

STUDENT TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY STUDY



CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT OF NEW ROCHELLE NEW ROCHELLE, NEW YORK

**PREPARED BY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY SERVICES
LOUIS J. BOFFARDI, SENIOR CONSULTANT**

OCTOBER 2015

DISTRICT PROFILE

In order to evaluate effectively a school district's transportation program, it is critically important that basic information be gathered in order to supply the foundation for further detailed analysis. Ordinarily, this information is taken from the Transportation Formula Aid Output Report (TRA). While the purpose of the TRA is to provide transportation aid information, some general information contained within the TRA is used by some school district officials as one of the assessment tools for their own transportation program, to compare one school district's transportation costs with other school districts, and to compare transportation expenses of similar sized school districts and/or similar located school districts in New York State.

The TRA does not become available from the State Education Department until mid to late fall. However, some financial and transportation service information relative to the School District's transportation program is provided by **TAS** from information gathered as part of the study of the transportation program.

The information provided has not been audited by the State Education Department, and it is based upon financial information available from the Business Office towards the end of August 2015. Also, the format is not that which is provided by the State, but it does provide information that may be useful to the School District.

Line	Category	2014-2015 Operating Year	Source of Information
1	Transportation Operating Expenses	\$12,338,785.15	District Information
2	Deduct Non-Allowable Transportation Aid Expenses for Monitors	\$901,130.00	District Information
3	Deduct Non-Allowable Transportation Aid Expenses for Athletic Program	\$394,267.00	District Information
4	Deduct Non-Allowable Transportation Aid Expenses for Music Program	\$18,027.25	District Information
5	Deduct Expenses for Public Carrier	\$823,500.00	District Information
6	Estimated Net Contracted Operating Expenses	\$10,201,860.90	Line 1 – Line 2 + Line 3 + Line 4 + Line 5
7	Salaries and Benefits for School District Management and Oversight of Transportation Program	\$358,219.08	District Information
8	Equipment and Supplies	\$2,057.07	District Information
9	Total Estimated Contracted as well as School District Management and Oversight Aideable Expenses	\$10,562,137.05	Line 6 + Line 7 + Line 8
10	Total Contracted Buses/Vans	162	District Information
11	Total Students Transported by Contractors	3,309	District Information

Line	Category	2014-2015 Operating Year	Source of Information
12	Average Cost per Contracted Bus/Van Based Upon Transportation Aid Allowable Expenses	\$65,198.38	Line 9 ÷ Line 10
13	Average Cost per Student on Contracted Buses/Vans Based Upon Transportation Aid Allowable Expenses	\$3,191.94	Line 9 ÷ Line 11
14	Average Cost per Contracted Bus/Van Including Expenses for Monitors (1)	\$70,760.91	Line 2 + Line 9 ÷ Line 10
15	Average Cost per Student on Contracted Buses/Vans Including Expenses for Monitors (1)	\$3,464.27	Line 2 + Line 9 ÷ Line 11
Note 1: The reason for the inclusion of average costs with and without monitors is that they exist on many vehicles even though transportation aid for their use is not allowable. The purpose is to show costs.			

It is also important to note that the above table represents operating and financial information from the 2014-2015 school year. As mentioned in the first paragraph of this Section of this report, each year the School District receives State Aid based upon the previous year's expenses, and this information is reported by the State on the TRA. The use of this report allows for a consistent evaluation of a program through the review of defined expense and operating categories. Presently, the latest report available from the State is the 2014-2015 State Aid year, which is the 2013-2014 operating year.

When the 2015-2016 TRA becomes available, the recommendation is that the School District utilize the TRA as a base of information in addition to information received directly from other area school districts and complete a comparative review of its average cost per vehicle and average cost per transported student with the average cost per vehicle and average cost per transported student of the other school districts. The other school districts would have to be comparable to New Rochelle. That is, they would have to use only contracted transportation services and be of comparable size. The comparison would be based upon the 2014-2015 school year.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recommendations pertaining to each section of this report are embodied in those sections. They are also included here in summary for easy reference. For a more definitive discussion of each topic, please refer to the section itself. **The following recommendations are not listed in any prioritized order.**

Section 4 – DISTRICT PROFILE

- ◆ When the 2015-2016 Transportation Formula Aid Output report (TRA) becomes available, the School District should use information contained within this report as part of a self assessment of expenditure, and use the TRA, as well as information received directly from other school districts, for a comparative study of costs.

Section 5 – CONTRACTED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

- ◆ The School District is operating its transportation program under four separate Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for home-to-school and for summer school transportation services, one Bid document for athletics and field trips, and one cooperative transportation Bid with six other school districts for home to-school and summer school transportation services.
- ◆ The RFPs are poorly constructed, do not reflect properly and totally the student transportation standards, do not conform to the industry standards at the time they were published, many sections were plagiarized from documents that were developed for other school districts, and some of the requirements are problematic for current use.
- ◆ The athletic and field trip Bid is inconsistent in parts with the RFP requirements for home-to-school and summer school transportation services and needs improvements in structure and in its specifications.
- ◆ Some concerns exist with the cooperative Bid document in that the multi-year award did not receive voter approval and the renewal may be for a time period longer than what is allowed due to the term limitation in the original document. Furthermore, the cooperative group of school districts is using the wrong time period as the base for the annual percentage increase to the Contractor for transportation services.
- ◆ A need exists for a Bid/RFP for coach buses since expenditures exceed the \$20,000.00 limit allowed for services without a Bid.

Section 6 - EXPENDITURES

- ◆ Due to the use of four separate RFPs, the prices for transportation services are different for identical and similar services from the same Contractor.

- ◆ Shuttle prices appear to be high for non prime time use.
- ◆ The School District is claiming as a transportation aidable expenditure the use of monitors on buses/van to supervise student behavior. This is a non transportation aidable expense.

Section 7 - FLEET

- ◆ The fleet utilized by First Student for transportation services to the School District is at the high end in average age and in average mileage. The fleet used by First Mile Square is slightly lower in age and substantially lower in mileage.
- ◆ Both companies have consistently met the standard established by the New York State Department of Transportation for a satisfactory bus inspection Profile. The bus inspection **Profile** of First Mile Square excellent.

Section 8 – MANAGEMENT and OVERSIGHT

- ◆ The number of people that comprise the School District's Transportation Department is appropriate and needed for the size and the type of transportation service
- ◆ The job description of the Transportation Assistant needs to be updated and brought more in line with the responsibilities of this position.
- ◆ The School District needs to comply with the requirements of §3624 of the Education Law for the Superintendent's approval of drivers in service to the School District. This approval requirement should be extended to attendants/monitors through the Bid/RFP requirements.
- ◆ Routing is primarily historical and does not reflect fully ridership patterns. The latter can be used to determine possible route reductions and changes in route design/structure.
- ◆ At least every other year the School District should take a ridership count for five consecutive days three times a year (mid fall, mid winter, and mid spring) to review the number of students riding the buses as one of the means to establish ridership and routing patterns.
- ◆ Route times developed by the School District's transportation management software should be checked with actual ridership time recorded by the bus drivers.
- ◆ The use of technology in the management of the Transportation Department and in the management of the transportation service needs substantial improvement.

- ◆ Compliance is needed with the legal and regulatory requirement of school bus emergency drills. The present failure of not conducting these drills is highly unusual and is hazardous to the students being transported.
- ◆ The Transportation Department has various requirements for information on the buses used for the transportation service that is not forthcoming and is unnecessary.

Section 9 – POLICY

- ◆ In Policy 3610, TRANSPORTATION, statements should exist on the maximum distance on walking to a bus stop, the establishment of child safety zones, and transportation requirements for pre-school and kindergarten students.
- ◆ In Policy 3680, BUS DRIVER QUALIFICATIONS, there should also be School District qualifications for attendants/monitors.
- ◆ Policy 3685, LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR SCHOOL BUS COMPANIES, should have the liability insurance extended to \$10 million.
- ◆ Policy statements/requirements should exist for transportation services to/from child care locations; religious instruction locations, if the School District wishes to continue this practice; bus stop reviews; temporary transportation services to locations other than child care locations; and music instruments as well as sports equipment on buses.

Section 10 – TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

- ◆ A recommendation is made that the School District considers a two-tier structure for the transportation of its elementary school students.
- ◆ Data information in the School District's computerized transportation management system needs to be updated and kept current.
- ◆ The School District should review the appropriateness and the legality of its practice of providing transportation to locations for religious instruction as part of its afternoon transportation service home and to child care locations.

SUMMARY BID/RFP REQUIREMENT STATEMENT

The primary recommendation is that the School District prepares a new Request for Proposal for its total transportation program. It is the understanding of **TAS'** Project Consultant that First Student has notified the School District that it will not renew its contract for the 2016-2017 school year. Therefore, the decision has been made by this company for their portion of the transportation program. The School District should inform First Mile Square that it will not renew its present contract with this company for the 2016-2017 school year and subsequent years. This will provide the School District with an opportunity to update its contract specifications and

consolidate the many portions of the transportation service. Both actions are needed.

A decision will be needed to utilize a Bid or a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the transportation service. A Bid award is based upon the lowest price from a responsible Bidder. An RFP for transportation services in New York State considers nine (9) other factors in addition to the lowest price. Each of the factors is weighted in accordance with what a school district considers important. However, no single factor can be more than fifty percent (50%) of the total. The submissions of information from Contractors are more extensive, and the review by school districts for an award is more complex.

The second decision is how to request the services needed. Regardless of whether a Bid or an RFP is used, New York State requires that the contract for Home-to-School transportation services, for Field and Sports trips, and for Summer School transportation services be separated. In theory, a school district can find itself with three (3) separate Contractors. However, it is more common to get one or two. Usually, the Contractor who gets the award for the Home-to-School contract gets the award for the Field and Sports trips contract due to the availability of vehicles for the latter from the services for the former. The Summer School contract is usually not connected to any other service.

Each of these three contracts can be broken into further divisions for many purposes. For example, the Home-to-School contract can be divided into public schools and private/parochial schools (including special education locations), into large buses and vans, into one section of the school district and another section of the school district, etc. The Field and Sports trips contract can be divided into field trips and into sports trips. The Summer School contract is very seldom divided because it is too small.

The recommendation is to utilize a Request for Proposals (RFP) rather than a Bid. In order to encourage competition and offer an opportunity for companies smaller than First Student and First Mile Square the recommendation is to segment the RFP.

1. The Home-to-School Contract should be divided into two (2) contracts, one for in-School District transportation services (specifically for the non public schools) and the other contract for all private/parochial schools as well as non New Rochelle School District special education locations.
2. The Field and Sports Trips contract should also be divided into two (2) contracts, one for Field Trips and one for Sports Trips.
3. The Summer School contract should be a single document since it's not an extensive program.

There will be a common core of requirements with separate pricing requests for the five (5) contractual portions of the transportation program.

Due to the break-up of the RFP into five (5) contracts, it is very possible that the School District will have more than one Contractor. Presently, it's been operating with two Contractors. Therefore, there is experience with multiple vendors.

Because of the complexity of an RFP, the time it takes to prepare a Proposal, and the segmentation of two out of the three basic contracts, the recommendation is that five weeks be allowed from the time the RFP document becomes publically available until the time Proposals are due. Furthermore, it is recommended that a pre-Proposal meeting be held to explain portions of the RFP document and to answer questions directly from prospective Proposers.

Since the day-to-day management of the transportation program will be completed by the Transportation Assistant and her staff, she should have some in-put into the Bid or RFP decision and the method(s) used to solicit Contractors for the transportation service.

A second recommendation is that a Bid should be requested for coach busing. For the 2014-2015 school year this service exceeded the maximum \$20,000 threshold allowed for purchased services without competitive Bidding. The School District is in non compliance with the Bidding requirement of the General Municipal Law.

The third recommendation is that training and instruction be provided for the Transportation Assistant and the Transportation Department staff. There is a need for improved skills as well as increased knowledge of the demands and the responsibilities of an oversight of the School District's transportation program. Many practices based upon past procedures need to be changed, and there is a need for the use of more current technology for communication within the School District and with the Contractors.

EXPENDITURES

The distribution of the 2014-2015 costs by the major portions of the transportation program and by vendor is shown on the following chart.

2014-2015 Summary of Operating Transportation Expenses								
	Athletics	BOCES	Music Program	Private Carrier	Public Carrier	Special Education	Summer 2014	Total
BOCES (1)		\$5,330.59 (1)						\$5,330.59 (1)
First Mile Square	\$319,650.00		\$8,452.00	\$7,390,877.12		\$5,059.50	\$35,937.00 (2)	\$7,759,975.62
First Student				\$2,426,783.00			\$88,404.00 \$251,658.00 (3)	\$2,515,187.00 + \$251,658.00 (3) ----- \$2,766,845.00
J & R Tours (2)	\$25,685.00			\$4,260.00				\$29,945.00 (2)
Metro Cards					\$45,650.00			\$45,650.00
Mile Square Bus Transportation	\$48,932.00		\$605.25	\$778,529.00		\$2,744.00		\$830,810.25
Montauk Student Transport (1)				\$113,408.69				\$113,408.69 (1)
Service Tours (2)			\$8,970.00					\$8,970.00 (2)
Westchester DOT					\$777,850.00			\$777,850.00
Total	\$394,267.00	\$5,330.59	\$18,027.25	\$10,713,857.81	\$823,500.00	\$7,803.50	\$88,404.00 + \$287,595.00 ----- \$375,999.00	\$12,051,190.15 + \$287,595.00 ----- \$12,338,785.15

2014-2015 Summary of Operating Transportation Expenses								
	Athletics	BOCES	Music Program	Private Carrier	Public Carrier	Special Education	Summer 2014	Total
Percentage	03.20%	00.04%	00.15%	86.83%	06.67%	00.06%	03.05%	100.00%
Note 1: Expenditures for oversight of a cooperative transportation program by BOCES with six other school districts. Note 2: Expenditures for coach buses Note 3: These expenditures were not paid from School District funds. They were paid from a grant. Source: School District Business Office provided information								

There were further expenses that were charged to the transportation budget. These are non operating transportation expenses that included \$346.68 for the purchase of a printer for the Transportation Department, \$12,753.25 for non transportation services contractual expenses, and \$1,710.39 for supplies and materials. The total is \$14,810.32.

The cost of salaries for the School District's Transportation Department office totaled \$251,381.81. To this number approximately 42.5% (\$106,837.27) must be added for fringe benefits and payroll taxes. This totals \$358,219.08.

When the \$14,810.32 plus the \$358,219.08 is added to the \$12,338,785.15 in operational expenses, the total 2014-2015 projected expenditures for the transportation service is approximately \$12,711,814.55 of which \$12,338,785.15 (97.07%) is contracted transportation services.

The distribution of operational expenditures by Contractor is shown again and is shown with percentages of expenditures.

Service Provider	Expenditure	Percentage	Comments
BOCES	\$5,330.59	00.04%	Cooperative Transportation Service
First Mile Square	\$7,759,975.62	62.89%	
First Student	\$2,766,845.00	22.42%	
J & R Tours	\$29,945.00	00.24%	
Metro Cards	\$45,650.00	00.37%	
Mile Square Bus Transportation	\$830,810.25	06.73%	
Montauk Student Transport	\$113,408.69	00.92%	Cooperative Transportation Service
Service Tours	\$8,970.00	00.07%	
Westchester DOT	\$777,850.00	06.30%	
Total	\$12,338,785.15		

The School District's transportation expenses are approximately 5.30% of the total 2014-2015 projected expended budget of approximately \$239,783,850.00 making it below the State average which is in the high five percent range. However, the State average is based upon a K-12 transportation program. The School District is providing direct transportation services for only those students in grades K-5 and is subsidizing partially the public transportation service for those students in grades 6-12.

The above budget expenditure numbers are based upon information provided towards the end of August 2015 and represent the vendor to which the expenditure was charged. Since some 2014-2015 School District expenses still have to be paid as of the time of this Section of this report, there may be some slight changes when the final reconciliation is completed.

A question was asked about the transportation expenditure of \$5,330.59 for BOCES since this was not self explanatory. Of the \$5,330.59, the amount of \$2,148.00 was for the School District's share for the oversight of the cooperative transportation service (see Section 5, CONTRACTED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES) and \$3,182.59 was the School District's share for fuel for the four routes that are shared with other school districts).

What factors influence the transportation operational expenditures?

1. Under School Board Policy (No. 3610), transportation services are provided for students who reside a mile-and-a-half or more from their school of attendance. This is the threshold for State aidable student transportation expenses. In effect, the transportation expenses for all students being transported from home-to-school are aidable at the School District's State aide rate of 45.2%

2. Generally, contracted transportation services are less costly than school district operated transportation program even when the Contractor has a bargaining unit representing its employees at the operational site. This is especially true if one or more of the Contractors are a national company. Ordinarily, the national company is able to purchase vehicles directly from the manufacturer and avoid dealer costs. Very frequently, the national company's purchasing ability enables it to purchase vehicles at a cost below the State contract price utilized by school districts. In addition, vehicles are generally purchased with fewer options than the vehicles purchased by school districts. Also, the national company often performs its own warrantee work, and it is reimbursed by the manufacturer.
3. It must also be said that some possible cost savings from national school bus Contractors could be offset by the corporate overhead and the need to have higher profit margins to satisfy stockholders as well as other investors. Often this drives the decision not to renew a contract and to request the school district to rebid the transportation service. Through the rebidding process, in the base year the Contractor can eliminate the cap of the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) which governs the increase in charges for service from one school year to the next.
4. By limiting the eligibility for transportation services to students who live a mile-and-a-half or more from their school of attendance and not providing transportation services to schools beyond ten miles from the student's home, the number of transportation eligible students is low.
5. In addition to the above, "yellow bus" transportation service is limited to elementary school students (Grades K-5) and to special education students in the middle school and the high school whose Individual educational plan (IEP) requires transportation to/from school as a related service.

Middle school and high school students who live a mile-and-a-half or more from their school of attendance rare sold subsidized public conveyer passes that offset the student's cost of using the public conveyer for transportation to/from school. Since the School District is paying for only part of the cost of the transportation service for middle school and high school students, there is a cost savings.

Initially, the School District was utilizing a national school bus Contractor and a large regional school bus Contractor. In September 2014 the area's national school bus company (First Student) and the large regional company (Mile Square Bus Transportation) jointly formed a new entity (First Mile Square) for service in the Hudson Valley, Westchester County, and the Bronx. For the School District, there is functionally now only one company that is providing its transportation service. Based upon School District records, First Mile Square and First Student are receiving 92.05% (\$11,357,630.87) of the contracted transportation expenditures of \$12,338,785.15.

One perspective is that competition between these two companies has been eliminated, and this must be considered by the School District when it structures any Bid/RFP documents for future service. A revised Bid/RFP structure may be needed to attract other companies (e.g., a multi-year contract, the School District paying for fuel, dividing the service needs into smaller components, a less complex Bid/RFP document, etc.). Another perspective is that bigger are better, and the School District now can have the best of both companies.

While the above provides summary information of expenditures, to understand fully the make-up of the transportation costs and to compare possibly these costs with the transportation program of other school districts, unit charge information is needed, that is, the per vehicle charge for the service being provided. The unit charges for transportation services by the Contractors are shown in the following three tables.

2014-2015 In-School District Unit Charges for Transportation Services					
School		Yearly Unit Charge Per Bus	Yearly Unit Charge Per Van	Yearly Unit Charge Per Aide	Contractor
Albert Leonard Middle School	AM/PM				
	Special Ed		\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	First Mile Square
	Late Route		\$9,800.00	\$1,970.00	
Columbus Elementary School	AM/PM	\$64,580.00	\$52,780.00	\$17,570.00	First Mile Square
	Special Ed		\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	
Daniel Webster Elementary Humanities Magnet School	AM/PM	\$52,890.00	\$48,050.00	\$27,090.00	First Mile Square
	Special Ed		\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	
George M. Davis, Jr. Elementary School	AM/PM	\$52,370.00		\$15,910.00	First Student
	Special Ed		\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	First Mile Square
	Late Route	\$13,930.00		\$8,580.00	First Mile Square
Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center	AM/PM	\$52,950.00	\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	First Mile Square
	Mid-Day	\$16,820.00	\$16,820.00	\$5,930.00	
	Special Ed		\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	
	Late Route	\$9,820.00	\$9,820.00	\$1,970.00	
Isaac E. Young Middle School	AM/PM	N/A			First Mile Square
	ESL and Special Ed		\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	
Jefferson Elementary School	AM/PM	\$64,070.00	\$52,770.00	\$17,430.00	First Mile Square
	Special Ed		\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	
	Late Route	\$17,530.00		\$7,750.00	

2014-2015 In-School District Unit Charges for Transportation Services					
School		Yearly Unit Charge Per Bus	Yearly Unit Charge Per Van	Yearly Unit Charge Per Aide	Contractor
New Rochelle High School	AM/PM	N/A			First Mile Square
	Special Ed		\$48,110.00	\$13,710.00	
Trinity Elementary School	AM/PM	\$52,370.00		\$15,910.00	First Student
	Special Ed		\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	First Mile Square
	Late Bus	\$13,930.00		\$8,580.00	First Student
William B. Ward Elementary School	AM/PM	\$52,370.00		\$15,910.00	First Student
	Special ED		\$48,110.00	\$13,730.00	First Mile Square
	Late Route	\$13,930.00		\$858.00	First Student
10 schools					
Note: Aide can be either an Attendant (special education) or a Monitor (deals with student behavior)					
Note: Mile Square and First Mile Square is the same company. The different billings represent the transition of Mile Square Bus Transportation to its association with First Student.					
Source: School District's Transportation Department provided information					

2014-2015 Out-of-School District Unit Charges for Private/Parochial School Transportation Services				
School	Yearly Unit Charge per Bus	Yearly Unit Charge per Van	Yearly Unit Charge per Aide	Contractor
Ethical Culture Fieldston School – Lower; and Riverdale Country School - Lower		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
French-American School – Larchmont; Sts. John & Paul School in AM; and Hudson Country Day School in AM	\$69,240.00			First Mile Square
French-American School – Larchmont in PM	\$69,240.00			First Mile Square
French-American School – Scarsdale in AM		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
German International School New York in AM; Our Lady of Perpetual Help in AM; and		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square

2014-2015 Out-of-School District Unit Charges for Private/Parochial School Transportation Services				
School	Yearly Unit Charge per Bus	Yearly Unit Charge per Van	Yearly Unit Charge per Aide	Contractor
Hudson Country Day School in PM				
Holy Name of Jesus School in AM/PM; Westchester Area School in AM		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
Hudson Country Day	Transportation combined with other schools			
Immaculate Heart of Mary School; Master School in AM; and French-American School – Scarsdale in PM		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
Iona Prep School in AM/PM; Thornton Donovan School in PM;		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
Our Lady of the Assumption School in AM/PM; and Thornton Donovan School in AM		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
Our Lady of Perpetual Help School	Combined with German International School			
Resurrection School in AM/PM; and Rye Country Day School in PM		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
Riverdale Country School – Lower	Transportation combined with Ethical Culture Fieldston School – Lower			
Rye Country Day School in PM		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
SAR Academy	\$69,240.00	\$57,560.00	\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Solomon Schechter School – Lower (K-5)	\$69,240.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Sts. John & Paul School in PM	\$69,240.00	\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
Thornton Donovan School	Transportation combined with Our Lady of the Assumption in AM and with Iona Prep School in PM			
Westchester Area School	Transportation combined with Holy Name of Jesus			
Westchester Day School	\$69,240.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Westchester Torah Academy in PM	\$69,240.00			First Mile Square

2014-2015 Out-of-School District Unit Charges for Private/Parochial School Transportation Services				
School	Yearly Unit Charge per Bus	Yearly Unit Charge per Van	Yearly Unit Charge per Aide	Contractor
Windward – Lower School		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
Yeshiva Day in AM/PM; and St. John in PM		\$57,560.00		First Mile Square
Archbishop Stepinac High School	Purchased subsidized Metro Cards or student passes			
Holy Name of Jesus School				
Iona Prep School				
Manhattan High School				
Masters School (The)				
Salesian High School				
Ursuline School				
York Prep School				
23 schools				
Note: Aide can be either an Attendant (special education) or a Monitor (deals with student behavior)				
Note: Mile Square and First Mile Square is the same company. The Business Office's record of expenditures to Mile Square Bus Transportation was made during the transition to its association with First Student.				
Source: School District's Transportation Department provided information				

2014-2015 Special Education					
School	Yearly Unit Charge per Bus	Yearly Unit Charge per Van	Yearly Unit Charge per W/C Van	Yearly Unit Charge per Aide	Contractor
Andrus Children's Center and John A. Coleman-Elizabeth Seton Pediatric Center		\$57,560.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Carmel Academy; and Eagle Hill		\$57,560.00			First Mile Square
Clear View School (The); and the Millwood Learning Center – Devereux		\$33,700.00		\$12,460.00	Montauk Student Transport
Community School		\$57,560.00			First Mile Square
Cerebral Palsy of Westchester, Inc.			\$61,690.00	\$19,020.00	First Mile Square

2014-2015 Special Education					
School	Yearly Unit Charge per Bus	Yearly Unit Charge per Van	Yearly Unit Charge per W/C Van	Yearly Unit Charge per Aide	Contractor
Eagle Hill School; and Carmel Academy		\$57,560.00			First Mile Square
Green Chimneys – Clearpool Campus		\$33,700.00		\$12,460.00	Montauk Student Transport
Green Chimneys School for Little Folk			\$57,560.00	\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Greenburgh-Graham UFSD; Martin Luther King Jr. H.S., and SAIL at Ferncliff		\$57,560.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Hawthorne Cedar Knolls and Hawthorne Country Day School		\$57,560.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Hawthorne Country Day School	Transportation combined with Hawthorne Country Day School				
Jewish Guild for the Blind School and Manhattan Day School in the AM only		\$51,460.00		\$21,070.00	First Mile Square
John A. Coleman School - Elizabeth Seton Pediatric Center	Transportation combined with Andrus Children's Center				
John Cardinal O'Connor School and Solomon Schechter – Upper school in the AM. SW BOCES – Irvington High School and Kenneth B. Clark Academy in the PM		\$57,560.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Kenneth B. Clark Academy	Transportation combined with SW BOCES – Irvington High School				
Lavelle School for the Blind and Mount St. Michael's Academy			\$61,690.00	\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Manhattan Day School	Transportation combined with Jewish Guild for the Blind School in the AM only				

2014-2015 Special Education					
School	Yearly Unit Charge per Bus	Yearly Unit Charge per Van	Yearly Unit Charge per W/C Van	Yearly Unit Charge per Aide	Contractor
Martin Luther King Jr. High School	Transportation combined with Greenburgh-Graham UFSD and SAIL at Ferncliff				
Mount St. Michael's Academy	Transportation combined with Lavelle School for the Blind				
New York School for the Deaf		\$57,560.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Putnam/Northern Westchester BOCES - Pines Bridge School and Walden School			\$61,690.00	\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Putnam/Northern Westchester BOCES - Walden School	Transportation combined with Putnam/Northern BOCES - Pines Bridge School				First Mile Square
Rockland BOCES - Hill Top School; and Jesse J. Kaplan School			\$61,690.00	\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Rockland BOCES - Jesse J. Kaplan School	Transportation combined with Hill Top School				First Mile Square
SAIL at Ferncliff Manor	Transportation combined with Greenburgh-Graham UFSD and Martin Luther King Jr. H.S.				
SAR High School		\$57,560.00			First Mile Square
Solomon Schechter - Upper School		\$57,560.00			First Mile Square
St. Vincent's Hospital		\$57,560.00			First Mile Square
Summit School		\$51,460.00		\$21,070.00	First Mile Square
SW BOCES - Blythedale Children's Hospital		\$57,560.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
SW BOCES - East View Elementary School; and St. Matthew's School			\$61,690.00	\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
SW BOCES Irvington High School and Kenneth B. Clark Academy		\$57,560.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
SW BOCES - Port Chester Middle School		\$57,560.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square

2014-2015 Special Education					
School	Yearly Unit Charge per Bus	Yearly Unit Charge per Van	Yearly Unit Charge per W/C Van	Yearly Unit Charge per Aide	Contractor
SW BOCES Rye Lake - Multi-Handicapped Program and Therapeutic Support Program		\$57,560.00		\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
SW BOCES - St. Matthews	Transportation combined with East View Elementary School				
Villa Maria School		\$57,560.00			First Mile Square
Westchester Day School – Upper School	\$69,240.00			\$19,020.00	First Mile Square
Windward School - Upper		\$57,560.00			First Mile Square
38 schools					
Note: Aide can be either an Attendant (special education) or a Monitor (deals with student behavior)					
Note: Mile Square and First Mile Square is the same company. The Business Office's record of expenditures to Mile Square Bus Transportation was made during the transition to its association with First Student.					
Source: School District's Transportation Department provided information					

In addition to the above expenditures, charges exist for shuttles. These are vans used to transport private/parochial school students or public school students to another location for special education related services.

The shuttle service is provided by First Mile Square at a one way charge of \$276.00 per trip and a round trip charge of \$321.00.

Some of the shuttle van charges appear to be disproportionately high compared to the some of the van charges for home-to-school transportation. For in-School District transportation services, First Mile Square is charging \$48,110.00 to \$52,770.00 per year. This is \$267.28 ($\$48,110.00 \div 180$) to \$293.17 ($\$52,770.00 \div 180$) per day. This is for one to a little more than one live hour in the morning and for one to a little more than one live hour in the afternoon, and it is for the use of a dedicated van. When the shuttle vans are operating during the time students are being transported to/from school, the shuttle van is a dedicated vehicle and the \$276.00 rate is consistent with the \$267.28 to \$293.17 rate. However, there are times when students are shuttled to other schools during the middle of the day. During these time periods, the shuttle rate should

be consistent with the mid day rate of \$16,820.00 (for Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center) or \$93.44 ($\$16,820.00 \div 180$) per day.

The recommendation is that for the next Bid/RFP submission the School District should ask for a prime time shuttle rate and a non prime time shuttle rate.

The unit charges show a problem inherent in the use of multiple Bid/RFP documents produced at different time periods for essentially the same service. Regardless of where the vehicle is going, the transportation service is taking students from home to school in the morning and back to home in the afternoon. The same is true for an aide. The School District has a variety of prices for the same service for the same type of vehicle or an aide for approximately the same amount of time. Note the following:

1. 65/66-Passenger Bus charges for in-School District public school transportation services are \$64,580.00, \$64,070.00, \$52,950.00, and \$52,890.00 from First Mile Square and \$52,370.00 from First Student.

For out-of-School District transportation services to private/parochial schools and to special education locations a 65/66-passenger bus is \$57,560.00 from First Mile Square.

2. Van charges for in-School District public school transportation services are \$52,770.00, \$48, from First Mile Square.
3. Aide charges for in-School District public school transportation services are \$27,090.00, \$17,570.00, \$17,430.00, and \$13,730.00 from Mile Square and \$15,910.00 from First Student.

For out-of-School District transportation services to private/parochial schools and to special education locations the aide charge is \$19,020.00 from First Mile Square. There is a charge of \$21,070.00 as an aide charge for transportation to the Jewish Guild for the Blind School and Manhattan Day School, but that is probably due to increase time.

The above differences will be eliminated if all service requests are in a single document.

In the course of the review of the expenditures of the transportation program, it was noticed that all operating charges for home-to-school transportation expenses were recorded as aidable. This is incorrect since bus monitors (aides on buses used to monitor student behavior) are not a transportation aidable expense. Only bus attendants (aides on buses for special education students if required by the student's IEP) are aidable. Therefore, the School District has been claiming historically as an aidable expense costs that are not aidable.

Note the following:

According to the August 2015 manual, Reference Guide to State Aide Planning, from Questar III BOCES' State Aide & Financial Service, under a section entitled TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES ELIGIBLE FOR TRANSPORTATION AID, there is a subsection on page 10 entitled "Salaries and Fringe Benefits. Under this subsection, the third bulleted item states as a transportation aid expense, "Salaries and fringe benefits for assistant drivers of buses transporting pupils with disabilities only if specified in the pupil's I.E.P."

Bus monitors do not fit the above definition. They are not used on buses transporting pupils with disabilities.

In addition to the above, the State Education Department's website has a section entitled Guide to Aidable/non-Aidable Transportation Expenses. Under "Section I: Transportation Aidable Expense Items (Exceptions Noted)", there is an alphabetical listing of aidable items. Page 6, under "M", the next to the last item is Monitor. It says "Aide for pupils w/disabilities only; aide for disciplinary reasons not aidable".

There is another State Education Department website entitled Transportation Disallowed Expenditures. Under Salaries, the third disallowed salary expenditure is "Assistant drivers on buses for regular pupils".

Non-aidable monitor expenses in 2014-2015 totaled \$901,130.00 distributed as follows:

School	Aide (Monitor) Costs That Are Not Transportation Aidable
Albert Leonard Middle School – Late Routes	\$919.00
Albert Leonard Middle School – Late Routes	\$1,859.00
Daniel Webster Elementary School	\$54,920.00
George M. Davis, Jr. Elementary School	\$159,100.00
George M. Davis, Jr. Elementary School – Late Routes	\$20,592.00
Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center	\$164,760.00
Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center – Mid-Day Routes	\$50,405.00
Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center – Late Routes	\$2,463.00
New Rochelle High School - BOCES Occupational Education Route	\$80,058.00
New Rochelle High School - BOCES	\$1,302.00

School	Aide (Monitor) Costs That Are Not Transportation Aidable
Occupational Education Route	
SAR Academy	\$19,020.00
Solomon Schechter – Lower School	\$19,020.00
Trinity Elementary School	\$47,730.00
Westchester Day School	\$19,020.00
William B. Ward Elementary School	\$238,650.00
William B. Ward Elementary School – Late Routes	\$21,312.00

Total	\$901,130.00

As part of her initial training and the on-going oversight by her supervisor(s), it appears that the Transportation Assistant was not provided with accurate and complete guidance as well as instruction on what transportation expenses are aidable as well as what is non aidable in order to provide information for the completion of State aid forms. The Transportation Assistant followed what was done in the past by her predecessor.

The recommendation was made by the **TAS** Project Consultant not to file for State aid for the above 2014-2015 expenses.

FLEET

As part of the review of the transportation service provided by the School District's Contractors, a request was made for a listing of the fleet used for this service from First Student and from First Mile Square. The request was for a fleet listing that included vehicle number, chassis year, student capacity, body manufacturer, chassis manufacturer, current odometer mileage, and route assignment.

Information was received initially from First Student and later from First Mile Square.

The requested fleet listing provided by First Student for transportation services for the School District is summarized in the chart listed below.

Chassis Year	16- Passenger	66- Passenger	Total	Percentage
2001		3	3	08.8%
2002		3	3	08.8%
2003		4	4	11.8%
2004				
2005		19	10	29.4%
2006		4	4	11.8%
2007		2	2	05.9%
2008				
2009				
2010		7	7	20.6%
2011				
2012	1		1	02.9%
2013				
2014				
2015				
	----	----	----	----
	1	33	34	100%

The average age of the fleet in service to the School District is 9.38 years. This is toward the high end since many school district operated transportation programs try to establish an average fleet age of seven years with no bus older than ten years. According to information provided by First Student's Location Manager, First Student's guideline is to replace a bus after 12 years and a van after 10 years. Given improved construction of buses and vans and improved vehicle maintenance (as judged by the **New York State Department of Transportation Vehicle Inspection System Operator Profile Summary** for the operational location) this is not unreasonable. However, First Student has six buses (17.6%) over 12 years of age.

A review was made of the **Operator Profile Summary** for First Student's Mount Vernon location since fleet age is only part of a review. If the fleet is well maintained, this can

offset a slightly high average age. However, the reader is advised that the only fully accurate and complete way to review a fleet **Profile** to examine the Department of Transportation (DOT) inspection records (form MC300) of the fleet in service to the School District rather than the **Profile** of the entire fleet at a specific location. This is because part of the fleet at a location may be in service to another school district.

To be fair, a five-year review of First Student's Mount Vernon's Department of Transportation **Profile** was made. This provides a better overall picture of the maintenance record than a review of one year.

The record shows an average of 326.6 inspections made. This is 163 vehicles of which only 34 (20.8%) are in service to the School District

State Fiscal Year	Total Inspections	Number Out-of-Service	Percent Out-of-Service	Percent Passing
April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015	314	18	5.7%	94.3%
April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2014	333	35	10.5%	89.5%
April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013	320	23	7.2%	92.8%
April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012	317	22	6.9%	93.1%
April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2011	349	15	4.3%	95.7%
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Average	326.6	22.6	6.9%	93.1%

The Department of Transportation **Profile** meets the DOT criteria of 90% or more of inspections passing on the first review. While it's good, it's not distinctive.

First Student's fleet is mixed as to body and chassis manufacturer. The 33 large buses consist of 13 Thomas Built Buses and 20 International Buses. They are all diesel fueled. The average mileage of the 34 vehicle fleet is 154,725.1. The mixture of Thomas Built Buses and International Buses may be indicative that buses that do not meet the age requirement of other contracts at other locations are sent to First Student's Mount Vernon's location to be used for the New Rochelle and the Mount Vernon Contract.

Unlike many other school districts, the reader also has to keep in mind that the New Rochelle School District does not have a vehicle age requirement in its RFP specifications for home-to-school and summer school transportation services, and it does not have a minimum DOT **Profile** requirement. These are omissions that should be corrected when the School District prepared new Bid/RFP specifications.

The requested fleet listing provided by First Mile Square for transportation services for the School District is summarized in the chart listed below.

Chassis Year	72-Passenger	66-Passenger	21-Passenger	18-Passenger	16-Passenger	W/C Van	5-Passenger Minivan
2000			1				
2001			2		1		1
2002				1			
2003							
2004		4					
2005							
2006				47			5
2007	2	18				1	4
2008		5					
2009		2	6	2	2		
2010			4	1	8		1
2011							
2012							
2013							
2014							
2015							
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	2	29	13	51	11	1	11

Chassis Year	Total Vehicles	Percentage
2000	1	00.8%
2001	4	03.4%
2002	1	00.8%
2003		
2004	4	03.4%
2005		
2006	52	44.1%
2007	25	21.2%
2008	5	04.2%
2009	12	10.2%
2010	14	11.9%
2011		
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		

	-----	-----
	118	110.0%

The average age of the fleet in service to the School District is 8.13 years, which is 1.25 years less than the age of First Student's fleet. Again, which this is towards the high end, there is no age for the fleet in service to the School District in the RFP specifications. There are six vans over 10 years of age representing 5.0% of the fleet.

A review was also made of the **Operator Profile Summary** for First Mile Square's Yonkers location to compare it with First Student's Mount Vernon location.

State Fiscal Year	Total Inspections	Number Out-of-Service	Percent Out-of-Service	Percent Passing
April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015	477	8	1.7%	98.3%
April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2014	494	11	2.2%	97.8%
April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013	539	14	2.6%	97.4%
	94	2	2.1%	97.9%
April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012	595	16	2.7%	97.3%
	107	2	1.9%	98.1%
April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2011	601	16	2.7%	97.3%
	99	0	0.0%	100.0%
Average	375.8	8.6	1.9%	98.1%
Note: For the three State Fiscal Years, April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2013, two records are shown at Mile Square's Yonkers location.				

First Mile Square's DOT five year average bus inspection passing percentage is higher than First Student by five (5.0) percentage points. In addition, the average mileage is 75,918.2 miles, which is 78,806.9 miles (50.9%) below that of First Student. Since First Mile Square did not provide information on the body type of its vehicles, a statement cannot be made about the mixture.

Like First Student, First Mile Square is operating other contracts from the same location that is servicing the City School District of New Rochelle. For example, First Mile Square provides student transportation services to the City of Yonkers. For more specific information on the DOT **Profile** of the 118 vehicles in service to New Rochelle, an examination will have to be made of the maintenance and the inspection records of those vehicles.

Both companies have a **Profile** that exceeds the DOT standard of 90% or more of inspections made passing on the first review. The average age is somewhat high for both companies, and First Student's fleet average mileage is twice that of First Mile Square. As mentioned above, the higher mileage of First Student's fleet appears to be partially indicative of buses coming from other locations and the lack of an age/mileage requirement in the School District's RFP specifications.

A recommendation is that such an age/mileage fleet requirement be part of any future Bid/RFP specifications for transportation services. The School District should also state that it requires a minimum of a 90% passing percentage each State fiscal year from its transportation service provider(s).

INTRODUCTION

Transportation Advisory Services (**TAS**) was engaged to perform an analysis of the student transportation program of the City School District of New Rochelle (hereinafter referred as “School District”). The purpose of this Study is to provide the School District with a third-party perspective on the operating efficiency of the current program and make recommendations for the future operation of the transportation system.

The School District’s liaison for the project was Jeffrey T. White, Assistant Superintendent for Business and Administration. Louis J. Boffardi, a Senior Consultant of **TAS**, served as the Project Consultant.

First Student and Mile Square Bus Transportation were the operators of the School District’s transportation program. Effective September 2014, Mile Square Bus Transportation became part of First Student under the name of First Mile Square. The new company will be providing transportation services in the Hudson Valley, Westchester County, and the Bronx.

The School District sought a review of the transportation program with specific emphasis on the following areas:

1. The current contract with the transportation program provider(s) and supporting specifications,
2. Routes servicing the School District to transport students to/from school and special education locations,
3. School District policies and procedures that provide the service levels, vehicle sizes, and configurations,
4. Whether alteration in the start and stop times (“bell schedules”) of the schools and other activities would facilitate economy by permitting vehicles to serve more than one destination school,
5. Reports and other means of communication that provide information between the School District and the Contractor(s),
6. Financial efficiency of the transportation program,
7. The performance of the Contractor(s),
8. Alternatives to the present means by which transportation services are provided,
9. Other transportation services including Field and Athletic Trips as well as the Summer School program.

Included was to be the identification of those procedures that are effective in the operation of the program, those that require improvement, and those that should be discarded for procedures that will enable the transportation program to operate more effectively and efficiently. Recommendations are to be made that will be consistent with industry standards, the requirements of various agencies that provide oversight of the transportation program, and those that are appropriate for the School District.

We believe it is important to note that although there are critical comments about aspects of the School District's oversight of its transportation program, and there are a number of recommendations provided to enhance the operation and efficiency of the Transportation Department, the School District's students are transported every day in a safe, reliable manner. By all appearances the School District has contracted with reliable operators who have had a long term association with the School District. The Contractors operate a transportation program that is responsive to the School District's needs.

TAS' well known experience, expertise, and knowledge in the student transportation industry will be used in conjunction with the resources contained within the School District.

STUDY PROFILE

The City School District of New Rochelle is located in the south central portion of Westchester County, New York and is a component of the Southern Westchester BOCES. Its boundaries are identical with the boundaries of the City of New Rochelle. According to information provided by the State Education Department, the School District is 13.209 square miles and has a 2012 public school enrollment (the latest year in which the enrollment is available from the State) of 10,663 students. Through this information, the State shows the 10,663 public school enrollment per square mile is 807.252 students.

The State provides 45.2% gross aid for eligible transportation expenses. Because the School District transports only those students who live more than a-mile-and-a-half from their school of attendance, it has a non-allowable pupil decimal of 0.0000%. The non-allowable pupil decimal is a ratio of non-allowable pupil transportation expenses expressed as a decimal to four places. The decimal is used to calculate a deduction from net transportation expenses of district-owned or contracted buses in the calculation of allowable pupil transportation expenses for aid purposes. In effect, non-allowable student transportation is the non-allowable cost from State aid calculations of transporting students who live one-and-a-half (1½) miles or less from the main route. Since the School District does not transport students who live one-and-a-half miles or less from the school they are attending, there are no non aideable transportation students. However, there are non aideable transportation expenses.

At the time of this report, the School District was providing two types of transportation services to 71 school locations including ten School District schools. Students in Grades K-5 are provided "yellow bus" service, and students in Grades 6-12 are provided with partially subsidized passes for public transportation services. Special education students in Grades K-12 receive "Yellow bus" services if their individual educational plan (IEP) requires transportation as a related service.

In order to facilitate the review and use of this report, it has been prepared in sections that represent the various aspects of the transportation program. This identifies more clearly the various issues, and enhances the on-going use of the report as a resource for the Administration and School District personnel.

Everyone involved was extremely cooperative and provided everything that was requested. All those individuals who cooperated in the study are thanked for their assistance.

METHODOLOGY

TAS' *modus operandi* is straightforward and analytical. We collect facts bearing on the efficiency of the existing program and compare current operations to established criteria. We test the feasibility of options available to the School District, based on the facts and historical practices in the industry, and make recommendations accordingly. We conduct interviews with numerous parties in order to gain perspectives about the effectiveness of the current operation. We evaluate operations, policies and procedures based on the experience that we have gained, and methods we have developed, over the course of working with more than 500 districts in twenty-one states over the past 28 years.

The following activities were undertaken as part of the analysis of the transportation program:

1. On June 4, 2015, Louis Boffardi of **TAS** had an initial meeting with Mr. Jeffrey White, Assistant Superintendent for Business and Administration as well as a brief meeting with Dr. Brian Osborne, Superintendent of Schools, of the New Rochelle School District. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss **TAS** services, and its ability to meet the School District's needs and desires for a third-party transportation program review. Part of the afternoon portion of the day was spent with Ms. Dianna Wessel, the School District's Transportation Assistant, to gain some information on the structure as well as the operation of the transportation program.
2. On July 16, 2015, the School District issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Transportation Consulting Services. **TAS** was informed of the Consulting Services opportunity on Tuesday, July 21st and submitted its Proposal dated Tuesday, July 28, 2015. **TAS'** Proposal was subsequently accepted by the Board of Education at its meeting on Tuesday, August 11, 2015.
3. An initial meeting was held on Wednesday, August 12th, with Ms. Dianna Wessell to discuss the scope and the methodology of the transportation program study as well as to begin to gather information.

4. Subsequent meetings were held on the following dates to gather information, to meet with various staff members who could provide information about the transportation program and with staff members who are users of the transportation service. Arrangements were also made through the School District's Transportation Assistant to make a site visit to the operational location of the two Contractors, First Student and Mile Square Bus Transportation:

Full day and partial day dates spent at the School District were as follows:

- a. August 13th, Thursday
 - b. August 24th, Monday
 - c. August 25th, Tuesday
 - d. August 31st, Monday
 - e. September 3rd, Thursday
 - f. September 4th, Friday
 - g. September 22nd, Tuesday
 - h. September 24th, Thursday
5. Interspersed with these meeting dates was time spent reviewing information received and writing portions of the report gathered through the visits to the School District's Transportation Department, interviews made, the site visits to the Contractors' terminals, e-mail and telephone contacts, and examinations of documents received.
 6. This document constitutes the final written report to the School District. A copy of the report should be provided to various School District representatives, including Administrators and Board Members. This report is intended to serve as an advisory document and resource for the School District, and as such it should be reviewed and evaluated by the School District for its applicability to the circumstances at the time of review.

The following information was utilized as a part of our analysis of the School District's transportation program:

1. Transportation Formula Aid Output Report (**TRA**)

2. A copy of the 2015-2016 Calendar of the City School District of New Rochelle
3. School listings to which transportation services are provided
4. Listing of Vehicles
5. School listings and time schedules
6. Route structures and time schedules
7. Board of Education Policies and Administrative Regulations
8. School District transportation forms
9. New York State Department of Transportation **Bus Inspection System Operator Profile** for First Student's operational location in Mount Vernon and for First Mile Square's (and Mile Square's) location in Yonkers
10. Route information reports with student listings
11. Special education information as it relates to transportation Services
12. Data contained within the School District's student's transportation management system (Transfinder)
13. Miscellaneous School District-prepared analyses and reports

Meetings were also held with the following individuals:

1. Jeffrey T. White, CPA, Assistant Superintendent for Business
2. Dianna Wessel, Transportation Assistant, Transportation Department
3. Francesca Windley, Data Entry Clerk, Transportation Department
4. Michelle Colety, Data Entry Clerk, Transportation Department
5. Lynda Greenbaum, Deputy Business Manager
6. Steve Young, Athletic Director
7. John Palomino, Location Manager, First Student
8. Leonardo Chaparro, Location Manager, Mile Square Bus Transportation
9. Joseph H. Williams, Assistant to the Superintendent for Human Resources
10. Yvette Goorevitch, Director of Special and Alternative Education

Implementation:

This report contains numerous observations and recommendations for the enhancement of the School District's student transportation program. Although **TAS** has developed these recommendations based upon our

observations, data review, and experience, it is incumbent on the School District to conduct a detailed review of each item to make a determination as to the benefit of modifying the existing protocols.

We recommend that this report be reviewed by the School District's Administration and the Board of Education. Unless there is a specific determination made by the School District not to implement a recommendation, we recommend that a timeline be established for the implementation. Along with the timeline, detail will be necessary if any equipment, personnel or expenditures are required for implementation.

***TAS** uses available information and its experience to estimate the potential costs and/or savings of particular transportation service arrangements described in this study. Although past experience can be an excellent basis for projections, **TAS** does not warrant that the costs or savings estimated herein will be realized if implemented. The School District should conduct a thorough review of the applicability of each recommendation prior to implementation.*

POLICY

Present School District Transportation Policies are contained in twelve documents. With the exception of the first two Policies, which are dated 2013, all other Policies are dated 1988. There are eight Administrative Regulations that support or complement these Policies.

1. Policy 3610, TRANSPORTATION

Essentially, this Policy statement deals with transportation eligibility requirements. The Policy states that transportation services are to be provided for students who live more than one-and-a-half miles, but not more than ten miles, from the school. Hopefully, when this Policy was adopted in 1988, the School District received voter approval to have ridership eligibility lower than the State requirement of two miles for elementary school students (Grades K-8) and three miles for high school students (Grades 9-12).

There is no statement defining the walking distance to a bus stop. The State Education Department has consistently stated that the walking distance to a bus stop can be no more than the maximum walking distance from a student's home or child care location to the student's school of attendance. This means a student can be required to walk a maximum of one-and-a-half miles to a bus stop. Obviously, this is not happening. What is happening is not clear. The walking distance to a bus stop can be anything the School District wishes, that is appropriate for the City, and is appropriate for the age of the students being transported. Examples would be a maximum of a quarter-of-a-mile, a maximum of half-a-mile, etc. It's not uncommon for a school district to have one distance requirement for transportation eligibility and a lower distance as the maximum walking distance to a bus stop. Within this Policy statement about bus stops, the School District should make it very clear that student behavior at a bus stop is the responsibility of the parent and not the School District.

In addition, there is no statement providing for the option to create Child Safety Zones (CSZ) for students who live less than a mile-and-a-half from their school of attendance and who must walk through an area that may be considered hazardous. See the Child Safety Transportation Act of 1992 (Chapters 69 and 403 of the Laws of 1992) and New York State Department of Transportation Regulations 191.1 to 191.8. Also, see Education Law §3635-b

Just about every school district has a Policy statement or an Administrative Regulation that states children in certain primary school grades who are transported from school are to be released from the school bus only to a responsible adult or to be released in a specific manner. Currently, the School District's practice is to pick-up/drop-off pre-school students at mid-day at the

home or child care location. In the morning and in the afternoon these students are picked-up/dropped-off at a bus stop. Kindergarten students are dropped-off in the afternoon at the home or child care location. The recommendation is that this practice be reviewed, and whatever is decided, it is to be formalized in Policy or an Administrative Regulation.

2. Policy 3615, MILEAGE MEASUREMENT

This Policy states the means by which mileage is measured to determine transportation eligibility.

3. POLICY 3620, SHORT TERM DISABILITIES

4. POLICY 3625, LONG TERM DISABILITIES

5. POLICY 3630, EDUCATIONAL FIELD TRIPS

The Policy should include the recommended State Education Department guidelines for the use of such charter buses. See www.p12.nysed.gov/schoolbus/TransDirector/htm/FieldTripGuidelines.htm.

6. POLICY 3635, ATHLETIC FUNCTIONS

The requirements of Education Law §1804.11 applies equally to students who participate in athletic events.

7. POLICY 3640, COOPERATIVE TRANSPORTATION

While the School District should make every effort to participate with neighboring school districts in cooperative transportation services, it is reminded that it cannot participate with a neighboring school district who also utilizes contracted transportation services unless there is a joint/cooperative Bid/RFP for the cooperative transportation service. The lack of a cooperative Bid/RFP is called “piggybacking”, and it is not permitted by the State Education Department.

Presently, the School District is participating with six other school districts in a cooperative transportation venture for transportation services to private/parochial schools and special education locations. The six other schools districts are Bronxville, Eastchester, Mamaroneck, Pelham, Rye Neck, and Tuckahoe. Payment for transportation services is on a per pupil basis depending upon the number of students each school district is having transported in each vehicle.

The consortium of school districts is called BEPT since it originally consisted of just Bronxville, Eastchester, Pelham, and Tuckahoe. The transportation service is operated by Montauk Student Transport.

8. POLICY 3655, HAZARDOUS ROADS

9. POLICY 3660, TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENTS

10. POLICY 3670, SUSPENSION FROM BUS RIDING PRIVILEGES

11. POLICY 3680, BUS DRIVER QUALIFICATIONS

The School District may wish to extend this Policy to include qualifications for attendants/monitors. Since the Policy was written in 1988, the State Education Department has required specific qualifications for people holding these positions.

In addition to the above, the School District may wish to include local requirements for bus drivers and attendants/monitors as well as specific local requirements for bus drivers and attendants transporting special education students. Local requirements can include student/child behavior management, epi-pen administration, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), child abuse recognition and reporting requirements, crisis prevention intervention (CPI), first aid, handling specialized/assistive equipment, physical examinations for attendants/monitors, training in the use of a student's educational records and in the responsibility to ensure the privacy of the student and his/her records, etc.

12. POLICY 3685, LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES

The School District should have its requirements for the amount of liability insurance by its school transportation contractor(s) reviewed and updated by its insurance consultant.

TAS generally recommends a Liability limit of \$10,000,000.00 for each accident for bodily injury and property damage with no endorsements reducing or limiting coverage unless approved beforehand by the School District.

We also recommend Commercial General Liability (CGL) with limits of at least \$1,000,000 per occurrence / \$3,000,000 aggregate to apply per location. Coverage is to be for bodily injury, property damage, products/completed operation, personal injury, and advertising injury. The CGL insurance is to include coverage for sexual misconduct.

There is no Policy or Administrative Regulation guideline on providing or not providing transportation services to/from child care locations. Although the School District's Transportation Department is making available transportation services to/from child care locations within the context of the requirements of Education Law §3635(1)(e), such transportation is discretionary. The School District should have a POLICY that is supported by an Administrative Regulation exercising its discretion to provide transportation services to/from child care locations consistent with the requirements of Education Law.

The practice of providing afternoon transportation services for students in Grades K-5 for religious instruction is not supported by Policy and Administrative Regulation. The School District's practice provides for such transportation within the elementary school attendance zone that a student attends and provides for transportation services from one zone to another zone. While TAS and the State Education Department feel the appropriateness of this practice is questionable, the practice has an impact upon the afternoon transportation program, and the School District should formalize the guidelines that exist through Policy and Regulation.

There are no guidelines for reviewing bus stops. Presently, it's subjective. A recommendation is made that the School District adopts a procedure that uses an objective criteria for the determination of what is a safe or an unsafe bus stop.

Suggestions that have been developed by TAS and used successfully by other school districts include the following:

1. Number of road lanes at the bus stop location
2. Speed limit and amount of traffic for the 15 minutes surrounding the time of the bus stop
3. Grade level of student crossers
4. Proximity to railroad tracks
5. Visibility of the bus stop to traffic
 - a. Existence of curves, hill crests, and blind spots in the area of the bus stop
 - b. Existence of large vehicle traffic during the 15 minutes surrounding the time of the bus stop
 - c. Adverse weather conditions at the bus stop such as an area that has persistent fog, white outs, flooding, etc.

- d. Non traffic barriers such as trees, shrubs, large knolls, etc. that inhibit visibility
 - e. Area must exist for students to wait, embark the bus, and disembark the bus safely
 - f. Distance of the bus stop from intersections and/or left hand turns into a four lane or wider road
 - g. Distance from other bus stops
 - h. Crossing barriers such as State Highways, Interstate Highways, railroad tracks, etc.
6. A point system could be established for each of the above safety issues and a certain point level could be the guideline for the creation of an additional bus stop or the relocation of a bus stop. There may be some safety issues that are special to the Briarcliff Manor School District, and these could be included in the criteria. It is recommended that the area to be reviewed be done by three people independent of one another. These can include a School District administrator; someone from the Contractor who is trained in safety reviews; and a third person independent of the other two. The average of the points from the three people can be used for helping to decide what action should be taken, if any.
7. The criteria can be posted on the transportation section of the School District's website. If there is a denial of a request to establish a bus stop or dissatisfaction with a decision to remove/change a bus stop, the School District could also consider a bus stop appeals process between the decision of the committee and the Board of Education or the School District administration. The appeals committee can also consist of three people, a transportation person from within or outside of the School District's transportation program, a different building administrator, and someone from outside the School District.
8. Most people have confidence in the inclusion of objective standards for decision-making. It eliminates resistance to maintain simply the *status quo*, the refusal to take action because the request is seen primarily as self-serving, and parental pressure through threats or intimidation. It also eliminates acquiescence to parental requests merely to be accommodating which may establish a precedent for other requests. It is for these reasons that the recommendation is made that the School District should give serious consideration to this proposal.

In acceding to parental requests, as opposed to the placement of a bus stop within a school district's guidelines and the use of an objective safety criterion,

the School District is not following the Education Commissioner's rulings which have consistently stated that it is the parent's responsibility to get the child to/from the bus stop safely. Issues such as "I can't see my child from my house", "I have a younger child that I cannot leave", "There's a big dog on the way to the bus stop", "Because there are no sidewalks in my area, the bus stop has to be in front of my house", or "I'm unable to walk to the bus stop with my child due to my infirmaries" are not considered germane to where the bus stop is placed and how the bus traverses the route. Although support for these types of requests provides a personal level of service and is considered responsive to the community, it can create a higher level of problems with routing and who gets what specialized service.

Finally, it must be stated that frequent bus stops are very problematic. They interfere with traffic and sometimes encourage drivers behind the bus to try to get ahead of the bus; the chance of a rear-end collision is increased; when proceeding from one stop to the next, the driver needs time to activate the yellow warning flashers to alert motorists; the operation of the route is extended due to the frequency of students getting on or off the bus, or the number of students who can ride the bus is reduced due to the time allowed for the route.

Other issues the School District may wish to consider include the following:

1. Some clarification should exist that deals with special and/or temporary transportation arrangements to locations other than home or child care locations. By this is meant transportation of students to scout meetings, after school birthday parties of classmates, what is called play dates, work locations, and other non school activities, etc., this practice should be formalized with guidelines.
2. There may be a need for a Policy on instruments, sports equipment, and other items on school buses. These can be particularly problematic since some of these items require the use of a seat or can be harmful to students in the event of an accident or misbehavior. A guideline of "what can be placed on your lap" is generally too subjective and unsatisfactory. There are school districts that have listed specific instruments that can be carried on a bus and those that cannot. A listing such as this should be supported by the Music Department and the transportation Contractor. Parents should also be informed of this list through the Music Department.

Community members see School District Policies as statements of belief and purposes. They typically seek completeness, consistency, and fairness. Transportation policies should be based upon laws and regulations as well as operational necessities and industry practices. Greater clarity and community comfort that the Policies exist, reflect community wishes, and are reasonably and consistently enforced will aid the School District as a whole and the Transportation Department in particular. Parents need to

know that their elected representatives, the Board of Education, have established the basic guidelines that operate the transportation program. Furthermore, these guidelines are to be known to the community, are to be seen as fair and equitable, and are consistent with operational needs.

Any new or revisions of existing Policy statements should be supported by clear and objective reasons in order to foster greater understanding and support. Consideration should be given to establishing Administrative Regulations to detail the methods and procedures for implementing the Policies.

CONTRACTED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

The primary contracted transportation services for home-to-school and summer school are embodied in the specifications of four (4) Requests for Proposals (RFP). There is a fifth contract in which the School District is part of seven school districts that provide cooperative transportation services through two Contractors. A sixth contract in Bid format exists for athletic and field trips. The existing four RFP's are copied from previously written RFPs, and they have been renewed annually.

The four primary RFPs that represent the contractual relationship between the School District and its two transportation service providers are as follows:

RFP No.	Initial Contractor	Contract Award Date	School
3	Mile Square Bus Transportation	May 7, 2004	Henry Barnard Early Childhood Center Daniel Webster Elementary School In-District Special Education and ESL
4	Mile Square Bus Transportation	April 28, 2005	Special Education - Northern Westchester Summer Special Education – Rockland County, Manhattan, Connecticut, and New Jersey Secondary Routes Summer Special Education – Northern Westchester and Putnam
5	Mile Square Bus Transportation	May 24, 2006	Special Education – Westchester, Bronx, and Connecticut Schools Out-of-District and In-District Private/Parochial Schools Jefferson School Columbus Elementary School In-District and Out-of-District Special Education – per trip charges
6	First Student	April 17, 2008	BOCES Occupational Education Summer Special Programs Summer Special Education – Lower Westchester (South of Mt. Kisco) George M. Davis Elementary School William B. Ward Elementary School Trinity Elementary School

A review of the four RFP specifications indicates the following:

1. The documents contain a listing of the elements to review the Proposal and the weight of each element. According to the State Education Department, the School District must establish a minimum number of points for an award. Ordinarily, this minimum number is shown on the RFP document. However, this does not appear in the School District's document and is therefore not known.
2. A certified check or a Proposal Bond for 10% of the amount of the Proposal is requested. If a Proposal Bond is to be submitted in lieu of a certified check, the A. M Best rating of the surety company should be required. This does not exist.
3. The "option to cancel any Contract at any time, and without penalty, by giving ten days' written notice to the Contractor" is highly unusual in Bid/RFP specifications. While this option is "in addition to the remedies available to it by reason of any failure to perform on the part of the Contractor", the School District should have a listing of contract infractions for which liquidated damages will be paid to remedy contractual infractions. The cancellation of a contract is generally listed as the last alternative after all other attempts are made to resolve problems. The consequences of a contract cancellation are severe for the Contractor and the School District.

The above implies that a ten day contract exists rather than a one year contract.

Does the Contractor have the right to cancel the contract upon ten days written notice for its reasons?

4. It's not stated in the Option to Renew section of the RFP specifications if the contract renewal prices from the Contractor are to be no more than the full percentage increase of the May Consumer Price Index.
5. The School District requires a physical examination standard higher than that which is required by Article 19-a of the New York State Vehicle and Traffic Law and the federal Department of Transportation. Specifically, it requires a chest x-ray, a Montoux test (PPD), and a cardiogram. (Note: The **Montoux test** or **Mendel-Montoux test** [also known as the **Montoux screening test**, **tuberculin sensitivity test**, **Pirquet test**, or **PPD test** for purified protein derivative] is a screening tool for [tuberculosis \[TB\]](#). It is one of the major [tuberculin](#) skin tests used around the world, largely replacing multiple-puncture tests such as the [Tine test](#).)

The requirement for the chest x-ray, a Montoux test (PPD), and a cardiogram appears to be consistent with the initial requirement for employment for all prospective employees for the School District.

The School District may wish to review its requirement for these tests since the Contractor's bus drivers and the Contractor's aides are not employees of the School District. On an individual basis one or more of these tests may be appropriate, but that should be the decision of the examining physician subject to the initial results of the physical examinations.

These physical examination requirements do not appear in the Bid specifications the School District has for cooperative transportation services with the Bronxville, Eastchester, Mamaroneck, Pelham, Rye Neck, and Tuckahoe School Districts.

A random review of the School District's records of the drivers of the Contractors shows that the School District does not have a record of a chest x-ray, a Montoux (PPD) test, and a cardiogram for all drivers performing services to the School District. The School District should check the driver and the attendant/monitor records in the possession of the Contractor(s).

The review also indicated that information on driver qualifications did not exist nor was there any record of any approval of the driver by the School Superintendent or his/her designee to provide services to the School District. The latter is required by §3624 of the Education Law.

6. As part of the physical examination requirement, the School District should include the option of having its physician or a physician of the School District's choice complete a physical examination of a driver and/or an attendant/monitor at the School District's expense.
7. Safety Requirements under the title of Vehicles and Equipment list the regulatory agencies that regulate school buses. One of the listed agencies is the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance. This department does not regulate school buses in New York State.
8. The school bus requirements are also listed under Safety Requirements. Most of the listed requirements are mandated by Federal and State laws and regulations. Therefore, the listings of the requirements that are mandated are unnecessary. Also, snow tires and chains stopped being used prior to the time period the RFP was published. If the school buses need chains to travel on the streets of New Rochelle due to heavy snow and ice, perhaps school should be closed or the opening of school should be delayed until the streets are cleared fully and properly.
9. The requirement to notify the School District in the event of an accident should be expanded to include the right of the School District to receive a copy of all accident reports, including a copy of the Contractor's internal documents dealing with the accident, and to participate actively in the accident investigation.

10. Under School Bus Monitors and Attendants, the School District should state that it has the right to assign its own monitor or attendant, a responsible adult, or a nurse, and the Contractor must comply with this assignment. This is important since at times the School District has assigned a nurse for a student on a route, and it has used its own aide as a 1:1 attendant on a route.

In addition to its requirement for training for cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), the School District should consider specialized training for attendants/monitors in student behavior management, child abuse recognition and reporting requirements, Crises Prevention Intervention (CPI), and epi-pen administration. These specialized training requirements can be for specific situations, specific routes, and/or specific students.

In the future, this training can be mandated of the Contractor through the Bid/RFP specifications or provided by the School District through a requirement that attendants/monitors must attend the training courses .

11. Requirements within the Evaluation Criteria of each of the elements of the RFP are plagiarized in very large part from the evaluation criteria developed for other school districts during the time period that the initial and subsequent School District's RFP was published.

12. While the Proposal Evaluation Chart used by the School District reflects the Evaluation Criteria for an award, its format is also plagiarized from the format used for other school districts during the time period that the School District's RFP was published.

Again, the required minimum number of points for an award is not shown on the Evaluation Chart.

13. The School District's Proposal Evaluation Chart of Element No. 4, Accident Record, uses information taken from the Article 19-A Motor Carrier Statistical Report (DS-3.3) to determine the number of accidents per 10,000 miles. However, the Report provides only the number of accidents. The School District's evaluation calls for the number of preventable accidents. Preventable accident information is not available through the use of this form nor is it available through Loss Runs. Ordinarily, it comes from site investigations and/or an interpretation of police reports.

14. The School District's Proposal Evaluation Chart of Element No. 6, Fleet Inspection Record and Vehicle Replacement Schedule, shows points being given below the DOT acceptable passing percentage of 90% or more. During the time period in which these RFPs were published, school bus operators did not have the high passing percentages that presently exist. Therefore, it was customary to give points below the 90% or better threshold. However, it was

very unusual to give points below 80%. By giving points for a DOT three year average passing percentage between 70% and 79%, the School District was accepting what was an unsatisfactory school bus maintenance record for that time period.

In addition to the above, Element No. 6 of the School District's Proposal evaluation states that it will consider the Proposer's replacement schedule. The law that created the RFP process and the Commissioner's Regulations at that time stated the evaluation was to consider the vehicle model year and not the replacement schedule. In other words, the review was to consider the age of the vehicles being used and not the age when they were replaced.

15. The School District's Proposal Evaluation Chart of Element No. 8, Financial Analysis, does not require the submitted financial documents to have been audited or reviewed by an independent Certified Public Accountant (CPA) in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards (GAAS). This should be stated, and the School District person/or the position of the person who will review the Proposer's financial statements should also be stated.
16. The section of the RFP that requests prices for specific services references a five-year contract. Nowhere does it state that a multi-year transportation contract requires voter approval. A Board of Education is not empowered to make such an award without voter approval. However, a separate proposition is not required. A line item in the annual budget and the budget brochure that the budget includes a multi-year transportation contract is sufficient. Included must be the cost for each year of the multi-year contract (See page 2 of State Education Department Transportation Contract form TC).
17. Since the publication of these RFP specifications, it has become common to require drivers and attendants/monitors to be trained in epi-pen administration. The School District should consider this for the future.
18. The pricing request for field and athletic trips has been replaced by a Bid with a submission date of March 12, 2012.
19. The inclusion in the Specifications of a copy of the State Education Transportation Contract Form TC and the Department of Motor Vehicles Article 19-A Bus Driver Application Form (DS-870) as well as the form (DS-874) for the Examination to Determine Physical Condition of Driver under Article 19A is unnecessary. The initial form is completed after the award and the latter two forms are the total responsibility of the Contractor in its dealings with the Department of Motor Vehicles.

The overall recommendation is that if the School District should elect to request Bids/RFPs in the future for its transportation program, it should update its specifications to incorporate current language usage and current requirements.

The Transportation Assistant has said that in seeking Proposers in the past for the School District's transportation program that there has been a lack of interest from Contractors other than First Student and Mile Square Bus Transportation. It is the opinion of the **TAS** Senior Consultant that the RFP specifications were not attractive to other Contractors. The School District's Transportation Assistant should speak to the smaller area Contractors to ask what it would take to have them participate in the Bid/RFP opportunity. Four main reasons come to the mind of the **TAS** Senior Consultant. First of all, a multi-year contract should be offered in order to make it financially viable for a Contractor to invest in equipment and personnel in order to provide the transportation service. The multi-year contract would be contingent upon voter approval. Secondly, the request for services should be broken into smaller unites in order make it possible for smaller Contractors to participate. Thirdly, the existing RFPs are awkwardly constructed and complex. They appear to be difficult for a small to medium sized Contractor to submit a Proposal due to the time necessary for a submission. Fourthly, if the School District provides fuel for the live miles of the contract, it will remove a major financial unknown of future expenditures for the Contractor. The preparation of a Proposal would be easier.

As mention in the opening portion of this Section of this report, in addition to the four RFPs, the School District is a member of a transportation cooperative with six other school districts – Bronxville, Eastchester, Mamaroneck, Pelham, Rye Neck, and Tuckahoe. The cooperative is more commonly referred as BEPT (Bronxville, Eastchester, Pelham, and Tuckahoe) since these were the four school districts that initially created a variety of cooperative arrangements that included transportation, in-service education, etc. The oversight of this cooperative transportation program is provided by Southern Westchester BOCES, and the transportation service is operated by Montauk Student Transport for the regular school year and by Royal Coach Lines for the summer.

1. Students from two or more of the seven school districts share a vehicle to a common school or special education location. Payment to the Contractor is on a per pupil basis which is a percentage of the number of students the school district has in a vehicle to the cost of the total ridership of that vehicle.
2. The School District is utilizing the cooperative transportation service to transport four students to/from school – two to the Clear View School in Briarcliff Manor, one to the Clearpool Campus in Carmel of the Green Chimneys School for Little Folk, and one to the Millwood Learning Center – Devereux.

According to the Transportation Assistant, there is a significant savings to the School District by participating in this cooperative transportation consortium.

3. Initially, the existing BEPT cooperative transportation Bid was for a three-year period, July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2015. It has since been extended to five years.
4. While **TAS'** review of the School District's transportation program did not include a detailed review of the cooperative transportation Bid that the School District has as a member of the consortium of school districts for transportation service purposes, there are a few items that are being brought to the attention of the School District.
 - a. Many portions of the Bid specifications prepared by Southern Westchester BOCES are plagiarized from documents that were developed for specific school districts.
 - b. The initial multi-year contract does not state the requirement for voter approval. Records show that the Bid was approved by the School District on June 19, 2012, but the recommendation for School Board approval does not show prior authorization/approval by the voters at the May 2012 budget vote.

The Bid submission date was March 30, 2012. For some, if not all, of the seven participating school districts this may have been insufficient time to have the nine Bid submissions reviewed and to include a notice in each school district's budget brochure that a multi-year transportation contract is included in the budget proposal.

The recommendation from Southern Westchester BOCES for approval of Montauk Student Transport's three-year Bid submission is dated May 23, 2012. This is after the opportunity to secure voter approval of the multi-year contract.

- c. Because the Bid specifications were for a three-year contract, it is possible that the school districts may not be empowered to enter into a five-year contract since that was not part of the original set of specifications. The School District should check with its legal counsel and the State Education Department to see if an increase in the contract term that was not part of the original set of specifications is allowable under an extension.

The possible problem of a five year extension may be moot since the initial contract for three years is problematic due to a lack of voter approval.

There is no written record of any extension of the Summer School transportation contract with Royal Coach Lines in the School District files.

However, cooperative transportation services were utilized in the summer of 2015.

- d. The letter of agreement written to Southern Westchester BOCES by Montauk Student Transport for a five-year renewal (2015-2016 to 2019-2020) is dated May 26, 2015. Southern Westchester BOCES recommended a renewal with fuel to be purchased by the participating school districts, and the price increase for each year is to be 2% or the percentage increase of the Consumer Price Index (CPI), whichever is lower.

The letter references the CPI percentage increase to be based upon the calendar year ending December 31st. The legal requirement is that the CPI percentage increase is to be for the preceding 12-month period. The State Education Department (SED) requires the use of the May 31st CPI percentage increase for all transportation contract increases and not the December 31st percentage increase. Because the May 31st CPI percentage increase is published mid to late June, it is considered the CPI of the preceding 12-month period.

- e. In addition to the above, since fuel was not provided in the initial three-year contract, a contract extension that provides fuel and a CPI percentage increase is actually paying more than what is capped by just the CPI. While the provision to provide fuel was in the original Bid specifications, the decision was made not to provide fuel. Because fuel was not provided initially, you can't provide it on contract renewals.

A Bid submission dated March 12, 2012 exists for field and athletic trips. Like many parts of the RFP, the specifications of this Bid could use substantial improvement.

1. The Athletic and Field Trip Bid requires a Performance Bond of 100% of the Contract. The RFP for the Home-to-School and the Summer School Contracts require a Performance Bond of 25% of the Contract. Why a higher requirement of a Performance Bond for an intermittent and a lower level of service?
2. The wheelchair vehicle requirement does not specify the minimum number of wheelchair positions.
3. The physical examination requirement for drivers does not specify the requirement for a chest x-ray, a Montoux test (PPD), and a cardiogram. If these tests are required for home-to-school and summer school drivers, why aren't they required for athletic and field trip drivers?
4. The requirement for CPR (cardiopulmonary resuscitation) training should be expanded to student behavior management, epi-pen administration, child

abuse recognition and reporting requirements, and Crises Prevention Intervention (CPI).

5. Vehicle requirements do not reflect what was being used at the time the Bid was published. VCR tapes, snow tires, and chains were not used.

There is a requirement that all vehicles must be air conditioned. Ordinarily, this is a requirement that is limited to 16/24-passenger vans and wheelchair vans transporting special education students. Air conditioned 65/66-passenger buses are highly unusual. However, the buses being used are not air conditioned. Therefore, this requirement is not being followed nor is it being enforced.

Finally, it must be stated that the School District periodically utilizes coach buses for field trips and athletic trips with the Athletic Department being the prime user of these types of vehicles. The main company supplying the coach bus is J & R Tours, Ltd. of Mount Vernon, New York. Another company used is Service Tours of Yonkers, New York. Whether or not J & R Tours or Service Tours are the appropriate coach bus companies for the School District to use is not part of this report. What is of concern is that for the 2014-2015 school year the School District's Athletic Department spent \$29,945 in coach bus service and the Music Department spent \$8,970 in coach bus service. The Athletic Department's need/purpose for the use of coach buses should also be reviewed. Furthermore, the service should have been Bid since coach bus services, like "yellow bus" services that exceeded \$20,000 is subject to Bid requirements. (See General Municipal Law §103 (1)).

Overall, the RFP/Bid specifications being used by the School District do not reflect the industry standards/practices at the time they were published. Portions are plagiarized from documents developed for other school districts at the time the School District's RFP/Bid documents were initially published and renewed. What the School District produced on its own is poorly written in part, and sections are not organized in a logical format; contain many requirements that are simply a repeat of the regulatory mandates of the time period; omit other requirements that should exist to ensure operational efficiency (e.g., vehicle age and/or mileage requirements), and do not contain a sufficiency of means to hold the Contractors accountable for a high level of performance (e.g., liquidated/non performance damages). Also, while Bid/RFP documents have changed over time due to different experiences; changes in industry equipment, practices, and regulations; and increased knowledge, the School District's current RFPs and Bid reflect a prior time period that no longer exists and a transportation program that is not currently operating.

Rather than having four separate RFPs stating the requirements for different parts of two services (home-to-school and summer school) and one Bid for one service (field and sports trips), long ago the School District should have done what a substantially high number of other school districts do, namely, issue one document with a common

set of requirements and a request for price submissions for the three different types of service.

If the School District should elect to issue new Bid/RFP specifications, it should not reissue the structure and the requirements of the existing specifications or build upon what presently exists. It should start fresh with more current requirements that reflect better the industry standards and the School District's needs for the present and the future. If designed properly, they will be easier to enforce, and they will attract more participation in the Bid/RFP submission process,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>SECTION</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
DISTRICT PROFILE	4
CONTRACTED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES	5
EXPENDITURES	6
FLEET	7
MANAGEMENT and OVERSIGHT	8
POLICY	9
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM	10

TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

The structure of the in-School District transportation program is as follows:

2014-2015 In-School District Home-to-School Transportation Program										
School	Enrl.	Number Trans.	Special Ed	ESL	Bus Passes	Buses	Vans	Aides	Late Route	Contractor
Albert Leonard Middle School	1,232				1,042				2 Buses @ 4:45 2 Buses @ 5:30	First Mile Square for Late Buses
Albert Leonard Middle School – Special Ed			22				3	3		First Mile Square
Best Buddies Program							1 W/C	1	3 Vans @ Various Times	First Mile Square
Columbus Elementary School	831	6	18				1		-----	First Mile Square
Columbus Elementary School – Special Ed							2	2	-----	First Mile Square
Daniel Webster Elementary School	544	160	4			2	3	4	1 Van @ 4:15	First Mile Square
Daniel Webster Elementary School – Special Ed							2	2	-----	First Mile Square
General In-School District Wheelchair Needs							2 W/C	2		First Mile Square
George M. Davis, Jr. Elementary School	762	514				10		10	3 Buses @ 4:15	First Student
George M. Davis, Jr. Elementary School –			17				3	3		First Mile Square

2014-2015 In-School District Home-to-School Transportation Program										
School	Enrl.	Number Trans.	Special Ed	ESL	Bus Passes	Buses	Vans	Aides	Late Route	Contractor
Special Ed										
Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center	507	404				7	5	12	3 Vans @ 4:15	First Mile Square
Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center – Special Ed			28				4	4		First Mile Square
Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center – Mid-Day (Pre-K)		[97/ AM] [94/PM]				[7]	[5]	[12]		[First Mile Square]
Isaac E. Young Middle School	1,174				97				-----	-----
Isaac E. Young Middle School - ESL and Special Ed			58	4			7	7		First Mile Square
Jefferson Elementary School	615	139				3		3	1 Bus @4:15	First Mile Square
Jefferson Elementary School – Special Ed			35				3	3		First Mile Square
New Rochelle High School	3,309				2,081				-----	-----
New Rochelle High School – Special Ed			110				8	8		First Mile Square
New Rochelle High School – Occupational Education		76 in AM 148 in PM				6	1	6		First Student
Special Olympics (after school program)		Varies				1		1	4 Vans @ various Times	First Mile Square
Trinity Elementary School	854	107				3		3	1 Bus @ 4:15	First Student

2014-2015 In-School District Home-to-School Transportation Program											
School	Enrl.	Number Trans.	Special Ed	ESL	Bus Passes		Buses	Vans	Aides	Late Route	Contractor
Trinity Elementary School – Special Ed			16					3	3		First Mile Square
William B. Ward Elementary School	1,027	754					15		15	3 Buses @ 4:15	First Student
William B. Ward Elementary School – Special Ed			35					4	4		First Mile Square
Total	10,855	2,308	343	4	3,220		47	50 + 3 W/C	91		
		2,655					100				
Source: Transportation Department provided information											

To avoid double counting, the totals in the above chart exclude the number of students in the Henry Barnard School pre-school program and the number of buses/vans transporting students to/from the pre-school program. These students and buses/van are included in the enrollment number and in the base number of buses and vans. The number of students, buses, vans, and aides are in brackets.

A Review of the School District's transportation program shows that it operates on a single tiers structure. Ordinarily, this would be considered highly unusual given that the School District has ten schools consisting of seven elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school. However, only the elementary school students receive transportation services, and that is limited to those students who live more than a mile-and-a-half from their school of attendance. Transportation services by school buses for middle school and for high school students are limited to special education students whose individual educational plan (IEP) requires this related service.

There is a common six-and-a-half hour instructional day for all elementary schools. However, three of the elementary school principals have requested that the school buses arrive earlier in order for the students to participate in the breakfast program. The principals of the four other elementary schools are satisfied with the 8:25 am arrival of the buses.

Note the school start/end time for the seven elementary schools in the chart below:

	Bus Arrival	School Start	School End	Buses	Vans	Late Routes	
						Buses	Vans
Columbus Elementary School	8:25 am	8:45 am	3:15 pm		4		
Daniel Webster Elementary School	8:25 am	8:45 am	3:15 pm	2	5		1
George M. Davis, Jr. Elementary School	8:10 am	8:45 am	3:15 pm	10	3	3	
Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center	8:25 am	8:45 am	3:15 pm	7	8		3
Jefferson Elementary School	8:00 am	8:45 am	3:15 pm	3	3	1	
Trinity Elementary School	8:10 am	8:45 am	3:15 pm	3	3	1	
William B. Ward Elementary School	8:25 am	8:45 am	3:15 pm	15	4	3	
Total				40	30	8	4

If the School District would consider a two-tier structure for its elementary schools, it could reduce the number of buses needed to transport students to/from school. There would be a cost savings due to fewer operating buses, but the buses would be operating longer. Presently, it appears that the buses are operating for one live hour in the morning and close to one live hour in the afternoon.

A two-tiered structure for elementary school could resemble what is shown in the chart below. Based on location, three elementary schools (George M. Davis, Daniel Webster,

and William B. Ward) would be on Tier 1 and four elementary schools (Columbus, Henry Barnard, Jefferson, and Trinity) would be on Tier 2. The structure presupposes a common bus arrival time for each elementary school in each tier which is something that presently does not exist. As shown in the chart above, three of the elementary schools require the buses/vans to arrive before the required arrival time of the other four elementary schools. This would have to change.

Tier	School	Bus Arrival	School Start	School End	Buses	Vans	Late Routes	
							Buses	Vans
1	George M. Davis, Jr. Elementary School	7:50 am	8:20 am	2:50 pm	15	3	3	
1	Daniel Webster Elementary School	7:50 am	8:20 am	2:50 pm	5	5		1
1	William B. Ward Elementary School	7:50 am	8:20 am	2:50 pm	20	4	3	
					----	----	----	----
	Total for Tier 1				40	12	6	1
2	Columbus Elementary School	8:45 am	9:15 am	3:45 pm	1	4		
2	Henry Barnard School Early Childhood Center	8:45 am	9:15 am	3:45 pm	17	2		3
2	Jefferson Elementary School	8:45 am	9:15 am	3:45 pm	6	3	1	
2	Trinity Elementary School	8:45 am	9:15 am	3:45 pm	5	3	1	
					----	----	----	----
	Total for Tier 2				29	12	2	3
Note: The number of vans for each school includes the number needed for special education transportation.								

For its elementary school transportation program, the School District is utilizing 40 buses and 30 vans for a total of 70 vehicles. In a preliminary planning for a two-tier structure, the tentative projection is that the School District would need 29 buses for two tiers and 40 buses for one tier. The need would be for only 12 vans. The possible reduction would be 18 vans. Using current pricing, savings could possibly be \$942,660.00 (18 x \$52,370.00) plus the cost of some aides that would not be needed.

The length of the breakfast program was projected at 30 minutes. This needs to be reviewed with the School District's food service department and the elementary school principals.

The above table shows an increase in the number of buses needed to transport the elementary school students to/from school. The goal was to have the maximum length of the bus ride be 45/50 minutes. The desired earliest time for the pick-up of students

attending the first tier schools should be no earlier than 7:00 am. Students should arrive at school no later than 7:45/7:50 am. Pick-up of students attending the Tier 2 schools should start around 7:55 am with a school arrival time of approximately 8:40/8:45 am.

While the above may appear to be immediately attractive in terms of cost savings, more work would have to be completed that would involve changes in route structure and the number of students assigned to a bus/van, etc. Time is needed for rerouting that would involve simulation testing utilizing the School District's transportation management software plus field testing is necessary before any firm commitment for this reduction.

Prior to any time and effort spent in the above, the recommendation is that the concept of a two tier elementary school structure be discussed with all parties affected. This includes the Board of Education, the elementary school principals, and the bargaining unit(s) representing the teachers and the support staff.

As part of the above and In lieu of the 4:15 pm late vehicles, the late routes can operate at 3:50 pm for Tier 1 schools and at 4:45 pm for Tier 2 schools. Presently, the School District requires eight (8) buses and four (4) vans for late routes. Under a two tier structure, it will need two (2) buses for two (2) tiers and four (4) buses for one tier. This is a reduction of two buses. In addition it will need one van for two tiers and two vans for one tier. This is a reduction of one van. The reduction in vehicles for late routes is part of the 18 vehicle reduction stated above. To have the students arrive home earlier than the projected 50 minutes, more vehicles can be added.

A two-tier structure for the elementary schools will have to consider the following:

1. The time allocated in the morning for the breakfast program would have to be the same, namely, 30 minutes. This is a reduction of five minutes from the 35 minutes that exists in two elementary schools (George M. Davis and Trinity), and a reduction of 15 minutes from the 45 minutes that exists in one elementary school (Jefferson). The four other elementary schools (Columbus, Daniel Webster, Henry Barnard, and William B. Ward) would have their breakfast program remain at 30 minutes.
2. A detailed review will have to be made to determine if there is sufficient room at each elementary school site and/or the area of each elementary school for the extra buses.
3. Students in the three Tier 1 elementary schools will be arriving home approximately 25 minutes earlier, and students in the four Tier 2 elementary schools will arrive home approximately 30 minutes later.
4. Elementary school students engaged in after school activities/programs that are not school based will be arriving at these activities/program at two different times.

5. Any District wide after school elementary school teacher meetings will be affected.
6. In the contracts between the bargaining units of the teachers and the support staff state the start/end work hours, then the start/end work hours will have to be renegotiated in order to implement a two-tier structure for the elementary schools.
7. Some parents will object to the two tier structure because it changes the time at home that is allocated to prepare a child for school and to receive the child after school. It will also change parent based/directed after school activities for elementary school students.

The recommendation is that the School District considers carefully the changing of the elementary school start/end times for the purpose of a two-tier transportation program in order to reduce transportation costs. If the School District is interested in pursuing this change, it should redevelop the routes in detail and affirm with greater specificity the cost savings before a presentation is made to the community.

Another view of the School District's in-School District home-to-school transportation program shows that all the non special education vehicles have aides (Technically, in New York State they are called monitors. The aides on special education vehicles are called attendants). The reason given by the Transportation Assistant is that the misbehavior of the students is such that a person in addition to the driver is required on the buses/vans for student supervision. The aides also assist the students on/off the bus and ensure safe crossing of a street. It was also stated that the use of aides on the buses/van transporting students to/from school is long standing, is supported by the community, and their use has become institutionalized. While cameras on the buses/vans are required in accordance with the RFP specifications, it appears that they are not a deterrent, some cameras represent old technology, and sometimes the cameras are not working.

In all fairness, while cameras (video and sound recording equipment) on buses and vans are now common, all they do is identify and document student misbehavior. They do not prevent the misbehavior or stop it when it is taking place unless the student recognizes that he/she will be identified and punished for the misbehavior through the use of the camera(s). It is for this reason some school districts place aides on some buses for short periods of time to reduce student misbehavior. However, it is very unusual to find the number of aides used as extensively as is found in the New Rochelle School District all of the time, and especially, year after year.

Another concern about the transportation program is the appropriateness and the questionable legality of the afternoon transportation service to locations for religious instruction. It appears that this is done two days a week. Unlike transportation services to/from child care locations, there is no specific legislation or regulation allowing this practice. However, in Question 48:29 on page 545 of the question-and-answer format

of the SCHOOL LAW Handbook, 35th Edition, published by the New York State School Boards Association, the following appears:

48:29 Must school district transport students to and from released time religious instruction?

No. School districts have no authority to transport students released for religious instruction to and from a church or parochial school where the religious instruction is held (*Appeal of Fitch*, 2 ED Dept Rep 394 (1963); see also *Appeal of Santicola*, 37 Ed Dept Rep 79 (1997)). However, a district may lease school buses to a not-for-profit released time instruction provider to transport public school students to and from released time religious instruction facilities (*St. James Church v. Bd. of Educ. of the Cazenovia CSD*, 163 Misc.2d 471(Sup. Ct. Madison Cnty. 1994)).

The School District should check with its legal counsel, and possibly with the State Education Department, as to whether the above Commissioner's decision, which applies to transportation for students released for religious instruction, is applicable to transportation for religious instruction in lieu of transportation home or to a child care location.

The School District requires the submission of an application for transportation to child care locations and for religious instruction.

1. The portion of the application form that deals with transportation to child care locations is quite specific and consistent with law/regulation, the School District's transportation policy, and the practice of many other school districts.
2. The top left hand paragraph on the reverse of the application states "The State law on childcare providers does not apply to after school religious instruction." The question is then, "What law or regulation does apply to transportation services for religious instruction?"

Students requesting transportation for religious instruction appear to have a benefit that children receiving transportation to child care locations do not. Specifically, mileage limitations for transportation eligibility exist for child care locations but do not exist for religious instruction. See statement c) under TRANSPORTATION TO AFTER SCHOOL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION, "Students who do not meet mileage eligibility for daily transportation may apply." However, statement c) under subsection REQUIREMENTS of the portion of the form entitled TRANSPORTATION FOR CHILDCARE PROGRAMS states "The childcare location must be 1.5 miles from the school and within the attendance zone of the school your child attends." However, provision exists for transportation to childcare providers outside of the attendance zone of the student's school that are licensed or registered under §390 of the Social Services Law.

3. For transportation services for religious instruction, provisions/practices exist for students who are assigned to one route for home-to-school but must use another route for transportation for religious instruction, and provisions/practices exist for students who are not eligible for transportation services.
4. There are various deadlines for an application for transportation to a childcare location. There are no deadlines for an application for transportation for religious instruction.
5. Item d) under the TRANSPORTATION TO AFTER SCHOOL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION portion of the application, the statement is made that "The school district will not incur additional expense to provide transportation to an after school religious program." To what extent this is true is not known. There does not appear to be additional buses added for this purposes. However, there may be an effect of increasing the number of students assigned to a bus and increasing the length of the bus ride.
6. After school transportation services for birthday parties, dance lessons, music lessons, play dates, scout meetings, etc. are not frequently requested. As a result, they are intermittent as well as restricted. The transportation service for these types of activities is subject to room on the bus, and the bus does not deviate from its route. The student must be transportation eligible, and the student must utilize the same bus that he/she ordinarily rides.

Transportation for religious instruction appears to be a long standing practice. Its appropriateness is questionable.

On another matter, the chart below provides transportation program information for the non-public schools. During the 2014-2015 school year, the School District provided bus/van transportation services for 515 Grade K-5 students to 22 non-public schools. It also provided buses passes to 17 Grade 6-12 students to seven non-public schools.

The Transportation Department is to be commended for the routing of the transportation program. Of the 22 schools to which transportation services are provided, only three have dedicated routes. The routes to the other 19 schools are structured so that more than one school is on each route. Due to different school start/end times some of the routes are structured differently in the afternoon than they are structured in the morning. The routes are complicated, but they are operationally as well as cost efficient, and they work.

In addition to the above, the Transportation Assistant has been successful in negotiating a half-day price for a bus or a van that operates only for half-a-day. Ordinarily, a bus/van that operates a half-day is paid at two-thirds (2/3rds) of the full day rate. Sometimes, payment is at three-quarters (3/4ths) of the full day rate. The reason is that

the Contractor needs to cover overhead expenses that include the cost of the vehicle, fuel, and possibly the full daily guarantee of paid hours for the driver even though the driver is working fewer hours.

Note that only two aides are needed for the non-public school transportation service, and these are considered "floating" aides. That is, the bus to a specific school to which they can be assigned can change, and the bus assignment is subject to the needs of the day. The reason given for substantially fewer aides is that transportation services to most of the schools utilize vans which contain fewer students, and there are less student behavior problems. In fact, only three of the 22 non-public schools utilize buses, and two of the three schools use a "floating" aide.

2014-2015 Home-to-School Non-Public Schools						
School	Location	Number Trans.	Bus Passes	Buses	Vans	Comments
Ethical Culture Fieldston School – Lower	Bronx	3			1	Transportation is with Riverdale Country School
French-American School – Larchmont	Larchmont	49		3 buses in AM (paying for 1.5 buses) 2 buses in PM (paying for 1 bus)		In AM transportation is with Sts. John & Paul School and Hudson Country Day In PM French American – Larchmont is alone.
French-American School – Scarsdale	Scarsdale	9			1	In AM French – Scarsdale is alone In PM transportation is with Immaculate Heart of Mary School
German International School New York	White Plains	4			1	In AM transportation is with Our Lady of Perpetual Help In PM transportation is with Hudson Country Day and Our Lady of Perpetual Help
Holy Name of Jesus School	New Rochelle	1			1	In AM and PM transportation is with Westchester Area School
Hudson Country Day	New Rochelle	5			0 in AM 0 in PM	In AM transportation is with French-American School and Sts. John & Paul School In PM transportation is with German International School and Our Lady of Perpetual Help School
Immaculate Heart of	Scarsdale	1			1	In AM transportation is alone

2014-2015 Home-to-School Non-Public Schools						
School	Location	Number Trans.	Bus Passes	Buses	Vans	Comments
Mary School					0 in PM	In PM transportation is with French-American School New York - Scarsdale
Iona Prep School	New Rochelle	4			1	In AM transportation is with Westchester Torah Academy. In PM transportation is with Thornton Donovan School
Our Lady of the Assumption School	Bronx	2		1 van in AM (paying for ½ van) 1 van in PM (paying for ½ van)		In AM transportation is with Thornton Donovan School In PM Our Lady of the Assumption School is alone Payment is for the equivalent of one van.
Our Lady of Perpetual Help School	Pelham	4			0	In AM transportation is with the German International School New York In PM transportation is with the German International School New York and the Hudson Country Day
Resurrection School	Rye	4			0 1 van in PM (paying for ½ van)	In AM Resurrection School transportation is with Rye Country Day School. In PM transportation is alone
Riverdale Country School - Lower	Bronx	2			0	Transportation is with Ethical Culture Fieldston School
Rye Country Day School	Rye	3			1	In AM Rye Country Day School is Resurrection School. In PM transportation is alone
SAR Academy	Bronx	123		3 buses in AM and PM plus floating side in AM and PM. One van for late dismissal.		
Solomon Schechter School – Lower	White Plains	69		2 buses plus 1 floating side		
Sts. John & Paul School	Larchmont	77		1 in PM Paying for 0 buses and 0 vans in AM Paying for ½ bus and 1 van in PM	2 in PM	In AM transportation is with French-American School and Hudson Country Day In the PM Sts. John & Paul School is alone

2014-2015 Home-to-School Non-Public Schools						
School	Location	Number Trans.	Bus Passes	Buses	Vans	Comments
Thornton Donovan School	New Rochelle	6			0	In AM transportation is with Our Lady of the Assumption School In PM transportation is with Iona Prep School
Westchester Area School	New Rochelle	1			0	In AM and PM transportation is with Holy Name of Jesus School
Westchester Day School	Mamaroneck	104		3 buses plus 1 floating aide		
Westchester Torah Academy	New Rochelle	31		1		In AM transportation with Iona Prep In PM transportation is alone
Windward School - Lower	White Plains	12			1	
Yeshiva Day School	Yonkers	1		1 van in AM (paying for ½ van) 1 van in PM (paying for ½ van)		In AM transportation is alone In PM transportation is with John Cardinal O'Connor School Payment is for the equivalent of one van.
Sub Total		515	0			
Archbishop Stepinac High School	New Rochelle	1	1			
Holy Name of Jesus School	New Rochelle	1	1			
Iona Prep School	New Rochelle	7	7			
Manhattan High School	New York	1	1			
Masters School (The)	Dobbs Ferry	1	1			
Salesian High School	New Rochelle	1	1			
Ursuline School	New Rochelle	5	5			
Sub Total		17	17			
Grand Total		532	17	15	13 vans plus 3 aides	

2014-2015 Home-to-School Non-Public Schools						
School	Location	Number Trans.	Bus Passes	Buses	Vans	Comments
Note: There are no late buses provided for the private/parochial schools						
Source: School District's Transportation Department provided information						

In 2014-2015, the School District transported 122 students to 41 special education locations. This is shown on the chart below. Like the routing to the non-public schools, many of the routes to special education locations have more than one school assigned to the route. Again, this is operationally and cost efficient. The use of aides is mandated by the requirements of each student's individual educational plan (IEP) and the Special Education Department.

2014-2015 Special Education						
School	Location	Number Trans.		Buses	Vans	Aides
Andrus Children's Center	Yonkers	2			1 W/C	2
				Transportation with John A. Coleman School - Elizabeth Selon Pediatric Center		
Carmel Academy	Greenwich	5			1	1
				Transportation with Eagle Hill School		
Cerebral Palsy of Westchester, Inc.	Rye Brook	8			3 W/C	3
Clear View School (The)	Briarcliff Manor	2			1	1
Community School	Teaneck	1			1	1
Eagle Hill School	Greenwich	6		Transportation with Carmel Academy		
Green Chimneys - Clearpool Campus	Carmel	1			1	1
Green Chimneys School for Little Folk	Brewster	5			1	1
Greenburgh-Graham UFSD	Hastings-on-Hudson	1			1	1
				Transportation in AM and PM with Martin Luther King Jr. H.S. and SAIL at Ferncliff Manor		
Hawthorne Cedar Knolls School	Hawthorne	3			1	1
Hawthorne Country Day School	Hawthorne	1			1	1
Jewish Guild for the Blind School	New York	0 in AM 1 in PM		Transportation in AM with Mannellen Day School Transportation in PM by itself (1% payment for PM)		
John A. Coleman School - Elizabeth	Yonkers	2		Transportation with Andrus Children's Center		

2014-2015 Special Education					
School	Location	Number Trans.	Buses	Vans	Aides
Seton Pediatric Center					
John Cardinal O'Connor School	Irvington	3	In AM transportation is with Solomon Schechter – Upper School In PM transportation is alone (No payment for 1 van)		
Kenneth B. Clark Academy	Dobbs Ferry	3	Transportation with SW BOCES – Irvington High School		
Lavelle School for the Blind	Bronx	1		1 W/C	1
			Transportation in AM and PM with Mount St. Michael's Academy		
Manhattan Day School	New York	3		1	
			Transportation in AM with the Jewish Guild for the Blind		
Martin Luther King Jr. High School	Hastings-on-Hudson	2	Transportation in AM and PM with Greenburgh-Graham UFSD and SAIL at Ferncliff Manor		
Mount St. Michael's Academy	Bronx	1	Transportation in AM and PM with Lavelle School for the Blind		
New York School for the Deaf	White Plains	6		1	1
			Transportation in AM and PM by itself.		
Putnam/Northern Westchester BOCES – Pines Bridge School	Yorktown Heights	2		1 W/C	1
			Transportation with Putnam / Northern Westchester BOCES Walden School		
Putnam/Northern Westchester BOCES – Walden School	Yorktown Heights	2	Transportation with Putnam / Northern Westchester BOCES Pines Bridge School		
Rockland BOCES - Hill Top School	Nyack	3		1 W/C	1
			Transportation with Rockland BOCES – Jesse J. Kaplan School		
Rockland BOCES - Jesse J. Kaplan School	West Nyack	5	Transportation with Rockland BOCES – Hill Top School		
SAIL at Ferncliff Manor	Hastings	2	Transportation in AM and PM with Greenburgh-Graham UFSD and Martin Luther King Jr. H.S.		
SAR High School	Bronx	3		1	
School of the Holy Child	Rye	1		1	
Solomon Schechter – Upper School	Hartsdale	1		1	
			Transportation in AM with John Cardinal O'Connor School Transportation in PM by itself. Payment is for one van.		

2014-2015 Special Education					
School	Location	Number Trans.	Buses	Vans	Aides
St. Vincent's Hospital	Harrison	Var		1	1
			Transportation in AM and PM by itself		
Summit School	Nyack	1		1	1
			Transportation in AM and PM by itself		
SW BOCES - Blythedale Children's Hospital	Valhalla	4		1	1
SW BOCES – East View Elementary School	White Plains	1		1 W/C	1
			Transportation in AM and PM with SW BOCES - St. Matthew's School		
SW BOCES - Irvington High School	Irvington	3		1	1
			Transportation with Kenneth B. Clark Academy		
SW BOCES – Isaac Young Middle School	New Rochelle	8		2 W/C	2
SW BOCES - Port Chester Middle School	Rye Brook	1		1	1
SW BOCES Rye Lake - Multi-Handicapped Program	White Plains	2		1	1
			Transportation with SW BOCES Rye Lake – Therapeutic Support Program		
SW BOCES Rye Lake – Therapeutic Support Program	White Plains	2	Transportation with SW BOCES Rye Lake Multi-Handicapped Program		
SW BOCES - St. Matthew's School	White Plains	3	Transportation in AM and PM with SW BOCES – East View Elementary School		
Villa Maria School	Stamford	1		1	
			Transportation in AM and PM by itself		
Windward School - Upper	White Plains	20		1	
			Transportation in AM and PM by itself		
Total		122	0	24 vans + 10 W/C	26
Source: School District's Transportation Department provided information					

The last portion of the description of the School District's transportation program is the cooperative transportation service it has with six other school districts (Bronxville, Eastchester, Mamaroneck, Pelham, Rye Neck, and Tuckahoe) that is overseen by Southern Westchester BOCES. The concept is that if two or more of the school districts

have students attending the same school or special education location, they will share the transportation service and the transportation cost. The transportation provider is Montauk Student Transport.

The information shown on the table below is the number of vehicles and aides used in 2014-2015 on a regular daily basis. It is not the number for which the School District is being charged. When a vehicle is used for only half-a-day, the charge is for 50% of the cost of the vehicle.

The late route vehicles are not additional vehicles, but are part of the same vehicles used to transport students to their home at the end of the school day.

	Buses	W/C Vans	Vans	Total
Number	62	13	87	162
Percentage	38.27%	08.02%	53.70%	99.99%

	Aides
Number	120

The number of students transported in 2014-2015 is summarized on the table below:

	Number of Students	Number of Bus Passes
Public Schools	2,655	3,220
Non-Public Schools	532	17
Special Education Locations	122	
	-----	-----
Total	3,309	3,237