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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’.

155 mystery shops on Bus Éireann busses and 27 mystery shops on bus stations were conducted from early 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 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 4 2019: 9th September – 22nd December 2019

We have used the following symbols to indicate significant differences versus previous quarter i.e. Qtr 3 March – June 2019 Q3 or year on year changes for same quarter last year i.e. Qtr 4 September – December 2018 Q4
Section 1: Stop Maintenance & Performance
Advertising at Bus Stops: There were no instances of commercial advertising on shelters this quarter and similarly on the bus stop poles.

Q14 Additional Commercial Advertising on Shelter Glass (77)

59% observed a Bus Stop Pole & 77% observed a shelter at the stop

Q15 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole (59)

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019

Q14 Is there additional commercial advertising on the shelter glass outside the designated advertising or travel information and timetable panels?
Q15 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 seven in 10 found the bus stop poles to be in good condition, while under a quarter saw signs of moderate damage. Almost all felt that the bus shelters were in good condition, with limited damage and one mention of hazardous damage (broken glass) on the bus shelter.

Q9 Condition of the Bus Stop Pole & Flag? (59)

- Good condition: 76%
- Moderate damage: 22%
- Scratches/graffiti: 2%
- Hazardous damage: 1%

Q10 Condition of the Bus Shelter? (77)

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

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 _Q4_, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019 _Q3_.

Shelter no 607801 @ University Hospital, Limerick in towards the city. Window glass broken on left hand side of shelter as you look at the shelter.
Timetable: Just over three in five noted a printed timetable present on the bus stop pole.

Base: (126) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q5/1

Q12 Printed Timetable Present (126)

%

37

63

Yes  No

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019
**Information Display:** Three quarters of stops included information display; over a third had an information panel on the shelter and over one in five had a small panel on the pole. The majority of the information displayed was fully legible, with 13% recording issues of various reasons, such as condensation or damaged/torn.

*Base: (126) IF POLE OR SHELTER AT Q5*

---

**Q6 Information Display (126)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Panel on Pole</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long panel on pole</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information panel on shelter</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFI Pole with information panel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25↑ (14) Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Q7 Information displayed (94)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
<td>87</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>1  ↓ (11) Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mounted correctly</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019**
Section 2: Customer Information Performance (CI)
Fares Displayed: Virtually all bus fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus in line with previous quarters

Base: (114), Routes with Fares Displayed at the Entrance*)

Q26 Were the fares displayed clearly at the entrance?

%

1

99

Yes

No

*Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018\textsubscript{Q4}, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019\textsubscript{Q3}
Timetable: 4 in 10 bus stop numbers were visible on bus stop poles, significantly lower both year on year and versus Q3. Two thirds had printed timetables. Only just over a quarter had a valid date present with over 6 in 10 reporting there was no date present which is a significant increase year on year.

Base: (155)

**Q1** Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus

- **Yes**: 95%
- **No**: 5%

**Q2** Bus Stop Number Visible

- **Yes**: 63%
- **No**: 37%

**Q3**

- **Yes**: 71%
- **No**: 29%

**Q4**

- **Yes**: 68%
- **No**: 32%

**Q12** Printed Timetable Present

- **Yes**: 63%
- **No**: 37%

**Q13** Valid from Date Present

- **Yes**: 95%
- **No**: 5%

- **Present but could not read**: 9%

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018_Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019_Q3

---

Q1 Did you have time to assess bus stop before arrival of bus

Q2 Is the bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag? This is an up to 6 digit number

Q12 Is there a printed timetable, for the route you are using, on display at the bus stop pole or bus shelter?

Q13 Is there a 'Valid From' date written on the timetable?
Section 3: Bus Driver Performance – D1
Driver Interaction: There was only one instance of any disputes with passengers or other road users. We know that the driver was polite in handling the situation.

Base: (155)

Q79 Any Disputes with Passengers/ Other Road Users
(155)
%

No 99

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 1

Could not observe

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019
Driver Assessment: Drivers continue to be very positively regarded in terms of both attitude & presentation

Base: (155)

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

Q27 Helpful %

0 Yes
100 No

Q30 Driver Wearing Uniform %

4 Yes
96 No

Q28 Polite %

0 Yes
100 No

Q31 Driver Well Presented %

99 Yes
1 No

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019

Q27 Was the driver helpful in response to your question?  Q30 Was the driver wearing uniform?
Q28 Was the driver polite in response to your question?  Q31 Was the driver well presented?
Bus Safety: Almost all interviewers reported comfortable journeys with the occasional instances of harsh braking, accelerating & moving off too early; nobody felt it was dangerous. Minimal mentions of moving off too early.

Base: (155)

**Q69 Driver Accelerated Smoothly**

- Yes, felt comfortable: 97%
- Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort: 3%
- Frequently too harsh: 2%
- Felt it was dangerous: 1%

**Q70 Driver Braking Smoothly**

- Yes, felt comfortable: 96%
- Occasionally felt too harsh – minor discomfort: 2%
- Frequently too harsh – serious discomfort: 1%
- Felt it was dangerous: 4%

**Q71 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?**

- Yes: 95%

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019
When Getting on the Bus: There were just three instances of buses not pulling up to the kerb and these occurred when boarding the bus and this was for various reasons such as another vehicle was in the way, road works, no footpath. Similarly for those getting off the bus, vehicles were parked in the way or there was not kerb at the bus stop destinations

Base: (3) No at Q36/2 (3) No at Q67/2

Q37 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (3)* Boarding

- Another vehicle was parked in the way 33%
- There were other obstructions such as road works at the stop 33%
- No footpath kerb was present 33%
- No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction -

Q68 Why Not Pulled to Kerb (3)* Alighting

- Other bus was in the way -
- Other vehicles were parked in the way 67%
- There were other obstructions -
- There was no kerb at my destination stop 33%
- Other reason -
- No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction -

*Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019
Driver Actions: Drivers stopped to pick up passengers when requested to do so, except for the one occasion when the bus did not stop, this was because the bus was full.

Base: (153), ALL EXCLUDING THOSE NOT REQUESTED TO STOP

Q78* Stopped to Pick Up Passengers
(153) %

Yes 99

Could not always stop as bus was full

Did not always stop to pick up, and no evident reason for not stopping 1

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019

* Question rebased off those whose bus stopped to pick up passengers
Driver Behaviour: The behaviour of the drivers was positively regarded overall and minimal mentions of use of the mobile phone, wearing an earpiece and driving. There has been a significant increase since last quarter for listening to music/radio while driving, now at 21%. Most did not hold long conversations with others either staff or passengers.

Base: (155)

Q72 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following (155) %
- Use mobile phone while driving 1
- Wear an earpiece while driving 1
- Drive the bus in a dangerous manner 1
- None of these 98

Q73 Driver Listening to Music/Radio (155)
- Yes 2
- No 77
- Could not observe 21

Q74 Driver Hold Long Conversations (155)
- Yes with other staff 1
- Yes with passengers 3
- No 95
- Could not observe

Driver took a brief call on his phone.

On the phone via earpiece going around the roundabout at University Hospital, Limerick at 13:15 pm. Could not observe any earpiece or phone but driver received call at 3 PM near Dalys Cross. He was only seconds speaking.

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019.
Leave Bus Unattended: The bus was left unattended, for reasons such as driver change and for some other reason and in most of these instances the driver turned off the engine.

Base: (155)

**Q75 Bus Left Unattended (155)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - because of driver change</td>
<td>5</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>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q77 Did the driver turn off the engine when leaving the bus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Driver left the bus at Sligo bus station to exchange the non functioning leap card validator. The exchanged validator worked and resulted in the electronic display board working also.

\[\downarrow\uparrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019}\]
Diversion or Terminated Early: On four occasions the bus was diverted or terminated early; the passengers were both informed in some way and two were not informed. For those that were diverted reasons were given or passengers informed in two cases, the other two were not given the reason.

Base: (155)

Q81 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

- Yes: 3
- No: 97

Q82 If Bus Diverted (4)

- Announce over PA
- Shout out information
- Inform passengers in some other way (e.g. tour the bus)
- Fail to inform passengers: 50

Q83 Passengers Told Reason for Diversion (4)*

- Yes: 50
- No: 50

Diversion was caused by ongoing roadworks. A printed notice is on display in bus.

Printed Notice on display inside bus. Diversion on account of ongoing roadworks.

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019.
Section 4:
Bus Equipment Performance
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: The wheelchair ramp was activated on request three out of the four times it was requested and in the other instance the person was not a wheelchair user.

Base: If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q84 (2)

Q85 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request (4)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</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>25</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>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019
Electronic Displays & Announcements: Over 7 in 10 report the electronic displays are working correctly. Over 2 in 5 claim that audio announcements were working correctly and a third claim there were none on the bus.

Base: (100), ALL WHO COULD SEE A DISPLAY / HEAR AN ANNOUNCEMENT (86)

Q54* Are the electronic displays on board indicating what the next stop is working correctly?
Q55* Is there an automatic next stop audio announcement working on the bus?

Q54* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working (100) %

- Yes - working correctly: 73%
- Working but not providing correct information: 10%
- Display turned off or not working: 17%

Q55* Audio Announcement for Next Stop Working (86) %

- Yes - working and volume correct: 43%
- Yes - working but too loud: 0%
- Yes - working but too quiet: 23%
- No - not working: 34%

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

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019
Route Number and Destination Visible: All route numbers and destinations were on the front of the bus. Virtually all numbers were on back or side of the bus, 3% had no route number.

Base: (155)

Q20 Route No. on Front (155) 100%
- Yes
- Not displayed
- Could not clearly see

Q22 Route No. on Side (155) 99%
- Correct route no. displayed
- Incorrect route no. displayed
- No route no. displayed
- There was no display panel for the route number
- Could not clearly see

Q21 Destination on Front (155) 100%
- Yes
- Not displayed
- Could not clearly see

Q61 Route No. on Back (155) 97%
- Yes
- Incorrect route number shown
- No route number shown
- Couldn’t see

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019.
CCTV: Two thirds 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. Over a third were single deck buses.

Base: (86), ALL EXCLUDING NO STAIRWELL / SINGLE DECK

**Q56** CCTV in Stairwell (86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turned on and working correctly</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned on, but not working properly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CCTV display present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stairwell / single deck</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018<sub>Q4</sub>, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019<sub>Q3</sub>

* Question rebased off those who could see a CCTV display
Fare Payment: All cash ticket machines & Leap Card readers were working correctly. All cash payers received either a printed ticket or the correct change. Over 7 in 10 were able to see what fare they were charged on their Leap card.

Q32 Cash Fare (92)
If Cash Fare at R5
Ticket Machine Working Correctly

Q33 Cash Fare
If Cash Fare at R5
Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt (92)

Q34* Leap Card Reader Present
at Driver Working Correctly (63)

Q35* Leap Card Reader at Driver
See Fare Charged (63)

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 (Q4), Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019 (Q3)

Q32 Was the ticket machine working correctly for you?
Q33 Were you given a printed ticket and change?
Q34 Did the Leap Card reader appear to be working correctly?
Q35 Could you see what fare were you charged?
Interior Lighting and Temperature: nearly 8 in 10 reported interior lighting to be functioning correctly when needed significantly up from the last quarter, with minimal instances of lights flickering/not working. Almost all interviewers found the on-board temperatures on the buses to be reasonable, significantly down from Q4 last year. The temperature was deemed to be not reasonable due to being a cold day and the heating being off.

Is the interior lighting on and functioning correctly?

Yes and functioning correctly: 79% (68) Q3

Yes but some lights flickering or not working: 8% (1) Q4

No and it is dark outside: (21) Q4

No but it is daylight outside: 14% (28) Q3

Do you consider the temperature on board the bus was reasonable given the weather conditions?

Yes: 95% (99) Q4

No: (5) Q4

Why do you think the temperature was not reasonable?

A cold day with the heating turned on: 63% (63)

A cold day with the heating turned off:

A cold day - not sure if heating is on: 38% (38)

A warm day with the heating turned off:

A warm day with the heating turned on:

A warm day - not sure if heating is on: -

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019 Q3
Section 5: Cleanliness Performance
C2: Station Cleanliness
**Station Seating:** Station seats showed only limited minor visible damage and in most cases were clean with only minimal mentions of dust, crumbs and gum or ingrained dirt or graffiti on seats.

Base: (27), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A

---

**Q1 Graffiti on Station Seats**

- **Total (27)***
  - No graffiti or defacing: 74%
  - Minor graffiti or defacing: 26%
  - Heavy defacing: =
  - Offensive graffiti: =

**Q2 Station Seats Damaged**

- **Total (27)***
  - No visible damage: 93%
  - Minor damage: 7%
  - Moderate damage: =
  - Hazardous damage including seat loose from seat structure: =

**Q3 Cleanliness of Station Seats**

- **Total (27)***
  - Clean: 81%
  - Significant dust or crumbs: 7%
  - Gum or other ingrained dirt: 11%
  - Wet or soiled: =

---

*Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019.*

*Caution: Small base size*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>What best describes graffiti or other defacing on station seats?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Were any station seats you observed damaged in any way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>What best describes level of cleanliness of station seats?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

KANTAR
Station Cleanliness: In the majority of cases the station walls and fixture are free of graffiti the floors and stairs are clean and there is limited litter, there is some light or moderate dirt on walls and other fixtures.

Base: (27), IF ASKED TO ASSESS A BUS EIREANN STATION Q1A

Q4 Graffiti on Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (27)*

- No signs: 93%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: Z%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: Z%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: Z%

Q5 Cleanliness of Walls, Panels Ceilings and other Fixtures (27)*

- No signs of dirt: 63%
- Light dirt: 30%
- Moderately dirty: Z%
- Very dirty*: Z%

Q9 Cleanliness of Station Floors or Stairs (27)*

- Generally Clean: 93%
- Dirt or liquid spills (wet or partially wet/sticky): Z%
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): Z%

Q10 Litter on Seats, Floors or Stairs? (27)*

- Appeared litter free: 93%
- Some litter: Z%
- A lot of litter: Z%

*Caution: Small base size

*Busáras and Sligo deemed very dirty

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019, Q3
Station Windows and Exterior: Station windows were though to be kept in good condition with very limited graffiti or etchings, with some mentions of light and moderate dirt. Less than 1 in 5 saw some litter around the exterior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6 Graffiti on Station Windows (27)*</th>
<th>Q8 Cleanliness of Station Windows (27)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q7 What best describes level of etching on station windows? (27)*</th>
<th>Q11 Exterior Litter Free (27)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor etching</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy etching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive etching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8 What best describes level of cleanliness of station windows?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11 Was the exterior of the bus station building litter free?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeared litter free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of litter*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Caution: Small base size

= Statistically significant differences are versus
Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019 Q3
Station Toilets: Station toilets were seen to be generally graffiti free with some mentions of minor graffiti. Over 8 in 10 report that the toilets were deemed clean, with some minor litter on floor. There was one mention of toilets being blocked and a few incidences of not flushing, toilet paper was available in stations.

Base: (26), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2,

Q16 Graffiti on Toilet Area (26)*

- No signs: 88%
- Minor graffiti: 12%
- Heavy graffiti: 4%
- Offensive graffiti: 0%

Q17 What best describes cleanliness of toilet area? (26)*

- Generally clean: 85%
- Minor litter on floors: 12%
- Minor dirt on floor, door or walls: 4%
- Very dirty: 0%

Photos from Cork bus station

Q18 Toilets Blocked (26)*

- Yes: 4%
- No: 96%

Q18 Toilets Blocked: Photos from Cork bus station

Q19 Flush Working (26)*

- Yes: 92%
- No: 8%

Q19 Flush Working: Photos from Cork bus station

Q20 Toilet Paper Available (26)*

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

Q20 Toilet Paper Available

*Caution: Small base size

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Q3 Jun - Sep 2019.

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 litter, dirt and minor graffiti. The washroom facilities were thought to be functioning correctly in the majority of cases.

Base: (26), IF TOILETS OPEN Q15/2,

Q21 Cleanliness of Washroom Area (26)*

- Generally clean: 85%
- Some litter: 12%
- Some dirt on floors or surfaces: 4%
- Very dirty: 0%

Q22 Graffiti in Washroom Area (26)*

- No signs: 85%
- Minor graffiti: 15%
- Heavy graffiti: 4%
- Offensive graffiti: 1%

Q23 Washroom Taps (26)*

- Yes (both hot and cold): 85%
- Hot only: 4%
- Cold only: 0%
- Neither: 0%

Q24 Soap/Hand Cleanser Available (26)*

- Yes: 85%
- No: 12%

Q25 Washroom Dryers (26)*

- Worked: 96%
- Did not work: 4%
- No washroom dryer: 0%

Q26 Paper Towel Dispenser (26)*

- Yes: 85%
- No: 15%

Q27 Bins Clean (26)*

- Yes: 88%
- Overflowing - needed to be emptied: 4%
- No bins present: 8%

 gravitational differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019Q3

*Caution: Small base size

() = Busáras
Section 6: Cleanliness Performance
C1: Bus Cleanliness
Assessment of Seats: There is a significant fall for no signs of graffiti on seats versus last year. However the majority found both bus seats & cushions to be clean & well-maintained, with some minor graffiti or ingrained dirt on seats. There was minimal mentions of minor tearing on seats.

Base: (155)

Q43 Graffiti on Seats (155)

- No Signs: 83%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 15%
- Heavy defacing: 2%
- Offensive graffiti: 1%

Q44 Cleanliness of Seats (155)

- Clean: 89%
- Significant dust or crumbs: 1%
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: 10%
- Wet or soiled: 0%

Q45 Damage to Seats (155)

- No: 88%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 10%
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 2%
- Moderate damage: 0%
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: 0%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019.
Bus Interior: The interior of the buses were generally clean and graffiti free, with a significant decrease in cleanliness of floors and stairs since last quarter. 7 in 10 claim the seats/floor stairs are litter free, with minimal levels of litter reported and some light dirt on panels, ceilings and fixtures.

Q49 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs (155)

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

Q50 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs* (155)

- Litter free: 70%
- Minimal level of litter: 15%
- Some litter: 6%
- A lot of litter: 9%

Q51 Graffiti of Panels Ceilings, Stairs and other Fixtures/Fittings (155)

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

Q52 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and other Fixtures/Fittings (155)

- No signs: 83%
- Light dirt: 15%
- Moderately dirty: 1%
- Very dirty: 1%

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019.
Bus Windows: The majority of interviewers reported no signs of graffiti or etchings on bus windows. 7 in 10 window were clear, with just over a fifth noticing light dirt.

Base: (155)

Q46 Graffiti on Windows (155)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor graffiti</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy defacing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q47 Etching on Windows (155)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor etching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy etching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive etching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q48 Cleanliness of Windows (155)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Signs</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light dirt</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019
Front, Side and Rear of Bus: This quarter there is a significant decline in cleanliness levels of both the front and side of the buses and also the rear. The dirt observed was mainly thought to have been picked up during operations that day, with a significant increase in levels of heavy dirt for the rear of the bus.

Base: (155)

Q23 Cleanliness of Front/Side of Bus (155)

<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>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dirty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q64 Was the Rear of the Bus Clean? (155)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some dirt</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy dirt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019 Q3

Q23 Were the front and side of the bus clean?
Q64 Was the rear of the bus clean?
Section 7: Customer Service Performance (C5)
**Travel Centre**: Travel centre staff were seen as polite and professional and friendly. Information provided appeared to be correct.

- **Q12 Travel Centre at Station**: 22% open, 7% closed, 70% closed (*Travel Centres were closed for some weekend interviewing*).
- **Q13 Travel Centre Assistant Response**:
  - Polite: 63%
  - Professional: 68%
  - Friendly: 32%
  - Indifferent: -
  - Ignored me: -
  - Rude or sarcastic: -
  - Abusive: -
- **Q14 Travel Centre Assistant Provide Correct Information**: 100%

Base: (19), IF TRAVEL CENTRE OPEN Q12/1