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Background to Research

This research programme monitors service, quality and compliance with contractual Dublin Bus requirements through “mystery shopping” surveys, to measure key aspects of service delivery. This mystery shopping programme was designed to provide robust and actionable data to the National Transport Authority to measure the overall service performance of Dublin Bus through the eyes of its ‘customers’.

205 mystery shops were conducted during Quarter 4 with mystery shoppers acting as passengers while waiting for and on board selected Dublin Bus routes around the city. A broad spread of bus routes were covered across different days of the week and times of the day. 10 Dublin Bus Head Office interviews were also completed and included in Quarter 4 data.

The mystery shops were carried out by trained Kantar Millward Brown interviewers, following an initial pilot and briefing session. These interviewers use portable HAPI (HandHeld Personal Interviewing) devices which enable both discreet and effective captures of location, bus and driver details at stops, when boarding, on board and after alighting buses.

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: No mention of third party advertising on either the bus shelter glass or on bus stop poles

**Q4 2019**

94% observed a Bus Stop Pole & Flag

---

**Q14 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Shelter glass**

(92)

- **0**
- **100**

- Yes
- No

**Q15 Third Party Commercial Advertising on Bus Stop Pole**

(177)

- **0**
- **100**

- Yes
- No

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Is there additional commercial advertising on the shelter glass outside the designated advertising or travel information and timetable panels? (Acceptable advertising must be in a “Case” or Side Panel and not just pasted on shelter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Are there any third party commercial advertisements or notices (excluding graffiti, stickers, or bus operator related advertisements) on the operator’s bus pole?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: (125) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q7
**Bus Shelters:** The vast majority found the bus stop poles & shelters to be in good condition, with only one mention of hazardous damage with a significant crack and loose.

Base: , IF YES TO BUS SHELTER Q30/1, (125) IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q7/1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8 Condition of the Bus Pole (125)</th>
<th>Q9 Condition of the Bus Shelter (92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Good condition</td>
<td>% Good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Moderate damage</td>
<td>7 Moderate damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch/graffiti</td>
<td>Hazardous damage requiring immediate repair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small side panel with significant crack and loose
Too dark to take photo

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019
Information Display: 8 in 10 report some information display, for those that report no display there is a significant fall versus last year. A significant increase for both small and long panels on poles. The condition of the display are fully legible and clean in the majority of cases with a significant uplift versus last year.

Q4 2019

**Q5** Information Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Display</th>
<th>Q4 2019</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Panel on Pole</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long panel on pole</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information panel on shelter</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF1 Pole with information panel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q6** Condition of Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Q4 2019</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully legible and clean</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>(93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by condensation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged or torn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscured by dirt / etching / graffiti /</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mounted correctly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Q5 What type of information display was there present at the stop? SEE IMAGE EXAMPLE

Q6 How would you describe the condition of this information display?
Section 2: Customer Information Performance
Fares: Virtually all interviewers found the fares were displayed clearly at the entrance to the bus.

Base: (205)

Q4 2019

Q26 Were the Fares Displayed Clearly at the Entrance?
(205)
%

 Depths

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Q3 Jun - Sep 2019.
Visible Information: Almost all interviewers saw a bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag. Over 3 in 4 saw printed timetables a significant increase year on year. Over half report an operative date present at the bus stop, which is a decrease versus the last quarter but an increase year on year.

Q1a Bus Stop Number Visible (202) %
- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

Q11 Printed Timetable Present (196) %
- Yes: 77%
- No: 23%

Q12 Operative Date Present (151) %
- Yes: 72%
- No: 24%
- Present but could not read: 16%

Base: IF YES TO BUS STOP POLE AND FLAG Q7/1 OR BUS SHELTER Q4/2, IF YES TO PRINTED TIMETABLE Q11/1

\[\text{Q4 2019}\]

\[\downarrow = \text{Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018}_{Q4}, \text{ Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019}_{Q3}\]

Q1a Is the bus stop number visible on the bus stop flag? This is an up to 6 digit number
Q11 Is there a printed timetable, for the route you are using, on display at the bus stop
Q12 Is there an “Operative Date” (Dublin Bus) or “Valid From” date written on the timetable? Interviewer note: can be very small print
Section 3: Bus Equipment Performance
When Getting on the Bus: Upon boarding the bus, over 8 in 10 said the centre doors opened and over two thirds noted the centre doors opening when alighting the bus, once again an improvement versus last year.

82% assessed buses with centre doors

**Q40 Did the Driver Open the Centre Doors?**
[Boarding Passengers]

Q4 2019

Q70 Centre Doors Open for Passengers*
[Alighting Passengers]

**Buses with no alighting passengers excluded**
On Board Displays/Announcements: Almost all interviewers who could see a display found that it was working correctly. 8 out of 10 found the next stop announcement was working correctly, while over 1 in 10 felt it was working but too quiet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4 2019</th>
<th>Q80* Electronic Displays for Next Stop Working</th>
<th>Q81* Automatic Next Stop Announcement Working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - was working correctly</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yes -working and volume was correct 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working but was not providing correct information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - working but too loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display was turned off or not working</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes - working but too quiet 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No - was not working 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* Question rebased off those who could see a display / hear an announcement
Wheelchair Ramp/Lift: All observed requests for a wheelchair ramp were activated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4 2019</th>
<th>Q91 Wheelchair Ramp/Lift Activated Upon Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No - driver stated it was broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No - person requesting was not a wheelchair user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No - driver refused to activate because unsafe to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No - driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No - other reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No - no reason given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: (6) If yes to WHEELCHAIR RAMP OR LIFT REQUEST Q90/1

No = driver refused to activate because unsafe to do so at the stop

No = driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present

No = other reason

No = no reason given

\[\text{Yes} = \text{No} - \text{driver stated it was broken} \]

\[\text{No} - \text{person requesting was not a wheelchair user} \]

\[\text{No} - \text{driver refused to activate because unsafe to do so at the stop} \]

\[\text{No} - \text{driver stated no wheelchair ramp or lift present} \]

\[\text{No} - \text{other reason} \]

\[\text{No} - \text{no reason given} \]

\(\Rightarrow=\) Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019.
Route Number and Destination Visible: Almost all found both the route numbers & destinations to be clearly visible on all sides of the bus. Reports of route number on the back of the bus has fallen significantly versus the last quarter.

Q20 Route No. on Front
- Yes: 100%
- Not displayed: 0%
- Could not clearly see: 0%

Q21 Destination on Front
- Yes: 100%
- Not displayed: 0%
- Could not clearly see: 0%

Q22 Route No. on Side
- Correct route no. displayed: 100%
- Incorrect route no. displayed: 0%
- No route no. displayed: 0%
- There was no display panel for route no. Could not clearly see: 0%

Q66 Route No. on Back
- Yes: 98%
- Incorrect route number shown: 1%
- No route number shown: 0%
- Couldn’t see: 0%

Δ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 vs. Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019

Q20 Could the correct route number be clearly seen on the front of the bus? ASK ALL
Q21 Could the correct destination be clearly seen on the front of the bus?
Q22 Could the correct route number be seen clearly on the side of the bus?
Q66 Was the correct route number displayed on the back of the bus?
CCTV: In the vast majority of buses that had CCTV cameras present the CCTV screens in the stairwells were turned on and functioning correctly, minimal reports of no CCTV display present or turned off.

Base: (169), IF CCTV Camera Present

Q4 2019

Q61 CCTV in Stairwell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turned on and working correctly</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned on, but was 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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019 Q3
Fare Payment: All ticket machines and leap card readers and pole were found to be functioning correctly. Nearly four in five Leap Card users could see the fare charged when using the reader at the driver.

Q4 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q32 Cash Fare (102) Ticket Machine Working Correctly</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33 Cash Fare* Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Change</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exact Change</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34 Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (50)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35 Leap Card Reader at Driver See Fare Charged (50)*</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37 Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader Working Correctly (53)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payment Methods were split as follows:
- 50% Cash exact change
- 25% Cash not exact change
- 25% Leap Card Reader at Driver
- 25% Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader

The questionnaire reads for the second answer 'Yes printed ticket and receipt' which is the 4%

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

Q32 Cash Fare* Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt

Q33 Cash Fare* Given Printed Ticket/Change Receipt

Q34 Leap Card Reader Present at Driver Working Correctly (50)

Q35 Leap Card Reader at Driver See Fare Charged (50)*

Q37 Pole Mounted Leap Card Reader Working Correctly (53)
Section 4: Cleanliness Performance
Assessment of Seats: All bus seats were found free of graffiti and damage on all occasions. Over 9 in 10 found that seats were clean, with some significant incidences of dust, crumbs and gum or ingrained dirt.

Base: (205)

Q4 2019

Q46 Graffiti on Seats

- No Signs: 100%
- Minor graffiti or defacing: 6%
- Heavy defacing: 2%
- Offensive graffiti: 2%

Q47 Cleanliness of Seats

- Clean: 92%
- Significant dust or crumbs: 2%
- Gum or other ingrained dirt: 2%
- Wet or soiled: 2%

Q48 Damage to Seats

- No: 100%
- Minor tear, less than 2cm in length: 2%
- Significant tearing greater than 2cm in length: 2%
- Moderate damage: 2%
- Hazardous damage including loose from seat structure: 2%

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

Q46 How would you best describe graffiti or other defacing on seat cushions or seat structure?

Q47 What best describes level of cleanliness of seat cushions?

Q48 Were any bus seat cushions you observed damaged in any way?
Bus Interior: In general the floors and stairs are clean. There is a significant dis-improvement since the last quarter on levels of litter (58%) with a further 3 in 10 claiming minimal levels of litter. No signs of graffiti reported. A significant improvement in levels of dirt and over 8 in 10 claim there are no signs of dirt a significant improvement versus this time last year.

Q52 Cleanliness of Floors and Stairs

- Generally clean: 88%
- Dirt or liquid spills: 3%
- Dirt or liquid stains (dried): 8%

Q53 Litter on Seats/Floor or Stairs

- Litter free: 58%
- Minimal level of litter: 31%
- Some litter: 9%
- A lot of litter: 2%

Q54 Graffiti on Panels, Ceilings, Stairs and Other Fixtures/Fittings

- No signs: 100%
- Minor graffiti or etchings: -%
- Heavy graffiti or etchings: -%
- Offensive graffiti or etchings: -%

Q55 Cleanliness of Panels, Ceilings and Other Fixtures/Fittings

- No signs of dirt: 81%
- Light dirt: 14%
- Moderately dirty: 4%
- Very dirty: 2%

↓ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019.
Bus Windows: No signs of graffiti and minimal reports of etchings on bus windows. Half found the bus windows had no signs of dirt, a significant decrease from the last quarter. Uplift in moderate dirt reported.

Base: (205)

Q4 2019

Q49 Graffiti on Windows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>No signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Offensive graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Heavy graffiti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q50 Etching on Windows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>No signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor etching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Offensive etching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Heavy etching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q51 Cleanliness of Windows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>No signs of dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Light dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Moderately dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very dirty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Q49 What best describes level of graffiti on windows?
Q50 What best describes level of etching on windows?
Q51 What best describes level of cleanliness of windows?
Front/Side of Bus: No reporting of any signs of visible damage, such as light scratches, to the front/side of the buses. Over 7 out of 10 felt the front and sides of the bus were clean a significant decrease on the last quarter. Increase in reports of light dirt picked up during operations of the day for both the front/side and rear of the bus from Q3. The levels of some dirt at the rear of the bus was significantly up from the previous quarter.

Q4 2019

Q23 Cleanliness of Front/ Side of Bus

| Yes | 75 |
| Light dirt, likely to have been picked up during operations today | 18 |
| Moderately dirty | 6 |
| Very dirty, likely to have accumulated over several days | - |

Q24 Visible Damage to Front/Side of Bus

| No Visible Damage | 100 |
| Light paintwork scratches only | 1 |
| Minor bodywork damage | 32 |
| Serious damage to bodywork | - |

Q69 Was the Rear of Bus Clean?

| Yes | 62 |
| Some dirt, likely to have been picked up during operation | 32 |
| Heavy dirt, likely to have accumulated over more than one day’s operation | 1 |
| Couldn’t see | 1 |

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

Q23 Were the front and side of the bus clean?
Q24 Was there visible damage to the front or side of the bus?
Q69 Was the rear of the bus clean?
Section 5: Bus Driver Performance
Driver Assessment: Drivers remain very highly regarded by almost all interviewers in terms of both attitude and presentation.

Base: (205)

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

Q4 2019

Q27 Helpful

- Yes: 0
- No: 100

Q30 Driver Wearing Uniform

- Yes: 4
- No: 96

Q28 Polite

- Yes: 0
- No: 100

Q31 Driver Well Presented

- Yes: 3
- No: 97

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019
Driver Interaction: On the two occasions when a driver dispute was observed, one driver was thought to handle the situation in a rude or sarcastic manner and the other one in a friendly manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver Interaction</th>
<th>Q4 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q86 How did driver handle situation? (2)%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent or ignored passenger</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rude or sarcastic</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The passenger got on the bus, it was very busy and raining. Our interviewer was about half way down the bus, the lady was foreign and her English was not good, he told her she had to pay another €1.20 extra. The interviewer thought the driver could have been more helpful on this occasion, in the end another passage paid the extra fare for the lady.

↓↑ = Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 Q4, Q4 3 Jun - Sep 2019 Q3
Bus Safety: The majority felt that drivers both braked and accelerated smoothly and gave people adequate time to find a seat or hold on, a significant improvement compared to this time last year.

**Q4 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q75 Driver Accelerated Smoothly*</th>
<th>Q76 Driver Braking Smoothly*</th>
<th>Q77 Did the driver give passengers adequate time to find their seats or hold on?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% (95) Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>90% (18) Yes, felt comfortable</td>
<td>96% (89) Yes, felt comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort</td>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - minor discomfort</td>
<td>Occasionally moved off too early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort</td>
<td>Occasionally felt too harsh - moderate discomfort</td>
<td>Frequently moved off too early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td>Frequently too harsh</td>
<td>Felt it was dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed to control</td>
<td>Failed to control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018 (<sup>Q4</sup>), Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019 (<sup>Q3</sup>)
Pulling up to kerb: In total there were only five incidents of the bus not pulling up to the kerb and in one case was a vehicle in the way, there didn’t appear to be any reasons in the four other cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q38 Why did the bus not pull up to the footpath kerb?</th>
<th>Q72 Why did the bus not pull up to the kerb?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another vehicle was parked in the way</td>
<td>Other bus was in the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No footpath kerb was present</td>
<td>There were other obstructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>-</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></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other reason - Please record details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No specific reason, there didn’t appear to be any restriction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4 2019

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q37/2 Why did the bus not pull up close to kerb?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q37/2, (8) IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q71/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Base: | 5, IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q37/2, 8 IF NO TO PULL UP CLOSE TO KERB Q71/2 |
Driver Actions: The buses stopped to pick up passengers on all occasions when requested.

Base: (203), ALL THOSE REQUESTED TO STOP

Q4 2019

Q84 Stopped to Pick Up Passenger

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

- 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

* Question rebased off those whose bus was requested to stop

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

So far as you could tell, did the driver always stop to pick up passengers when requested?
Driver Behaviour: There were no reports of a driver issues. Only about one in ten said a driver listened to radio/music and no mentions of holding long conversations.

Q4 2019

Q78 Did Bus Driver do Any of the Following:

- Use mobile phone while driving
- Wear an earpiece while driving
- Drive the bus in a dangerous manner

None of these

Q79 Driver Listening to Music/Radio

- Yes
- No
- Could not observe

Q80 Driver Hold Long Conversations

- Yes with other staff
- Yes with passengers
- No
- Could not observe

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

Q78 Q79 Q80 Did the bus driver do any of the following while driving? Did the driver listen to music or the radio whilst driving? Did the driver hold long conversations with other people on the bus while driving?
Driver Actions: No report any instances of drivers leaving buses unattended

Q4 2019

Q81 Driver Left Bus Unattended

- Yes - because of driver change
- Yes - to go to shops
- Yes - to go to toilet
- Yes - some other reason - Please record details
- Yes – don’t know the reason

No 100

= Statistically significant differences are versus Qtr 4 Sep - Dec 2018, Qtr 3 Jun - Sep 2019.
Diversion or Terminated Early: Just minimal level of buses diverted or terminated early this quarter

Base: (205)

Q4 2019

Q87 Bus Diverted/Terminated Early

- Yes
- No

Q82 If Bus Diverted (2)

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

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