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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’.

157 mystery shops (plus an additional 35 bus station boosts) were conducted from mid September to end December 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 2018: 10th September – 30th December 2018

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus the previous quarter i.e. Qtr 3 June – Sep 2018 Q3 or versus the same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 4 Oct – Dec 2017 Q4.
Section 1:
Stop Maintenance & Performance
Advertising on Shelter or Bus Stop: There were no instances of commercial advertising present on bus shelters this quarter, and minimal instances on bus stop poles.

Base: IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 (63) / (63) YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

43*% observed a Bus Stop Pole & 64*% observed a shelter at the stop

Q 37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass
(63) %

Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole
(63)%

上下 = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec - Jun-Sep 2018 Q3

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; while a third saw signs of moderate damage. Almost all interviewers felt that the bus shelters were in good condition with minimal instances of moderate damage reported. Hazardous damage was observed at minimal levels.

Base: (63), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 / (63) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

Q29b Condition of the Bus Stop Pole & Flag?

- Good condition: 67%
- Moderate damage: 27%
- Scratches/graffiti: 5%
- Hazardous damage: 3%

Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter?

- Good condition: 94%
- Moderate damage: 6%
- Hazardous damage: -

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018

Q29b What is the condition of the bus stop pole and flag?
Q31 What is the condition of the bus shelter?
**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. 4 in 5 interviewers found the information displays to be fully legible and clean however there have been increases in displays obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti versus Q3.

Base: (121) IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q28C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q28d* Information Display (121)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Panel on Pole</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long panel on pole</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information panel on shelter</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFI Pole with information panel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q28e* Information displayed (104)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged or torn</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /</td>
<td>11↑(2) Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mounted correctly</td>
<td>-↓(4) Q3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New for Q1 2018

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018 Q3
Section 2: Customer Information Performance (CI)
Fares Displayed: Almost all interviewers found fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus, increasing both versus last quarter and same time last year.

Base: (116), Routes with Fares Displayed at the Entrance*

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

- Yes: 98%
- No: 2%

↓ (11) Q4
↓ (8) Q3

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018

*Filter added in Q3 2016
Timetable: Of the 9 in 10 interviewers who had time to assess the bus stop before the arrival of the bus, just under 7 in 10 found the bus stop numbers to be clearly visible, increasing YOY, while half saw a printed timetable present, dropping versus last year. 2 in 5 were able to observe the operative date on the timetable.

Base: (157)

Q28 Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus
(157)

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible
(63)

Q34 Printed Timetable Present
(63)

Q36 Operative Date Present
(32)

Yes
No
Present but could not read

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018 Q3
Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance
Electronic Displays & Announcements: Of those who saw an electronic next stop display present, 7 in 10 found that they were working correctly, increasing from last quarter but declining YOY, while 1 in 4 couldn’t see a display. For those who heard an audio next stop announcement, just under 2 in 5 found that it was working while almost half noted that it was not working.

Base: (101), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT (157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (101)</th>
<th>Q81* Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (157)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - working correctly</td>
<td>Yes - working and volume correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working but not providing correct information</td>
<td>Yes - working but too loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display turned off or not working</td>
<td>Yes - working but too quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot see a display</td>
<td>No - not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018

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

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?
**Wheelchair Ramp/Lift:** Of the 2 interviewers who observed a wheelchair ramp request, both found that it was activated upon request

Base: (157), If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105 (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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 2018 Sep-Dec Q4 – Jun-Sep 2018 Q3
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all interviewers reported seeing both route and destination numbers on the front and sides of the bus. There were no incidents of replacement buses this quarter.

Q43 Route No. on Front (157)

- Yes: 99%
- Not displayed: 1%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

Q45 Route No. on Side (157)

- Correct route no. displayed: 99%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: (3) Q4, (4) Q3
- No route no. displayed: 1%
- There was no display panel for the route number: 1%
- Could not clearly see: (3) Q4

Q44 Destination on Front (157)

- Yes: 100%
- Not displayed: 1%
- Could not clearly see: 1%

Q87 Route No. on Back (157)

- Yes: 97%
- Incorrect route number shown: (92) Q4, (91) Q3
- No route number shown: 1%
- Couldn’t see: (4) Q3

* = Small Base Size
** = Q added in Q2 2018

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2017, Q1 – Sep-Dec 2017, Q4 –
CCTV: The majority of interviewers who saw a CCTV screen in the stairwell noted that it was turned on and working correctly. There have been significant uplifts in those who saw no CCTV displays present, both versus last year and last quarter.

Base: (90), ALL EXCLUDING NO STAIRWELL / SINGLE DECK

---

**Q82** CCTV in Stairwell (90) %

- Turned on and working correctly: 53%
- Turned on, but not working properly: 1%
- Turned off: 7%
- No CCTV display present: 46%
- No stairwell / single deck: -%

*Question rebased off those who could see a CCTV display

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-DecQ4 – Jun-Sep 2018Q3
Fare Payment: Almost all interviewers reported the ticket machine & Leap Card readers to be working correctly. The majority of cash payers received either a printed ticket or the correct change, with minimal instances of not receiving a ticket. 3 in 4 Leap users were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus.

Q56 Cash Fare (96)
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>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q57b Cash Fare
If Cash Fare at R5
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt (96)

<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>%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q58b* Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Don't know/Couldn't tell Machine was not working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018

*Question amended in Q2 2016
Interior Lighting and Temperature: 3 in 4 interviewers found the interior lighting of the buses to be functioning correctly, improving versus last quarter, with 1 in 5 noting that it was daylight outside. 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 on board were unreasonable.

**Q83 Interior Lighting (157)**

- Yes and functioning correctly: 73\(\uparrow\)(52)\(_{Q3}\) %
- Yes but some lights flickering or not working: 6 %
- No and it is dark outside: -
- No but it is daylight outside: 21\(\downarrow\)(43)\(_{Q3}\) %

**Q84 Temperature Reasonable (157)**

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

\(\downarrow\uparrow\) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec\(_{Q4}\) – Jun-Sep 2018\(_{Q3}\)
Section 4: Cleanliness Performance
C1: Bus Cleanliness
Assessment of Seats: Almost all interviewers found both bus seats & cushions to be clean & well-maintained, with significant improvements in the number of seats seen to be free of graffiti versus last quarter.

Base: (157)

Q69 Graffiti on Seats (157)

- No Signs: 91%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 8%
- Heavy defacing: 1%
- Offensive graffiti: 1%

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats (157)

- Clean: 92%
- Significant dust or crumbs: 1%
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: 7%
- Wet or soiled: 1%

Q71 Damage to Seats (157)

- No: 92%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 3%
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 5%
- Moderate damage: 2%
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: 1%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018.

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 positively regarded by the almost all interviewers with some minor instances of litter & dirt reported. Encouragingly, there have been significant improvements in the number of interviewers reporting litter free buses YOY.

Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs (157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally clean</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt or liquid spills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt or liquid stains</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs* (157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litter free</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal level of litter</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some litter</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of litter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q77 Graffiti of Panels Ceilings, Stairs and other Fixtures/Fittings (157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti or etchings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti or etchings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures/Fittings (157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Question amended in Q2 2016

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018 Q3
Bus Windows: The majority of interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows while 1 in 5 observed light dirt only. The number of windows seen to be moderately dirty have significantly decreased versus last quarter, with heavier dirt reported at minimal levels.

Base: (157)

Q72 Graffiti on Windows (157)
- No Signs: 99%
- Minor graffiti: 1%
- Heavy defacing: 0%
- Offensive graffiti: 0%

Q73 Etching on Windows (157)
- No Signs: 97%
- Minor etching: 3%
- Heavy etching: 0%
- Offensive etching: 0%

Q74 Cleanliness of Windows (157)
- No Signs: 76%
- Light dirt: 21%
- Moderately dirty: 2%
- Very dirty: 1%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec and Q3 – Jun-Sep 2018.
Front, Side and Rear of Bus: In the majority of instances, buses were thought to be clean at both the front, sides & rear. Any dirt observed was mainly thought to have been picked up during operations that day with drop offs in reports of heavier dirt both quarter on quarter and year on year.

Base: (157)

**Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus (157)**

- **Yes:** 70%
  - Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 24%
  - Moderately dirty: 6%

**Q90 Was the Rear of the Bus Clean? (157)**

- **Yes:** 61%
  - Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 36%
  - Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation: 2%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec to Jun-Sep 2018 Q3
Driver Assessment: Drivers continue to be very positively regarded in terms of both attitude & presentation.

Base: (157)

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

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

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

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform
- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

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

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018 Q3
Bus Safety: Encouragingly, almost all interviewers reported comfortable journeys with minimal instances of harsh braking, accelerating & moving off too early. Significant improvements are noted across the board, both versus last year and last quarter.

Base: (157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Q3 2018</th>
<th>Q4 2018</th>
<th>Q4 2017</th>
<th>Q3 2017</th>
<th>Q4 2016</th>
<th>Q3 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly</td>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh –</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minor discomfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Serious discomfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly</td>
<td>Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh –</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minor discomfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Serious discomfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q96 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hold on?</td>
<td>Occasionally moved off too early</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec-Q3 – Jun-Sep 2018-Q3

* Question amended in Q2 2016
When Getting on the Bus: Of the 8 instances where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for boarding passengers, 4 did not see a reason for the restriction, 3 noted no footpath kerb was present while 1 observed another vehicle parked in the way. On the 5 instances where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for alighting passengers, similar issues arose.

Base: (157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Boarding</th>
<th>Alighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q62 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (8)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footpath kerb was present</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q93 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (5) Alighting

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep–Dec Q3 – Jun-Sep 2018 Q3

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??
Driver Actions: Almost all interviewers reported drivers stopping to pick up passengers when signalled to do so. Minimal instances of buses not always stopping as they were full.

Base: (157), ALL EXCLUDING THOSE NOT REQUESTED TO STOP

Q102* Stopped to Pick Up Passengers
(157)

Yes

99

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 4 2018 Sep-Dec_Q4 – Jun-Sep 2018_Q3

* Question rebased off those whose bus stopped to pick up passengers
Driver Behaviour: The behaviour of the drivers was very positively regarded overall with no instances of dangerous driving reported, improving versus last quarter. 1 in 5 interviewers observed drivers listening to music while driving, whilst over 9 in 10 did not observe drivers holding any long conversations with other passengers or staff.

Base: (157)

Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following 
(157) %
Use mobile phone while driving -
Wear an earpiece while driving -
Drive the bus in a dangerous manner -
None of these 100 (97) Q3

Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio (157)

Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations (157) %

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018 Q3
**Leave Bus Unattended:** There were 2 instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter; to go to the shops or to go to the toilets.

Base: (157)

### Q100 Bus Left Unattended (157) %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</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>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - to go to toilet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - some other reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - don't know the reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec**

---

Q100 Did the driver leave the bus unattended at any time?

Q101a Did the driver turn off the engine when leaving the bus?
Diversion or Terminated Early: For the 3 interviewers who encountered a bus diversion/termination, 2 were informed by the driver while 1 was not told of the exact reason for the diversion/termination.

**Base**: (157)

**Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early**

- **Yes**: 2
- **No**: 98

**Q108 If Bus Diverted/Terminated Early (3)**

- Announce over PA: -
- Shout out information: -
- Inform passengers in some other way (e.g. tour the bus): 67
- Fail to inform passengers: 33

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

- **Yes**: 33
- **No**: 67

---

**“The bus was on the timetable to go to Tullamore, but the driver said that he was going only to Edenderry. Said he was new to the route and knew no more. Didn’t know if there was another bus”**

**“Road closures due to fallen trees - storm damage. Passengers learned reason by overheard radio instruction to driver.”**

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018 Q3

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q107</th>
<th>Did bus terminate early or divert off course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q108</th>
<th>Did driver...?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q109</th>
<th>Were passengers told the reason for early termination or diversion off course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Announce over PA**

- 33

**Shout out information**

- 67

**Inform passengers in some other way (e.g. tour the bus)**

- 67

**Fail to inform passengers**

- 33
**Driver Interaction:** There were no instances of driver disputes recorded this quarter

Base: (157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q103 Any Disputes with Passengers/ Other Road Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - fares -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - bus didn’t stop when expected -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - buggy or wheelchair issue -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Dispute with other road users/pedestrians -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Drunk or abusive passengers -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - other -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not observe 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec/Q4 – Jun-Sep 2018/Q3
Section 6: Cleanliness Performance
C2: Station Cleanliness
**Station Seating:** The majority of interviewers found the station seats to be clean & well maintained; with improvements noted both versus last year and last quarter.

Base: (42), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A

(6), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1 Graffiti on Station Seats</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Q2 Station Seats Damaged</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Q3 Cleanliness of Station Seats</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No graffiti or defacing</td>
<td>95 (100)</td>
<td>No visible damage</td>
<td>100 (100)</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>100 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti or defacing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy defacing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hazardous damage including seat loose from seat structure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-DecQ4 – Jun-Sep 2018Q3

(100) = Busáras
Station Cleanliness: Station walls, floors, ceilings & stairs were found to be generally clean overall, with some instances of minor graffiti and light dirt reported.

Q4 Graffiti on Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (42)
- No signs: 90%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 10%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings:
  - Offensive graffiti or etchings:

Q5 Cleanliness of Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (42)
- No signs of dirt: 86%
- Light dirt:
- Moderately dirty:
- Very dirty:

Q9 Cleanliness of Station Floors or Stairs (42)
- Generally Clean: 100%
- Dirt or liquid spills (wet or partially wet/sticky):
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried):

Q10 Litter on Seats, Floors or Stairs? (42)
- Appeared litter free: 93%
- Some litter:
- A lot of litter:

() = Busáras

Base: (42), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A. Base: (6), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec vs Jun-Sep 2018 Q3
Station Windows and Exterior: Station windows were found to be kept in good condition by the majority of interviewers. Outside of the bus station, there were minor instances of graffiti, dirt and litter observed.

Base: (42), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A, **Base: (6), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A**

**Q6 Graffiti on Station Windows (42)***

- No signs: 93% (100)
- Minor graffiti: 7%
- Heavy graffiti: -
- Offensive graffiti: -

**Q7 What best describes level of etching on station windows? (42)***

- No signs: 100% (100)
- Minor etching: -
- Heavy etching: -
- Offensive etching: -

**Q8 Cleanliness of Station Windows (42)***

- No signs: 76% (100)
- Light dirt: 21%
- Moderately dirty: 2%
- Very dirty: -

**Q11 Exterior Litter Free (42)***

- Appeared litter free: 67% (100)
- Some litter: 33% (12) Q4
- A lot of litter: - (14) Q4

(1) = Busáras

\( \downarrow \) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018

Q6 What best describes level of graffiti on station windows?  
Q7 What best describes level of etching on station windows?  
Q8 What best describes level of cleanliness of station windows?  
Q11 Was the exterior of the bus station building litter free?
Station Toilets: Station toilets were seen to be generally free of graffiti, with only minor instances reported. The cleanliness of the toilets has improved YOY with declines in the number of ‘very dirty’ toilets observed. Facilities were seen to be present and functioning correctly by almost all interviewers.

Base: (38), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (6), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2

Q16 Graffiti on Toilet Area (38)

- No signs: 84%
- Minor graffiti: 16%
- Heavy graffiti: 5%
- Offensive graffiti: 5%

Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area? (38)

- Generally clean: 82%
- Minor litter on floors: 11%
- Minor dirt on floor, door or walls: 3%
- Very dirty*: 5%

*Busaras deemed to be very dirty

Q18 Toilets Blocked (38)

- Yes: 5%
- No: 95%

Q19 Flush Working (38)

- Yes: 95%
- No: 5%

Q20 Toilet Paper Available (38)

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018

Q16 What best describes level of graffiti in toilet area?
Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area?
Q18 Were any toilets you viewed blocked?
Q19 Was the flush working on the toilet(s) you tested?
Q20 Was there toilet paper available at the toilet(s) you viewed?
Station Washroom Area: Station washrooms are seen to be generally clean, improving YOY, with the number of washrooms deemed ‘very dirty’ in decline. The washroom facilities were thought to be functioning correctly by the majority of interviewers.
Section 7: Customer Service Performance (C5)
Travel Centre: Of the 42 interviewers who surveyed a bus station, 30 were able to assess the relevant travel centres. Of these, the staff were thought to be polite, professional and friendly and most found that the information they were given appeared to be correct.

Q12 Travel Centre at Station (42)

- Yes -open
- Yes - closed*
- No

Q13 Travel Centre Assistant Response (30)

- Polite 67%
- Professional 33%
- Friendly 67%
- Indifferent -
- Ignored me -
- Rude or sarcastic -
- Abusive -

Q14 Travel Centre Assistant Provide Correct Information? (30)

- Information provided and appears to be correct 97%
- Information provided but appeared to be incorrect or out of date 3%
- Information not provided -

* Travel Centres were closed for some weekend interviewing

\( \downarrow \uparrow \) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 2018 Sep-Dec – Jun-Sep 2018