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Background to Research

This research programme monitors service, quality and compliance with contractual Bus Éireann requirements, through utilising “mystery shopping” surveys to measure key aspects of service delivery (i.e. the driver and the vehicle).

This mystery shopping programme was designed to provide robust and actionable data to the National Transport Authority to measure the overall service performance of Bus Éireann through the eyes of its ‘customers’.

167 mystery shops (plus an additional 10 bus station boosts) were conducted from end March to mid June as mystery shoppers acted as passengers while waiting for and on board selected Bus Éireann around the country. Different Bus Éireann services were included such as city services, town services, Dublin Commuter services and long distance interurban services. These were all conducted across different days of the week and times of the day.

The mystery shops were carried out by trained Kantar Millward Brown interviewers, following an initial pilot on Dublin Bus and briefing session. These interviewers use portable HAPI (HandHeld Personal Interviewing) devices which enable both discreet and effective interviewing before, when boarding, on board the buses and after alighting.

Quarter 2 2018: 26th March – 17th June 2018

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus previous quarter i.e. Qtr 1 Jan—March 2018 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 2 April – June 2017
Section 1: Stop Maintenance & Performance
Advertising on Shelter or Bus Stop: There was very little instances of additional commercial advertising present on bus stop poles or shelters this quarter

Base: (72), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 / (47) YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

59% observed a Bus Shelter
Q 37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass

33% observed a Bus Stop Pole
Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-JunQ2 – Jan-Mar 2018Q1
Bus Shelters: Just under 3 in 4 interviewers found the bus stop poles to be in good condition; while nearly 2 out of 5 saw signs of moderate damage. Almost all interviewers felt that the bus shelters were in good condition with minimal instances of damage reported.

Base: (89), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 (47) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q29b Condition of the Bus Stop Pole & Flag?

- Good condition: 72
- Moderate damage: 19
- Scratches/graffiti: 4
- Hazardous damage: 4

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter?

- Good condition: 90
- Moderate damage: 9
- Hazardous damage: 1

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun vs Jan-Mar 2018
Timetable: Just under two thirds of interviewers noted a printed timetable present. So scores are heading back to levels previously seen last year.

Base: (47) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun $Q_{2}$ – Jan-Mar 2018 $Q_{1}$
Information Display: Just over 4 in 10 interviewers saw an information display present at the bus stop, while nearly 2 out of 5 saw a small panel on the pole and also a TFI Pole with information included. 8 in 10 interviewers found the information displays to be fully legible and clean.

Base: (131) IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q28C

- **Q28d** Information Display (131) %
  - Small Panel on Pole: 16
  - Long panel on pole: 8
  - Information panel on shelter: 44
  - TFI Pole with information panel: 15 (6) Q1
  - None: 22

- **Q28e** Information displayed (102) %
  - Fully legible and clean: 80
  - Obscured by condensation: 8
  - Damaged or torn: 7
  - Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /: 7
  - Not mounted correctly: 9

*Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Jan-Mar 2018 Jan.*

*New for Q1 2018*
Section 2: Customer Information Performance (CI)
Fares Displayed: Almost all interviewers found fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus

Base: (119), Routes with Fares Displayed at the Entrance*

Q50** Were the fares displayed clearly at the entrance?

- Yes: 90%
- No: 10%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1

** Interviewer instructions have been updated for Qtr 3 2016 therefore no YOY comparisons made

*Filter added in Q3
Timetable: Of the 9 in 10 interviewers who had time to assess the bus stop before the arrival of the bus, 7 in 10 found the bus stop numbers to be clearly visible, whilst just under two thirds there was a printed timetable at the bus stop/shelter. Over a third were able to observe the operative date on the timetable.

Base: (167)

Q28 Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus (167)

- Yes: 90%
- No: 10%

(21) Q2

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible (47)

- Yes: 70%
- No: 30%

(49) Q2

Q34 Printed Timetable Present (47)

- Yes: 38%
- No: 62%

Q36 Operative Date Present (29)

- Yes: 59%
- No: 38%
- Present but could not read: 3%

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1

Q28 Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus
Q32 Is the bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag? This is an up to 4 digit number (6 for Bus Éireann).
Q34 Is there a printed timetable, for the route you are using, on display at the bus stop pole or bus shelter?
Q36 Is there an 'Operative Date' (Dublin Bus) or 'Valid From' date (Bus Éireann) written on the timetable?
Section 3: Bus Driver Performance – D1
**Driver Interaction**: There were no instances of driver disputes recorded this quarter.

Base: (167)

**Q103 Any Disputes with Passengers/ Other Road Users**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>(167)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(97) Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - fares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - bus didn’t stop when expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - buggy or wheelchair issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Dispute with other road users/pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Drunk or abusive passengers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not observe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-JunQ2 – Jan-Mar 2018Q1

---

**Q103 Did you notice any disputes between driver and passengers or other road users?**
**Driver Assessment:** Drivers continue to be very positively regarded in terms of both attitude & presentation, but we see a fall in those wearing uniform vs quarter 2 last year.

Base: (167)

**Questions to Driver**
- How much is it to ____?
- Can I pay with a note?
- Does this bus go to ____?

**Q51 Helpful**
- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

**Q52 Polite**
- Yes: 98%
- No: 2%

**Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform**
- Yes: 93%
- No: 7%

**Q55 Driver Well Presented**
- Yes: 98%
- No: 2%

▲ Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun 
Q2 – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1

Q51 | Q52 | Q54 | Q55
--- | --- | --- | ---
Was the driver helpful in response to your question? | Was the driver polite in response to your question? | Was the driver wearing uniform? | Was the driver well presented?
Bus Safety: Encouragingly, almost all interviewers reported comfortable journeys with some minor instances of harsh braking, accelerating & moving off too early; nobody felt it was dangerous

Base: (167)

*Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly
(167)

Yes, felt comfortable 92

Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort 7

Frequently too harsh 1

Felt it was dangerous

*Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly
(167)

Yes, felt comfortable 89

Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort 9

Frequently too harsh 1

Felt it was dangerous

Q96 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?

(167)

Yes 95

Occasionally moved off too early 4

Frequently moved off too early 1

Felt it was dangerous

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Jan-Mar 2018

* Question amended in Q2 2016
Driver Actions: All interviewers reported drivers stopping to pick up passengers when signalled to do so.

Base: (121), ALL EXCLUDING THOSE NOT REQUESTED TO STOP

Q102* Stopped to Pick Up Passengers

(121)

%  

Yes 100

Could not always stop as bus was full

Did not always stop to pick up, and no evident reason for not stopping

Was not requested during this journey, other than at boarding stop

* Question rebased off those whose bus stopped to pick up passengers

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun$Q_2$ – Jan-Mar 2018$Q_1$

Q102 So far as you could tell, did the driver always stop to pick up passengers when requested?
Driver Behaviour: The behaviour of the drivers was very positively regarded overall with very minimal mentions of use of mobile phones or earpieces. Under a quarter of interviewers observed drivers listening to music while driving whilst just over 9 in 10 did not observe the drivers holding any long conversations with others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following (% of 167)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use mobile phone while driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear an earpiece while driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive the bus in a dangerous manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio (167)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations (167)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes with other staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes with passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Q2 2018
Leave Bus Unattended: There were 3 instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter; one was because of a driver change, the other was a comfort (toilet) break, while the other did not know the reason.

Base: (167)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q100 Bus Left Unattended (167)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - because of driver change</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to shops</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to toilet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - some other reason</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - don't know the reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cleaned bus at Kent station while bus was empty and removed litter, then allowed passengers on)

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun Q2 – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1
Diversion or Terminated Early: For the two interviewers who encountered a bus diversion/termination, they were not informed by the driver as to why the bus was diverted/terminated.

Base: (167)

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

- Yes: 2
- No: 98

Q109 Passengers Told Reason for Early Termination/Diversion (3)

- Yes: 100
- No: -

Q108 If Bus Diverted/Terminated Early (3)

- Announce over PA: -
- Shout out information: -
- Inform passengers in some other way (e.g. tour the bus): -
- Fail to inform passengers: 100

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1
Section 4: Bus Equipment Performance
**Wheelchair Ramp/Lift:** Of the 4 interviewers who observed a wheelchair ramp request, all found that it was activated when necessary

Base: (4), If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No - driver stated it was broken</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - person requesting was not a wheelchair user</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver refused to activate because unsafe to do so at the stop</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present on the bus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - other reason - please record details</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - no reason given</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request (4) %

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun Q2 – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1
Electronic Displays & Announcements: Of those who saw an electronic next stop display present, over 3 in 5 saw that they were working correctly, while just under a quarter found that they were turned off or not working. For those who heard an audio next stop announcement, just under a quarter found that it wasn’t working while 3 in 5 noted that it was, which is a significant uplift for both the last quarter and this time last year.

Base: (102), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT (72)

Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (102)

- Yes - working correctly: 65%
- Working but not providing correct information: 14%
- Display turned off or not working: 22%
- Cannot see a display: -%

Q81* Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (72)

- Yes - working and volume correct: 61%
- Yes - working but too loud: 2%
- Yes - working but too quiet: 11%
- No - not working: 28%
- None on the bus: -%

* Question rebased off those who could see a display / hear an announcement

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1

Q80  Are the electronic displays on board indicating what the next stop is working correctly?
Q81  Is there an automatic next stop audio announcement working on the bus?
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all interviewers reported seeing both route and destination numbers on the front and sides of the bus. Of the 4 interviewers who could not clearly see a route number, 1 noted that the bus appeared to be a replacement bus.

Q43 Route No. on Front (167)
- Yes: 98%
- Not displayed: 1%

Q44 Destination on Front (167)
- Yes: 98%
- Not displayed: 1%

Q45 Route No. on Side (167)
- Correct route no. displayed: 95%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 1%
- No route no. displayed: 1%

Q45a Replacement Bus (4*)
- Yes: 25%
- No: 75%

Q87 Route No. on Back (167)
- Yes: 95%
- Incorrect route number shown: 1%
- No route number shown: 1%

** = Q added in Q2 2018

* = Small Base Size

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun vs Q2 2017 Mar-Jun
CCTV: The majority of interviewers who saw a CCTV screen in the stairwell noted that it was turned on and working correctly. Just over a third saw that there was no CCTV display present.

Base: (65), ALL EXCLUDING NO STAIRWELL / SINGLE DECK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turned on and working correctly</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned on, but not working properly</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned off</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CCTV display present</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Question rebased off those who could see a CCTV display

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-JunQ2 – Jan-Mar 2018Q1
Fare Payment: Almost all interviewers reported the ticket machine & Leap Card readers to be working correctly. The majority of cash payers received either a printed ticket or the correct change, with minimal instances of receiving incorrect change occurring. Just over 4 in 5 Leap users were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus.

### Q56 Cash Fare (96)

**If Cash Fare at R5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ticket Machine Working Correctly</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q57b Cash Fare

**If Cash Fare at R5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt (96)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, printed ticket</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, printed ticket and correct change</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not given a ticket</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q59b Leap Card Reader at Driver

**See Fare Charged (71)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don’t know/Couldn’t tell Machine was not working)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(29) 2018Q2 Q2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question amended in Q2 2018*

Q56 Cash Fare (96)

Q57b Cash Fare

Q59b Leap Card Reader at Driver

Q58b Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (71)

Q58b Did the Leap Card reader appear to be working correctly?

Q59b Could you see what fare were you charged?
Interior Lighting and Temperature: Two thirds found the interior lighting of the buses to be functioning correctly, with minimal instances of lights flickering / not working. Almost all interviewers found the on-board temperatures on the buses to be reasonable considering the weather conditions outside; with only 6 interviewers feeling the temperatures on board were unreasonable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q83 Interior Lighting (167)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes and functioning correctly</td>
<td>66 ↓ (78) Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes but some lights flickering or not working</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No and it is dark outside</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No but it is daylight outside</td>
<td>28 ↓ (14) Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q84 Temperature Reasonable (167)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q85 Why Temperature Not Reasonable

(6) %

- A cold day with the heating turned on -
- A cold day with the heating turned off -
- A cold day - not sure if heating is on 17
- A warm day with the heating turned off -
- A warm day with the hearing turned on -
- A warm day - not sure if heating is on 83

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun Q2 – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1

- Q83 Is the interior lighting on and functioning correctly?
- Q84 Do you consider the temperature on board the bus was reasonable given the weather conditions?
- Q85 IF NO to REASONABLE TEMPERATURE Q.81 Is it...?
Section 5: Cleanliness Performance

C2: Station Cleanliness
Station Seating: The majority of interviewers found the station seats to be clean & well maintained; with minor reports of damage/graffiti observed

Base: (25), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A

Q1 Graffiti on Station Seats %

- No graffiti or defacing: 80%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 20%
- Heavy defacing: -
- Offensive graffiti: -

Q2 Station Seats Damaged %

- No visible damage: 92%
- Minor damage: 8%
- Moderate damage: -
- Hazardous damage including seat loose from seat structure: -

Q3 Cleanliness of Station Seats %

- Clean: 88%
- Significant dust or crumbs: -
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: -
- Wet or soiled: -

*= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Jan-Mar 2018

Caution: Small base size

Q1 What best describes graffiti or other defacing on station seats?
Q2 Were any station seats you observed damaged in any way?
Q3 What best describes level of cleanliness of station seats?
Station Cleanliness: Station walls, floors, ceilings & stairs were found to be generally clean, with some instances of minor graffiti and moderate dirt reported.

Q4 Graffiti on Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (25*)

- No signs: 84%
- Minor graffiti or etchings
- Heavy graffiti or etchings
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 16%

Q5 Cleanliness of Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (25*)

- No signs of dirt: 68%
- Light dirt: 28%
- Moderately dirty
- Very dirty*: 2%

Q9 Cleanliness of Station Floors or Stairs (25*)

- Generally Clean: 92%
- Dirt or liquid spills (wet or partially wet/sticky)
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 4%

Q10 Litter on Seats, Floors or Stairs? (25*)

- Appeared litter free: 92%
- Some litter
- A lot of litter: 8%

*Caution: Small base size

Note: Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun vs Jan-Mar 2018 Q1
Station Windows and Exterior: Station windows were thought to be kept in good condition by the majority of interviewers. Outside of the bus station, the majority of interviews reported seeing no litter present.

Q6 What best describes level of graffiti on station windows? (25*)

- No signs: 100%
- Minor graffiti
- Heavy graffiti
- Offensive graffiti

Q7 What best describes level of etching on station windows? (25*)

- No signs: 96%
- Minor etching
- Heavy etching
- Offensive etching

Q8 What best describes level of cleanliness of station windows? (25*)

- No signs: 80%
- Light dirt: 16%
- Moderately dirty: 4%
- Very dirty: 0%

Q11 Was the exterior of the bus station building litter free? (25*)

- Appeared litter free: 92%
- Some litter
- A lot of litter*: 8%

*Caution: Small base size

\[\text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun, Q2 – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1}\]
Station Toilets: Station toilets were seen to be mainly graffiti and litter free by the majority of interviewers, with facilities functioning correctly. Over 1 in 4 saw signs of minor graffiti while 2 in 5 saw minor litter.

Q16 Graffiti on Toilet Area (24*)%
- No signs 71
- Minor graffiti 29
- Heavy graffiti
- Offensive graffiti

Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area? (24*)
- Generally clean 75
- Minor litter on floors 21
- Minor dirt on floor, door or walls
- Very dirty

Q18 Toilets Blocked (24*)%
- Yes 4
- No 96

Q19 Flush Working (24*)%
- Yes 100
- No

Q20 Toilet Paper Available (24*)%
- Yes 4
- No 96

Caution: Small base size

Q16: What best describes level of graffiti in toilet area?
Q17: What best describes cleanliness of toilet area?
Q18: Were any toilets you viewed blocked?
Q19: Was the flush working on the toilet(s) you tested?
Q20: Was there toilet paper available at the toilet(s) you viewed?
Station Washroom Area: Station washrooms are seen to be generally clean but with some instances of dirt and minor graffiti reported. The washroom facilities were thought to be functioning correctly by the majority of interviewers.

**Q21 Cleanliness of Washroom Area (24*)**

- Generally clean: 71%
- Some litter: 13%
- Some dirt on floors or surfaces: 17%
- Very dirty: 2%

**Q22 Graffiti in Washroom Area (17*)**

- No signs: 71%
- Minor graffiti: 29%
- Heavy graffiti: 13%
- Offensive graffiti: 4%

**Q23 Washroom Taps (24*)**

- Yes (both hot and cold): 21%
- Hot only: 79%

**Q24 Soap/Hand Cleanser Available (17*)**

- Yes: 25%
- No: 75%

**Q25 Washroom Dryers (24*)**

- Worked: 4%
- Did not work: 96%

**Q26 Paper Towel Dispenser (24*)**

- Yes, with paper towels: 29%
- Yes, but no paper towels: 71%

**Q27 Bins Clean (24*)**

- Yes: 100%
- Overflowing - needed to be emptied: 25%
- No bins present: 75%

*Caution: Small base size

**Base:** (24), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2
Assessment of Seats: Almost all interviewers found both bus seats & cushions to have minimal levels of graffiti. However there is a significant fall for cleanliness of the seats this quarter.

Base: (167)

Q69 Graffiti on Seats (167)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti or defacing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy defacing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats (167)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant dust or crumbs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gum or other ingrained dirt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet or soiled</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q71 Damage to Seats (167)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor tear, less than 2cm in length</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-JunQ2 – Jan-Mar 2018Q1

Q69: How would you best describe graffiti or other defacing on seat cushions or seat structure?
Q70: What best describes level of cleanliness of seat cushions?
Q71: Were any bus seat cushions you observed damaged in any way?
Bus Interior: The interior of the buses were generally positively regarded with some minor instances of litter & dirt reported.

**Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs (167)**

- Generally clean: 90%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 4%
- Dirt or liquid stains: 6%

**Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs* (167)**

- Litter free: 56%
- Minimal level of litter: 30%
- Some litter: 11%
- A lot of litter: 2%

**Q77 Graffiti of Panels Ceilings, Stairs and other Fixtures/Fittings (167)**

- No signs: 96%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 4%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: -
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: -

**Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures/Fittings (167)**

- No signs: 84%
- Light dirt: 9%
- Moderately dirty: 5%
- Very dirty: 1%

*= Question amended in Q2 2016

**Q75** What best describes level of cleanliness of floors and stairs?

**Q76** What best describes level of litter on seats, floors or stairs?

**Q77** What best describes level of graffiti or etchings on of panels, ceilings, stairs and other fixtures and fittings?

**Q78** What best describes level of cleanliness of panels, ceilings and other fixtures and fittings?
Bus Windows: The majority of interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows while just over a quarter observed light dirt.

Base: (167)

**Q72 Graffiti on Windows (167)**
- No Signs: 96%
- Minor graffiti: 4%
- Heavy defacing: 2%
- Offensive graffiti: 1%

**Q73 Etching on Windows (167)**
- No Signs: 97%
- Minor etching: 3%
- Heavy etching: 1%
- Offensive etching: 0%

**Q74 Cleanliness of Windows (167)**
- No Signs: 68%
- Light dirt: 28%
- Moderately dirty: 2%
- Very dirty: 2%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Q2 – Jan-Mar 2018
Front, Side and Rear of Bus: In the majority of instances, buses were thought to be clean at both the front, sides & rear, a slight increase for moderate levels of dirt on the buses. The levels of dirt observed that was mainly thought to have been picked up during operations has decreased significantly this quarter.

Base: (167)

Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus (167)

- **Yes**: 67%
- **Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today**: 22%
- **Moderately dirty**: 10%

Q90 Was the Rear of the Bus Clean? (167)

- **Yes**: 61%
- **Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today**: 32%
- **Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation**: 7%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun vs Qtr 1 2018
Travel Centre: Of the 25 interviewers who surveyed a bus station, 11 were able to assess the relevant travel centres. Of these, the staff were thought to be polite professional and friendly and the majority found that the information they were given appeared to be correct.

**Question amended in Q2 2018**

**Q12 Travel Centre at Station (25)**

- Yes -open: 12%
- Yes - closed*: 20%
- No: 68%

**Q13 Travel Centre Assistant Response (17)**

- Polite: 73%
- Professional: 64%
- Friendly: 45%
- Indifferent: -
- Ignored me: -
- Rude or sarcastic: -
- Abusive: -

**Q14 Travel Centre Assistant Provide Correct Information? (17)**

- Information provided and appears to be correct: 94%
- Information provided but appeared to be incorrect or out of date: 6%
- Information not provided: -

* Travel Centres were closed for some weekend interviewing

**Question amended in Q2 2018**

\[\downarrow \uparrow\] = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Jan-Mar 2018