Outline of Presentation

Background to Research

Section 1: Stop Maintenance Performance (SI)

Section 2: Customer Information Performance (CI)

Section 3: Bus Driver Performance - D.1

Section 4: Bus Equipment Performance - E.1

Section 5: Cleanliness Performance - C.2: Station Cleanliness

Section 6: Cleanliness Performance - C.1: Bus Cleanliness

Section 7: Customer Service Performance (CS)

Summary

Appendix
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’.

150 mystery shops (plus an additional 26 bus station boosts) were conducted from early January to end March 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 1 2019: 1st January – 25th March 2019

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus the previous quarter i.e. Qtr 4 Sep – Dec 2018 q4 or versus the same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 1 Jan – Mar 2018 q1.
Section 1: Stop Maintenance & Performance
Advertising on Shelter or Bus Stop: There were no instances of commercial advertising present on bus stop poles this quarter, while 1 in 10 saw advertising on shelter glass.

Base: IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q37/1 (80) / (44) YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q38/1

27% observed a Bus Stop Pole & 57% observed a shelter at the stop

Q 37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass

- Yes: 9%
- No: 91%

Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

⚠️ Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar vs Mar-Jun 2018

---

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: Just over 3 in 5 interviewers found the bus stop poles to be in good condition; while a third saw signs of moderate damage. Nearly 9 in 10 felt that the bus shelters were in good condition with minimal instances of damage reported. There were no reports of more hazardous damage.

Base: (80), IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 (44) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

**Q29b Condition of the Bus Stop Pole & Flag?**

- **Good condition**: 64%
- **Moderate damage**: 32%
- **Scratches/graffiti**: 5%
- **Hazardous damage**: -%

**Q31 Condition of the Bus Shelter?**

- **Good condition**: 88%
- **Moderate damage**: 13%
- **Scratches/graffiti**: -
- **Hazardous damage**: -%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar – Mar-Jun 2018 Q4
**Information Display:** Half of interviewers saw an information panel on the shelter, while 1 in 5 saw a small panel on the pole. 4 in 5 interviewers found the information displays to be fully legible and clean, with declines in reports of dirt or graffiti versus last quarter.

Base: (112) IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q28C

**Q28d** What type of information display was there present at the stop?

- Small Panel on Pole: 21%
- Long panel on pole: 1%
- Information panel on shelter: 51%
- TFI Pole with information panel: 10%
- None: 20%

**Q28e** How would you describe the condition of this information display?

- Fully legible and clean: 82%
- Obscured by condensation: 13%
- Damaged or torn: 2%
- Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti / Not mounted correctly: 1%

\[\downarrow\uparrow: \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar - Mar-Jun 2018}\]

*New for Q1 2018*
Fares Displayed: Almost all interviewers found fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus, with no significant movements observed.

Base: (106), Routes with Fares Displayed at the Entrance

Q50 Were the fares displayed clearly at the entrance?

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar versus Q4

%
**Timetable:** Of the 9 in 10 interviewers who had time to assess the bus stop before the arrival of the bus, just under 3 in 5 found the bus stop numbers to be clearly visible, whilst almost 7 in 10 saw a printed timetable present. Almost half were able to observe the operative date on the timetable.

Base: (150)

- **Q28 Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus (150)**
  - Yes: 94%
  - No: 6%

- **Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible (44)**
  - Yes: 39%
  - No: 61%

- **Q34 Printed Timetable Present (44)**
  - Yes: 34%
  - No: 66%

- **Q36 Operative Date Present (29)**
  - Yes: 21%
  - No: 45%
  - Present but could not read: 34%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar & Mar-Jun 2018
Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance
Electronic Displays & Announcements: Of those who saw an electronic next stop display present, 7 in 10 saw that they were working correctly, while 1 in 4 found that they were turned off or not working. For those who heard an audio next stop announcement, 2 in 5 found that it was working with volume correct, while a further 2 in 5 noted that it was not working.

Base: (101), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT (80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (101)</th>
<th>Q81* Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes - working correctly</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes - working and volume correct</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working but not providing correct information</td>
<td>Yes - working but too loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display turned off or not working</td>
<td>Yes - working but too quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot see a display</td>
<td>No - not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None on the bus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar Q1 – Mar-Jun 2018 Q4

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 5 interviewers who observed a wheelchair ramp request, all found that it was activated upon request.

Base: (150), If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105 (5)

Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver stated it was broken</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - person requesting was not a wheelchair user</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver refused to activate because unsafe to</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do so at the stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - other reason - please record details</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - no reason given</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar Q1 – Mar-Jun 2018 Q4
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all interviewers reported seeing both route and destination numbers on the front and sides of the bus. 4 interviewers noted that the bus they were on appeared to be a replacement bus.

- **Q43 Route No. on Front (150)**
  - Yes: 97%
  - Not displayed: 1%
  - Could not clearly see: 1%

- **Q44 Destination on Front (150)**
  - Yes: 97%
  - Not displayed: 2%
  - Could not clearly see: 1%

- **Q45 Route No. on Side (150)**
  - Correct route no. displayed: 96%
  - Incorrect route no. displayed: 1%
  - No route no. displayed: 1%
  - There was no display panel for the route number: 1%
  - Could not clearly see: 1%

- **Q45a Replacement Bus (4)**
  - Yes: 25%
  - No: 75%
  - * = Small Base Size
  - ** = Q added in Q2 2018

- **Q47 Route No. on Back (150)**
  - Yes: 92%
  - Incorrect route number shown: 7%
  - No route number shown: 1%
  - Couldn’t see: 1%

* = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 Jan-Mar 2018–Q4 8–Dec 2018

**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?**

**Q45a Does the bus appear to be a replacement bus?**

**Q47 Was the correct route number displayed on the back of the bus?**
CCTV: More than a third of interviewers saw the CCTV screens turned on and working correctly whilst on the bus. As almost half of interviewers were on board single deck buses, they were not in a position to observe any CCTV screens in the stairwell.

Base: (150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turned on and working correctly</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned on, but not working properly</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned off</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CCTV display present</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stairwell / single deck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q82 CCTV in Stairwell (150)

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar $Q_1$ – Mar-Jun $Q_4$ 2018.
CCTV: For those interviewers who observed a CCTV screen in the stairwell, 7 in 10 found that they were turned on and working correctly, increasing versus last quarter, while reports of screens that were either turned off or not present have declined.

Base: (80), ALL EXCLUDING NO STAIRWELL / SINGLE DECK

Q82*: CCTV in Stairwell (80)

- Turned on and working correctly: 69%
- Turned on, but not working properly: 1%
- Turned off: 1%
- No CCTV display present: 29%
- No stairwell / single deck: 53%

* Question rebased off those who could see a CCTV display

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar – Mar-Jun 2018
Fare Payment: Almost all interviewers reported that the ticket machine & Leap Card readers were working correctly. The majority of cash payers received either a printed ticket or the correct change, however reports of interviewers not receiving a ticket have increased versus last year. 3 in 5 Leap users were able to see what fare they were charged when boarding the bus, dropping versus last year, while those who couldn’t see the fare charged have increased.

Q56 Cash Fare (85)
If Cash Fare at R5
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q57b Cash Fare
If Cash Fare at R5
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt (85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, printed ticket</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, printed ticket and correct change</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, printed ticket and incorrect change</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got handwritten ticket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not given a ticket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q58b Leap Card Reader Present
at Driver Working Correctly (64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q59b Leap Card Reader at Driver
See Fare Charged (64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Couldn’t tell</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine was not working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar\_{Q1} – Mar-Jun 2018\_{Q4}

Q56 Was the ticket machine working correctly for you?
Q57b 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: 3 in 4 interviewers found the interior lighting of the buses to be functioning correctly, with minimal reports of lights flickering / not working. Almost all interviewers found the on-board temperatures on the buses to be reasonable considering the weather conditions outside; with only 5 interviewers feeling the temperatures on board were unreasonable.

Base: (150)

Q83 Interior Lighting (150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes and functioning correctly</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes but some lights flickering or not working</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No and it is dark outside</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No but it is daylight outside</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q84 Temperature Reasonable (150)

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

Q85 Why Temperature Not Reasonable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A cold day with the heating turned on</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cold day with the heating turned off</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cold day - not sure if heating is on</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A warm day with the heating turned off</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A warm day with the heating turned on</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A warm day - not sure if heating is on</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4:
Cleanliness Performance
C1: Bus Cleanliness
Assessment of Seats: Most interviewers found both bus seats & cushions to be clean & well-maintained with minimal reports of graffiti or tearing observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q69 Graffiti on Seats (150)</td>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor graffiti or defacing</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy defacing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q70 Cleanliness of Seats (150)</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant dust or crumbs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gum or other ingrained dirt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wet or soiled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q71 Damage to Seats (150)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor tear, less than 2cm in length</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate damage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar, Q2 2018 Apr-Jun, Q3 2018 Jul-Sep, Q4 2018 Oct-Dec.
Bus Interior: The interior of the buses were generally positively regarded overall, with reports of litter free floors and stairs increasing this year.

Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs (150)

- Generally clean: 93%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 2%
- Dirt or liquid stains: 5%

Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs* (150)

- Litter free: 75%
- Minimal level of litter: 19%
- Some litter: 5%
- A lot of litter: 1%

Q77 Graffiti of Panels Ceilings, Stairs and other Fixtures/Fittings (150)

- No signs: 97%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 3%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: -
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: -

Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures/Fittings (150)

- No signs: 88%
- Light dirt: 7%
- Moderately dirty: 5%
- Very dirty: -

* Question amended in Q2 2016

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar, Q1 – Mar-Jun 2018, Q4
**Bus Windows:** The majority of interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows while a third observed light dirt. The number of windows seen to be moderately dirty have significantly increased versus last year while reports of very dirty windows are only reported at minimal levels.

*Base: (150)*

### Q72 Graffiti on Windows (150)

- **No Signs:** 98%
- **Minor graffiti:** 2%
- **Heavy defacing:**
- **Offensive graffiti:**

### Q73 Etching on Windows (150)

- **No Signs:** 99%
- **Minor etching:**
- **Heavy etching:**
- **Offensive etching:**

### Q74 Cleanliness of Windows (150)

- **No Signs:** 66%
- **Light dirt:** 27%
- **Moderately dirty:** 5%
- **Very dirty:** 1%

---

> = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar vs. Q4 2018

---

**What best describes level of graffiti on windows?**

**What best describes level of etching on windows?**

**What best describes level of cleanliness of windows?**
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 fewer instances of heavier dirt reported.

Base: (150)

**Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus (150)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q90 Was the Rear of the Bus Clean? (150)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some dirt</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy dirt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar vs Mar-Jun 2018.
Section 5: Bus Driver Performance – D1
Driver Assessment: Drivers continue to be very positively regarded in terms of both attitude & presentation, with little movement observed this quarter.

Base: (150)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Helpful (%)</th>
<th>Polite (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar – Mar-Jun 2018 Q4

Q51: Was the driver helpful in response to your question?
Q52: Was the driver polite in response to your question?
Q54: Was the driver wearing uniform?
Q55: Was the driver well presented?
Bus Safety: Almost all interviewers reported comfortable journeys with minor instances of harsh acceleration or drivers moving off too early; however these have both risen versus last quarter.

Base: (150)

Q94 Driver Accelerated Smoothly
- Yes, felt comfortable: 95%
- Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort: 5%
- Frequently too harsh: 4%

Q95 Driver Braking Smoothly
- Yes, felt comfortable: 93%
- Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort: 7%
- Frequently too harsh: 4%

Q96 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?
- Yes: 96%
- Occasionally moved off too early: 4%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar Q1 – Mar-Jun 2018 Q4
When Getting on the Bus: On the 2 instances where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for boarding passengers, 1 interviewer noted that this was because another vehicle was parked in the way while the other found that there was no footpath kerb present. On the 4 occasions where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for alighting passengers, 2 interviews found that either a bus or another vehicle was parked in the way, while the remaining 2 reported there being no footpath kerb present at the destination stop.

Base: (150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q62 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (2) Boarding %</th>
<th>Q93 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (4) Alighting %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>Other bus was in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop</td>
<td>Other vehicles were parked in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footpath kerb was present</td>
<td>There were other obstructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>There was no kerb at my destination stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar – Mar-Jun 2018

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, the remainder noted that the bus could not always stop as it was full.

Base: (150), ALL EXCLUDING THOSE NOT REQUESTED TO STOP

Q102* Stopped to Pick Up Passengers

(150)

% 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 1 2018 Jan-Mar_Q1 – Mar-Jun 2018_Q4

* Question re-based off those whose bus stopped to pick up passengers

Q102 So far as you could tell, did the driver always stop to pick up passengers when requested?
Driver Behaviour: The behaviour of the drivers was very positively regarded overall, with minimal reports of drivers wearing an earpiece while driving. One fifth of interviewers observed drivers listening to music, dropping year on year, while there were no reports of drivers holding any long conversations with others this quarter.

**Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following (150) %**
- Use mobile phone while driving -
- Wear an earpiece while driving 1
- Drive the bus in a dangerous manner -
- None of these 99

**Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio (150) %**
- Yes (32) Q1
- No 75
- Could not observe (62) Q1

**Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations (150) %**
- Yes with other staff 3
- Yes with passengers -
- No 97
- Could not observe -

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan–Mar, Q4 2018 Jan–Mar – Jun 2018.
Leave Bus Unattended: There were 2 instances of drivers leaving buses unattended this quarter; one was because of a driver change while the other was to assist a passenger with the wheelchair ramp.

Base: (150)

Q100 Bus Left Unattended (150)

| Yes - because of driver change | 1 |
| Yes - to go to shops | - |
| Yes - to go to toilet | - |
| Yes - some other reason | 1 ‘To lower ramp for passenger with walking aid’ |
| Yes - don’t know the reason | - |
| No | 99 |

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar/Q1 – Mar-Jun 2018/Q4
Diversion or Terminated Early: For the one interviewer who encountered a bus diversion/termination, they were informed by the driver that there would be a termination but were not told of the exact reason.

Base: (150)

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar, Q1 – Mar-Jun 2018, Q4

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?
Driver Interaction: There were minimal instances of driver disputes recorded this quarter, mainly due to the bus not stopping when expected. On the other occasions, interviewers were unable to observe the incident at the time.

Base: (150)

Q103 Any Disputes with Passengers / Other Road Users
(150)
%

No 98

Yes - fares

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

Could not observe 1

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-MarQ1 – Mar-Jun 2018Q4
Section 6: Cleanliness Performance
C2: Station Cleanliness
Station Seating: The majority of interviewers found the station seats to be free of graffiti or damage, however reports of clean seats have declined versus last quarter.

Base: (37), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS ÉIREANN STATION Q1A
(5), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

Q1 Graffiti on Station Seats

- No graffiti or defacing: 86%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 11%
- Offensive graffiti: 3%

Q2 Station Seats Damaged

- No visible damage: 97%
- Minor damage: 2%
- Moderate damage: 5%
- Hazardous damage including seat loose from seat structure: 3%

Q3 Cleanliness of Station Seats

- Clean: 86%
- Significant dust or crumbs: 8%
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: 5%
- Wet or soiled: 3%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar vs Mar-Jun 2018
Station Cleanliness: Station walls, floors, ceilings & stairs were found to be generally clean by most interviewers, with only minimal instances of dirt or litter reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti on Walls, Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures (37)</td>
<td>Cleanliness of Walls, Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures (37)</td>
<td>Cleanliness of Station Floors or Stairs (37)</td>
<td>Litter on Seats, Floors or Stairs? (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>Minor graffiti or etchings</td>
<td>Generally Clean</td>
<td>No signs of dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Caution: Small base size

() = Busáras

↑↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar – Mar-Jun 2018

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 free of graffiti or etchings by most interviewers, with dirt reported at light to moderate levels. Outside of the bus station, the majority of interviews reported seeing no litter present.

Q6 What best describes level of graffiti on station windows?
- No signs: 92%
- Minor graffiti: 8%
- Heavy graffiti: 2%
- Offensive graffiti: 0%

Q7 What best describes level of etching on station windows?
- No signs: 95%
- Minor etching: 5%
- Heavy etching: 5%
- Offensive etching: 0%

Q8 What best describes level of cleanliness of station windows?
- No signs: 68%
- Light dirt: 27%
- Moderately dirty: 5%
- Very dirty: 0%

Q11 Was the exterior of the bus station building litter free?
- Appeared litter free: 84%
- Some litter: 16%
- A lot of litter: 0%

(*) = Busáras

*Caution: Small base size

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar, Q1 – Mar-Jun 2018Q4
Station Toilets: Station toilets were seen to be generally free of both graffiti and litter by the majority of interviewers, with facilities functioning correctly. Less than 1 in 5 reported some dirt and graffiti at minor levels.

Q16 Graffiti on Toilet Area (29)*

- No signs: 86%
- Minor graffiti: 14%
- Heavy graffiti: 2%
- Offensive graffiti: 2%

Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area? (29)*

- Generally clean: 79%
- Minor litter on floors: 17%
- Minor dirt on floor, door or walls: 2%
- Very dirty: 2%

Q18 Toilets Blocked (29)

- Yes: 3%
- No: 97%

Q19 Flush Working (29)

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

Q20 Toilet Paper Available (29)

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

Base: (29), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (4), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar vs Mar-Jun 2018 Q4
Station Washroom Area: Station washrooms are seen to be generally clean but with some minor instances of litter and graffiti reported. The washroom facilities were thought to be functioning correctly by almost all interviewers.

Q21 Cleanliness of Washroom Area (29)*

- Generally clean: 83%
- Some litter: 14%
- Some dirt on floors or surfaces: 3%

Q22 Graffiti in Washroom Area (29)*

- No signs: 90%
- Minor graffiti: 14%
- Heavy graffiti: 3%
- Offensive graffiti: 1%

Q23 Washroom Taps (29)

- Yes (both hot and cold): 3%
- Hot only: 97%
- Cold only: 3%
- Neither: 14%

Q24 Soap/Hand Cleanser Available (29)

- Yes: 86%
- No: 14%

Q25 Washroom Dryers (29)

- Worked: 100%
- Did not work: 3%
- No washroom dryer: 9%

Q26 Paper Towel Dispenser (29)

- Yes: 100%
- Yes, with paper towels: 21%
- Yes, but no paper towels: 79%
- No paper towel dispenser: 21%

Q27 Bins Clean (29)

- Yes: 97%
- Overflowing - needed to be emptied: 3%
- No bins present: 97%

Base: (29), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (4), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2

(%) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar Q1 – Mar-Jun 2018 Q4

() = Busáras
Section 7: Customer Service Performance (C5)
Travel Centre: Of the 37 interviewers who surveyed a bus station, 23 were able to assess the relevant travel centres. Of these, the staff were thought to be polite, professional and friendly and almost all found that the information they were given appeared to be correct.

Base: (23), IF TRAVEL CENTRE OPEN Q13A/1

Q12 Travel Centre at Station (37)*

- Yes -open: 62%
- Yes - closed*: 24%
- No: 14%

Q13 Travel Centre Assistant Response (23)*

- Polite: 100%
- Professional: 100%
- Friendly: 100%
- Indifferent: -
- Ignored me: -
- Rude or sarcastic: -
- Abusive: -

Q14 Travel Centre Assistant Provide Correct Information? (23)*

- Information provided and appears to be correct: 96%
- Information provided but appeared to be incorrect or out of date: 4%
- Information not provided: -

* Travel Centres were closed for some weekend interviewing

↓ ↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 1 2018 Jan-Mar – Mar-Jun 2018