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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’.

156 mystery shops were conducted from mid June to mid September 2017 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 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.

Wave 1: Quarter 4 2015: 15th November – 23rd December 2015
Wave 2: Quarter 1 2016: 18th January – 27th March 2016
Wave 5: Quarter 4 2016: 12th September – 31st December 2017
Wave 6: Quarter 1 2017: 9th January – 26th March 2017
Wave 7: Quarter 2 2017: 27th March – 18th June 2017
Wave 8: Quarter 3 2017: 19th June – 10th September 2017

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus: recent changes since previous quarter i.e. Qtr 2 March – June 2017 q2 or from the same time period last year i.e. Qtr 3 June – September 2017 q3.
Section 1: Stop Maintenance & Performance
Advertising on Shelter or Bus Stop: Just under 9 in 10 interviewers reported advertising free shelters, while almost all observed advertising free poles.

Base: IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 / (46) YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

59% observed a Bus Shelter
Q 37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass (74)

37% observed a Bus Stop Pole & Flag
Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole (46)

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017Q2

Q37  Is there additional commercial advertising on the shelter glass outside the designated advertising or travel information and timetable panels?
Q38  Are there any third party commercial advertisements or notices (excluding graffiti, stickers, or bus operator related advertisements) on the operator’s bus pole?
Bus Shelters: Over 3 in 5 interviewers found the bus stop poles to be in good condition; significantly lower than what was reported in Q3 2016, with instances of both scratches/graffiti and hazardous damage on the rise. Reports of moderate damage to bus shelters have also increased year on year.

Base: (74), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 (46) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q29b Condition of the Bus Stop Pole & Flag? (46)

- Good condition: 67%
- Moderate damage: 15%
- Scratches/graffiti: 11%
- Hazardous damage: 7%

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter? (74)

- Good condition: 85%
- Moderate damage: 14%
- Hazardous damage: 1%

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016_{Q3} – Mar-Jun 2017_{Q2}
Timetable: Just under 3 in 4 interviewers noted a printed timetable present and of these, nearly 9 in 10 found them to be fully legible & clean. Minimal levels of damage to the timetables were reported, with no significant movements observed.

Base: (103) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1 OR BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (74) IF YES TO PRINTED TIMETABLE Q34/1

Q34 Printed Timetable Present (103)

- Yes: 72%
- No: 28%

Q35 Condition of Timetable (74)

- Fully legible and clean: 88%
- Obscured by dirt: 3%
- Not mounted properly: 1%
- Torn / damaged: 4%
- Obscured by etchings / scratching: 3%
- Obscured by condensation: 4%
- Obscured by graffiti or stickers: 1%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017Q2
Section 2: Customer Information Performance (CI)
Fares Displayed: Just under 3 in 4 interviewers found fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus

Base: (82), Routes with Fares Displayed at the Entrance*

** Interviewer instructions have been updated for Qtr 3 2016

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Filter added in Q3 2016

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016, Q2 Mar-Jun 2017
Timetable: Of the 4 in 5 interviewers who had time to assess the bus stop before the arrival of the bus, over half found the bus stop numbers to be clearly visible, whilst just under 3 in 4 noted a printed timetable present. The majority were able to observe the operative date on the timetable, while those interviewers who saw a printed timetable present but could not read it has significantly declined year on year.

Base: (156)

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

(Q28) (156) %

Yes No

20 80

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible

(Q32) (103) %

Yes No

43 57

Q34 Printed Timetable Present

(Q34) (103) %

Yes No

28 72

Q36 Operative Date Present

(Q36) (74) %

Yes No

45 55

Present but could not read

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017 Q2

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: only 1 incident of a driver dispute was reported this quarter over fares

Base: (156)

Q103 Any Disputes with Passengers/ Other Road Users
(156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispute Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - fares</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - bus didn’t stop when expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - buggy or wheelchair issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Dispute with other road users/peDESTrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Drunk or abusive passengers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not observe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 - Mar-Jun 2017

Did you notice any disputes between driver and passengers or other road users?
Driver Assessment: Drivers continue to be positively regarded in terms of both attitude & presentation

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

Q51 Helpful

- %
  - Yes
  - No
  1
  99

Q52 Polite

- %
  - Yes
  - No
  0
  100

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform

- %
  - Yes
  - No
  6
  94

Q55 Driver Well Presented

- %
  - Yes
  - No
  2
  98

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016q3 – Mar-Jun 2017q2

Q51 = Q52
Q54 = Q55
**Bus Safety:** Encouragingly, almost all interviewers reported comfortable journeys with minor instances of frequently harsh braking; nobody felt it was dangerous.

Base: (156)

**Interviewer instructions have been updated in Qtr 2 2016**

1. **Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly** *(156)*
   - Yes, felt comfortable: 92%
   - Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort: 4%
   - Frequently too harsh: 3%
   - Serious discomfort: (-) Q3
   - Felt it was dangerous: -

2. **Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly** *(156)*
   - Yes, felt comfortable: 92%
   - Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort: 13%
   - Frequently too harsh – serious discomfort: -
   - Felt it was dangerous: -

3. **Q96 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?** *(156)*
   - Yes: 92%
   - Occasionally moved off too early: 6%
   - Frequently moved off too early: 2%
   - Felt it was dangerous: -

* = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016-Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017-Q2

= Question amended in Q2
When Getting on the Bus: In almost all instances, the buses pulled up correctly to the kerb when able to do so. Of the 4 instances where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for both boarding and alighting passengers, having other buses or vehicles parked in the way were cited as the main reasons for this

Q61 Pulled to Kerb Correctly (Boarding)

- Yes: 99%
- No: 1%

Q62 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (2) Boarding

- Another vehicle was parked in the way: 100%
- There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop: -
- No footpath kerb was present: -
- No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction: -

Base: (156)

Q92 Did the bus pull up to the kerb at the bus stop sufficiently to allow passengers to board and alight from the bus?

Q93 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb?

- Other bus was in the way: 50%
- Other vehicles were parked in the way: 50%
- There were other obstructions: -
- There was no kerb at my destination stop: -
- Other reason: -
- No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction: 50%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 (Q3) – Mar-Jun 2017 (Q2)
Driver Actions: All interviewers reported drivers stopping to pick up passengers when signalled to do so

Base: (156)

Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passengers
(156)

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

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016_Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017_Q2

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 no instances of reckless behaviour observed. Just over a third observed drivers listening to music while driving whilst over 9 in 10 did not observe the drivers holding any long conversations with others.

**Base: (156)**

**Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following (156) %**
- Use mobile phone while driving: -
- Wear an earpiece while driving: -
- Drive the bus in a dangerous manner: -
- None of these: 100

**Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio (156)**
- Yes: 3%
- No: 65%
- Could not observe: -

**Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations (156)**
- Yes with other staff: 31%
- Yes with passengers: 94%
- No: -
- Could not observe: -

---

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 (Q3) – Mar-Jun 2017 (Q2)

Q97: Did the bus driver do any of the following while driving?
Q98: Did the driver listen to music or the radio whilst driving?
Q99: Did the driver hold long conversations with other people on the bus while driving?
Leave Bus Unattended: Few interviewers observed drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter, with no significant movements observed.

Base: (156)

Q100 Bus Left Unattended (156) %

Yes - because of driver change | 1
Yes - to go to shops | -
Yes - to go to toilet | -
Yes - some other reason | 1
Yes - don’t know the reason | 1
No | 98

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017Q2
Diversion or Terminated Early: Of the 8 interviewers who encountered a bus diversion/termination, 7 were not informed of these terminations, whilst one was informed by the driver shouting out the information. No interviewers were told of the specific reasons for the early terminations/diversions.

Base: (156)

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early
- Yes: 5
- No: 95

Q108 If Bus Diverted/Terminated Early (8)
- Announce over PA: 1
- Shout out information: 13
- Inform passengers in some other way (e.g. tour the bus): 1
- Fail to inform passengers: 88

Q109 Passengers Told Reason for Early Termination/Diversion (8)
- Yes: 0
- No: 100

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016_Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017_Q2

Q107 Did bus terminate early or divert off course?
Q108 Did driver...?
Q109 Were passengers told the reason for early termination or diversion off course?
Section 4: Bus Equipment Performance
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: Of the 2 interviewers who observed a wheelchair ramp request being made, both stated that the ramp was activated upon request.

Base: (156), if yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105 (2)

Q105 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Requested (156)

- Yes: 99%
- No: 1%

Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request (2)

- Yes: 100%
  - No - driver stated it was broken
  - No - person requesting was not a wheelchair user
  - No - driver refused to activate because unsafe to do so at the stop
  - No - driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present on the bus
  - No - other reason - please record details
  - No - no reason given

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017Q2.
Electronic Displays & Announcements: Just over a third of interviewers observed fully functioning next stop displays when on the bus, while 1 in 5 observed the audio next stop announcer working correctly.

Base: (156)

### Q80 Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working correctly</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working but not providing correct information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display turned off or not working</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot see a display</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q81 Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working and volume correct</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working but too loud</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working but too quiet</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - not working</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None on the bus</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017Q2

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.

Base: (156)

**Q43 Route No. on Front (156)**

- Yes: 93%
- Not displayed: 5%
- Could not clearly see: 2%

**Q44 Destination on Front (156)**

- Yes: 97%
- Not displayed: 3%
- Could not clearly see: 3%

**Q45 Route No. on Side (156)**

- Correct route no. displayed: 92%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 1%
- No route no. displayed: 1%
- There was no display panel for the route number: 4%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

**Q87 Route No. on Back (156)**

- Yes: 91%
- Incorrect route number shown: 7%
- No route number shown: 6%
- Couldn’t see: 3%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 vs Mar-Jun 2017 Q2

Q43  Could the correct route number be clearly seen on the front of the bus?
Q44  Could the correct destination be clearly seen on the front of the bus?
Q45  Could the correct route number be seen clearly on the side of the bus?
Q87  Was the correct route number displayed on the back of the bus?
CCTV: 2 in 5 interviewers saw the CCTV screens turned on and working correctly whilst on the bus. As almost half of interviewers were on board single deck buses, they were not in a situation to observe any CCTV screens whilst on the bus.

Base: (156)

Q82 CCTV in Stairwell (156)%

- Turned on and working correctly: 40
- Turned on, but not working properly: 10
- Turned off: 3
- No CCTV display present: 10
- No stairwell / single deck: 47

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 - Mar-Jun 2017
Fare Payment: Almost all interviewers reported the ticket machine & Leap Card readers to be functioning correctly in the majority of cases, however reports of tickets machines not working correctly has risen year on year. The majority of cash payers received either a printed ticket or the correct change however there has been a significant increase year on year in the number of interviewers who weren’t given a ticket. 3 in 5 Leap users were able to see what fare they were charged.

Q56** Cash Fare (98)
If Cash Fare at R5
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q57b** Cash Fare
If Cash Fare at R5
Got handwritten ticket
Was not given a ticket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes, printed ticket</th>
<th>Yes, printed ticket and correct change</th>
<th>Got handwritten ticket</th>
<th>Was not given a ticket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q58b* Leap Card Reader Present
at Driver Working Correctly (58)
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt (98)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q59b* Leap Card Reader at Driver
See Fare Charged (58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Interview instructions updated in Qtr 2 2016

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017Q2

**Question amended in Q2 2016
Interior Lighting and Temperature: The majority of interviewers found the interior lighting of the buses to be functioning correctly; with 2 in 5 noting that it was daylight outside so no need for interior lighting. Almost all interviewers found the on-board temperatures on the buses to be reasonable considering the weather conditions outside; with only 1 interviewer feeling the temperatures were too cold.

**Q83 Interior Lighting (156)**

- Yes and functioning correctly: 57%
- Yes but some lights flickering or not working: 3%
- No and it is dark outside: 40%
- No but it is daylight outside: 99%

**Q84 Temperature Reasonable (156)**

- Yes: 99%
- No: 1%

**Q85 Why Temperature Not Reasonable (1)**

- 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: -
- A warm day with heating turned off: -
- A warm day with the heating turned on: -
- A warm day - not sure if heating is on: 100%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016$_{Q3}$ – Mar-Jun 2017$_{Q2}$
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 & ingrained dirt observed.

Base: (10), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A

### Q1 Graffiti on Station Seats %
- **No graffiti or defacing**: 80%
- **Minor graffiti or defacing**: 10%
- **Heavy defacing**: 10%

*Offensive graffiti reported in Sligo bus station

### Q2 Station Seats Damaged %
- **No visible damage**: 90%
- **Minor damage**: 10%
- **Moderate damage**: 10%
- **Hazardous damage including seat loose from seat structure**: 10%

*Moderate damage reported in Sligo bus station

### Q3 Cleanliness of Station Seats (10)
- **Clean**: 90%
- **Significant dust or crumbs**: 10%
- **Gum or other ingrained dirt**: 10%
- **Wet or soiled**: 10%

<sup>*Caution: Small base size</sup>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 <sub>Q3</sub> – Mar-Jun 2017 <sub>Q2</sub>

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 moderate dirt & stains reported.

Q4 Graffiti on Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (10)

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

Q5 Cleanliness of Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (10)

- No signs of dirt: 60%
- Light dirt
- Moderately dirty
- Very dirty

*Moderate dirt reported in Cork bus station

Q9 Cleanliness of Station Floors or Stairs (10)

- Generally Clean: 90%
- Dirt or liquid spills (wet or partially wet/sticky)
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried)

Q10 Litter on Seats, Floors or Stairs? (10)

- Appeared litter free: 100%
- Some litter
- A lot of litter

*Caution: Small base size

Q4 What best describes level of graffiti or etchings on of walls, panels, ceilings, stairs and other fixtures and fittings?
Q5 What best describes level of cleanliness of walls panels, ceilings and other fixtures and fittings?
Q9 What best describes level of cleanliness of station floors or stairs?
Q10 Was there litter on station seats, floor or stairs?

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 - Mar-Jun 2017 Q2

KANTAR MILLWARD BROWN
Station Windows and Exterior: Station windows were thought to be kept in good condition by the majority of interviewers, with minor instances of light dirt reported.

Q6 What best describes level of graffiti on station windows?
- No signs: 100%
- Minor graffiti: 0%
- Heavy graffiti: 0%
- Offensive graffiti: 0%

Q7 What best describes level of etching on station windows?
- No signs: 100%
- Minor etching: 0%
- Heavy etching: 0%
- Offensive etching: 0%

Q8 What best describes level of cleanliness of station windows?
- No signs: 60%
- Light dirt: 40%
- Moderately dirty: 0%
- Very dirty: 0%

Q11 Was the exterior of the bus station building litter free?
- Appeared litter free: 100%
- Some litter: 50%
- A lot of litter: 0%
Station Toilets: Station toilets were seen to be generally graffiti and litter free by the majority of interviewers, with facilities functioning correctly in most cases.

**Q16 Graffiti on Toilet Area (10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No signs</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy graffiti</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area? (10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generally clean</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor litter on floors</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor dirt on floor, door or walls</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q18 Toilets Blocked (10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Toilets blocked in Monaghan bus station

**Q19 Flush Working (10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Flush not working in Cavan bus station

**Q20 Toilet Paper Available (10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No toilet paper available in Cavan bus station

**Base:** (10), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2

*Caution: Small base size

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 – Mar-Jun 2017

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 (10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally clean</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some litter</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some dirt on floors or surfaces</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q22 Graffiti in Washroom Area (10)**

- No signs: 90%
- Minor graffiti: 10%
- Heavy graffiti: 10%
- Offensive graffiti: 10%

**Q23 Washroom Taps (10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (both hot and cold)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold only</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q24 Soap/Hand Cleanser Available (10)**

Yes: 100%
No: 0%

**Q25 Washroom Dryers (10)**

- Worked: 100%
- Did not work: 0%
- No washroom dryer: 0%

**Q26 Paper Towel Dispenser (10)**

- Yes, with paper towels: 20%
- Yes, but no paper towels: 10%
- No paper towel dispenser: 80%

**Q27 Bins Clean (38)**

- Yes: 80%
- Overflowing - needed to be emptied: 10%
- No bins: 10%

*Caution: Small base size*

- = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 – Mar-Jun 2017
- Bin overflowing in Cavan bus station
- Base: (10), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2

---

KANTAR MILLARDBROWN
Section 6:
Cleanliness Performance
C1: Bus Cleanliness
Assessment of Seats: Most interviewers found both bus seats & cushions to be clean & well-maintained overall. Instances of minor graffiti/defacing have significantly increased versus last quarter while reports of gum or other ingrained dirt have also increased year on year.

Base: (156)

Q69 Graffiti on Seats (156)

- No Signs: 78%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 21%
- Heavy defacing: 1%
- Offensive graffiti: 1%

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats (156)

- Clean: 85%
- Significant dust or crumbs: 3%
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: 12%
- Wet or soiled: 3%

Q71 Damage to Seats (156)

- No: 88%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 8%
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 5%
- Moderate damage: 3%
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: 12%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 – Mar-Jun 2017
**Bus Interior:** The interior of the buses were generally positively regarded with minor instances of litter, dirt & graffiti reported.

**Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs (156)%**
- Generally clean: 88%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 4%
- Dirt or liquid stains: 8%

**Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs* (156)%**
- Litter free: 53%
- Minimal level of litter: 34%
- Some litter: 10%
- A lot of litter: 3%

**Q77 Graffiti of Panels Ceilings, Stairs and other Fixtures/Fittings (156)%**
- No signs: 89%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 10%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 1%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 1%

**Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures/Fittings (156)%**
- No signs: 80%
- Light dirt: 13%
- Moderately dirty: 5%
- Very dirty: 1%

*Question amended in Q2

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016 – Mar-Jun 2017
Bus Windows: The majority of interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows while just over a third reported light dirt; a significant increase versus last year.

Base: (156)

Q72 Graffiti on Windows (156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy defacing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q73 Etching on Windows (156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor etching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy etching</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive etching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q74 Cleanliness of Windows (156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016_Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017_Q2
Front, Side and Rear of Bus: In the majority of instances, buses were thought to be clean at both the front, sides & rear. For those interviewers who observed dirt on the buses, most felt it was likely to have been picked up during operations that day.

Base: (156)

Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus (156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q90 Was the Rear of the Bus Clean? (156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day's operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016Q3 – Mar-Jun 2017Q2
Section 7:
Customer Service Performance (C5)
Travel Centre: Of the 10 interviewers who surveyed a bus station, 8 were able to assess the Travel Centre. Of these, the staff were thought to be polite, professional and friendly. All interviewers found the information they were provided in the travel centre to be correct.

Base: (8), IF TRAVEL CENTRE OPEN Q13A/1

### Q12 Travel Centre at Station (10)

- **Yes -open**: 10
- **Yes - closed**: 80
- **No**: 10

### Q13 Travel Centre Assistant Response (8)

- **Polite**: 50%
- **Professional**: 25%
- **Friendly**: 25%
- **Indifferent**: -
- **Ignored me**: -
- **Rude or sarcastic**: -
- **Abusive**: -

### Q14 Travel Centre Assistant provide Correct Information? (8)

- **Information provided and appears to be correct**: 100%
- **Information provided but appeared to be incorrect or out of date**: -
- **Information not provided**: -

* Travel Centres were closed for some weekend interviewing

\[ \downarrow \uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 Jun-Sep 2016}_{Q3} - \text{Mar-Jun 2017}_{Q2} \]