	PDAM Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
16	Trunojoyo Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
17	RSUD Bangkalan 2 Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
18	Bebek Sinjay 2 Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
19	Pancer Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
20	Tangkel 2 Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
21	Petapan Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
22	IKM 2 Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
23	Tanean Suramadu 2 Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
24	Samsat Kenjeran 2 Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
25	Kedung Cowek 2 Bus Shelter	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
26	Pogot 2 Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
27	Tuwowo 2 Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
28	Kenjeran 2 Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
29	Simokerto 2 Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
30	Sidotopo 2 Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
31	Semampir 2 Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
32	Poltekpel Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
33	Pabean Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
34	Perak West Sign	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
35	Medaeng Bus Stop	0% (Less Compliant)	38% (Less Compliant)	50% (Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)
36	Point Trans Jatim Bus Stop	0% (Less Compliant)	38% (Less Compliant)	100% (Compliant)	0% (Less Compliant)

The assessment highlights a critical gap in accessible infrastructure along Corridor V. The absence of essential features not only contravenes the standards but also reduces the independence and mobility of persons with disabilities, limiting their ability to safely and efficiently use public transport [20]. Furthermore, inconsistent accessibility measures can discourage public transport use among people with disabilities, undermining broader goals of social inclusion and equitable urban mobility [21]. To address these deficiencies, future planning should prioritize comprehensive design and retrofitting. Bus stops should incorporate tactile guidance paths, fully compliant ramps with handrails, safe stairs with proper landings, and clearly designated wheelchair spaces. In addition, regular monitoring and maintenance are essential to ensure these facilities remain functional and safe over time. Enhancing accessibility in public transport infrastructure not only fulfills legal requirements but also supports social equity, inclusive mobility, and improved quality of life for all citizens [22].

4. Conclusions

This study concludes that the primary and supporting facilities at Trans Jatim bus stops along Corridor V are generally inadequate, with the average accessibility score falling below 50.00. However, some facilities have met the required standards, achieving scores above 50.00.The assessment shows that the provision of facilities for persons with disabilities—such as ramps, stairs, guiding blocks, and designated wheelchair spaces—has not been optimally fulfilled at most bus stops. This condition indicates that the existing infrastructure has not fully complied with the minimum standards set out in Ministry of Public Works Regulation No. 30/PRT/M/2006. The lack of adequate and consistent facilities significantly limits the mobility and independence of persons with disabilities in accessing public transportation safely and efficiently. In addition, incomplete or substandard facilities may increase safety risks and reduce overall service quality. These findings highlight the importance of more comprehensive infrastructure planning and improvement. Furthermore, regular monitoring, maintenance, and enforcement of standards are necessary to ensure long-term functionality and regulatory compliance. Addressing these issues is expected to enhance accessibility and support the realization of more inclusive, equitable, and high-quality public transportation services for all members of society.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have supported and contributed to the completion of this research. My special thanks go to my academic advisor for their invaluable guidance, advice, and constructive feedback throughout the research process.I also wish to thank my colleagues and friends at the Civil Engineering Study Program, Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, for their support, insightful discussions, and technical assistance, which greatly facilitated the progress of this study. The moral support, encouragement, and collaboration from all of them have been deeply appreciated.Finally, I acknowledge all contributions, and I hope this research can provide meaningful insights and benefits to the advancement of knowledge and practice in the relevant field.

Author Contribution

Yulia Dwi Elyana: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing – Original Draft. Nurani Hartatik: Validation, Software, Visualization, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision, Project Administration, Funding Acquisition, Correspondence. I Gede Agus Punarta: Resources, Data Collection, Technical Support, Validation.

Competing Interest

All authors should disclose any financial, personal, or professional relationships that might influence or appear to influence their research.

References

[1] Affif, A.M. (2021). Pengaruh Desain Fasilitas Halte terhadap Kepuasan Pengguna Bus Trans Metro Deli. *RUANG-SPACE, Jurnal Lingkungan Binaan (Space : Journal of the Built Environment)*, *8*(2), 137. https://doi.org/10.24843/jrs.2021.v08.i02.p05.

[2] Astiwi, A.; Setyowati, D.L.; Sholeh, M.; Benardi, A.I.; Hayati, R. (2024) The Design of Trans Jateng Bus Stop for Susuwono Region to Establish Clean Transportation. *Journal of Geoscience and Environment Protection*, *12*, 253−269. https://doi.org/10.4236/gep.2024.1212016.

[3] Gumasing, M.J.J.; Del Castillo, T.R.P.; Palermo, A.G.L.; Tabino, J.T.G.; Gatchalian, J.T. (2025). Enhancing Accessibility in Philippine Public Bus Systems: Addressing the Needs of Persons with Disabilities. *Disabilities*, *5*, 45. https://doi.org/10.3390/disabilities5020045.

[4] Flemmer, C.; McIntosh, A. (2025). Perceptions of People with Disabilities on the Accessibility of New Zealand's Built Environment. *Disabilities*, *5*, 75. https://doi.org/10.3390/disabilities5030075.

[5] Ismael, K. (2026). A User-Driven Importance–Performance Analysis of Bus Stops for Prioritizing Improvements. *Vehicles*, *8*, 67. https://doi.org/10.3390/vehicles8030067.

[6] Briant, S.; Cushing, D.; Washington, T.; Swart, M. Small but Significant: A Review of Research on the Potential of Bus Shelters as Resilient Infrastructure. *Applied Sciences*, *15*, 6724. https://doi.org/10.3390/app15126724.

[7] Corazza, M.V.; Imbastaro, S.; Pascucci, M. (2020). Regenerating Communities. New Life for a Local Railway: A Technological and Environmental Study. *Sustainability*, *12*, 3693. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093693.

[8] Zhao, S.; Ni, Y.; Sun, S.; Chang, T. (2023). Passenger Satisfaction Evaluation and Achieving Sustainable Integrated Urban Transport: Structural Equation Analysis Based on Macau Data. *Sustainability*, *15*, 5463. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065463.

[9] Duri, B.; Luke, R. (2024). Assessing Accessibility of Transport and Universal Access in the City of Tshwane Using Expert Opinion. *Social Sciences*, *13*, 690. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13120690.

[10] Frizziero, L.; Donnici, G.; Galiè, G.; Pala, G.; Pilla, M.; Zamagna, E. (2023). QFD and SDE Methods Applied to Autonomous Minibus Redesign and an Innovative Mobile Charging System (MBS). *Inventions*, *8*, 1. https://doi.org/10.3390/inventions8010001.

[11] Bęczkowska, S.A.; Zysk, Z. (2021). Safety of People with Special Needs in Public Transport. *Sustainability*, *13*, 10733. https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910733.

[12] Koutamanis, A. (2024). Stair Design and User Interaction. *Architecture*, *4*, 692–716. https://doi.org/10.3390/architecture4030036.

[13] Öztürk, S.V.; Durukan, A. (2025). Unseen Needs: The Imperative of Building Biology-Based Design in Educational Spaces for Individuals with Down Syndrome. *Buildings*, *15*, 3016. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15173016.

[14] Rivera-Coloma, R.; Cajas-Cajas, V.; Llamuca-Llamuca, J.; Oleas-Lara, C. (2025). The Impact of Smart Stops on the Accessibility and Safety of Public Transport Users. *Future Transp.*, *5*, 131. https://doi.org/10.3390/futuretransp5040131.

[15] Bokhari, A.; Sharifi, F. (2024). Public Transport Inequality and Utilization: Exploring the Perspective of the Inequality Impact on Travel Choices. *Sustainability*, *16*, 5404. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16135404.

[16] Chidiac, S.E.; Reda, M.A.; Marjaba, G.E. (2024). Accessibility of the Built Environment for People with Sensory Disabilities—Review Quality and Representation of Evidence. *Buildings*, *14*, 707. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14030707.

[17] Tzimos, N.; Kyriazidis, I.; Voutsakelis, G.; Kontogiannis, S.; Kokkonis, G. (2025). Interaction with Tactile Paving in a Virtual Reality Environment: Simulation of an Urban Environment for People with Visual Impairments. *Multimodal Technol. Interact.*, *9*, 71. https://doi.org/10.3390/mti9070071.

[18] Gupta, A.; Yadav, M.; Nayak, B.K. (2025). A Systematic Literature Review on Inclusive Public Open Spaces: Accessibility Standards and Universal Design Principles. *Urban Sci.*, *9*, 181. https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci9060181.

[19] Štimac Grandić, I.; Šćulac, P.; Grandić, D.; Vodopija, I. (2024). The Accessible Design of Pedestrian Bridges. *Sustainability*, *16*, 1063. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16031063.

[20] Duri, B.; Luke, R. (2025). Service Quality Barriers Encountered in Urban Public Transport by People with Disability in South Africa. *Soc. Sci.*, *14*, 366. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14060366.

[21] Karaca, M.; Yalınız, P. (2026). Accessibility Barriers in Urban Public Transport for Disabled Users: An AHP-Based Severity Index and Behavioral Regression Analysis. *Sustainability*, *18*, 3299. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18073299.

[22] Johnson, L.L.; Ebakivie, O.; Everett, J.; Wynn, S. (2025). Inclusive and Accessible Transportation for All: Strategies for Integrating Equity in Transportation Research. *Logistics*, *9*, 72. https://doi.org/10.3390/logistics9020072.