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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’.

140 mystery shops on Bus Éireann busses and 31 mystery shops on bus stations were conducted from early March to mid June 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 Kantar Millward Brown interviewers, and has been ongoing since 2016. 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 2 2019: 26th March – 18th June 2019

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus previous quarter i.e. Qtr 1 Jan – March 2019 Q1 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 2 March – June 2018 Q2
Section 1: Stop Maintenance & Performance
Advertising on Shelter or Bus Stop: There were very limited instances of commercial advertising present at bus stops/shelters this quarter.

Q37 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass (70)%

Base: (67) IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1 / (52) YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

38% observed a Bus Stop Pole & 49% observed a shelter at the stop

Q38 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole (52) %

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018\textsubscript{Q2}, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019\textsubscript{Q1}
**Timetable:** Just over half of interviewers noted a printed timetable present on the bus stop pole, in line with last quarter.

Base: (52) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q29/1

---

**Q34 Printed Timetable Present (52)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 $Q_2$, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 $Q_1$
Section 2: Customer Information Performance (CI)
Fares Displayed: Almost all had fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus

Base: (107), Routes with Fares Displayed at the Entrance* (amended Q3’16)

Q50 Were the fares displayed clearly at the entrance? %

- Yes: 94%
- No: 6%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1
Timetable: 7 in 10 bus stop numbers were visible on bus stop poles, half of these has printed timetables, but only 45% of these had a legible operative date

Base: (140)

Q28 Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus
(140) %

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible (52) %

Q34 Printed Timetable Present (52) %

Q36 Operative Date Present (29) %

↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019

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

Q32 Bus Stop Number Visible

Q34 Printed Timetable Present

Q36 Operative Date Present

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019
Section 3:
Bus Driver Performance – D1
Driver Interaction: There were minimal instances of any disputes with passengers or other road users but the details were not observed.

Base: (140)

Q103 Any Disputes with Passengers/ Other Road Users
(140)
%  
No 96 \(\downarrow\) (100) \(_{Q2}\)
  
Yes - fares
  
Yes - bus didn’t stop when expected
  
Yes - buggy or wheelchair issue
  
Yes - Dispute with other road users/pedestrians
  
Yes - Drunk or abusive passengers
  
Yes - other
  
Could not observe 4 \(\uparrow\) (-) \(_{Q2}\)

\(\downarrow\uparrow\) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 \(_{Q2}\), Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 \(_{Q1}\)
Driver Assessment: Drivers continue to be very positively regarded in terms of both attitude & presentation

Base: (140)

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

Q51 Helpful %
1
99
Yes
No

Q54 Driver Wearing Uniform %
4
96
Yes
No

Q52 Polite %
1
99
Yes
No

Q55 Driver Well Presented %
3
97
Yes
No

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019.
Bus Safety: Encouragingly, almost all interviewers reported comfortable journeys with only minor instances of harsh braking, accelerating & moving off too early; nobody felt it was dangerous.

Base: (140)

- **Q94** Driver Accelerated Smoothly (140)
  - Yes, felt comfortable: 94%
  - Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort: 4%
  - Frequently too harsh – serious discomfort: 1%
  - Felt it was dangerous: 1%

- **Q95** Driver Braking Smoothly (140)
  - Yes, felt comfortable: 93%
  - Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort: 6%
  - Frequently too harsh – serious discomfort: 1%
  - Felt it was dangerous: 1%

- **Q96** Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on? (140)
  - Yes: 96%
  - Occasionally moved off too early: 3%
  - Frequently moved off too early: 1%
  - Felt it was dangerous: 1%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019.
When Getting on the Bus: Of the 4 instances where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for boarding passengers, in 2 of these cases a vehicle was parked in the way. Where the bus did not pull up to the kerb for alighting passengers, there was a specific reason in 3 of these 4 cases.

Base: (140)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q93 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (3) Alighting</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other bus was in the way</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vehicles were parked in the way</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were other obstructions</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no kerb at my destination stop</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓⇑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1

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: Virtually all drivers stopped to pick up passengers when signalled to do so, on the very rare occasion they didn’t there was no specific reason.

Base: (139), ALL EXCLUDING THOSE NOT REQUESTED TO STOP

Q102* Stopped to Pick Up Passengers
(139)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not always stop as bus was full</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Question rebased off those whose bus stopped to pick up passengers

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019
Driver Behaviour: The behaviour of the drivers was very positively regarded overall with very minimal mentions of wearing an ear piece. There has been a small decline in the no of drivers listening to music/radio while driving, now at 14%. Most did not hold long conversations with others such as staff or passengers.

Base: (140)

### Q97 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following (140)%

- Use mobile phone while driving: 9%
- Wear an earpiece while driving: 1%
- Drive the bus in a dangerous manner: 0%
- None of these: 99%

### Q98 Driver Listening to Music/Radio (140)

- Yes: 9%
- No: 77%
- Could not observe: 14%

### Q99 Driver Hold Long Conversations (140)%

- Yes with other staff: 6%
- Yes with passengers: 1%
- No: 91%
- Could not observe: 2%

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019
Leave Bus Unattended: there were minimal mentions of the bus being left unattended for driver change or other season

Base: (140)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q100 Bus Left Unattended (140) %</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - because of driver change</td>
<td>2</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>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - don't know the reason</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“When bus arrived in Cork Merchants Quay and before other passengers got on, driver stepped outside bus for a cigarette.”

“Because Driver Finished Work”

△ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1
Diversion or Terminated Early: For the one instance when the bus was diverted or terminated early the reason was shouted out to passengers.

Base: (140)

Q107 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

- Yes
- No

99

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

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

- Yes
- No

100

“Driver asked passengers for their destination. All passengers were going to (destination) so driver said we would go directly there. Traffic was slow, stationery at times. The driver referred to Road works on a Friday. Therefore the bus journey the interviewer shopped went directly from Town Centre (Markievicz Rd) to where the interviewer alighted at destination (opposite Village Inn.)”

\(\uparrow\) = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019.
Section 4: Bus Equipment Performance
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: Of the 4 times the wheelchair ramp was requested, two were not activated and no reason was given.

Base: (140), If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q105 (2)

Q106 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</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 do so at the stop</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present 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>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electronic Displays & Announcements: When an electronic next stop display was present, almost three quarters were working correctly, a quarter were turned off/not working & only 4% were not providing correct details, significantly reduced down a year ago. As many audio announcements were not working as were working correctly, the later significantly down from this time last year.

Base: (88), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT (68)

Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (88) %

- Yes - working correctly: 73
- Working but not providing correct information: 5
- Display turned off or not working: 23

Q81* Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (68) %

- Yes - working and volume correct: 41 (61)\textsubscript{Q2}
- Yes - working but too quiet: 21
- No - not working: 38

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

\textdownarrow = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018\textsubscript{Q2}, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019\textsubscript{Q1}
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all (95%+) of buses had both route and destination numbers on the front, side and rear of the bus and destination on the front.

**Q43 Route No. on Front (140)**
- Yes: 96%
- Not displayed
  - Could not clearly see: 1%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 2%
- No route no. displayed: 1%
- There was no display panel for the route number: 3%

**Q45 Route No. on Side (140)**
- Correct route no. displayed: 95%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 2%
- No route no. displayed: 2%
- Could not clearly see: 3%

**Q45a Replacement Bus (4)**
- Yes: 50%
- No: 50%

**Q44 Destination on Front (140)**
- Yes: 96%
- Not displayed
  - Could not clearly see: 1%

**Q87 Route No. on Back (140)**
- Yes: 96%
- Incorrect route number shown: 1%
- No route number shown: 3%
- Couldn't see: 1%

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

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019
CCTV: Three in five of CCTV screens in the stairwell were turned on and working correctly. There were no records of screens turned on and not working properly or turned off. 41% had no CCTV display.

Base: (77), ALL EXCLUDING NO STAIRWELL / SINGLE DECK

Q82* CCTV in Stairwell (77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turned on and working correctly</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned on, but not working properly</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned off</td>
<td>(8) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CCTV display present</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1

* Question rebased off those who could see a CCTV display
Fare Payment: Almost all cash ticket machines & all Leap Card readers were working correctly. The majority of cash payers received either a printed ticket or the correct change, with minimal instances of receiving incorrect change occurring. Significantly less than last year were able to see what fare they were charged on their Leap card (64%).

Q56 Cash Fare (80)
If Cash Fare at R5
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

- Yes
  - No

- 100%

Q57b Cash Fare
If Cash Fare at R5
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt (80)

- Yes, printed ticket
  - Yes, printed ticket and correct change
  - Got handwritten ticket
  - Was not given a ticket

- 45%

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

- Yes
  - No

- 100%

Q59b* Leap Card Reader at Driver
See Fare Charged (60)

- Yes
  - Don’t know/Couldn’t tell
  - Machine was not working)

- 63% (83)

- 37% (13)

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019
Interior Lighting and Temperature: 7 in 10 reported interior lighting to be functioning correctly when needed, with minimal instances of lights flickering/not working. Almost all interviewers found the on-board temperatures on the buses to be reasonable, with minimal issues.

Base: (140)

**Q83 Interior Lighting (140) %**
- Yes and functioning correctly: 71%
- Yes but some lights flickering or not working: 6%
- No and it is dark outside: -
- No but it is daylight outside: 22%

**Q84 Temperature Reasonable (140) %**
- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

**Q85 Why Temperature Not Reasonable (4) %**
- A cold day with the heating turned on: 25%
- A cold day with the heating turned off: -
- A warm day - not sure if heating is on: 25%
- A warm day with heating turned off: 25%
- A warm day with the heating turned on: -
- A warm day - not sure if heating is on: 25%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Q1 Jan - Mar 2019.
Section 5: Cleanliness Performance
C2: Station Cleanliness
Station Seating: Station seats showed no visible damage and in most cases were clean with only minimal mentions of dust, crumbs and ingrained dirt. Just under one in five saw minor graffiti or defacing on seats.

Base: (31), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS ÉIREANN STATION Q1A  
(4), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

Q1 Graffiti on Station Seats %

- No graffiti or defacing: 77%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 23%
- Heavy defacing
- Offensive graffiti

Q2 Station Seats Damaged %

- No visible damage: 100%
- Minor damage
- Moderate damage
- Hazardous damage including seat loose from seat structure

Q3 Cleanliness of Station Seats %

- Clean: 81%
- Significant dust or crumbs
- Gum or other ingrained dirt
- Wet or soiled: 16%

*Caution: Small base size

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019

KANTAR
**Station Cleanliness:** Station walls, panels and ceiling were found in the main to be graffiti free and generally clean, however the was some light and moderate dirt and one mention of very dirty. Floors were also generally clean with minimal mentions of spills and litter.

**Q4 Graffiti on Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (31)**

- No signs: 90%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 10%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 2%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 0%

**Q5 Cleanliness of Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (31)**

- No signs of dirt: 73%
- Light dirt: 13%
- Moderately dirty: 13%
- Very dirty*: 0%

**Q9 Cleanliness of Station Floors or Stairs (31)**

- Generally Clean: 90%
- Dirt or liquid spills (wet or partially wet/sticky): 10%
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 0%

**Q10 Litter on Seats, Floors or Stairs? (31)**

- Appeared litter free: 87%
- Some litter: 13%
- A lot of litter: 0%

*Caution: Small base size

*Busáras and Sligo deemed very dirty

**Base:** (31), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A. Base: (4), IF ASKED TO ASSESS BUSÁRAS Q1A

*Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1
Station Windows and Exterior: Station windows were thought to be kept in good condition with very limited graffiti and etchings, with some mentions of lights and moderate direct and Busáras rated as very dirty on one occasion. Outside of the bus station, the majority were seen as litter free with a quarter seeing some litter and one mention of a lot of litter for Sligo.

Q6 What best describes level of graffiti on station windows? (31)

- No signs: 94%
- Minor graffiti: 6%
- Heavy graffiti: -
- Offensive graffiti: -

Q7 What best describes level of etching on station windows? (31)

- No signs: 94%
- Minor etching: 6%
- Heavy etching: -
- Offensive etching: -

Q8 What best describes level of cleanliness of station windows? (31)

- No signs: 55%
- Light dirt: 32%
- Moderately dirty: 10%
- Very dirty*: 3%

Q11 Exterior Litter Free (31)

- Appeared litter free: 65%
- Some litter: 32%
- A lot of litter*: 3%

*Caution: Small base size
Station Toilets: Station toilets were seen to be generally graffiti free with only a few mentions of minor or heavy graffiti. 7 in 10 toilets were deemed clean, with some minor litter on floor but also some mentions of minor dirt or very dirty for Sligo and Cork. There were a few mentions of toilets being blocked or no toilet paper available.

Q16 Graffiti on Toilet Area (30)
- No signs: 83%
- Minor graffiti: 13%
- Heavy graffiti: 3%
- Offensive graffiti: 3%

Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area? (30)
- Generally clean: 70%
- Minor litter on floors: 10%
- Minor dirt on floor, door or walls: 10%
- Very dirty*: 10%

Q18 Toilets Blocked (30)
- Yes: 13%
- No: 87%

Q19 Flush Working (30)
- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

Q20 Toilet Paper Available (30)
- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

*Caution: Small base size

Base: (30), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (4), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019

Base: (30), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base: (4), IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2
Station Washroom Area: Station washrooms are seen to be generally clean but with some instances of litter, dirt and minor graffiti. The washroom facilities were thought to be functioning correctly in the majority of cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q21 Cleanliness of Washroom Area (30)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally clean</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some litter</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q22 Graffiti in Washroom Area (30)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q23 Washroom Taps (30)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (both hot and cold)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q24 Soap/Hand Cleanser Available (30)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q25 Washroom Dryers (30)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No washroom dryer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q26 Paper Towel Dispenser (30)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, with paper towels</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but no paper towels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No paper towel dispenser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q27 Bins Clean (30)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overflowing - needed to be emptied</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bins present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Caution: Small base size

**Base:** (30), **IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2, Base:** (4), **IF TOILETS OPEN BUSÁRAS Q15/2**

Q2 - Jan-Mar 2018

Mar-Jun Q2 ~ Jan-Mar 2019

Q = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 2019

*= Caution: Small base size

**KANTAR**
Section 6: Cleanliness Performance
C1: Bus Cleanliness
Assessment of Seats: Almost all interviewers found both bus seats & cushions to be clean & well-maintained with minimal levels of graffiti or ingrained dirt (see example). There was minimal mentions of tearing on seats.

Base: (140)

Q69 Graffiti on Seats (140) %
- No Signs: 86%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 13%
- Heavy defacing: 1%
- Offensive graffiti: 1%

Q70 Cleanliness of Seats (140) %
- Clean: 94%
- Significant dust or crumbs* Gum or other ingrained dirt: 6%
- Wet or soiled: -

Q71 Damage to Seats (140) %
- No: 91%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 6%
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 1%
- Moderate damage: 2%
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: -

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019.
Bus Interior: The interior of the buses were generally clean and graffiti free. However, there has been a significant drop in those that were litter free (now 63%), although most others has minimal litter and only a few mentions of a lot of litter. There has bee a significant drop in reports of moderate dirt on panels, ceilings etc.

**Q75 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs (140)**

- Generally clean: 95%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 2%
- Dirt or liquid stains: 3%

**Q76 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs**

- Litter free: 62%
- Minimal level of litter: 29%
- Some litter: 6%
- A lot of litter: 3%

**Q77 Graffiti of Panels Ceilings, Stairs and other Fixtures/Fittings (140)**

- No signs: 95%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: 4%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: 1%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: 1%

**Q78 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures/Fittings (140)**

- No signs: 86%
- Light dirt: 12%
- Moderately dirty: 11%
- Very dirty: 1%

*Question amended in Q2 2016*

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019
Bus Windows: The majority of interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows. 7 in 10 window were clear, with a quarter showing light direct and limited mentions of moderate dirt.

Base: (140)

Q72 Graffiti on Windows (140)

- No Signs: 97%
- Minor graffiti: 3%
- Heavy defacing: 2%
- Offensive graffiti: 1%

Q73 Etching on Windows (140)

- No Signs: 97%
- Minor etching: 3%
- Heavy etching: 1%
- Offensive etching: 0%

Q74 Cleanliness of Windows (140)

- No Signs: 71%
- Light dirt: 26%
- Moderately dirty: 3%
- Very dirty: 1%

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1
Front, Side and Rear of Bus: In the majority of instances, buses were thought to be clean at both the front, sides & rear with significant increase this quarter. Any dirt observed was mainly thought to have been picked up during operations that day with a significant drop in mentions of moderate direct, especially for the rear of the bus.

Base: (140)

Q47 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus (140)

- Yes: 79% (67) Q2 (67) Q1
- Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 20% (10) Q2 (7) Q1
- Moderately dirty*: 1%
- Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days

Q90 Was the Rear of the Bus Clean? (140)

- Yes: 70% (51) Q1
- Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today: 29% (43) Q1 (7) Q2 (5) Q1
- Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day's operation: 1%

\[\uparrow\downarrow\] = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1
Section 7: Customer Service Performance (C5)
Travel Centre: Travel centre staff were seen as polite and professional, with one incidence of indifference and all information appeared to be correct.

Base: IF TRAVEL CENTRE OPEN Q13A/1

Q12 Travel Centre at Station (31)

- Yes -open: 23%
- Yes - closed*: 68%
- No: 10%

Q13 Travel Centre Assistant Response (21)

- Polite: 48%
- Professional: 43%
- Friendly: 19%
- Indifferent: 5%
- Ignored me: -
- Rude or sarcastic: -
- Abusive: -

Q14 Travel Centre Assistant Provide Correct Information? (21)

- 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

↓ ↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 2 Mar - Jun 2018 Q2, Qtr 1 Jan - Mar 2019 Q1