

Background and Overview

In the spring of 2018 the Lakewood Board of Education sent out a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a study of its student transportation program. The main purpose of this study was to help the Board of Education determine whether it should remain a majority District-owned bus program for its public schools or to privatize the system. In order to determine this the Board commissioned this study to provide an analysis of costs and to see if privatizing would be more economical than the current majority District-owned system.

Lakewood is unique in that it has an exceptionally large number of school aged children in relation to the total population. Currently there are approximately 38,000 school aged children residing in the Township. Of these, approximately 6,000 students attend the six Lakewood Public Schools and approximately 32,000 students attend 125 non-public schools. Further the overwhelming majority of the non-public schools are attended by Orthodox Jewish children. Because of this all buses transporting these non-public school students have to provide services to only one gender on each bus. This means that even if there are two schools within proximity of each other both in terms of time and distance, students of both genders are not scheduled on the same bus.

A further complication is that the District provides all students with an extensive hazardous (non-mandated) transportation program.¹ For all schools the maximum walk to school distance is one half mile from home to school. State regulations are that in order for students in grades K-8 to be eligible for transportation a student must reside two miles or greater from the school and for students in grades 9-12 students must reside 2.5 miles from home to school. Eligible students are considered mandated for transportation by the State and the District is eligible for State aide for these students. Any students residing within these mileage parameters are considered not eligible for transportation. A District may provide either courtesy or hazardous transportation for non-mandated student transportation. Although the District is not aided for hazard transportation the Township can fund hazardous transportation provided the Board has an approved list of hazardous streets (which must be agreed to with Township officials) and that list must be in Board of Education Policy. The District does have a list of hazardous streets and the Township has funded non-mandated public school students in the amount of \$ 825,391.47.² The list of hazardous streets should be in Board of Education policy. It appears that it may have been at one time, however, if it is not it should be adopted.

Of the approximately 5,600 public school children transported approximately one-half of that population is non-mandated. Of the non-public school children transported 21,000 are mandated and 11,000 are non-mandated. The Township has contributed approximately \$1.1 million dollars to the LSTA although it is not clear how that funding was to be used.

The transportation program is further complicated in that a majority of the transportation times (mornings between 6:00AM and 9:00 PM the District both public and non-public) are transporting nearly 38,000 (just over 32,000 to non-public and 5,500 to public) children to in-District public and non-public schools. This also aligns with such factors as rush hour traffic (and there are several commuter routes from neighboring towns which pass through Lakewood) as well as competition with such town services as rubbish collection which clog streets and block

¹ Non-mandated transportation is transportation provided to students who do not meet distance requirements which are 2.0 miles for pre-K -8 students and 2.5 miles for students in grades 9-12.

² As per a letter from the Township to the Superintendent dated May 4, 2018. This agreement does not consider any distance home to school. The letter has a number of conditions listed and is available for public view.

buses.

It is almost impossible to align the arrival and departure time of the non-public and public schools, especially in the afternoons where there are multiple dismissal times in the nonpublic schools based upon grade levels. The public schools have no control over the length of day or bell schedule of the non-public schools.

Neither of these issues are news nor is it not understood by the Board of Education. In fact, three years ago the Board of Education, in conjunction with the State Education Department and the New Jersey State Legislature created an entity whose purpose was to separate public and non-public school transportation. That entity became known as the Lakewood Student Transportation Authority (LSTA) which had sole responsibility for transporting non-public school students to in- District private and parochial schools. The LSTA puts out transportation bids, creates its own routes and is responsible for the supervision of the program. The budget (\$ 21,000,000) is included in the budget of the Lakewood Board of Education, and all reporting to the State regarding the LSTA is the responsibility of District.

The LSTA is in the final year of the Legislative mandate and as of this writing (August, 2018) has not yet been extended beyond the 2018-19 school year. If it is not extended the routing and management of the non-public school transportation program will revert to the Lakewood School District. It is reasonable to estimate that during the next five years that the non-public enrollment will continue to grow and based upon trends, even if the public schools remain stable, the total number of student transported could exceed 40,000.³ Although this study does not include the LSTA, because of the inter-relationship between the District and the LSTA, there are references to it throughout this report, where relevant. Further in our analysis of District-owned and privatization modeling we will refer to the route bids and contracts that are under the auspices of the LSTA.⁴

May to August, 2018

This study began in early May, 2018. At the outset, and based upon the RFP due date⁵, this study would not have recommendations specifically for September, 2018. In the early days of this project a request was made for this report could be accelerated to June 30, 2018. After looking at the mountains of data needed to be sorted it was clear that this could not happen. The Board again asked if the report could be done by July 18, 2018. Again, considering the depth of the report and the fact that the final 2017-18 fiscal reports were not completed the ability to provide an accurate report could not meet that date. This report, submitted in August, 2018 is based upon the most accurate and up to date data that our company has from the District and other entities.⁶ Between May and August, 2018 three *preliminary reports* were provided to the Board of Education. Although clearly not intended to be used as final recommendations from our company the Board did act on some of that information. As a result changes were made in the organizational structure of the Transportation Department, bell times were extended, and adjustments were made to driver/staff contracts. Discussions have been ongoing (as of this

³ Attached to this study is a cohort survival table done by our company in 2017 which shows cohort survival projection tables for both the public and non-public schools. We suggest that the District do an update of this study.

⁴ The LSTA does not own or operate its own buses, all routes are contracted..

⁵ Actual due date November, 2018

⁶ All data used in this report was provided by the Lakewood Public Schools Administration and Transportation Departments, where necessary from the State Education Department, and as needed from the LSTA. The accuracy of this report is dependent upon the accuracy of the data provided by those entities.

writing) regarding overtime and pre and post route checkups. All of these actions are under the purview of the Lakewood Administration and the Lakewood Board of Education.

Lakewood Public School Transportation

One of the very first things that came to our attention at the outset of this study was a lack of continuity in terms of the leadership in the Transportation Department. In our opinion this lack of continuity has led to many of the problems we encountered during the past few months.

During the time that the District was transitioning to a District-owned operation (for the 2016-17 school year) the transportation department was using the services of an outside consultant to route the buses for the 2016-17 school year. At that time a new transportation supervisor was hired. She remained until June of 2017 (one year). As a result of her leaving the routing for the 2017-18 school year was again done by the same transportation consultant. The routes were then handed over to a new transportation supervisor, who was hired in September, 2017. The issues regarding these routes, including completing the DRTRS (District Report of Transported Resident Students) required by the State became her responsibility. Further it appears that the underlying data needed to support that reported was not accurate, thus requiring virtually a complete review of all relevant student, route and mileage data. According to staff much of the problem stemmed from issues regarding the computer maps being used by the District.⁷

According to the District personnel (including input from the LSTA) the map being used by the District was outdated and had not been updated for several years (the LSTA had implemented a new version of the map in January, 2017--we do not have any information as to why this was not done for the public schools). As a result, not only did this cause a problem in creating the DRTRS it also created substantial issues regarding the routing of the public schools. It appears that no action was taken to address the map issues until they emerged in one of the preliminary reports provided to the administration.

By the end of June, 2018 it was found that although the preliminary routes had not been completed for 2018-19 contract renewals had been sent out. At that time the current Transportation Director was terminated and the head of the LSTA was placed in an interim position to get the routes ready for September, 2018.

The rest of this report will address issues which surfaced over the course of this study, what has driven the cost of public school transportation and finally a comparison of District-owned costs per route versus contractor costs per route.

Transportation Office

The current transportation office staff comprises eight individuals plus a coordinator with four located in the Administration Building and four individuals in an office in the Middle School. The total salaries and benefits for the transportation office in 2018-19 was \$ 863,631.52. In addition other costs (supplies, etc.) were \$5,947.29. The total cost for operating the transportation office for the 2017-18 school year was \$ 880, 494,93.

Staffing and Payroll

⁷ The District uses Versatrans software. Versatrans is one of the two software products used by many New Jersey School Districts. Issues with the map are generally not an inherent problem with Versatrans, but with the ability of District personnel to make proper adjustments.

Table 1: Transportation Department Office Staff (2017-18)

Last Name	First Name	Job Title
Staff	1	Transportation Dispatcher
Staff	2	Transportation Safety Coordinator
Staff	3	Mechanic Full Time
Staff	4	Transportation Routing Clerk
Staff	5	Transportation Clerical Assistant
Staff	6	Payroll Clerk
Staff	7	Assistant Transportation Coordinator
Staff	8	Assistant Transportation Coordinator
Staff	9	Transportation Routing Clerk
Staff	10	Transportation Supervisor

Table 2 provides information regarding salaries and benefits for transportation office staff. One of the areas of payroll that stood out was the amount of overtime paid to staff members. Overtime comprised more than 30% of the wages paid to these employees.

Table 2: Transportation Office Staff Salaries

Transportation Office Staff Salary											
Last	First	Base	Overtime	Percentage	Total	Med/Rx	Est EE	Est Cost	Pension	FICA/	Employee
				of Base	Wages		Contribution	to Dist	Approp	Med	Total
Staff	1	\$48,623.90	\$13,810.06	28.40%	\$62,433.96	\$24,676.08	\$2,467.66	\$22,208.42	\$6,277.35	\$4,776.20	\$122,839.67
Staff	2	\$49,427.82	\$29,923.45	60.54%	\$79,351.27	\$13,557.84	\$1,898.00	\$11,659.84	\$6,381.13	\$6,070.37	\$118,918.45
Staff	3	\$53,576.70	\$19,111.76	35.67%	\$72,688.46	na			\$6,916.76	\$5,560.67	\$85,165.89
Staff	4	\$25,699.96	\$5,789.20	22.53%	\$31,489.16	\$24,676.06	\$1,110.46	\$23,565.60	\$3,317.86	\$2,408.92	\$86,568.06
Staff	5	\$33,676.76	\$180.38	0.54%	\$33,857.14	\$13,557.84	\$1,355.90	\$12,201.94	\$4,347.67	\$2,590.97	\$67,911.46
Staff	6	\$52,578.76	\$8,866.12	16.86%	\$61,444.88	\$13,557.84	\$2,711.54	\$10,846.30	\$6,787.92	\$4,700.53	\$100,049.01
Staff	7	\$52,578.76	\$32,540.00	61.89%	\$85,118.76	\$13,557.84	\$2,711.54	\$10,846.30	\$6,787.92	\$7,435.98	\$126,458.34
Staff	8	\$5,192.26	\$171.75	3.31%	\$5,364.01	na			\$670.32	\$410.35	\$6,444.68
Staff	9	\$73,387.82				\$38,237.40		\$27,530.86	\$10,119.88		\$149,275.96
Total		\$394,742.74	\$110,392.72	27.97%	\$431,747.64	\$141,820.90	\$12,255.10	\$91,328.40	\$51,606.81	\$33,953.99	\$863,631.52

In examining the procedures in the transportation office one of our first requests was for office job descriptions from the coordinator. We did not receive them and subsequently were told, by staff, that they were unaware that any existed. It is very difficult to evaluate the performance of any employee without some baseline performance standards or tasks that should be in a job description. Further, it is unfair to an employee to not have his or her duties and

responsibilities made clear so that they may know the parameters of their jobs. During the writing of this report we were finally immediately provided with job descriptions upon request from the Superintendent. We are not sure if these have ever been distributed to the members of the department nor does it in our opinion appear that they have been evaluated based upon job given a survey in which they had an opportunity to provide an overview of their jobs. These were filled out and returned. This was then followed up with a one on one interview with each employee. In addition to the interviews we also reviewed the vouchers that each employee has to submit in order to have overtime approved. The purpose of the review was for us to understand what appeared to be excessive overtime (approximately 34% of the total payroll with some employees adding between 28% and 62% of their base pay to their wages).

The first thing that struck us in reviewing the vouchers was (with one exception) the complete lack of detail. Each voucher asks for the date of the overtime, the number of hours of overtime put in, and the description of services rendered. For the vast majority of these vouchers the description of services column only had the hourly rate and the total hours but not the service rendered. In reviewing these documents it is, for the most part, impossible to determine what the employees were doing. Further, we asked staff if they were required to request prior permission before putting in for overtime or if there were any limitations on the amount of overtime allowed per employee. Apparently neither permission for overtime or limitations on overtime exists.

There were two notable exceptions to the lack of detail in the voucher. The first were the forms provided by (an office staff member). . Virtually all of her overtime was charged to checking and correcting (including follow ups) on the B6T's. The B6T is the application which must be filed by parents or guardians of non-public school students in order to qualify and receive transportation to and from school. In Lakewood this process is absolutely overwhelming in that as of the most recent school year nearly 32,000 of these applications had to be reviewed and checked for such things as accuracy of information and towns of residence. According to the office there were a great many errors in these which had to be corrected and the process virtually took the entire school year. This amounted to a payment of \$ 8,866.12 which was approximately 16.8% above Ms. Patagonia's base pay. If the in-school staff continues to be responsible for reviewing the B6T's this expense will continue.

The second area which appears to have created overtime was putting together the DRTRS (District Report of Transported Resident Students). It appears that, based upon discussions we have had, that the transportation coordinator, who was new to the position, had little or no experience with this report which must be filed with the State Education Department in the fall of each year. The report took an excessive amount of time and overtime was needed by other staff members in order to make the report both accurate and on time. We are told that going into the 2018-19 school year this should not take as long. However, as of this writing, there is no official transportation supervisor and we are not sure who, amongst current staff, has the experience to fill out the DRTRS.

We noticed that four employees had the largest proportion of overtime.. From the vouchers it was hard to determine exactly what comprised their overtime. Each of them is an eight (8) hour employee. Their basic duties as dispatcher, Assistant Transportation Coordinator, safety officer and bus mechanic should be able to be accomplished, for the most part and with exceptions at certain times of the year, within their regular work day. ***It is extremely important to note that in no way did this report suspect or find any wrongdoing on the part of any employee.*** Rather many of the issues were on the shoulders of management and a lack of coordination and communication in the Transportation Office. For example, generating a lot of

the overtime for three of the employees had to do with opening and closing the bus yard. It is important that staff be available to open the yard in the morning and check and close at night. This should not require more than one person. It would seem, based upon the interviews that better management and scheduling of these individuals could cut down overtime considerably. Alternatives, such as offsetting working hours to cover the yard would provide the same coverage, have both of these staff members overlap during the day for the purpose of discussing mechanical and safety issues, and this would also make sure that at least one of these individuals was available during the school day and through the late/athletic runs. This is not to say that doing this would eliminate overtime, but it could cut it back substantially.

One employee indicated that she sometimes spends as much as 12 hours at work on any given day because of having to open and close the yard. One of her arguments for this (and this is valid) is that she is the only Spanish speaking person on staff (now that one of the two Spanish speaking persons is no longer employed). Given the large non-English speaking population in Lakewood consideration should be given to ensuring a Spanish speaking person is available to speak with parents or guardians at all times.

In speaking with a fourth staff member it was determined that she too has responsibility for locking up the yard and turning off the lights. Her daily job description primarily deals with dispatching and updating special education routes. Again, with the exception of the closing of the yard (which would generate overtime) we are not certain why so much overtime (28.4%) has been paid over her base salary. Again, this has more to do with a lack of management and a clear definition of job scope and responsibility.

Management and Supervision

The last two years have seen significant changes in the way Lakewood provides transportation to both public and non-public school students. Beginning with the 2016-17 school year transportation services were to be provided to non-public school students through a legislatively created entity named the Lakewood Student Transportation Authority commonly referred to as the LSTA. Although the LSTA functions as an independent organization responsible for contracting services, routing students and coordinating with the non-public schools under its own management team the funding is provided by the Lakewood Public Schools. The LSTA, for the 2017-18 school year had a budget of \$ 21,000,000.⁸

At the same time the public school transitioned from a privatized transportation program to a District-owned operation. At that time the District purchased approximately thirty-three 54 passenger buses, nineteen 24 passenger buses, and four 5 passenger vans. The total number of vehicles included 2 older 54 passenger vans and two specially equipped vans for students with special needs.

For the 2016-17 school year a new Transportation Coordinator was hired. The routes for that year were developed by an outside consultant. During that year there was some "confusion" regarding driver packages and driver hours. The State Monitor intervened in order make sure that all drivers were working the full amount of hours for which they were paid. In addition, drivers were paid for a 30 minute pre and post check of their buses adding one hour to their packages. At the end of the 2016-17 school year the transportation coordinator left to take a position elsewhere. Routes for the subsequent school year, (2017-18) were once again created by the. In September, 2017 a new transportation coordinator was hired. She inherited the routes

⁸ Analysis of the LSTA is not within the scope of this study.

that were developed and implemented by the consultant.

Recommendations for Transportation Office Operations

The transportation office staff currently is composed of nine individuals. This includes a transportation coordinator plus eight other individuals.⁹ The amount of overtime (>30% over base wages paid to the entire department) has been a great concern to the Board of Education. The following recommendations address several issues including overtime.

1. The Coordinator should:¹⁰
 - a. Distribute and review job descriptions, discuss with each staff member what can be reasonably accomplished within the framework of an eight hour day.
 - b. Discuss with each member what issues causes them to charge overtime.
 - c. Make sure there is no overlapping or duplication of duties.
 - d. Schedule offset hours for staff. For example there are two assistant coordinators. Their hours should be set so that one of them is there at the opening (supported by at least one other staff member with offset hours) and that one of them is there at closing (with at least one other staff member). The hours set are dependent upon bus schedules.
 - e. Evaluate each staff member based upon job skills and requirements minimally based on the job descriptions.
2. Overtime:
 - a. Prior permission for overtime should be requested prior to the overtime taking place with the written permission of the Coordinator.
 - b. Careful tracking of overtime costs should be completed by the Coordinator who should be given an overtime budget. Need for additional funds for overtime beyond what is budgeted must require approval from the Business Administrator.
 - c. The vouchers submitted for overtime should be re-evaluated. All overtime should have a clear description of services along with the hours and rate for those services (how is overtime calculated at the standard hourly rate and what is the threshold for time and a half for office staff members).

⁹ At the time of this report the department was down by two individuals, the Coordinator and a Routing Clerk. This report assumes both positions will be filled.

¹⁰ When hired

3. Staff:

It is important to note that at the time of this writing the New Jersey State Legislature has not yet acted to extend the LSTA beyond the 2018-19 school year. This study assumes that the LSTA will be extended. Based upon that assumption the following recommendations are made:

- a. A full time coordinator should be hired as quickly as possible. Due to the complexity of the Lakewood situation a search should be made for an experienced individual who has a least five years of experience in a comparably sized school district.
- b. Over the course of the coming school year staff should be evaluated, actual office needs examined in order to determine actual staffing needs and how to adjust to the appropriate staffing levels.

To an outside observer looking over the past two years there has been entirely too much inconsistency in the department which has led to management issues. There were two coordinators and during that period of time, the District transitioned to a majority District-run operation, the LSTA was implemented and the routing was done by an outside consultant (although the consultant was a former coordinator and knew the District he was not involved in the day to day operations once he submitted the routes).

In order to increase office efficiency stability must be brought to the transportation office. This includes better management of the transportation budget, staff (all staff including drivers, mechanics and aides), and far better understanding of the routing issues that are unique to Lakewood.

Routing and Route Management

For the past two years the routing has been done by the outside consultant. The consultant, although a former employee of the District did not participate on the day to day supervision of the transportation department. That responsibility was first on supervisor 1 (2016-17 school year and then by supervisor 2017-18). This study focused on the 2017-18 school year.

The first step in this process was to do an analysis of the utilization of District-owned vehicles. As of August, 2018 the District owns thirty-six 54 passenger vehicles. The oldest vehicle is a 2014; all other 54 passenger buses are 2015-2019 models. The District also owns sixteen 24 passenger vehicles (five are handicap accessible), one 14 passenger vehicle, two 15 passenger vehicles and five 8 passenger vehicles. These are primarily used for special education transportation. With one exception (1 2010 vehicle) all of the other vehicle model years range from 2015-2019). In addition there are eight (8) five passenger 2014 Dodge Caravans.¹¹

The District provided the majority of the public school transportation beginning in 2016-17.¹²

¹¹ Vehicular data provided by the Lakewood Transportation Department.

¹² With considerable supplementary contracted routes.

Eligibility, Bell Times and Tiers

According to the New Jersey Department of Education transportation is provided to general education students in grades K-8 if they reside 2.0 miles or greater from their school of attendance. For students in grades 9-12 transportation is provided for those who live 2.5 miles or further from their school. Special Education students will receive waivers from this eligibility if the need for special transportation is indicated in their IEP (Individual Education Prescription). Students who meet these requirements are called mandated students. All students residing in areas that are less than those mileages are non-mandated students (students for whom the District is not required to provide transportation). For these non-special needs students the State does not provide transportation aid. A District, however, may declare, in conjunction with the Township, streets that may be deemed as hazardous. The Board of Education may then designate these streets as hazardous and put them in Board of Education Policy¹³. Once done it is possible, at the discretion of the Township, for the Township to provide funding for 'hazardous routes.'" The Lakewood Board of Education provided transportation for all students who reside more than one-half mile from their school for both public school students as hazardous routes. The District received funding for these non-mandated students as part of the pilot program. This will expire at the end of the 2018-19 school year. Table 3 shows the number of mandated and non-mandated students transported to the public schools in 2017-18.¹⁴

Table 3: Mandated & Non-Mandated Public School Students

Category	Students
PK (Public, Charter, ECC, Community Provider	190
Public School Students (exc Voc)	2,014
Vocational School Students	6
Transported Chart School Students	75
Special Education Students	733
Total Mandated (Public Schools)	3,018
Total Courtesy Students	2,852
Total Transported	5,870

Table 3 shows that 48.6% of public school students being transported are non-mandated.¹⁵ In addition, the LSTA is transporting, in the same time period (especially in the AM) approximately 20,147 mandated students along with an additional 11,000 non-mandated students.¹⁶ Funding for LSTA students is a combination of parental fees (\$150 per child) and District funded, along with additional funding from the Township.

There are approximately 39,500 children being transported daily in the District. Not only is this costly to the District but it adds to the considerable amount of traffic during morning

¹³ As of this report (August, 2018) there has been no agreement between the District and the Township and therefore is no policy on hazardous streets at this time.

¹⁴ Data taken from DRTRS filed with New Jersey Department of Education on January 24, 2018.

¹⁵ Although Lakewood does not use the term courtesy, the State does.

¹⁶ The number of courtesy or hazardous route students for the LSTA is not reported on the DRTRS.

and afternoon rush hours. This traffic causes the need to lower the number of students per bus and/or to add buses in order to make sure that students do get to school on time. This was somewhat moderated for the 2017-18 school year by changing the bell times and extending the time between schools to 45 minutes. The bell schedule for 2018-19 has been changed to provide a little more time between school starts.¹⁷

While the safety of children is always the first concern we believe that the configuration of the hazardous streets may be more complex than need be.¹⁸ We strongly recommend that these streets be re-evaluated and adjustments made as needed. Streets without sidewalks are ***not necessarily hazardous***. Additionally it may be possible to create ***safe walk zones with crossing guards*** strategically located to maximize safety. At the very least it may be possible to decrease the number of hazardous streets for secondary students. Another consideration may be having secondary buses staying on main roads with designated stops along the route to which students have to walk (thus cutting down on the number of turns a secondary bus needs to make). This would "mimic" what a transit bus does).

Tiers

The Lakewood Public Schools operates on a three tier system (three tiers in the morning and three in the afternoon). A tier is a block of time in which a bus has to drop off or pick up students from a school or group of schools. The most economical way of operating in a three tier system is to have one vehicle be able to complete three missions (drop off or pick up students at each tier). Table 4 shows the schools at each tier.

Table 4: Public School Tiers (rev August, 2018)

	AM Arrival	PM Departure	AM Arrival	PM Departure	AM Arrival	PM Departure
High School	6:30	1:30				
Middle School	6:30	1:30				
Clarke			7:30	2:15		
Oak			7:30	2:15		
Clifton			7:30	2:15		
Spruce					8:15	3:00
Piner					8:15	3:00
LECC					8:15	3:00

It appears that bell times are not an issue regarding the ability of buses to get to schools on time and be able to continue on to the next school. The three tier system appears to work in terms of time; ***however it may also be restrictive in requiring additional routes for the middle and high school that cannot be accommodated in a three tier system.***

In 2017-18 there were a total of 13 District operated high school routes and 15 District operated middle school routes on 54 passenger buses. In addition, on that first tier there were three 54 passenger buses used for non-public schools. Out of the thirty-six 54 passenger buses

¹⁷ As of this writing, August, 2018.

¹⁸ A list of the most current hazardous streets is appended to this report.

31 were being used and 5 were spares.¹⁹

The high school required 30 large buses and the middle school 24 for a total of 54 first tier buses. Twenty-eight District-owned buses were used and twenty-six contracted buses were added. The total additional cost for the contracted buses was \$489,424. Because each contracted bus was paid for as an individual route and not as part of a package the per bus costs on a daily basis were higher than the per route cost for the District owned. Table 5 shows the daily costs per route between the District-owned vehicles and those contracted (all public schools are shown in this table).

Table 5: District-owned Route Costs Compared to Contracted Buses

Tier 1				
School	District-Owned	Dist Cost	Contracted	Cont Cost
LHS	13	\$92.07	17	\$102.65
LMS	15	\$92.07	9	\$106.56
Tier 2				
School	District-Owned	Dist Cost	Contracted	Cont Cost
Clarke	2	\$92.07	5	\$103.80
Oak	15	\$92.07	7	\$155.43
Clifton	10	\$92.07	5	\$117.20
Tier 3				
School	District-Owned	Dist Cost	Contracted	Cont Cost
Spruce	10	\$92.07	4	\$212.50
Piner	17	\$92.07	6	\$193.33
LECC			1	\$205.00

The first column in this table is the school, the second column indicates the number of routes needed as done by District-owned vehicles. The third column is the estimated daily cost of operating the bus. Table 9 in the Appendix shows the calculations and data used in this study determine daily costs for operating a 54 passenger vehicle. The average cost for operating a district owned 54 passenger bus was, in 2017-18, \$276.22. Because each District-owned vehicle is used three times in the morning and three in the afternoon the operational cost is divided by three. This cost does not include extended year or field trips. By utilizing in-house buses more savings can be realized by the District.

The next column shows the number of contracted vehicles used for public school regular education transportation. The last column is the cost per bus. The distinction between the District cost column and the contractor cost column must clearly be understood in terms of making a decision between remaining a majority (for public schools) District-owned operation or deciding to fully contract buses for the public schools. The difference is that the District costs are on a per route basis. So, with each public school bus doing three routes in the am and pm the

¹⁹ The District may want to consider hold back no more than three buses for spares and having 33 of the buses used for daily pick-ups and drop-offs.

cost for the bus is distributed over the three routes. With the average cost per route being \$ 276.22 the per route cost is \$ 92.07. The contractor cost is per bus, that is, a bus only doing one route. Given that we can estimate that a three route package, based upon the average daily bus cost would range between \$399.78 and \$436 per bus.

Table 5 also suggests that the District could save \$ 489,424 by moving from a three tier to a four tier system. The high school, in the first tier would need 30 buses (which is six under the available vehicles), the second tier for the middle school would use 24 buses. In the third tier it would be possible to eliminate the 5 contracted Clarke buses so that there would be 32 District-owned vehicles on the road (and that would be the peak tier, using 32 out of 36 buses). In the fourth tier the 4 Spruce contracts could be District operated thus using 31 District owned buses.

The bell times could be: HS: 6:45; MS: 7:30; Tier 3 Schools: 8:15 and Tier 4 schools at 9:00. It was determined as of August, 2018 that all buses could be required to be at the schools no later than 15 minutes prior to the bell times to allow for the breakfast program.

There are also other non-special education routes which are the responsibility of the public schools. Table 6 lists the school, vendor, daily route costs, days of service and annual cost.

Table 6: Ocean Charter Academy

Ocean Charter				
School	Vendor	Days	Daily Cost	Annual Cost
Ocean Charter	Seman Tov	92	\$350.00	\$32,200.00
Ocean Charter	Seman Tov	92	\$350.00	\$32,200.00
Ocean Charter	Seman Tov	110	\$350.00	\$38,500.00
Ocean Charter	Jays	180	\$175.00	\$31,500.00
Ocean Charter	Jays	180	\$175.00	\$31,500.00
Ocean Charter	Jays	110	\$245.00	\$26,950.00
Ocean Charter	Jays	110	\$245.00	\$26,950.00
Ocean Charter	Klarr	180	\$372.00	\$66,960.00
Ocean Charter	Klarr	180	\$186.00	\$33,480.00
Ocean Charter	Klarr	180	\$372.00	\$66,960.00
Ocean Charter	Klarr	110	\$380.00	\$41,800.00
Total			\$290.91	\$429,000.00

Table 6 shows the total number of routes and the route costs for transporting Lakewood Students to the Ocean Charter Academy (which is located in Lakewood). The total cost in 2017-18 was \$ 429,000 with an average daily rate of \$ 290.91 and a median daily rate of \$ 350. This was for a total of 194 students transported (an average cost of over \$ 2,200 per student. It is important to note that this situation was caused by the failure of the consultant who routed the District for 2017-18 to route this school just before opening. My concern here is that this type of error needs to be avoided in the future. The District must limit the number of routes to this in-District Charter School. I am also concerned at the prices charged to the District by the contractors. Although it was late, it still seems these charges were extremely high. There are

several other non-special education contracts for public school facilities. Some of these contracts are short term (30 days) and are used for different types of situation such as supplementing over crowded routes or for driver shortages. The cost of transporting students to Ocean Academy appears to be extremely excessive. This must be reviewed by the transportation department.

In reviewing the contracts it is my opinion that the issuance of contracts, the reason for the contracts, the data backing up the need for the contracts (especially in terms of routing efficiency and capacity needs) requires more scrutiny. Table 6 is an example of what might not be the most efficient use of contracting services. The number of contracts issued during the school year combined with renewals and emergency needs have created a jumble of paper which in many ways is hard to reconcile with supporting data. Just as with the vouchers for overtime which provide limited information regarding the reason for the overtime, many of the contracts or at least the backup for the contracts have little or any detail.

One of the issues, which at this point may have been rectified, was that renewals went out in June prior to any 2018-19 routes. This is poor practice and if it has not been corrected it must change in the future.

Although the focus of this study was not focused on special needs transportation, which could be the subject of a separate study, it is important to note differences between contracted and District-owned route costs.

The Lakewood School District has a total of 24 smaller vehicles that are used primarily for special needs transportation. Table 10 in Appendix A shows the total costs for the operation of these vehicles. These vehicles primarily transport students to in-District special needs programs. The average daily cost per District-operated special needs vehicles is \$ 464.29 per day.²⁰ Most of these vehicles cover 3 am and 3 pm routes. The cost per route is approximately \$ 154.83 per route. The average bus price for a single route from the contractors is \$ 254.20 with a median price of \$ 238. Again it is important to note that we are comparing District owned costs per route (in each tier) as opposed to a single bus doing one route. The difference on a per route basis is \$99.44 per day.

In our opinion, and based upon the data as presented to us by the District, along with the fact that the District bids single routes for its public school buses from contractors, the numbers appear to show that the District-owned operation, while not perfect, is less costly than contracted services. The prime motivation for this study was to determine if the District would save money by fully contracting the public school transportation as opposed to owning and operating its own buses. ***My recommendation is that the District continues to operate its own vehicles. There are improvements to be made which will be outlined in the conclusion section of this study.***

Athletic, Field Trip and Late Runs

Late runs are done by District buses and personnel. Field trips during the day are primarily done by in-District buses and personnel (one of the drivers of overtime). Because athletic runs in the fall and spring often conflict with pm routes the majority of these are contracted. At this point we have no recommendations for changes in these runs unless at some point District-owned buses do become available for athletic runs.

²⁰ This does include the salaries of aides on special education vehicles.

Contract Times

The District has drivers bidding for packages (package defined as a grouping of routes). There are 6, 6.5, 7, 7.5 and 8 hour packages. Drivers are paid overtime at their hourly rate for overtime (time over contracted hours) and time and a half for work past 8 hours. Also, drivers have been given an additional hour for pre and post checks. The District has proposed that each driver have an additional 45 minutes added to their package. This would cover a 15 minute pre and post check in the morning and a post check in the afternoon. This would also include any trips required to fuel vehicles (the District is limiting the number of fill ups to two days per week. There may be some vehicles which would require more than two days for fueling, depending on the size of the fuel tank. Fueling of vehicles does require additional driver time and it puts more buses on the road, especially in the late afternoon. The District should do an analysis of possible cost savings by exploring two areas:

1. Installing tanks and fuel pumps on premises (which may have some environmental implications).
2. Contracting for onsite fueling (there are companies which send tanker trucks onsite to fuel vehicles, both diesel and gasoline).

\ The District currently fuels from the Township and is charged Township prices plus a small administrative charge. The District might benefit by exploring the two alternatives listed above.

Overtime

- The total overtime paid to drivers in 2017-18 was \$ 129,959.47. As with the office staff the vouchers were not clear as to the purpose of the overtime. In general (but not specifically stated) the overtime primarily came for field trips (late runs are covered by driver hours and athletic runs are contracted). As with the office the recommendation is that there is a set overtime budget, all requests for overtime should receive prior approval and vouchers submitted should contain detail. Time and a half should only be paid for services rendered past 8 hours. A driver should only be paid at his/her hourly rate .

Routing and Efficiency

The District utilizes Versatrans Software for its routing and transportation management. Versatrans is one of the major providers of this type of software and is used by many New Jersey School Districts. It is an excellent product and a great tool for route planning, determining student ridership (based upon mileage), providing distance and load characteristics for each route, generating student lists and providing data for the DRTRS (District Report of Transported Resident Students) which is required by the State. But, just like any other computerized system the results are only as good as the foundation data put into the system. Further, over time the map of a community changes as do other traffic conditions and unless the software is set up properly initially and then updated and maintained the results generated by the software become less dependable. It is also essential that staff be fully trained in the use of this software in order to understand both its strengths and weaknesses.

One of the first steps in analyzing the District's public school routes was to obtain copies of all of the public school routes generated by the Versatrans System. These were printed out and organized by routes. Each of these route sheets contained the total number of stops, the total number of students assigned to each stop (and the route total); the time at each stop; the total route time and the total route distance. Student eligibility for transportation, both for non-mandated students residing more than one-half mile from the school and mandated students (all students residing more than one-half mile from the school) .

The first step in reviewing the routes was to test the accuracy of both the time and distances being generated by the Versatrans Program. This was a multi-step process. The first step was to give each District driver a form in which they filled in for each of the AM and PM routes they drove; the start time of the route; , the end time of the route; the start mileage of each route and the end mileage of each route. In addition the drivers were to indicate head count for each route (the actual number of riders on the bus). This was done for a period of two days at the beginning of May, 2018.

Once these were completed by the drivers they were reviewed and compared to the routes generated by the Versatrans System. We found a number of discrepancies between the data on the Versatrans sheets in terms of time and distance, as well as differences in the numbers of students on each route. In order to verify the distances we checked mileages by actually driving selected streets and measuring distances between stops. We also found that several of the locations of the schools were not precise. As a secondary check we also reviewed the mileages against a known accurate street map. We also learned that the LSTA had recently upgraded their Versatrans Map. In reviewing that map we found it to be far more accurate than the one being used by the District. We also learned that the District had obtained the new map, but had not yet updated to that map. This also meant that all of the routes which were implemented for the 2017-18 school year as well as the assignments of student eligibility by the system had varying degrees of errors.

Further, we also found that over the course of the school year there appeared to be no correction to the map and any streets which had been added in were not properly scaled (all functions which can be adjusted either in-District or by Versatrans).²¹ Finally, we also found that the Transportation Supervisor had limited knowledge of the basics of the Versatrans System and in our opinion could not use its functionality to its fullest.

Capacity Versus Ridership

Table 7: Summary of Ridership and Capacity

School	September					May				
	Total	Average	Routes	Capacity	% Cap	Total	Averag	Routes	Capacity	% Capacity
High School	426	39	13	702	60.68%	370	25	15	810	45.68%
Middle School	704	44	15	810	86.91%	487	37	13	702	69.37%
Clarke	57	29	2	108	52.78%	56	28	2	108	51.85%
Oak	499	32	15	810	61.60%	420	27	14	756	55.56%
Clifton	234	27	10	540	43.33%	308	22	10	540	57.04%
Spruce	324	31	10	540	60.00%	300	26	10	540	55.56%
Piner	230	22	17	918	25.05%	343	23	15	810	42.35%

²¹ Please note that in our opinion Versatrans is one of the best products on the market for routing students, but like any other program the system produces results only as good as the data that is put into it.

Table 7 is a summary of ridership and capacity for District-owned 54 passenger buses. The left side of the table (September) shows the average assigned load per route as per the Versatrans System²². The right side of the table (May) shows the ridership as per the driver sheets in May. Clearly what this table is showing that from a capacity point of view there was more than enough space available to transport all eligible students. This number, of course, does not include the balance of the public school students who were assigned to contracted buses.

There appear to be a number of reasons why these percentages are low:

1. Too many house stops. In general there were too many house stops for all routes. This was further exacerbated by a belief by the District that all pre-K students are required to have house stops. Absent a policy by the District this is simply not true. House stops are only required for special needs students who have that requirement written into their IEP.
2. A failure to analyze stops from year to year thus accumulating an inventory of unneeded stops and or too many stops which forces the Versatrans System to assign students to the closest but not the optimal stop.
3. Poor route planning and implementation. The system, based upon parameters set by the user will create routes, but they must be analyzed and adjusted. For example, if there are a number of stops with low student counts these should be consolidated. Reasonable minimum student walk distances to stops should be evaluated and implemented.
4. Unused stops should be purged from the system each year.

It appears that during the course of the school year the solution to routing issues was to contract more buses when the solutions, in many cases, could be creative combinations of locations of stops.. For, at the very least, the District owned large buses had more than enough capacity to accommodate changes.

Route Times and Student Loads

Table 8: Driver Time/Load²³

Public School 54 Passenger Buses				
Average Time	Average	Average %	High Count	Low Count
Time	Load	Load		
1:28	28	55%	48	9

The first column in Table 8 shows the actual average driving time per three hour package. The average time is one hour and twenty-eight minutes. If an additional 15 minutes were added

²² Data taken from route sheets provided by the Transportation Department.

²³ Table based upon driver summary sheets as of early May, 2018

to this average time the total road time would be one hour and forty-three minutes. Adding another 10 minutes for deadhead time (the time the last student is dropped off on a route to getting to the first student to be picked up on the next route--i.e.-empty bus) the total average time would be increased to one hour and 53 minutes. The drivers have a total of 3 hours (on a 6 hour package) to complete their missions (or a total of 180 minutes). The total average number of minutes is 113 minutes. That leaves an average of 37 minutes that a percentage of the drivers are not doing over the road operations. Granted that there are a number of three hour packages that are greater than the one hour and 53 minute average, it appears that some routes could be longer than they are or at least consolidating some routes for more efficient operations.

The next column shows that average load on a 54 passenger bus is 28 with an average percentage load of 55%. That also indicates that there should be a degree of route consolidation, especially when the last column is considered (a low head count of 9). In fact based upon the driver reports there were 16 routes with 20 or less students.

Miscellaneous

At a meeting late in June it was revealed that an additional (and unbudgeted) \$ 200,000 worth of contracts were awarded to cover routes due to a shortage of substitute drivers. To the best of our knowledge (and based upon what we heard at that meeting) there was no approval for this expenditure (for which there was no explanation) and no Board action approving this expenditure. To make matters worse it appears that no one in the administration was aware of the critical situation regarding the lack of substitute drivers. This is clearly an example of mismanagement in the Department as well as the lack of consistency in leadership year to year. There does not seem to be any meaningful communication between the transportation department, business office and central administration.

It is essential that an experienced transportation coordinator/manager be hired and clear lines of communication and procedures be firmly established.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Lakewood is unique in the State of New Jersey and probably in the entire country. Public school districts are required to provide transportation, textbooks and special education services to non-public school students residing in that District. When these laws were created a District like Lakewood could not be envisioned (36,000 non public school students and 6,000 public school students). As the non-public school enrollment has grown so has the transportation program. During the morning and afternoon arrival and departure times literally hundreds of buses transporting approximately 38,000 students are on the road. In order to try to ameliorate this, in part, the scheduling and routing of non-public school students was given to the Lakewood Student Transportation Authority, a semi-autonomous entity created by the New Jersey State Legislature. While funded through the Lakewood budget it does have complete autonomy in terms of awarding contracts, routing students and managing the non-public school system.

As a result of the LSTA the public school system now transports approximately 5,800 students on both District-owned and contracted routes. This study whose purpose was to recommend whether the District should continue to be majority District operated or go to a fully contracted system

did find a number of issues and concerns. Based upon those finding we are making the following recommendations

1. The District should continue to operate its own vehicles and continue to reduce the number of contracted routes to the public schools. Based upon our findings we believe that on both daily and annualized costs District-owned buses are more financially beneficial to the District. Of course knowing the operating cost of a District owned vehicle bids could be sent out mid-year and decisions made on the results of the bid packages.
2. If the District does go out to bid all bids must be made by packages and multi-year contracts must be offered (if the District expects a good response to bids).
3. Move to a four tier system--this can potentially save almost 1/2 million dollars per year.
4. Significantly reduce cost to Ocean Charter: Spending almost 1/2 million dollars to transport 122 non-special education students in-District is virtually inconceivable. This may have been a onetime error but because it was such a large budgetary hit we must point it out and provide suggestions for the future.
 - a. Shuttle from central pick up points--and have very limited stops.
 - b. Compare annualized cost for purchasing 4 buses to handle Ocean Academy (buses which could have alternative uses)
5. Schedule off set hours in transportation office to maintain coverage but reduce overtime.
6. Have B6T's checked by LSTA and have LSTA pay for staff for this task.
7. Consider either installing fueling stations at District or contracting with a company for on-site fueling.
8. Re-organizing elementary schools into neighborhood k-5, pk-5, or LECC and pk-5 schools. This might take a new demographic, redistricting and facility study. But this does have the potential (based upon analysis) to reduce the number of routes, shorten routes, and reduce traffic in Lakewood.
9. Continue to try to work with the Township to develop a reasonable list of hazardous streets and then adopt them into Board Policy.
10. Make sure distances for eligibility are accurate.
11. Continued consolidation of stops and elimination of non-essential house stops.
12. Having walk out stops along main arteries, where determined safe, and having buses avoid turning into smaller streets (mainly for secondary students).
13. Increase HS bus capacity to 60 for high schools students.
14. If LSTA is extended hire a transportation coordinator for District:
 - a. At least five years' experience in a District of more than 5000 transported.
 - b. Experience with top level computerized software--**preferably experience with Versatrans**, but other nationally recognized programs may be acceptable in terms of knowledge of how these systems operate.
 - c. Make transportation coordinator an administrative position and offer a multiyear contract--after two supervisors left for two years in a row attracting high level personnel may be difficult.

15. Review each person's job description in the office and create an evaluation tool in order to assess an individual's performance (and to provide an opportunity to credit individual for performance above and beyond). ***All administrators and teachers are evaluated based upon performance criteria, the same must apply to transportation staff.***
16. Clear lines of communication between the transportation department and the administration be established and implemented.

Savings Analysis

1. Go to a four tier system. This will save nearly \$ 500,000. in contracted services.
2. By reducing the number of stops and routes through more efficient routing and stop locations and using accurate mapping data cost savings will be realized. For every large route saved, based upon our cost analysis, the District saves approximately \$ 92. per day. That times 181 equals an annual saving per route of \$ 16,652 per route.
3. Although what happened at Ocean Charter Academy may have been a one off situation this must be avoided in the future. We estimate that by cutting back on the routes to Ocean Charter the District (even going to five routes @ \$ per route) the District would spend an annualized cost of \$ 83,260. Deducted from the \$ 427,000 spent last year that is a possible savings of \$ 343,740.
4. By offsetting transportation office schedules the District can save as much as \$ 110,393.
5. Cutting back on overtime for drivers by creating contracts which reflect the actual hourly needs could save as much as \$ 129,959.

Summary of Potential Savings:

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 1. Four tier system | \$ 500,000 (aprox) |
| 2. Five routes to Ocean County (by District)..... | \$ 343,740. (aprox) |
| 3. Cut office overtime..... | \$ 110,393.* |
| 4. Cut driver overtime..... | \$ 129,959.* |

This is a total of \$ 1,083,822. In addition, for every route eliminated an additional \$ 16,652 may be saved.

*not all overtime can be completed eliminated

Afterword

This study was done during the late spring and summer of 2018. During that time the transportation department has undergone significant changes. The coordinator was terminated at the end of June. The head of the LSTA was temporarily assigned to complete the routing for the 2018-19 school year. It appears that a number of changes have either taken place and/or will shortly take place in terms of the contracts with the drivers. In fact, we believe at the time of this writing, the teamsters union is about to negotiate for the drivers.

8/31/2018

In many ways we believe that the awareness of the need for change in the District was motivated by the fact that this study was being done. Moreover, during the course of the summer at least three progress reports were provided, and although not conclusive, they did provide some direction for the administration in calling for some of these changes.

It is our recommendation that a follow up study be done in October or November in order to assess the impact of the changes made over the course of this summer and on the basis of this study.

Appendix: Supplemental Tables

Table 9: Operational Costs for 54 Passenger Buses

Operational Costs of District Owned Vehicles--54 Passenger																	
Bus Number	Capacity	Year Purchased	Driver	Contract Hours	Salary and Benefits	Salary Less Overtime	Insurance (Allocated)	Maintenance, tires and fuel (Allocated)	Maintenance (In-District allocated)	Estimated Depreciation Cost (15 year)	Total Cost	Daily Cost (Total x 181 days)	Base Salary	Overtime	Six Hour Allocation	Hourly rate for 6 Hours	Add one hour at hourly rate
1504	54	2015	Susan Kemerle-Guiro	8	\$37,879.75	\$34,834.71	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$44,606.34	\$246.44	\$28,700.87	\$3,045.04	\$184.83	\$30.81	\$215.64
1505	54	2015	Jabeen Naghat	6.5	\$25,868.31	\$25,806.81	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$35,578.44	\$196.57	\$21,401.88	\$61.50	\$181.45	\$27.91	\$209.36
1506	54	2017	Amy Font	6	\$21,921.29	\$21,900.79	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$31,672.42	\$174.99	\$21,921.29	\$20.50	\$174.99	\$29.16	\$204.15
1507	54	2017	Ellen Reed	6	\$37,589.89	\$36,190.84	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$45,962.47	\$253.94	\$37,589.89	\$1,399.05	\$253.94	\$42.32	\$296.26
1508	54	2017	Julio Rivera	6	\$58,967.55	\$51,966.02	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$61,737.65	\$341.09	\$58,967.55	\$7,001.53	\$341.09	\$56.85	\$397.94
1509	54	207	Morris Wilder	6	\$24,147.85	\$21,142.02	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$30,913.65	\$170.79	\$24,147.85	\$3,005.83	\$170.79	\$28.47	\$199.26
1510	54	2017	Eugene Kens	7	\$51,898.18	\$47,460.12	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$57,231.75	\$316.20	\$51,898.18	\$4,438.06	\$271.03	\$38.72	\$309.74
1512	54	2017	Mary Brown	6	\$41,339.22	\$41,267.47	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$51,039.10	\$281.98	\$41,339.22	\$71.75	\$281.98	\$47.00	\$328.98
1513	54	2017	Sarah Grimes	7	\$61,537.40	\$57,067.88	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$66,839.51	\$369.28	\$61,537.40	\$4,469.52	\$316.52	\$45.22	\$361.74
1514	54	2017	Yves George	11	\$61,482.40	\$61,359.40	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$71,131.03	\$392.99	\$61,482.40	\$123.00	\$214.36	\$35.73	\$250.08
1514	54	2017	Jamil Mohammed		\$16,531.44												
1515	54	2017	Joseph Keating	8	\$70,047.85	\$61,327.81	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$71,099.44	\$392.81	\$70,047.85	\$8,720.04	\$294.61	\$36.83	\$331.44
1516	54	2017	Ted Throckmorton	6	\$29,328.38	\$27,011.37	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$36,783.00	\$203.22	\$29,328.38	\$2,317.01	\$203.22	\$33.87	\$237.09
1517	54	2017	Laura Lisi	7	\$28,841.40	\$27,230.74	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$37,002.37	\$204.43	\$28,841.40	\$1,610.66	\$175.23	\$25.03	\$200.26
1518	54	2017	Rosmond Griffin	6.5	\$45,617.21	\$45,366.08	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$55,137.71	\$304.63	\$45,617.21	\$251.13	\$281.20	\$43.26	\$324.46
1519	54	2017	Madeline Fortino	7.5	\$51,881.76	\$44,541.89	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$54,313.52	\$300.07	\$51,881.76	\$7,339.87	\$240.06	\$32.01	\$272.07
1520	54	2017	Christine Sanchez	7	\$27,251.10	\$26,764.85	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$36,536.48	\$201.86	\$27,251.10	\$486.25	\$173.02	\$24.72	\$197.74
1521	54	2017	Kimberley Yurocko	7	\$44,304.51	\$41,962.01	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$51,733.64	\$285.82	\$44,304.51	\$2,342.50	\$244.99	\$35.00	\$279.99
1522	54	2017	Anthony Gonella	6.5	\$26,710.12	\$25,782.48	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$35,554.11	\$196.43	\$26,710.12	\$927.64	\$181.32	\$27.90	\$209.22
1523	54	2017	Brian Gibson	7	\$45,189.05	\$44,838.05	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$54,609.68	\$301.71	\$45,189.05	\$351.00	\$258.61	\$36.94	\$295.55
1524	54	2017	John Birgel	6	\$43,462.79	\$38,258.31	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$48,029.94	\$265.36	\$43,462.79	\$5,204.48	\$265.36	\$44.23	\$309.59
1525	54	2017	Sal Danio	8	\$48,809.97	\$47,323.72	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$57,095.35	\$315.44	\$48,809.97	\$1,486.25	\$236.58	\$29.57	\$266.16
1526	54	2017	Diane Smit	6	\$36,265.79	\$36,040.29	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$45,811.92	\$253.10	\$36,265.79	\$225.50	\$253.10	\$42.18	\$295.29
1527	54	2017	Alba Ortiz	7	\$50,621.33	\$47,646.30	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$57,417.93	\$317.23	\$50,621.33	\$2,975.03	\$271.91	\$38.84	\$310.75
1528	54	2018	James Credle	8	\$46,773.08	\$45,206.49	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$54,978.12	\$303.75	\$46,773.08	\$1,566.59	\$227.81	\$28.48	\$256.29
1529	54	2018	Barry Moyer	7	\$56,725.96	\$56,725.96	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$66,497.59	\$367.39	\$56,725.96		\$314.91	\$44.99	\$359.89
1530	54	2018	Pat Crockam	6.5	\$50,767.54	\$45,687.43	\$566.00	\$2,103.21	\$1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$55,459.06	\$306.40	\$50,767.54	\$5,080.11	\$282.83	\$43.51	\$326.35
1531	54	2018	Mark Gardner	7	\$44,578.32	\$41,268.34	\$566.00	2,103.21	1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$51,039.97	\$281.99	\$44,578.32	\$3,309.98	\$241.70	\$34.53	\$276.23
1532	54	2018	Pablo Luian	6.5	\$45,368.94	\$45,368.94	\$566.00	2,103.21	1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$55,140.57	\$304.64	\$45,368.94		\$281.21	\$43.26	\$324.47
1533	54	2018	Richard Hurley	6	\$18,616.91	\$18,365.78	\$566.00	2,103.21	1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$28,137.41	\$155.46	\$18,616.91	\$251.13	\$155.46	\$25.91	\$181.36
1534	54	2018	Many Beltran	8	\$48,236.77	\$47,205.00	\$566.00	2,103.21	1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$56,976.63	\$314.79	\$48,236.77	\$1,031.77	\$236.09	\$29.51	\$265.60
1535	54	2018	Rufina Santos	8	\$52,227.19	\$48,117.56	\$566.00	2,103.21	1,252.42	\$5,850.00	\$57,889.19	\$319.83	\$52,227.19	\$4,109.63	\$239.87	\$29.98	\$269.86
31 54 Passenger Vehicles For Routes					\$1,350,789.25	\$1,261,035.46	\$17,546.00	\$65,199.51	\$38,825.02	\$181,350.00	\$1,563,955.99	\$8,640.64	\$1,320,612.50	\$73,222.35		Average	\$276.22

Table 11a: 54 Passenger Bus Route Detail (page 1)

BUS #	RTE	AM Start Time	AM End Time	PM Start Time	PM End Time	AMRun Length	PMRun Length	School Name	Assn Ld	Bus Cap	Hdcnt	% Load
LBOE 1504	H 27	6:28 AM	6:38 AM	1:35:00 PM	1:46:00 PM	0:10	0:11	LAKESWOOD HS		54	13	54.17%
LBOE 1504	OAK 18	7:10 AM	7:34 AM	2:15:00 PM	2:35:00 PM	0:24	0:20	OAK ES		54	42	79.25%
LBOE 1504	S 6	7:50 AM	8:21 AM	3:06:00 PM	3:43:00 PM	0:31	0:37	SPRUCE ES		54	37	68.52%
LBOE 1505	H 23	6:20 AM	7:00 AM	1:37:00 PM	2:17:00 PM	0:40	0:40	LAKESWOOD HS		54	35	145.83%
LBOE 1505	OAK 15	7:25 AM	7:39 AM	2:24:00 PM	2:37:00 PM	0:14	0:13	OAK ES		54	34	62.96%
LBOE 1505	PES 15	7:59 AM	8:15 AM	3:02:00 PM	3:25:00 PM	0:16	0:23	PINERS		54	30	55.56%
LBOE 1506	H 24	6:10 AM	6:40 AM	1:15:00 PM	1:56:00 PM	0:30	0:41	LAKESWOOD HS		54	27	50.00%
LBOE 1506	OAK 2	7:14 AM	7:39 AM	2:15:00 PM	2:39:00 PM	0:25	0:24	OAK ES		54	34	62.96%
LBOE 1506	PRS 5	7:46 AM	8:35 AM	2:45:00 PM	3:29:00 PM	0:49	0:44	PINERS		54	12	22.22%
LBOE 1507	H 20	6:11 AM	6:46 AM	1:35:00 PM	2:02:00 PM	0:35	0:27	LAKESWOOD HS		54	26	48.15%
LBOE 1507	OAK 13	7:06 AM	7:38 AM	2:16:00 PM	2:43:00 PM	0:32	0:27	OAK ES		54	29	53.70%
LBOE 1507	S 7	7:48 AM	8:20 AM	3:05:00 PM	3:31:00 PM	0:32	0:26	SPRUCE ES		54	17	31.48%
LBOE 1508	H 21	6:15 AM	6:36 AM	1:00:00 PM	1:30:00 PM	0:21	0:30	LAKESWOOD HS		54	19	35.19%
LBOE 1508	OAK 3	7:00 AM	7:45 AM	2:00:00 PM	3:00:00 PM	0:45	1:00	OAK ES		54	34	62.96%
LBOE 1509	H 19	6:21 AM	6:41 AM	1:28:00 PM	1:55:00 PM	0:20	0:27	LAKESWOOD HS		54	29	53.70%
LBOE 1509	OAK 14	7:08 AM	7:35 AM	2:10:00 PM	2:40:00 PM	0:27	0:30	OAK ES		54	37	154.17%
LBOE 1509	PRS 1	7:45 AM	8:40 AM	3:00:00 PM	3:45:00 PM	0:55	0:45	PINERS		54	17	31.48%
LBOE 1510	H 26	6:10 AM	6:43 AM	1:20:00 PM	1:50:00 PM	0:33	0:30	LAKESWOOD HS		54	24	44.44%
LBOE 1510	OAK 10	7:16 AM	8:30 AM	2:15:00 PM	2:51:00 PM	1:14	0:36	OAK ES		54	22	40.74%
LBOE 1510	PES 13	7:46 AM	8:40 AM	3:00:00 PM	4:00:00 PM	0:54	1:00	PINERS		54	30	55.56%
LBOE 1512	LMS 4	6:00 AM	6:45 AM	1:00:00 PM	2:06:00 PM	0:45	1:06	LAKESWOOD MS		54	36	66.67%
LBOE 1512	OAK 8	7:00 AM	7:40 AM	2:20:00 PM	2:45:00 PM	0:40	0:25	OAK ES		54	6	11.11%
LBOE 1512	S 10	8:04 AM	8:16 AM	3:15:00 PM	3:45:00 PM	0:12	0:30	SPRUCE ES		54	22	40.74%
LBOE 1513	LMS 5	6:08 AM	6:41 AM	1:30:00 PM	2:00:00 PM	0:33	0:30	LAKESWOOD MS		54	35	64.81%
LBOE 1513	C 2	7:05 AM	7:40 AM	2:25:00 PM	3:07:00 PM	0:35	0:42	CLARKE ES		54	31	57.41%
LBOE 1513	PES 18	8:12 AM	8:25 AM	3:10:00 PM	3:35:00 PM	0:13	0:25	PINERS		54	16	29.63%
LBOE 1515	LMS 8	6:15 AM	6:45 AM	1:15:00 PM	1:55:00 PM	0:30	0:40	LAKESWOOD MS		54	27	50.00%
LBOE 1515	OAK 1	7:15 AM	7:47 AM	2:15:00 PM	2:50:00 PM	0:32	0:35	OAK ES		54	31	57.41%
LBOE 1515	PES 5	7:50 AM	8:40 AM	2:50:00 PM	3:45:00 PM	0:50	0:55	PINERS		54	20	37.04%
LBOE 1516	H 17	6:15 AM	6:47 AM	1:15:00 PM	2:00:00 PM	0:32	0:45	LAKESWOOD HS		54	32	59.26%
LBOE 1516	B 7	7:20 AM	7:45 AM	2:15:00 PM	2:45:00 PM	0:25	0:30	CLIFTON ES		54	23	42.59%
LBOE 1516	PES 6	8:05 AM	8:43 AM	3:00:00 PM	3:45:00 PM	0:38	0:45	PINERS		54	23	42.59%
LBOE 1517	H 6	6:24 AM	6:46 AM	1:20:00 PM	1:55:00 PM	0:22	0:35	LAKESWOOD HS		54	14	25.93%
LBOE 1517	C 1	7:10 AM	7:50 AM	2:23:00 PM	3:10:00 PM	0:40	0:47	CLARKE ES		54	23	42.59%
LBOE 1517	S 2	7:50 AM	8:50 AM	3:35:00 PM	4:25:00 PM	1:00	0:50	SPRUCE ES		54	29	53.70%
LBOE 1518	LMS 25	6:16 AM	6:53 AM	1:34:00 PM	2:02:00 PM	0:37	0:28	LAKESWOOD MS		54	29	53.70%
LBOE 1518	B 11	7:20 AM	7:41 AM	2:24:00 PM	2:36:00 PM	0:21	0:12	CLIFTON ES		54	32	59.26%
LBOE 1518	S 3	7:47 AM	8:25 AM	3:05:00 PM	3:54:00 PM	0:38	0:49	SPRUCE ES		54	37	68.52%

Table 11b: 54 Passenger Bus Route Detail (page2)

BUS #	RTE	AM Start Time	AM End Time	PM Start Time	PM End Time	AMRun Length	PMRun Length	School Name	Days	Capacity	% Load
LBOE 1519	H 10	6:00 AM	6:43 AM	1:30 PM	2:02 PM	0:43	0:32	LAKEWOOD HS	54	22	40.74%
LBOE 1519	PRS 2	7:25 AM	7:58 AM	2:45 PM	3:23 PM	0:33	0:38	PINERS	54	25	46.30%
LBOE 1519	TVA	7:10 AM	7:35 AM	9:30 AM	10:25 AM	0:25	0:55	TVA	54	14	25.93%
LBOE 1520	LMS 24	6:02 AM	6:45 AM	1:10 PM	2:22 PM	0:43	1:12	LAKEWOOD MS	54	42	77.78%
LBOE 1520	OAK 7	7:35 AM	7:39 AM	2:22 PM	2:51 PM	0:04	0:29	OAK ES	54	30	55.56%
LBOE 1520	PES 14	7:47 AM	8:39 AM	2:51 PM	3:52 PM	0:52	1:01	PINERS	54	9	16.67%
LBOE 1521	SJ1	6:25 AM	7:15 AM	2:30 PM	3:30 PM	0:50	1:00	ST JOE/DONOV	54	14	25.93%
LBOE 1522	H 18	6:10 AM	6:50 AM	1:40 PM	2:05 PM	0:40	0:25	LAKEWOOD HS	54	42	77.78%
LBOE 1522	B 10	7:30 AM	7:50 AM	2:30 PM	2:50 PM	0:20	0:20	CLIFTON ES	54	35	64.81%
LBOE 1522	S 11	8:01 AM	8:30 AM	3:00 PM	3:40 PM	0:29	0:40	SPRUCE ES	54	30	55.56%
LBOE 1523	H 14	6:22 AM	6:56 AM	1:22 PM	2:11 PM	0:34	0:49	LAKEWOOD HS	54	21	38.89%
LBOE 1523	OAK 19	7:17 AM	7:51 AM	2:20 PM	2:55 PM	0:34	0:35	OAK ES	54	19	35.19%
LBOE 1523	PRS 4	7:56 AM	8:53 AM	3:07 PM	3:49 PM	0:57	0:42	PINERS	54	14	25.93%
LBOE 1524	LMS 20	6:27 AM	6:45 AM	1:10 PM	1:40 PM	0:18	0:30	LAKEWOOD MS	54	48	88.89%
LBOE 1524	OAK 12	7:27 AM	7:45 AM	2:10 PM	2:30 PM	0:18	0:20	OAK ES	54	23	42.59%
LBOE 1524	PES 16	8:12 AM	8:30 AM	3:15 PM	3:35 PM	0:18	0:20	PINERS	54	32	59.26%
LBOE 1525	LMS 3	6:00 AM	6:40 AM	1:30 AM	1:56 AM	0:40	0:26	LAKEWOOD MS	54	48	88.89%
LBOE 1525	B 12	7:10 AM	7:45 AM	2:20 PM	3:00 PM	0:35	0:40	CLIFTON ES	54	23	42.59%
LBOE 1525	PES 9	7:56 AM	8:30 AM	3:15 PM	3:40 PM	0:34	0:25	PINERS	54	32	59.26%
LBOE 1526	LMS 18	6:20 AM	6:45 AM	1:30 PM	2:03 PM	0:25	0:33	LAKEWOOD MS	54	30	55.56%
LBOE 1526	OAK 17	7:25 AM	7:44 AM	2:10 PM	2:46 PM	0:19	0:36	OAK ES	54	42	77.78%
LBOE 1526	PES 7	8:18 AM	8:35 AM	3:06 PM	3:26 PM	0:17	0:20	PINERS	54	16	29.63%
LBOE 1527	LMS 26	6:26 AM	6:45 AM	1:00 PM	2:05 PM	0:19	1:05	LAKEWOOD MS	54	48	88.89%
LBOE 1527	B 3	7:36 AM	7:45 AM	3:05 PM	3:20 PM	0:09	0:15	CLIFTON ES	54	28	51.85%
LBOE 1527	S 13	8:02 AM	8:30 AM	3:00 PM	4:05 PM	0:28	1:05	SPRUCE ES	54	24	44.44%
LBOE 1528	LMS 22	6:20 AM	6:49 AM	1:20 PM	1:55 PM	0:29	0:35	LAKEWOOD MS	54	44	81.48%
LBOE 1528	B 1	7:06 AM	7:34 AM	2:10 PM	2:58 PM	0:28	0:48	CLIFTON ES	54	32	59.26%
LBOE 1528	PES 10	7:48 AM	8:27 AM	3:10 PM	3:37 PM	0:39	0:27	PINERS	54	22	40.74%
LBOE 1529	LMS 17	6:15 AM	6:40 AM	1:05 PM	1:32 PM	0:25	0:27	LAKEWOOD MS	54	42	77.78%
LBOE 1529	OAK 16	7:10 AM	7:44 AM	2:13 PM	2:38 PM	0:34	0:25	OAK ES	54	34	62.96%
LBOE 1529	S 5	7:48 AM	8:35 AM	2:48 PM	3:13 PM	0:47	0:25	SPRUCE ES	54	32	59.26%
LBOE 1530	H 25	6:11 AM	6:48 AM	1:35 PM	2:05 PM	0:37	0:30	LAKEWOOD HS	54	26	48.15%
LBOE 1530	OAK 6	7:15 AM	7:33 AM	2:17 PM	2:48 PM	0:18	0:31	OAK ES	54	32	59.26%
LBOE 1530	S 9	7:46 AM	8:40 AM	3:00 PM	3:50 PM	0:54	0:50	SPRUCE ES	54	46	85.19%
LBOE 1531	LMS 10	5:45 AM	6:45 AM	1:15 PM	2:10 PM	1:00	0:55	LAKEWOOD MS	54	48	88.89%
LBOE 1531	B 6	6:45 AM	7:40 AM	2:10 PM	3:10 PM	0:55	1:00	CLIFTON ES	54	48	88.89%
LBOE 1531	PES 12	7:45 AM	8:35 AM	3:10 PM	3:45 PM	0:50	0:35	PINERS	54	46	85.19%
LBOE 1532	LMS 21	6:05 AM	6:40 AM	1:30 PM	2:01 PM	0:35	0:31	LAKEWOOD MS	54	27	50.00%
LBOE 1532	B 4	7:00 AM	7:40 AM	2:25 PM	3:05 PM	0:40	0:40	CLIFTON ES	54	21	38.89%
LBOE 1532	S 12	7:46 AM	8:25 AM	3:15 PM	3:41 PM	0:39	0:26	SPRUCE ES	54	22	40.74%
LBOE 1533	CRHS 1	7:15 AM	7:45 AM	2:00 PM	2:55 PM	0:30	0:55	CENTRAL REG	54	29	53.70%
LBOE 1534	LMS 23	6:12 AM	6:48 AM	1:34 PM	2:00 PM	0:36	0:26	LAKEWOOD MS	54	37	68.52%
LBOE 1534	B 16	7:20 AM	7:36 AM	2:20 PM	2:40 PM	0:16	0:20	CLIFTON ES	54	22	40.74%
LBOE 1534	PRS 3	7:50 AM	8:30 AM	2:50 PM	3:30 PM	0:40	0:40	PINERS	54	22	40.74%
LBOE 1535	LMS 19	6:15 AM	6:42 AM	1:30 PM	1:55 PM	0:27	0:25	LAKEWOOD MS	54	31	57.41%
LBOE 1535	LHS TO BVA	7:05 AM	7:20 AM	9:40 AM	10:20 AM	0:15	0:40	LHS TO BVA	54	10	18.52%
LBOE 1535	B 8	7:37 AM	7:45 AM	2:20 PM	2:40 PM	0:08	0:20	CLIFTON ES	54	39	72.22%
LBOE 1535	PES 8	8:00 AM	8:20 AM	2:55 PM	3:18 PM	0:20	0:23	PINERS	54	10	18.52%

Table 12a: Small Vehicle Route Detail

BUS #	RTE	AM Start Time	AM End Time	PM Start Time	PM End Time	AMRun Length	PMRun Length	School Name	School Type	%LOAD	Bus Cap	Hdcnt
LBOE 101	LMS 8	6:10 AM	6:45 AM	1:35 PM	2:15 PM	0:35	0:40	LAKESWOOD MS		12.50%	24	3
LBOE 101	SO 3	7:15 AM	7:40 AM	2:15 PM	2:45 PM	0:25	0:30	OAK ST		50.00%	24	12
LBOE 101	SPRS 2	7:50 AM	9:05 AM	2:00 PM	3:00 PM	1:15	1:00	PINERS	SP	62.50%	24	15
LBOE 104	WCH 2	6:15 AM	6:40 AM	1:05 PM	1:32 PM	0:25	0:27	LAKESWOOD HS	WC	16.67%	24	4
LBOE 104	SOWC1	7:10 AM	7:44 AM	2:13 PM	2:38 PM	0:34	0:25	OAK ST	SP	29.17%	24	7
LBOE 104	SPES 2	7:48 AM	8:35 AM	2:48 PM	3:14 PM	0:47	0:26	PINERS	SP	16.67%	24	4
LBOE 105	LMS 2	6:00 AM	6:45 AM	1:25 PM	2:05 PM	0:45	0:40	LAKESWOOD HS		50.00%	24	12
LBOE 105	SO 2	7:15 AM	7:50 AM	2:05 PM	2:45 PM	0:35	0:40	OAK	SP	16.67%	24	4
LBOE 105	SSS 6	7:50 AM	8:34 AM	2:45 PM	3:35 PM	0:44	0:50	SPRUCE	ES	29.17%	24	7
LBOE 106	LMS 1	6:15 AM	6:51 AM	1:30 PM	1:51 PM	0:36	0:21	LAKESWOOD MS		33.33%	24	8
LBOE 106	SC 1	7:15 AM	7:45 AM	2:20 AM	2:40 PM	0:30	12:20	CLARKE		20.83%	24	5
LBOE 106	SSS 3	7:15 AM	7:45 AM	2:20 PM	2:40 PM	0:30	0:20	SPRUCE	SP	45.83%	24	11
LBOE 107	SHS 3	6:20 AM	6:55 AM	1:20 PM	1:45 PM	0:35	0:25	LAKESWOOD HS		16.67%	24	4
LBOE 107	CES 2	7:00 AM	7:45 AM	2:10 PM	3:15 PM	0:45	1:05	CLIFTON ES		41.67%	24	10
LBOE 107	SPES 5	7:56 AM	8:34 AM	3:30 PM	4:10 PM	0:38	0:40	PINERS	SP	45.83%	24	11
LBOE 108	SHS 4	6:00 AM	6:50 AM	1:00 PM	1:40 PM	0:50	0:40	LAKESWOOD HS	SP	16.67%	24	4
LBOE 108	CESS3B	7:15 AM	7:45 AM	2:00 PM	2:55 PM	0:30	0:55	CLIFTON ES		16.67%	24	4
LBOE 108	SPES 1	7:45 AM	8:39 AM	3:05 PM	3:40 PM	0:54	0:35	PINERS		50.00%	24	12
LBOE 111	H 22	6:10 AM	6:49 AM	1:36 PM	2:08 PM	0:39	0:32	LAKESWOOD HS		58.33%	24	14
LBOE 111	SO 10	7:14 AM	7:53 AM	2:33 PM	3:05 PM	0:39	0:32	OAK	SP	62.50%	24	15
LBOE 111	SPES 6	8:15 AM	8:33 AM	3:10 PM	3:27 PM	0:18	0:17	PINERS	SP	12.50%	24	3
LBOE 112	SMS 7	6:10 AM	6:43 AM	1:30 PM	1:50 PM	0:33	0:20	LAKESWOOD MS		20.83%	24	5
LBOE 112	CES 3A	7:05 AM	7:35 AM	1:30 PM	1:50 PM	0:30	0:20	CLIFTON ES		25.00%	24	6
LBOE 112	SPRS 3	7:50 AM	8:50 AM	2:55 PM	4:00 PM	1:00	1:05	PINERS		70.83%	24	17
LBOE 114	SMS 1	6:15 AM	6:50 AM	1:15 PM	1:55 PM	0:35	0:40	LAKESWOOD MS		33.33%	24	8
LBOE 114	SO 6	7:15 AM	7:50 AM	2:15 PM	2:50 PM	0:35	0:35	OAK ST		50.00%	24	12
LBOE 114	SSS 1	8:05 AM	9:15 AM	2:55 PM	4:15 PM	1:10	1:20	SPRUCE ST		37.50%	24	9
LBOE 115	SHS 5	6:00 AM	6:49 AM	1:00 PM	1:50 PM	0:49	0:50	LAKESWOOD HS		16.67%	24	4
LBOE 115	CES 1	6:50 AM	7:50 AM	1:50 PM	3:00 PM	1:00	1:10	CLIFTON ES		25.00%	24	6
LBOE 115	SSS 2	7:50 AM	9:15 AM	3:00 PM	4:15 PM	1:25	1:15	SPRUCE		50.00%	24	12
LBOE 116	MATES	6:25 AM	7:01 AM	1:45 PM	2:37 PM	0:36	0:52	M.A.T.E.S.		4.17%	24	1
LBOE 116	SPRS 4	7:41 AM	8:40 AM	2:46 PM	3:35 PM	0:59	0:49	LECC		75.00%	24	18
LBOE 118	SMS 5	6:12 AM	6:50 AM	1:25 PM	3:10 PM	0:38	1:45	LAKESWOOD MS		12.50%	24	3
LBOE 118	SO 5	7:10 AM	7:42 AM	2:26 PM	2:54 PM	0:32	0:28	OAK ST		33.33%	24	8
LBOE 118	SPES 4	8:00 AM	8:31 AM	3:14 PM	3:30 PM	0:31	0:16	PINERS		20.83%	24	5
LBOE 119	CRHS 2	6:15 AM	7:15 AM			1:00	#VALUE!	CENT REG AM		45.83%	24	11

Table 12b: Small Vehicle Route Detail

BUS #	RTE	AM Start Time	AM End Time	PM Start Time	PM End Time	AMRun Length	PMRun Length	School Name	%LOAD	Bus Cap	Hdcnt
LBOE 119	C 7	7:15:00 AM	7:50:00 AM	1:50 PM	2:50 PM	0:35	1:00	CLARKE	33.33%	24	8
LBOE 119	SPES 7	7:51:00 AM	8:50:00 AM	2:50 PM	3:45 PM	0:59	0:55	PINERS	45.83%	24	11
LBOE 119	SMS 8			1:20 PM	1:50 PM	#VALUE!	0:30	LAKESWOOD	12.50%	24	3
LBOE 120	LMS 28	6:05:00 AM	6:45:00 AM	1:15 PM	2:11 PM	0:40	0:56	LAKESWOOD MS	50.00%	24	12
LBOE 120	B 9	7:05:00 AM	7:40:00 AM	2:27 PM	2:57 PM	0:35	0:30	CLIFTON ES	45.83%	24	11
LBOE 120	STV 1	8:28:00 AM	9:03:00 AM	3:30 PM	4:15 PM	0:35	0:45	ST VERONICAS	16.67%	24	4
LBOE 121	LMS 9	6:05:00 AM	6:45:00 AM	1:15 PM	2:10 PM	0:40	0:55	LAKESWOOD	66.67%	24	16
LBOE 121	SC 4	7:05:00 AM	7:45:00 AM	2:30 PM	2:45 PM	0:40	0:15	CLARKE	8.33%	24	2
LBOE 121	SPRS 7	7:55:00 AM	8:45:00 AM	3:00 PM	4:10 PM	0:50	1:10	SPRUCE	83.33%	24	20
LBOE 122	LMS 21	6:25:00 AM	6:48:00 AM	1:35 PM	2:05 PM	0:23	0:30	LAKESWOOD	91.67%	24	22
LBOE 122	JVA IN	7:10:00 AM	7:40:00 AM			0:30	0:00	JACKSON VO	37.50%	24	9
LBOE 122	JVP OUT	10:00:00 AM	10:24:00 AM			0:24	0:00	JACKSON VO	37.50%	24	9
LBOE 122	HOMESS	9:00:00 AM	9:12:00 AM	3:30 PM	3:45 PM	0:12	0:15	JAMES CUTLAS	4.17%	24	1
LBOE 123	SHS 2	6:22:00 AM	6:33:00 AM	1:22 PM	1:57 PM	0:11	0:35	LAKESWOOD HS	14.71%	34	5
LBOE 123	SO 7	7:36:00 AM	7:53:00 AM	2:11 PM	2:27 PM	0:17	0:16	OAK ST	62.50%	24	15
LBOE 123	SPRS 1	8:04:00 AM	8:48:00 AM	2:58 PM	3:55 PM	0:44	0:57	CAMPUS 1 2 3	70.83%	24	17
LBOE 124	SMS 6	6:05:00 AM	6:42:00 AM	1:29 PM	2:05 PM	0:37	0:36	LAKESWOOD MD	9.26%	54	5
LBOE 124	SO 4	7:09:00 AM	7:40:00 AM	2:09 PM	2:52 PM	0:31	0:43	OAK ST	29.63%	54	16
LBOE 124	SPRS 8	7:49:00 AM	8:32:00 AM	3:00 PM	3:34 PM	0:43	0:34	LECC	14.81%	54	8
LBOE 205	HOMEH S1	5:35:00 AM	6:45:00 AM	1:00 PM	1:30 PM	1:10	0:30	LAKESWOOD MS	60.00%	5	3
LBOE 205	HOME S2	6:55:00 AM	8:05:00 AM	2:10 PM	2:45 PM	1:10	0:35	OAK ST	80.00%	5	4
LBOE 206	WVED	6:30:00 AM	7:29:00 AM	1:35 PM	2:30 PM	0:59	0:55	WARETOWN VT	40.00%	5	2
LBOE 206	WVAM OUT	6:20:00 AM	7:45:00 AM	10:05 AM	10:34 AM	1:25	0:29	LAKEHURST VT	20.00%	5	1
LBOE 206	WVFD OUT	8:28:00 AM	9:13:00 AM	2:47 PM	2:57 PM	0:45	0:10	ST VERONICAS	80.00%	5	4
LBOE 207	SAIC 1	6:00:00 AM	8:30:00 AM	1:00 PM	3:00 PM	2:30	2:00		60.00%	5	3
LBOE 208	HOMHS3	7:09:00 AM	7:40:00 AM	2:09 PM	2:52 PM	0:31	0:43	LAKESWOOD HS	60.00%	5	3
LBOE 208	CTM 1	8:07:00 AM	8:40:00 AM	2:31 PM	3:10 PM	0:33	0:39	LAKEHURST VT	33.33%	24	8

Table 13: District-Wide Public Schools Projection (cohort survival--based upon data through 2016-17)

Year	Births		K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11		12	Tot K-12	Sp Ed	PK	Total
2011-12	3129	0.19	592		561		466		444		380		370		349		301		297		255		265		229		215	4724	319	186	5229
				0.551	0.970	0.961	0.989	0.976	0.997	1.037	0.927	0.916	0.965	0.830	0.913																
2012-13	3461	0.18	627		326		544		448		439		371		369		362		279		272		246		220		209	4712	419		5131
				0.986	1.681	0.994	0.946	0.986	0.941	0.970	0.903	0.975	0.996	0.776	0.945																
2013-14	3448	0.17	602		618		548		541		424		433		349		358		327		272		271		191		208	5142	306	202	5650
				0.978	0.943	0.974	0.926	0.960	0.935	0.954	0.983	0.976	0.967	0.878	1.016																
2014-15	3746	0.15	551		589		583		534		501		407		405		333		352		319		263		238		194	5269	342	196	5807
				1.038	0.917	0.964	0.921	0.976	0.990	0.936	0.973	0.915	0.975	0.882	0.971																
2015-16	3849	0.13	508		572		540		562		492		489		403		379		324		322		311		232		231	5365	340	126	5831
				0.974	0.949	0.911	0.927	0.935	0.949	0.911	0.916	0.935	0.919	0.875	0.987																
2016-17	3966	0.12	484		495		543		492		521		460		464		367		347		303		296		272		229	5273	317	264	5854
Av		0.16		0.994	0.936	0.961	0.942	0.967	0.962	0.962	0.940	0.943	0.964	0.848	0.966																
Year	Births		K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11		12	Total K-12	Sp Ed	PK	Total
2017-18	3971		554		481		464		522		463		504		443		446		345		327		292		251		263	5356	341	195	5891
2018-19	4178		540		551		451		446		492		448		485		426		420		326		316		248		243	5389	344	197	5929
2019-20	4337		527		537		516		433		420		475		431		466		400		396		314		268		240	5423	332	195	5950
2020-21	4464		523		524		503		496		408		406		457		415		438		378		382		266		259	5454	336	195	5985
2021-22	4326		526		520		491		483		467		394		390		440		390		413		364		324		257	5460	335	209	6004

This table is a projection for the public schools with historical data through 2016-17. It shows that at that point the District was showing growth. This table does not include potential housing. This projection should be updated to reflect current enrollment and impact of new housing.

Table 14: Non-Public School Cohort Projection

Non Public School Enrollment History and Enrollment																					
Year	Births		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Tot K-12	Sp Ed	PK	Total		
2011-12	3129	0.82	2577	2350	2212	1969	1847	1657	1500	1402	1236	906	755	678	531	19620	157		19777		
			0.969	0.991	1.003	0.999	1.008	0.996	0.998	0.991	0.792	0.990	0.931	0.861							
2012-13	3461	0.81	2792	2496	2328	2218	1968	1861	1651	1497	1389	979	897	703	584	21363	122		21485		
			1.074	0.985	0.997	1.003	0.995	1.001	1.003	0.943	0.670	0.894	0.889	0.789							
2013-14	3448	0.81	2799	2998	2458	2322	2224	1958	1863	1656	1412	930	875	797	555	22847	89		22936		
			1.001	0.889	1.002	0.992	0.997	0.993	0.994	0.991	0.860	1.124	1.070	0.895							
2014-15	3746	0.82	3077	2802	2665	2464	2303	2218	1945	1852	1641	1214	1045	936	713	24875	83		24958		
			1.003	1.001	1.011	1.003	1.013	0.998	1.004	0.985	0.781	0.974	0.971	0.810							
2015-16	3849	0.85	3257	3086	2804	2695	2472	2334	2214	1953	1825	1281	1182	1015	758	26876	164		27040		
			0.979	1.011	1.014	1.010	1.001	1.002	1.005	0.997	0.838	1.034	0.947	0.934							
2016-17	3966	0.89	3518	3187	3119	2842	2723	2474	2338	2224	1948	1529	1324	1119	948	29293	151	1579	31023		
Av		0.83		1.005	0.975	1.005	1.002	1.003	0.998	1.001	0.982	0.788	1.003	0.961	0.858						
Year	Births		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total K-12	Sp Ed	PK	Total		
2017-18	3971		3307	3535	3108	3136	2846	2731	2469	2340	2183	1535	1533	1273	960	30957	128	1579	32664		
2018-19	4178		3479	3323	3448	3125	3141	2854	2726	2471	2297	1720	1539	1474	1092	32690	123	1579	34392		
2019-20	4337		3612	3497	3241	3467	3130	3150	2849	2728	2426	1810	1725	1480	1265	34377	123	1579	36079		
2020-21	4464		3718	3630	3410	3259	3472	3138	3144	2851	2677	1911	1815	1659	1270	35953	129	1579	37661		
2021-22	4326		3603	3736	3540	3428	3264	3482	3133	3146	2799	2110	1917	1745	1423	37324	136	1579	39039		

This table is a projection for the non-public schools based upon data through 2016-17. This is showing the projection for the non-public schools. When added to the public schools the total of school aged children will be approximately 45,000. I am sure that if both these projections were updated the numbers would be significantly higher.

Table 15: Summary of Contracted Public School Routes

8/31/2018

	Daily	Annual	Daily	Annual	Daily	Annual	Daily	Annual	Daily	Annual	Daily	Annual	Daily	Annual	Daily	Annual	Total
	LHS	LHS	LMS	LMS	Clarke	Clarke	Oak	Oak	Clifton	Clifton	Spruce	Spruce	Piners	Piners	LECC	LECC	
	\$104.00	\$18,824.00	\$95.00	\$17,195.00	\$95.00	\$17,195.00	\$265.00	\$47,965.00	\$125.00	\$22,625.00	\$365.00	\$66,065.00	\$365.00	\$66,065.00	\$205.00	\$37,105.00	
	\$96.00	\$17,376.00	\$95.00	\$17,195.00	\$120.00	\$21,720.00	\$265.00	\$47,965.00	\$122.00	\$22,082.00	\$202.00	\$36,562.00	\$180.00	\$32,580.00			
	\$96.00	\$17,376.00	\$97.00	\$17,557.00	\$142.00	\$25,702.00	\$99.00	\$17,919.00	\$122.00	\$22,082.00	\$94.00	\$17,014.00	\$188.00	\$34,028.00			
	\$99.00	\$17,919.00	\$107.00	\$19,367.00	\$162.00	\$29,322.00	\$99.00	\$17,919.00	\$122.00	\$22,082.00	\$189.00	\$34,209.00	\$119.00	\$21,539.00			
	\$95.00	\$17,195.00	\$118.00	\$21,358.00			\$122.00	\$22,082.00	\$95.00	\$17,195.00			\$159.00	\$28,779.00			
	\$101.00	\$18,281.00	\$117.00	\$21,177.00			\$119.00	\$21,539.00					\$149.00	\$26,969.00			
	\$96.00	\$17,376.00	\$110.00	\$19,910.00			\$119.00	\$21,539.00									
	\$96.00	\$17,376.00	\$115.00	\$20,815.00													
	\$100.00	\$18,100.00	\$105.00	\$19,005.00													
	\$125.00	\$22,625.00															
	\$110.00	\$19,910.00															
	\$109.00	\$19,729.00															
	\$105.00	\$19,005.00															
	\$105.00	\$19,005.00															
	\$98.00	\$17,738.00															
	\$105.00	\$19,005.00															
	\$105.00	\$19,005.00															
No. Rtes	17		9	9	4	4	7	7	5	5	4	4	6	6	1	1	
Average	\$102.65		\$106.56		\$129.75		\$155.43		\$117.20		\$212.50		\$193.33		\$205.00		
Total		\$315,845.00		\$173,579.00		\$93,939.00		\$196,928.00		\$106,066.00		\$153,850.00		\$209,960.00		\$37,105.00	\$1,287,272.00

This table shows the daily and annual costs per contracted route, by school, during the 2017-18 school year. It does not have the totals from the Ocean Academy contracts (see table 6, page 12).