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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’.

192 mystery shops (including additional Q2 mop ups plus 8 bus station boosts) were conducted from mid June to early September 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.

Quarter 3 2018: June 18th – Sep 9th 2018

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus the previous quarter i.e. Qtr 2 April – June 2018 q2 or versus the same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 3 July – Sep 2017 q3. Significant differences are tested at 95% confidence and above.
Section 1:
Stop Maintenance & Performance
Advertising on Shelter or Bus Stop: There were minimal instances of commercial advertising present on bus stops this quarter, particularly on shelter glass which has shown improvement year on year.

Base: IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 (88) / (65) YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

41% observed a Bus Stop Pole & 50% observed a shelter at the stop

Q 37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass

(88) %

Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole

(65) %

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-SepQ3 – Mar-Jun 2018Q2
Bus Shelters: 3 in 5 interviewers found the bus stop poles to be in good condition; while over a third saw signs of moderate damage, a significant uplift versus last year. Reports of more hazardous damage have declined year on year. 4 in 5 interviewers felt that the bus shelters were in good condition with just under 1 in 5 reporting more moderate damage to shelters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q29b Condition of the Bus Stop Pole &amp; Flag?</th>
<th>Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratches/graffiti</td>
<td>Scratches/graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage</td>
<td>Hazardous damage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: (88), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 (65) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

\[ \text{Q29b } \text{Condition of the Bus Stop Pole & Flag?} \]

\[ \text{Q31 } \text{Condition of the Bus Shelter?} \]

\[ \text{Good condition} \]

\[ \text{Moderate damage} \]

\[ \text{Scratches/graffiti} \]

\[ \text{Hazardous damage} \]

\[ \text{Good condition} \]

\[ \text{Moderate damage} \]

\[ \text{Scratches/graffiti} \]

\[ \text{Hazardous damage} \]

\[ = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018} \]

Q29b What is the condition of the bus stop pole and flag?
Q31 What is the condition of the bus shelter?
Timetable: 3 in 5 interviewers noted a printed timetable present, with no significant movements observed.

Q34 Printed Timetable Present
(65) %

38 Yes
62 No

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-SepQ3 – Mar-Jun 2018Q2

Base: (65) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1
Information Display: 2 in 5 interviewers saw an information display present at the bus stop, while a third saw a small panel on the pole, a significant uplift from last quarter. 4 in 5 interviewers found the information displays to be fully legible and clean.

Base: (146) IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q28C

Q28d* Information Display (146) %

- Small Panel on Pole: 34 (16) Q2
- Long panel on pole: 5
- Information panel on shelter: 40
- TFI Pole with information panel: 9
- None: 15

Q28e* Information displayed (124) %

- Fully legible and clean: 83
- Obscured by condensation: 8
- Damaged or torn: 2
- Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /...: 2
- Not mounted correctly: 4

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018 Q2

*New for Q1 2018

Q28d What type of information display was there present at the stop?
Q28e How would you describe the condition of this information display?
Section 2: Customer Information Performance (CI)
Fares Displayed: Almost all interviewers found fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus, a significant uplift versus last year.

Base: (118), Routes with Fares Displayed at the Entrance

Q50 Were the fares displayed clearly at the entrance?

- Yes: 92%
- No: 8%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep vs. Mar-Jun 2018.
Timetable: Of the 9 in 10 interviewers who had time to assess the bus stop before the arrival of the bus, the majority found the bus stop numbers to be clearly visible a significant increase vs last year, whilst 3 in 5 saw a printed timetable present. Half of interviewers were able to observe the operative date on the timetable.

Base: (192)

Q28 Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus (192)

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible (65)

Q34 Printed Timetable Present

Q36 Operative Date Present

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018.
Section 3: Bus Driver Performance – D1
Driver Interaction: There was 1 instance of a driver dispute recorded this quarter over a buggy or wheelchair issue.

Base: (192)

Q103 Any Disputes with Passengers/ Other Road Users (192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - fares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - bus didn’t stop when expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - buggy or wheelchair issue</td>
<td>1</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 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018 Q2
Driver Assessment: Drivers continue to be very positively regarded in terms of both attitude & presentation

Base: (192)

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

Q51 Helpful
- %
  - Yes: 98
  - No: 2

Q52 Polite
- %
  - Yes: 99
  - No: 1

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

Q55 Driver Well Presented
- %
  - Yes: 99
  - No: 1

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep - Mar-Jun 2018 Q2
**Bus Safety:** Encouragingly, almost all interviewers reported comfortable journeys with minor instances of harsh braking, accelerating & moving off too early; nobody felt it was dangerous. However, instances of drivers occasionally braking too harshly have significantly increased versus this time last year.

Base: (192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly</td>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently too harsh – serious discomfort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly</td>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently too harsh – serious discomfort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q96 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally moved off too early</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently moved off too early</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018 Q2

* Question amended in Q2 2016

---

Q94 | Generally, did the bus driver accelerate smoothly?  
Q95 | Did the bus driver brake and take corners smoothly?  
Q96 | Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?
When Getting on the Bus: Of the 5 instances where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for boarding passengers, 3 noted that this was due to no footpath kerb being present, 1 noted another vehicle parked in the way while another felt that there was no specific restriction. Of the 9 instances where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for alighting passengers, 6 felt that there didn’t appear to be any restriction while 3 found there was no kerb present at the destination stop.

Base: (192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q62 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (5) Boarding</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footpath kerb was present</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q93 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (9) Alighting</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other bus was in the way</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vehicles were parked in the way</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no kerb at my destination stop</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep Q3 – Mar-Jun 2018 Q2
**Driver Actions:** All interviewers reported drivers stopping to pick up passengers when signalled to do so

Base: (182), ALL EXCLUDING THOSE NOT REQUESTED TO STOP

Q102* Stopped to Pick Up Passengers (182)

- **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-JunQ2 – Jan-Mar 2018Q1

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 minimal mentions of drivers using mobile phones or earpieces (only a very small number of instances observed).

1 in 5 interviewers observed drivers listening to music while driving, significantly down versus last year, whilst almost all interviewers did not observe the drivers holding any long conversations with others.

Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following

- Use mobile phone while driving: 2%
- Wear an earpiece while driving: 1%
- Drive the bus in a dangerous manner: -
- None of these: 97%

Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio (192)

- Yes: 2%
- No: 20%
- Could not observe: 78%

Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations (192)

- Yes with other staff: 1%
- Yes with passengers: 2%
- No: 97%
- Could not observe: -

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018

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: There were 3 instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter; two were because of the driver going to the shops while the other involved the driving getting out to get fresh air outside.

Base: (192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q100 Bus Left Unattended (192)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - because of driver change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - some other reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'To get fresh air outside'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - don't know the reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep - Mar-Jun 2018 Q2
Diversion or Terminated Early: For the 4 interviewers who encountered a bus diversion/termination, one was informed by the driver shouting out information while the other three noted that the driver failed to informed passengers.

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

- Yes: 2
- No: 98

Q108 If Bus Diverted/Terminated Early (4)

- Announce over PA
- Shout out information: 25
- Inform passengers in some other way (e.g. tour the bus)
- Fail to inform passengers: 75

Q109 Passengers Told Reason for Early Termination/Diversion (4)

- Yes: 25
- No: 75

≤ Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018 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 4 interviewers who observed a wheelchair ramp request, all found that it was activated when necessary

Base: (192), If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105 (4)

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

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 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018 Q2
Electronic Displays & Announcements: Of those who saw an electronic next stop display present, half saw that they were working correctly, a significant decline versus last year, while 2 in 5 found that they were turned off or not working, a significant increase versus last quarter. For those who heard an audio next stop announcement, just under 2 in 5 found that it was working while half noted that it was not working, a significant uplift from last quarter.

Base: (100), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT (72)

Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working correctly</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working but not providing correct information</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display turned off or not working</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot see a display</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q81* Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working and volume correct</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working but too loud</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working but too quiet</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - not working</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None on the bus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[\downarrow\] = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun\textsubscript{Q2} – Jan-Mar 2018\textsubscript{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, with no significant movements observed. Of the 12 interviewers who could not clearly see a route number, 3 noted that the bus appeared to be a replacement bus.

Q43 Route No. on Front (192)  
- Yes: 95%  
- Not displayed: 1%  
- Could not clearly see: 4%

Q44 Destination on Front (192)  
- Yes: 95%  
- Not displayed: 1%  
- Could not clearly see: 4%

Q45 Route No. on Side (192)  
- Correct route no. displayed: 93%  
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 1%  
- No route no. displayed: 5%  
- There was no display panel for the route number: 1%  
- Could not clearly see: 5%

Q45a Replacement Bus (12*)  
- Yes: 25%  
- No: 75%

Q87 Route No. on Back (192)  
- Correct route no. displayed: 91%  
- Incorrect route number shown: 1%  
- No route number shown: 5%  
- Couldn’t see: 4%
CCTV: 3 in 5 interviewers who saw a CCTV screen in the stairwell noted that it was turned on and working correctly. A quarter saw no CCTV displays present.

Base: (109), ALL EXCLUDING NO STAIRWELL / SINGLE DECK

Q82* CCTV in Stairwell (109)

- Turned on and working correctly: 61%
- Turned on, but not working properly: 4%
- Turned off: 7%
- No CCTV display present: 28%

* Question rebased off those who could see a CCTV display

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2017 Mar-Jun – Jan-Mar 2018 Q1
Fare Payment: Almost all interviewers reported the ticket machine & Leap Card readers were working correctly. The majority of cash payers received either a printed ticket or the correct change where appropriate, with significant declines in those not given ticket year on year. 3 in 4 Leap users were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus, with significant declines amongst those who couldn’t tell what fare they were charged versus last year.

Q56 Cash Fare (110)
If Cash Fare at R5
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q57b Cash Fare
If Cash Fare at R5
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt (110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, printed ticket</th>
<th>Yes, printed ticket and correct change</th>
<th>Yes, printed ticket and incorrect change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q58b* Leap Card Reader Present
at Driver Working Correctly (79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q59b* Leap Card Reader at Driver
See Fare Charged (51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don't know/Couldn't tell Machine was not working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>22 (38) Q3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question amended in Q2 2016

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep, Mar-Jun 2018 Q2

Q26 Q57b Was the ticket machine working correctly for you? Were you given a printed ticket and change?
Q58b Did the Leap Card reader appear to be working correctly?
Q59b Could you see what fare were you charged?
Interior Lighting and Temperature: Half of interviewers found the interior lighting of the buses to be functioning correctly, declining versus last quarter, with 2 in 5 noting that there was no need for lighting as it was daylight outside, a significant uplift versus last quarter. There were minimal instances of lights flickering / not working. Almost all interviewers found the on-board temperatures on the buses to be; with 7 interviewers feeling the temperatures on board were unreasonable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q83 Interior Lighting (192)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes and functioning correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes but some lights flickering or not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No and it is dark outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No but it is daylight outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q84 Temperature Reasonable (192)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q85 Why Temperature Not Reasonable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A cold day with the heating turned on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cold day with the heating turned off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cold day - not sure if heating is on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A warm day with heating turned off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A warm day with the heating turned on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A warm day - not sure if heating is on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \downarrow \uparrow \) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018
Section 5: Cleanliness Performance
C2: Station Cleanliness
Station Seating: The majority of interviewers found the station seats to be clean & well maintained; with 1 in 5 noting signs of minor graffiti/defacing.

Base: (50), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS ÉIREANN STATION Q1A (7), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

Q1 Graffiti on Station Seats %

No graffiti or defacing: 70 (57)
Minor graffiti or defacing: 22 (43)
Offensive graffiti/Heavy defacing: 8

Q2 Station Seats Damaged %

No visible damage: 90 (100)
Minor damage: 6
Moderate damage: 4
Hazardous damage including seat loose from seat structure

Q3 Cleanliness of Station Seats (50) %

Clean: 90 (100)
Significant dust or crumbs
Gum or other ingrained dirt
Wet or soiled

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep - Mar-Jun 2018

*Caution: Small base size
Station Cleanliness: Station walls, floors, ceilings & stairs were found to be generally clean, with some instances of minor graffiti and litter reported.

Q4 Graffiti on Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (50)
- No signs: 84 (43)
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 2 (14)
- Heavy graffiti or etchings*: 12 (43)

Q5 Cleanliness of Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (50)
- No signs of dirt: 72 (71)
- Light dirt: 24 (29)
- Moderately dirty: 2

Q9 Cleanliness of Station Floors or Stairs (50)
- Generally Clean: 86 (100)
- Dirt or liquid spills (wet or partially wet/sticky): 6
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 8

Q10 Litter on Seats, Floors or Stairs? (50)
- Appeared litter free: 84 (71)
- Some litter: 16 (29)
- A lot of litter:  -

*Caution: Small base size

Base: (50), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A. Base: (7), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

\(=\) Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018 Q2

Base: (5), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

*Heavy graffiti observed in Busáras

*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?
Station Windows and Exterior: Station windows were thought to be kept in good condition by the majority of interviewers. Outside of the bus station, a third of interviews reported seeing litter present.

**Q6** What best describes level of graffiti on station windows? (50)
- No signs: 92%
- Minor graffiti: 6%
- Heavy graffiti: 2%

**Q7** What best describes level of etching on station windows? (50)
- No signs: 90%
- Minor etching: 8%
- Heavy etching: 2%

**Q8** What best describes level of cleanliness of station windows? (50)
- No signs: 76%
- Light dirt: 20%
- Moderately dirty: 4%
- Very dirty: 0%

**Q11** Was the exterior of the bus station building litter free? (50)
- Appeared litter free: 68%
- Some litter: 24%
- A lot of litter*: 8%

*Caution: Small base size

Base: (50), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A, **Base: (7), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A**

*Limerick station thought to have a lot of litter

*= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep and Mar-Jun 2018

(14) = Busáras

/= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep and Mar-Jun 2018

(29) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep and Mar-Jun 2018

(86) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep and Mar-Jun 2018

(14) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep and Mar-Jun 2018

(71) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep and Mar-Jun 2018

(29) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep and Mar-Jun 2018
Station Toilets: Station toilets were seen to be generally graffiti and litter free by the majority of interviewers, with facilities functioning correctly. 1 in 4 saw signs of minor graffiti while 1 in 5 saw minor litter.

Q16 Graffiti on Toilet Area (39)

- No signs: 77%
- Minor graffiti: 23%
- Heavy graffiti: 3%
- Offensive graffiti: 2%

Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area? (39)

- Generally clean: 69%
- Minor litter on floors: 18%
- Minor dirt on floor, door or walls: 10%
- Very dirty*: 3%

Q18 Toilets Blocked (39)

- Yes: 3%
- No: 97%

Q19 Flush Working (39)

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

Q20 Toilet Paper Available (39)

- Yes: 92%
- No: 8%

*Caution: Small base size

*Limerick station thought to be very dirty

† = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018.

Base: (39), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (4), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2
Station Washroom Area: Station washrooms are seen to be generally clean but with some instances of minor graffiti and litter reported. The washroom facilities were thought to be functioning correctly by the majority of interviewers.

Q21 Cleanliness of Washroom Area (39)

- Generally clean: 67%
- Some litter: 15%
- Some dirt on floors or surfaces: 18%

Q22 Graffiti in Washroom Area (39)

- No signs: 85%
- Minor graffiti: 15%
- Heavy graffiti: 5%
- Offensive graffiti: 26%

Q23 Washroom Taps (39)

- Yes (both hot and cold): 82%
- Hot only: 9%
- Cold only: 8%
- Neither: 1%

Q24 Soap/Hand Cleanser Available (39)

- Yes: 92%
- No: 8%

Q25 Washroom Dryers (39)

- Worked: 100%
- Did not work: 0%

Q26 Paper Towel Dispenser (39)

- Yes: 69%
- Yes, with paper towels: 26%
- Yes, but no paper towels: 5%

Q27 Bins Clean (39)

- Yes: 85%
- Overflowing -needed to be emptied: 8%
- No bins present: 75%

Base: (39), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (4), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2

**Caution: Small base size**
Section 6: 
Cleanliness Performance 
C1: Bus Cleanliness
Assessment of Seats: Almost all interviewers found both bus seats & cushions to be clean & well-maintained with minimal levels of graffiti or damage observed. The number of interviewers reporting no signs of graffiti on seats has significantly declined versus last quarter while those reporting minor graffiti has significantly increased.

Base: (192)

Q69 Graffiti on Seats (192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti or defacing</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy defacing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats (192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant dust or crumbs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gum or other ingrained dirt</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet or soiled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q71 Damage to Seats (192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor tear, less than 2cm in length</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

נאמר כי הבדלים סטטיסטיים משמעותיים בין הש��ים של ה.periods Q3 2017 Jun-Sep - Mar-Jun 2018 Q2

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. Encouragingly, there have been significant increases in the number of interviewers reporting litter free interiors both quarter on quarter and year on year.

Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs (192)

- Generally clean: 92%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 3%
- Dirt or liquid stains: 6%

Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs* (192)

- Litter free: 70%
- Minimal level of litter: 24%
- Some litter: 6%
- A lot of litter: 2%

Q77 Graffiti of Panels Ceilings, Stairs and other Fixtures/Fittings (192)

- No signs: 95%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 5%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 1%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 0%

Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures/Fittings (192)

- No signs: 83%
- Light dirt: 10%
- Moderately dirty: 6%
- Very dirty: 1%

* Question amended in Q2 2016

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep - Mar-Jun 2018
Bus Windows: The majority of interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows while 1 in 3 observed light dirt. The number of windows seen to be moderately dirty have significantly increased both versus last quarter and last year.

Base: (192)

Q72 Graffiti on Windows (192)
- No Signs: 95%
- Minor graffiti: 5%
- Heavy defacing: -
- Offensive graffiti: -

Q73 Etching on Windows (192)
- No Signs: 97%
- Minor etching: 3%
- Heavy etching: -
- Offensive etching: -

Q74 Cleanliness of Windows (192)
- No Signs: 61%
- Light dirt: 29%
- Moderately dirty: 10%
- Very dirty: 1%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018

* = Hosepipe ban in place during Q3 fieldwork
Front, Side and Rear of Bus: In the majority of instances, buses were thought to be clean at both the front, sides & rear, however this is declining year on year. Most of the dirt observed was mainly thought to have been picked up during operations that day, however there has been significant increases in heavier dirt observed at the rear of the buses year on year.

Base: (192)

*K47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus (192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018 Q2

*K90 Was the Rear of the Bus Clean? (192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cleanliness</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day's operation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Hosepipe ban in place during Q3 fieldwork
Section 7: Customer Service Performance (C5)
Travel Centre: Of the 50 interviewers who surveyed a bus station, 35 were able to assess the relevant travel centres. Of these, the staff were thought to be polite, professional and friendly and all found that the information they were given appeared to be correct.

Base: (12), IF TRAVEL CENTRE OPEN Q13A/1

Q12 Travel Centre at Station (50) %
- Yes -open: 12
- Yes -closed*: 70
- No: 18

Q13 Travel Centre Assistant Response** (35)
- Polite: 92%
- Professional: 58%
- Friendly: 58%
- Indifferent: -
- Ignored me: -
- Rude or sarcastic: -
- Abusive: -

Q14 Travel Centre Assistant Provide Correct Information? (35)
- Information provided and appears to be correct: 100%
- Information provided but appeared to be incorrect or out of date: -
- Information not provided: -

* Question amended in Q2 2018
* Travel Centres were closed for some weekend interviewing

↓ ↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 3 2017 Jun-Sep – Mar-Jun 2018