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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’.

154 mystery shops were conducted from mid September to end December 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.

Quarter 4 2017: 11th September – 23 Dec 2017

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus: recent changes since previous quarter i.e. Qtr 3 June – Sept 2017 q3 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 4 Sept – Dec 2016 q4
Section 1: Stop Maintenance & Performance
Advertising on Shelter or Bus Stop: Almost all interviewers reported no signs of additional commercial advertising on bus shelters this quarter, a significant improvement vs both last year and last quarter. Similarly, over 9 in 10 interviewers reported no signs of additional commercial advertising on bus stop poles.

Base: (78) IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 / (50) YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

64% observed a Bus Shelter
Q 37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass (78)

41% observed a Bus Stop Pole & Flag
Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole (50)

\[\text{%} = 100 \times \frac{\text{Number of Yes}}{\text{Total}}\]

\[\text{Q37: Is there additional commercial advertising on the shelter glass outside the designated advertising or travel information and timetable panels?}\]

\[\text{Q38: Are there any third party commercial advertisements or notices (excluding graffiti, stickers, or bus operator related advertisements) on the operator's bus pole?}\]

\[\text{Q4} - \text{Jun-Sep 2017} \quad \text{Q3} - \text{Sep-Dec 2016}\]

\[\text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016} \quad \text{Q4} - \text{Jun-Sep 2017} \quad \text{Q3} - \text{Sep-Dec 2016}\]
Bus Shelters: 3 in 4 interviewers found the bus stop poles to be in good condition; while just under 1 in 5 observed signs of moderate damage. Over 9 in 10 interviewers found the bus shelters to be in good condition, a significant improvement from last quarter, while reports of moderate damage have significantly declined versus Q3.

Base: (78), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 (50) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q29b Condition of the Bus Stop Pole & Flag? (50)

- Good condition: 74%
- Moderate damage: 16%
- Scratches/graffiti: 10%
- Hazardous damage: 1%

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter? (78)

- Good condition: 95%
- Moderate damage: 4%
- Hazardous damage: 1%

↓⇑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

Q29b What is the condition of the bus stop pole and flag?
Q31 What is the condition of the bus shelter?
**Timetable:** Just over 3 in 4 interviewers noted a printed timetable present and of these, 4 in 5 found them to be fully legible & clean. Minimal levels of damage to the timetables were reported, with no significant movement observed.

Base: (112) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1 OR BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (86) IF YES TO PRINTED TIMETABLE Q34/1

### Q34 Printed Timetable Present (112)

- **Yes:** 77
- **No:** 23

### Q35 Condition of Timetable (86)

- **Fully legible and clean:** 81%
- **Obscured by dirt:** 5%
- **Not mounted properly:** 7%
- **Torn / damaged:** 5%
- **Obscured by etchings / scratching:** 2%
- **Obscured by condensation:** 2%
- **Obscured by graffiti or stickers:** 2%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

---

**Q34** Is there a printed timetable, for the route you are using, on display at the bus stop pole or bus shelter?

**Q35** How would you describe the state of the timetable?
Section 2: 
Customer Information Performance (CI)
Fares Displayed: Just under 9 in 10 interviewers found fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus, a significant improvement versus last quarter.

Base: (101), Routes with Fares Displayed at the Entrance*

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

(101)

%  

Yes: 89%

No: 11%

*Filter added in Q3 2016

** Interviewer instructions have been updated for Qtr 3 2016

\[\downarrow\uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 – Jun-Sep 2017}\]
Timetable: Of the 4 in 5 interviewers who had time to assess the bus stop before the arrival of the bus, half found the bus stop numbers to be clearly visible, whilst just over 3 in 4 noted a printed timetable present. Just over half were able to observe the operative date on the timetable, with no significant movements observed across the board.

Base: (154)

Q28 Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus
(154)

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible
(112)

Q34 Printed Timetable Present
(112)

Q36 Operative Date Present
(86)

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3
Section 3: Bus Driver Performance – D1
Driver Interaction: 4 incidents of driver disputes were reported this quarter

Base: (154)

Q103 Any Disputes with Passengers/ Other Road Users
(154)

No 97

| Yes - fares | 1 |
| Yes - bus didn’t stop when expected | 1 |
| Yes - buggy or wheelchair issue | - |
| Yes - Dispute with other road users/pedestrians | - |
| Yes - Drunk or abusive passengers | - |
| Yes - other | 1 |
| Could not observe | - |

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

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 by almost all interviewers

Base: (154)

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

Q51 Helpful

Q52 Polite

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform

Q55 Driver Well Presented

\[\uparrow \downarrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016} \quad \text{Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017} \quad \text{Q3}\]

Q51 Helpful
- % Yes: 1
- % No: 99

Q52 Polite
- % Yes: 3
- % No: 97

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform
- % Yes: 2
- % No: 98

Q55 Driver Well Presented
- % Yes: 100
- % No: (97)
Bus Safety: Encouragingly, almost all interviewers reported comfortable journeys with minimal instances of harsh braking, accelerating & moving off too early; nobody felt it was dangerous

** Interviewer instructions have been updated in Qtr 2 2016

*Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(154)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(154)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(154)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally moved off too early</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently moved off too early</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Question amended in Q2 2016

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3
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 boarding passengers, 3 noted that other vehicles were parked in the way, while for the 3 alighting passengers, the majority found that there was no specific reasons for the restrictions.

Base: (154)

Q61 Pulled to Kerb Correctly (Boarding)
- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

Q62 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (4) Boarding
- Another vehicle was parked in the way: 75%
- 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: 25%

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

Q93 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb?
- Other bus was in the way: -
- Other vehicles were parked in the way: -
- There were other obstructions: 33%
- There was no kerb at my destination stop: -
- Other reason: -
- No specific reason, there didn't appear to be any restriction: 67%
Driver Actions: Almost all interviewers reported drivers stopping to pick up passengers when signalled to do so.

Base: (154)

Q102 Stopped to Pick Up Passengers
(154)

- Yes: 97%
- No:
  - Could not always stop as bus was full: 3%
  - Did not always stop to pick up, and no evident reason for not stopping: 3%
  - Was not requested during this journey, other than at boarding stop: 2%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

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 under a third of interviewers observed drivers listening to music while driving whilst 9 in 10 did not observe the drivers holding any long conversations with others.

Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following (154)

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 (154)

Yes 10
No 68
Could not observe 29%

Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations (154)

Yes with other staff 33
Yes with passengers 4
No 91
Could not observe

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3
Leave Bus Unattended: There was 1 instance of a driver leaving the bus unattended this quarter and on this occasion, there was no specific reason as to why the driver left the bus.

Base: (154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q100 Bus Left Unattended (154)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - because of driver change</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to shops</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to toilet</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - some other reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - don’t know the reason</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3
Diversion or Terminated Early: For the 1 interviewer who encountered a bus diversion/termination, they were not informed of the reason for this diversion/termination.

Base: (154)

**Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early (154)**

- Yes
- No

Q109 Passengers Told Reason for Early Termination/Diversion (1)

- Yes
- No

**Q108 If Bus Diverted/Terminated Early (1)**

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

Fail to inform passengers: 100

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

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 being made, all stated that the ramp was activated upon request.

Base: (154), If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105 (4)

Q105 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Requested (154) %

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

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 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

Q105 Was use of a wheel chair ramp or wheelchair lift requested on your trip?
Q106 Was the wheel chair ramp or wheelchair lift activated upon request?
Electronic Displays & Announcements: Just over 2 in 5 interviewers observed fully functioning next stop displays when on the bus, a significant improvement versus last quarter. 1 in 5 interviewers observed the audio next stop announcer working correctly, while 1 in 6 found that it wasn’t working.

Base: (154)

Q80 Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (154) %

- Yes - working correctly: 45%
- Working but not providing correct information: 2%
- Display turned off or not working: 6%
- Cannot see a display: 46%

Q81 Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (154) %

- Yes - working and volume correct: 21%
- Yes - working but too loud: 6%
- Yes - working but too quiet: 6%
- No - not working: 16%
- None on the bus: 56%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

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: The majority of interviewers reported seeing both route and destination numbers on the front and sides of the bus this quarter, although there has been a significant decline in the number of interviewers observing the correct route number on the side of the bus year on year.

**Q43 Route No. on Front (154)**
- Yes: 96%
- Not displayed: 3%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

**Q44 Destination on Front (154)**
- Yes: 99%
- Not displayed: 1%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

**Q45 Route No. on Side (154)**
- Correct route no. displayed: 90%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 1%
- No route no. displayed: 0%
- There was no display panel for the route number: 2%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

**Q47 Route No. on Back (154)**
- Yes: 92%
- Incorrect route number shown: 1%
- No route number shown: 5%
- Couldn’t see: 3%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 – Jun-Sep 2017

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: Just over a third of interviewers saw the CCTV screens turned on and working correctly whilst on the bus, while 1 in 6 saw no CCTV displays present. As the majority of interviewers were on board single deck buses, they were not in a situation to observe any CCTV screens whilst on the bus.

Base: (154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCTV Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turned on and working correctly</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned on, but not working properly</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned off</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CCTV display present</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stairwell / single deck</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† † = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3
Fare Payment: Almost all interviewers reported the ticket machine to be functioning correctly, a significant improvement versus last quarter. Similarly, almost all interviewers found the Leap Card readers to be functioning correctly when on the bus. The number of cash paying interviewers that were not given a ticket has significantly reduced versus last quarter while just over 7 in 10 Leap users were able to see what fare they were charged.

Q56 Cash Fare (108) 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>99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q57b Cash Fare If Cash Fare at R5
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt (108)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<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>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6) Q3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q58b* Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (45)

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

Q59b* Leap Card Reader at Driver See Fare Charged (45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don't know/Couldn't tell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Machine was not working)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Interviewer instructions have been updated in Qtr 2 2016

**Question amended in Q2 2016**
Interior Lighting and Temperature: 4 in 5 interviewers found the interior lighting of the buses to be functioning correctly; a significant improvement both quarter on quarter and year on year. Significant decreases are only observed amongst interviewers who noted 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 6 interviewers feeling the temperatures were unreasonable.

Base: (154)

Q83 Interior Lighting (154)

- Yes and functioning correctly: 80%
- Yes but some lights flickering or not working: 5%
- No and it is dark outside: 1%
- No but it is daylight outside: 14%

Q84 Temperature Reasonable (154)

- Yes: 96%
- No: 4%

Q85 Why Temperature Not Reasonable (6)

- A cold day with the heating turned on: 17%
- A cold day with the heating turned off: 33%
- A cold day - not sure if heating is on: -
- A warm day with heating turned off: -
- A warm day with the heating turned on: 50%
- A warm day - not sure if heating is on: -

\[\text{\(\downarrow\uparrow\)} = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 – Jun-Sep 2017}\]
Section 5: Cleanliness Performance
C2: Station Cleanliness
Station Seating: The majority of interviewers found the station seats to be clean & free of damage although reports of minor graffiti / defacing have significantly increased year on year.

Base: (43), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A
(11*), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

Q1 Graffiti on Station Seats %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total (43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No graffiti or defacing</td>
<td>67 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti or defacing</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy defacing</td>
<td>33 (14) Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 Station Seats Damaged %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total (43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No visible damage</td>
<td>91 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>9 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous damage</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including seat loose from seat structure</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3 Cleanliness of Station Seats %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total (43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>84 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant dust or crumbs</td>
<td>14 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gum or other ingrained dirt</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet or soiled</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \uparrow \) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

*Caution: Small base size
Station Cleanliness: Station walls, floors, ceilings & stairs were found to be generally clean, although some instances of minor graffiti, dirt & dried stains reported. Encouragingly, there has been a significant increase in the number of interviewers reporting no sign of litter year on year.
Station Windows and Exterior: Station windows were though to be kept in good condition by the majority of interviewers, although there has been a significant increase in the number of station windows deemed to be very dirty year on year. Outside of the bus station, 3 in 4 interviews reported seeing no litter present while there has also been a significant decrease in the number of interviewers reporting some litter year on year.

Q6 What best describes level of graffiti on station windows?
- No signs: 93%
- Minor graffiti: 7%
- Heavy graffiti: 2%
- Offensive graffiti: 2%

Q7 What best describes level of etching on station windows?
- No signs: 93%
- Minor etching: 7%
- Heavy etching: 1%
- Offensive etching: 1%

Q8 What best describes level of cleanliness of station windows?
- No signs: 65%
- Light dirt: 16%
- Moderately dirty: 9%
- Very dirty**: 10%

Q11 Was the exterior of the bus station building litter free?
- Appeared litter free: 74%
- Some litter: 12%
- A lot of litter**: 14%

*Caution: Small base size

Base: (43), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A, Base: (11*), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

(1) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016

(2) = Statistically significant differences are 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

** = Busáras deemed very dirty

** = Busáras deemed to have a lot of litter
Station Toilets: Station toilets were seen to be generally graffiti and litter free by the majority of interviewers, with facilities functioning correctly, although reports of toilets deemed very dirty have significantly increased versus last year.

Base: (37), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (10*), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2

** = Cavan, Cork & Busáras stations deemed very dirty

Q16 Graffiti on Toilet Area (37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy graffiti</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Offensive graffiti     | 0  | (30)

Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area? (37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally clean</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor litter on floors</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor dirt on floor, door or walls</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty**</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18 Toilets Blocked (37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| No          | 14 | (30)

Q19 Flush Working (37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| No          | 14 | (30)

Q20 Toilet Paper Available (37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| No          | 11 | (100)

*Caution: Small base size

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 heavy dirt and minor graffiti reported. The washroom facilities were thought to be functioning correctly by the majority of interviewers.

**Q21 Cleanliness of Washroom Area (37)**

- Generally clean: 59%
- Some litter: 11%
- Some dirt on floors or surfaces: 8%
- Very dirty**: 22%

**Q23 Washroom Taps (37)**

- Yes (both hot and cold): 81%
- Hot only: 8%
- Cold only: 3%
- Neither: 11%

**Q24 Soap/Hand Cleanser Available (37)**

- Yes: 86%
- No: 14%

**Q25 Washroom Dryers (37)**

- Worked: 86%
- Did not work: 14%

**Q26 Paper Towel Dispenser (37)**

- Yes, with paper towels: 19%
- Yes, but no paper towels: 3%
- No paper towel dispenser: 78%

**Q27 Bins Clean (37)**

- Yes: 78%
- Overflowing - needed to be emptied: 16%
- No bins present: 3%

**Caution: Small base size**

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

**Base:** (37), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2 Base: (10*), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2

**Notes:**
- **Busáras & Cavan stations deemed very dirty**
- Minor graffiti, Heavy graffiti, Offensive graffiti
- Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3
- *Caution: Small base size*
Section 6: Cleanliness Performance
C1: Bus Cleanliness
Assessment of Seats: Around 9 in 10 interviewers found both bus seats & cushions to be clean & well-maintained with minimal levels of dirt or damage observed

Base: (154)

Q69 Graffiti on Seats (154) %
- No Signs: 89%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 10%
- Heavy defacing: 1%
- Offensive graffiti: -%

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats (154) %
- Clean: 88%
- Significant dust or crumbs: 38%
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: -
- Wet or soiled: -

Q71 Damage to Seats (154) %
- No: 90%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 7%
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 3%
- Moderate damage: -
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: -

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 - Jun-Sep 2017 Q3

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 instances of litter & graffiti reported. Year on year, there has been a significant decrease in the number of interviewers reporting no signs of graffiti on fixtures and fittings although there has been a significant increase in those observing no litter on seats, floors or stairs. Reports of moderate dirt on fixtures and fittings have also significantly declined year on year.

Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs (154)

- Generally clean: 92%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 3%
- Dirt or liquid stains: 5%

Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs* (154)

- Litter free: 53% (↑97) Q4
- Minimal level of litter: 27%
- Some litter: 16%
- A lot of litter: 5%

Q77 Graffiti of Panels Ceilings, Stairs and other Fixtures/Fittings (154)

- No signs: 92%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 6%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 1%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 1%

Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures/Fittings (154)

- No signs: 86%
- Light dirt: 12%
- Moderately dirty: 1%
- Very dirty: 1%

* Question amended in Q2 2016

\[ \uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 to Jun-Sep 2017} \]

Q4 = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 to Jun-Sep 2017
Bus Windows: The majority of interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows while just under 1 in 3 interviewers observed some light dirt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No Signs</th>
<th>Minor graffiti</th>
<th>Heavy defacing</th>
<th>Offensive graffiti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q72 Graffiti on Windows (154)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No Signs</th>
<th>Minor etching</th>
<th>Heavy etching</th>
<th>Offensive etching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q73 Etching on Windows (154)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No Signs</th>
<th>Light dirt</th>
<th>Moderately dirty</th>
<th>Very dirty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q74 Cleanliness of Windows (154)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3
Front, Side and Rear of Bus: There has been a significant decline in the number of interviewers reporting clean fronts / sides of buses versus last quarter. There has also been a significant increase in the number of interviewers observing heavier dirt at the rear of the bus versus Q3.

Base: (154)

**Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus (154)**

- Yes: 65% (65)
- Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 30% (30)
- Moderately dirty: 5% (5)
- Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days: 1% (1)

**Q90 Was the Rear of the Bus Clean? (154)**

- Yes: 51% (51)
- Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 41% (41)
- Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation: 6% (6)

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec 2016 Q4 – Jun-Sep 2017 Q3
Section 7: Customer Service Performance (C5)
Travel Centre: Of the 43 interviewers who surveyed a bus station, 20 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: (20), IF TRAVEL CENTRE OPEN Q13A/1

Q12 Travel Centre at Station (43)

- Yes -open (47)
- Yes - closed* (37)
- No (16)

Q13 Travel Centre Assistant Response (20)

- Polite: 55%
- Professional: 30%
- Friendly: 15%
- Indifferent: -
- Ignored me: -
- Rude or sarcastic: -
- Abusive: -

Q14 Travel Centre Assistant provide Correct Information? (20)

- 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

\[\downarrow \uparrow \text{ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep-Dec} \quad \text{Q4 – Jun-Sep} \quad \text{Q3} \]