

1975  
Session

**THE USE OF SCHOOL BUSES  
FOR  
NON-PUPIL TRANSPORTATION**

**REPORTED TO  
THE GOVERNOR  
AND  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**



**HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 2**

**SEPTEMBER 1974**

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
Department of Purchases and Supply  
Richmond**

1975

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

WAYNE A. WHITHAM  
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION  
AND PUBLIC SAFETY  
910 CAPITOL STREET  
RICHMOND 23219

Report of the  
Secretary of Transportation and Public Safety  
to  
The Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia  
TO: THE HONORABLE MILLS E. GODWIN, JR., Governor of Virginia  
and  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

The 1974 General Assembly enacted House Joint Resolution No. 89 which directed the Secretary of Transportation and Public Safety and the Secretary of Education to initiate a study to determine by what methods school buses owned by school systems might be used in the periodic scheduled transportation of citizens. In the absence of a Secretary of Education, I requested the Division of State Planning and Community Affairs to conduct this effort with the assistance of the Department of Education. The resultant findings and recommendations that were prepared for me may wish to be further considered to satisfy selected transportation needs.

I wish to thank all those who cooperated in the conduct of this study.

Respectfully submitted,



## **ABSTRACT**

**TITLE:** The Use of School Buses for Non-Pupil  
Transportation

**AUTHOR:** Hassan M. Valad, Senior Transportation  
Planner  
Gary D. Janak, Transportation Planner  
Transportation and Public Safety Section  
Division of State Planning and Community  
Affairs

**SUBJECT:** The Use of School Buses by Social Service  
Agencies to Provide Community Assistance  
and Services

**DATE:** September, 1974

**AGENCY:** Commonwealth of Virginia  
Office of the Governor  
Division of State Planning and Community  
Affairs

**SOURCE OF COPIES:** Department of Purchases and Supply

**NUMBER OF COPIES:** Limited number printed

**NUMBER OF PAGES:** 74

**ABSTRACT:** This report identifies methods by which  
school buses owned by school systems  
might be used in the periodic  
scheduled transportation of citizens.

**THE USE OF SCHOOL BUSES  
FOR  
NON-PUPIL TRANSPORTATION**

**Prepared By:**

**Division of State Planning and Community Affairs  
Transportation and Public Safety Section**

**September 1974**

The Division of State Planning and Community Affairs wishes to express its appreciation to those social service agencies that have provided information; the Department of Education, the State Corporation Commission, the Department of Highways and Transportation, the Highway Safety Division, and the Highway Research Council who have given advice and material without which the many issues could not have been addressed; the counties of Arlington and Fairfax for sharing their experiences; and those other public and private agencies and firms that assisted in helping the Division present a study of possible greater school bus utilization in Virginia.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY .....	6
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
I. Public Transportation in Virginia.....	9
Rural.....	9
Urban.....	10
II. Pupil Transportation in Virginia.....	16
III. Possible Increased Utilization of School Buses..	25
Office on Aging.....	26
Employment Commission.....	27
Department of Health.....	29
Office of Recreation.....	30
Commission for the Visually Handicapped.....	31
Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	31
Department of Welfare.....	33
IV. Non-Pupil Use of School Buses in Virginia.....	35
Arlington County.....	36
Fairfax County.....	38
V. National Trends.....	42
VI. Recommendations.....	45
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
A. House Joint Resolution No. 89.....	50
B. Transit Companies in Virginia.....	51
C. School Bus Fleet Data for Each School	
Division in Virginia.....	52
D. Statistical Data and Cost Analysis of	
School Bus Operation.....	58
E. Summary of the Code of Virginia Statutes	
Pertaining to School Buses.....	63
F. Fairfax County Public Schools,	
Field Trip Form.....	72
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>73</b>

## INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The 1974 session of the General Assembly, through House Joint Resolution No. 89, directed the Commonwealth's Secretaries of Transportation and Education to conduct "a \*\*\* ERROR \*\*\* INVALID NUMBER study and report on methods by which school buses might be used in the periodic scheduled transportation of citizens." (Appendix A)

The primary purpose of the study is to determine whether and how school buses, purchased by public funds and available for additional service, could be used to satisfy transportation needs of other citizens particularly those in rural areas where other means of transportation are not readily available.

The conduct of the study was assigned to the Transportation and Public Safety Section of the Division of State Planning and Community Affairs in cooperation with the Division of Special Services of the State Department of Education.

### Study Methods

A number of sources were investigated in the conduct of the study.

Supporting information was obtained by:

1. Review of national, state and local publications. (A computerized search of the Information Bank of the Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, did not produce reference to any material related to this study.)
2. Meetings and discussions with selected State human resource agencies.
  - a. Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation
  - b. Department of Vocational Rehabilitation
  - c. Employment Commission
  - d. Commission for the Visually Handicapped
  - e. Department of Health
  - f. Department of Welfare
  - g. Division of State Planning and Community Affairs
  - h. Office on Aging

(A limited study schedule made it impossible to contact all State agencies that may have provided input. The objective was to gain

insight into the nature of particular agency transportation needs and to learn of some existing practices now being utilized to meet those needs.)

3. Coordination and contact with the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation.
4. Contact with the Center for Urban and Regional Studies, Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University.
5. Contact and input from several planning district commissions.
6. Investigation of related experiences in Virginia.
  - a. Fairfax County
  - b. Arlington County
7. Contact and input from the Virginia Highway Safety Division.
8. Meeting with the Insurance Bureau of the State Corporation Commission.
9. Investigation of a related project in Klamath Falls, Oregon.
10. Discussion with the Commerce Counsel, State Corporation Commission.
11. Contact with the Division of Legislative Services (to determine the approaches taken by other states on the use of school buses for public transportation).

#### Related Public Transportation Studies

Concurrent with this study, the State is engaged in two other efforts aimed at the general problems of public transportation needs. Since all three studies have certain elements in common, a brief description of the other two studies would be informative and helpful.

1. The Commonwealth's Secretary of Transportation and Public Safety has applied to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration for a \$50,000 technical studies grant to be used for an investigation of public transportation policy in Virginia. This study, requiring approximately 3 man-years of effort, will focus on the unique problems of small urban areas.
2. The Commonwealth's Secretary of Transportation and Public Safety has invited Virginia's twenty-two planning district commissions to submit proposals for rural public transportation demonstration programs. The State Department of Highways and Transportation is responsible for receiving and disseminating these proposals. An Inter-Agency task force will review all submittals. The Secretary will then transmit selected

programs to the Federal Highway Administration for funding under the provisions of Section 147 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973. At present, the FHWA is in the process of drafting final regulations related to the submittal of these proposals. All applications must be received within 90 days of the announced regulations.

### Summary

The report that follows reviews existing public and pupil transportation in Virginia; identifies selected transportation demands within the public sector; outlines experiences in providing increased transportation service with the school bus in the Commonwealth; touches upon restricting legislation, insurance and safety within the context of expanded use; and sets forth recommendations for a course of action that may wish to be implemented by the General Assembly and Administration.

The primary purpose of the school bus is to transport school children and that purpose must never be compromised. Along with transporting children, the safety of those children is paramount. Any expanded use of the vehicle must be limited and performed under conditions which would not alter the respect and concern for caution that the yellow school bus evokes among the motoring public.

The findings, therefore, recognize that there is excess capacity as far as vehicle use is measured and that equipment which now stands idle for much of the day could be assigned to serve transportation needs that are not now being met, or are being met in only a limited or expensive manner. Any added assignments should be limited, however, to a small percentage of a localities total school bus fleet and used only to serve public agency sponsors. This would ensure close control while supporting acceptable community services that are being offered through public funds. In addition, the school bus would not, and should not, become a substitute for a general transit vehicle.

Expanded use of the school bus to provide additional service to a community should be a local decision. The Commonwealth, through the Legislature and its administrative structure, can remove existing obstacles to such use, assist and provide incentives to those localities which may chose such a course, and carefully monitor and regulate any increased use to ensure that the prime purpose of the school bus is not sacrificed and the safety of children is not jeopardized.

The material that follows provides information upon which subsequent decisions concerning school bus utilization can be made or upon which further study may be based. The recommendations that are presented merely reflect the study findings; it is intended that they serve as a point of departure from which those responsible for policy can accept, reject or modify, as the subject is reviewed and further evaluated.



## Chapter I

### PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IN VIRGINIA

The availability of public transportation varies widely across the Commonwealth of Virginia, from rapid rail transit that will soon be available in the Northern Virginia region, to major bus transit systems in twelve urban regions of the State, along with additional smaller transit companies operating in the suburbs and smaller cities. Taxicab companies serve all of Virginia's metropolitan areas, some smaller cities and towns and a number of rural counties; however, neither taxicabs nor any other mode of public transportation exist in many parts of the State.

#### Existing Transportation in Rural Areas

The road network of the Commonwealth offers the only means of access to work, shopping and other trips for residents in rural areas. Auto and auto passenger movement is clearly the dominant mode, while bus and taxicab service is limited to a few places, usually close to or surrounding urban centers. Each of these modes, however, possesses characteristics which limit its utilization by all the population.

Taxicabs provide personal service, often favored by the elderly and physically handicapped, usually because of their inability to own or operate their own automobile. Taxis provide door-to-door service, privacy, comfort, and safety; however, the taxicab is expensive, with a one-way fare ranging from \$1.00 to many dollars, depending on the distance traveled. In rural areas distances are usually significant between origins and destinations. Also, the service is not always available.

Bus service is provided in several capacities. Greyhound and Continental Trailways offer intercity and interstate service to many rural communities. This system provides poor service when used for work, shopping or other short trips. Some rural communities have access to charter and rental buses, but the service provided is not conducive to recurring trip needs that require a certain level of flexibility and frequency of service. Several small towns and cities have limited public transportation service such as the City of Radford and the Town of Grundy.

Some State and county health and social service agencies use their own vehicles to transport their clientele. For example, the Greene County Welfare Agency owns one car, the Greene County Dental Clinic has one van for patients,<sup>1</sup> the College of William and Mary operates a shuttle bus for students and faculty, and the Eastern State Hospital has a van for patients.<sup>2</sup> Other public agencies either have limited access to a vehicle or pay others for transportation. For example, the Greene County Health Department pays \$350 - \$450 per month for having two or three patients transported per day.<sup>3</sup> (A subsequent chapter outlines the needs of public service agencies.)

The private automobile is usually the only mode of

transportation in rural areas. The automobile, however, is not available to many rural residents because of cost or inability to drive. For example, in Planning District 1 an estimated 25% or 5,942 families have an annual income below \$4,000, and therefore cannot afford to own, maintain, or operate a car.<sup>4</sup> In Fauquier County, eighty-two percent of the population is rural. Fifteen percent of those living in the “rural pockets of poverty” have no automobile and fifty-two percent have only one auto.<sup>5</sup> Throughout the State, 12.4 percent of all households in unincorporated areas do not own cars. These households account for only 3.5 percent of all trips and 2.5 percent of auto-miles of travel.<sup>6</sup>

### Demand for Transportation in Rural Areas

Recent studies are beginning to quantify the demand for transportation in rural Virginia. The studies are identifying “latent demand” for transportation which is the demand for trips that are not now being made, but would be, if improved transportation were available. Expressed mode for travel is also of concern. This is the travel made by persons at a price (dollars, time, inconvenience) higher than what would be expected for the trip.<sup>7</sup> Latent demand is measured by finding the difference between the present trips taken for a time period and the number of trips the same population would take if they were the “average American.” The difference has been labeled the “transportation gap.” For Giles County, the transportation gap was 46,416 trips per month for those families that owned either one or no vehicles.<sup>8</sup> Based on the same type of gap analysis, Madison County households would make an additional 520 trips per day if transportation were available.<sup>9</sup>

The inability of the poor to make trips means that they are being isolated from jobs and services. The U. S. Department of Agriculture identified the lack of transportation as a major reason why farmers cannot obtain labor.<sup>10</sup> A recent survey pointed to the inaccessibility of an automobile as being a major reason for unemployment.<sup>11</sup> In a Campbell County survey, it was discovered that one-half of 3,000 public and voluntary agency clients had transportation access problems when attempting to reach clinics in the county. Forty-four percent had no car in one of the five localities of the county. Up to seventy-one percent indicated that they could not afford a taxi in a second locality. Approximately five percent of the clients in each locality of the county had access problems because they were physically handicapped.

It can be concluded that the needs of many rural residents in the area of transportation are not being met. Heavy dependence on automobiles by the poor should be alleviated. Shopping, health service and other facilities need to be made more accessible. The transportation gap must be closed before every rural resident can enjoy employment opportunities and social and health care services offered by the State.

### Existing Public Transportation in Urban Areas

Twenty-five transit companies provide public transportation in twelve of the metropolitan regions and five other urban areas of the State. Fifteen of the transit companies are privately-owned, while the other ten are publicly-owned. Six transit companies are

anticipating public take over and are presently conducting studies to evaluate that possibility. (See Appendix B). Where public-ownership occurs, the transit companies sell their depleted stock to the municipalities they serve rather than to cease operating. This tendency toward public-ownership is the result of transit companies being caught in the growing cost-revenue squeeze.

The reasons for the cost-revenue squeeze are many. Bus transit service and operation have generally remained at the same level during recent years. The nearly level continuation of service means that the amount of physical equipment generating the costs remains constant. On the other hand, a decline in passengers over the years has resulted in a drastic reduction in farebox revenues. The result is a decline in total revenues combined with a substantial increase in total costs. Raising fares alleviate the deficit to a small degree, but such action also tends to reduce the number of passengers. To overcome the cost-revenue squeeze, transit companies have often been subsidized by local governments or been taken over completely, as, for example, the Greater Richmond Transit Company did on September 1, 1973.

Following is a brief account of the statistical trend for three urban transit companies in Virginia.<sup>12</sup> They were chosen merely to provide examples of public transportation operations in representative locations.

	TRANSIT TRENDS 1968 - 1973		
	Lynchburg Transit Company Inc.	Roanoke City Lines	Virginia Transit Company (Richmond)
Patronage	17.5% decline	0.86% decline	15.95% decline
Annual Operating Mileage	9.0% decline	4.23% decline	11.09% decline
Total Revenue	8.0% decline	1.56% decline	9.17% increase
Total Expenditures	16.0% increase	22.01% increase	21.12% increase
Year Entered Deficit	1969	1970	1973

The percentages show total revenue decreasing along with patronage and annual mileage, while total expenditures have increased about twenty-one percent. All three companies are presently operating at a deficit and are presently subsidized or operated by the cities they serve.

Transit ridership trends in Virginia generally parallel those of the United States transit industry. The heaviest rates of patronage loss in Virginia since 1970 have been experienced in Northern Virginia, Southeastern and Peninsula regions. Richmond is regaining some of its patronage through transit improvement techniques. Martinsville is also showing a slight increase in ridership.<sup>13</sup>

#### Demand for Public Transportation in Urban Areas

**Tripmaker Characteristics**—Characteristics of the tripmaker include such variables as auto ownership, income, age, and sex. Households with one or no vehicle tend to take less trips, but the number of transit trips are more pronounced. The percent of households using transit and owning no automobile in certain Virginia cities are as follows: Roanoke 30%; Lynchburg 55%; and Richmond 56%. In Richmond and Lynchburg, 87% of the transit riders had no automobile available for the trip.<sup>14</sup> It is evident that as the availability of automobiles decreases in a household, the need for public transportation increases.

The transit dependent rider has distinct economic and social characteristics. It has been generally found that lower income families rely more heavily on public transportation for their travel needs. In Richmond, over 60% of the transit riders come from families having income less than \$6,000. For Lynchburg and Roanoke, the figure is about 43%. A large share of the transit riders in the three cities are female (average of 66%) and over the age of forty-five (average of 48% transit riders).

**Trip Characteristics**—Characteristics of trips which describe the demand for public transportation include the purpose of the trip and the orientation to the Central Business District. Most transit trips are essential trips between the home and work, school or shopping locations. Approximately fifty percent of the transit trips are work trips; while work, school and shopping activities account for seventy percent of all transit trips.

Orientation of the trip to the Central Business District (CBD) is an important consideration. Transit routes have the tendency to radiate from the CBD to the suburbs. Transit riders find it difficult to travel to neighboring suburbs since there are no direct routes. As a result, employment, shopping, and other opportunities in these areas are not readily accessible to everyone.

**Transportation System Characteristics**—This group of characteristics includes variables that are used to compare the several modes of transportation available to the user. The significant variables are travel time, travel cost, and accessibility. For public transit, travel time includes riding time, walking to and from the bus stop, and making transfers. Automobile travel time includes getting to the vehicle, driving to the parking space, and walking from the parked vehicle to final destination. People using transit are forced to accept longer travel times than would be required by automobile, even though in congested urban areas the transit trips are often as fast.

Travel cost to the user is generally regarded as the perceived out-of-pocket cost. The automobile users concept of travel cost is gasoline and parking fees. For him the transit fare appears as costly as automobile usage and is usually not preferred for most trips.

Accessibility is the distance covered within a time band for a specific trip for a specific mode. An accessibility index for an urban area is composed of three measurements: (1) the area serviced by a mode in a time period; (2) the number of bus stops, or streets in the

geographic area; and (3) the availability of socioeconomic opportunities in the area. A map showing the area served by a mode in, for example, twenty minutes, shows which areas are not properly served. Maps of this sort graphically portray hard to get to areas, which is especially significant if needed socioeconomic activity occurs there. The number of bus stops or streets in a geographic area is important since sparse access points within a transit system can hinder mobility, while numerous bus stops can increase mobility. Modes of transportation should strive to make available many socioeconomic opportunities in a geographic area. Lack of these facilities is a major concern for many citizens and government officials.

In summary, the demand for public transportation in urban areas is not being met. Workers need improved accessibility to more jobs. Social and health service agencies are struggling to transport their clientele. The aged and physically handicapped cannot make their necessary trips. Also, in relation to this, transit companies continue to lose revenue and riders each year. The "transit dependent" is the prime loser when the number of transit miles is reduced and service is lessened.

## FOOTNOTES

1. Rural Transportation Demonstration Project for the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (Charlottesville, Virginia: July 1974), p. 15.
2. James City County, Virginia, Rural Highway Public Transportation Demonstration Program (James City County, Virginia: June 21, 1974), 10.
3. Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, loc. cit.
4. LENOWISCO Planning District Commission, A Rural Public Transportation Proposal (Duffield, Virginia: June 28, 1974), p. 10.
5. Rappahannock-Rapidan Planning District, Proposal for a Cooperative Rural Transportation Program for the Rappahannock-Rapidan Planning District under the Rural Highway Public Transportation Program: Preliminary Proposal, July 25, 1974, p. 3.
6. John W. Dickey, Rural Public Transportation Needs and Recommendations, Report to the Virginia Metropolitan Areas Transportation Study Commission, November 1973, (Commonwealth of Virginia, 1973), p. 13.
7. Charles Van Schaik Mix, The Need For and Design of a Rural Transportation System for Madison County, Virginia. Published major paper, Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University, May 1974, p. 8.
8. Proposal for a Cooperative Rural Transportation Program for the New River Valley Planning District Rural Highway Transportation Program, July 30, 1974, p. 3.
9. Rappahannock-Rapidan Planning District Commission, Proposal for a Cooperative Rural Transportation Program, p. 3.
10. James City County, Virginia, Rural Highway Public Transportation Demonstration Program, p. 5.
11. Richmond Regional Planning District Commission, A Preliminary Proposal for a Rural Transportation Demonstration Project (Richmond, Virginia: July, 1974), p. 1.
12. Alan M. Voorhees & Associates, Inc., A Transit Development Program for the Lynchburg Urban Area, prepared for the City of Lynchburg, Virginia, p. 42; Wilbur Smith & Associates, Roanoke Transit Study, p. 54; Greater Richmond Transit Company, A FY 1975 - FY 1979 Transit Development Program for Richmond, Virginia, April 1974, Richmond, Virginia, p. 46.
13. Wilbur Smith & Associates, Public Transportation Needs in

Virginia's Metropolitan Areas, prepared for the Virginia Metropolitan Areas Transportation Study Commission, November 1971, p. 32.

14. The transit statistics in this discussion for Roanoke, Lynchburg, and Richmond come from Alan M. Voorhees and Associates, Inc., A Transit Development Plan for Lynchburg, pp. 9-19; Greater Richmond Transit Company, Transit Development Program for Richmond, pp. 37-40; and Wilbur Smith & Associates, Roanoke Transit Study, pp.73-91.

## **Chapter II**

### **PUPIL TRANSPORTATION IN VIRGINIA**

Public school boards in the Commonwealth of Virginia have the right to provide pupil transportation if they find it desirable. Section 22-72.1 of the Code of Virginia gives the counties permission by stating,

County school boards may provide for the transportation of pupils; but nothing herein contained shall be construed as requiring such transportation.

Section 22-97.1 of the Code gives similar permission to Cities as follows:

City school boards may provide for the transportation of pupils; but nothing herein contained shall be construed as requiring such transportation.

Presently 119 of the 136 school divisions operate school bus fleets. Seven school divisions contract with private operators; one has arrangements for transit buses to exclusively transport students; two cities have pupils transported by counties; three operate public buses and contract with private operators; and seven provide no transportation.<sup>1</sup>

Section 22-276 of the Virginia School Laws gives the legal authority for the State Board of Education's operation and design of public school buses in the State. The law states as follows:

The State Board may make all needful rules and regulations not inconsistent with laws relating to the construction, design, operation, equipment, and color of school buses, and shall have the authority to issue an order prohibiting the operation on public streets and highways of any school bus which does not comply with such regulations, and any such order shall be enforced by the Department of State Police.

The State Board of Education in turn authorized the Director of Pupil Transportation Service and the Director of the Division of Special Services with concurrence of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to make adjustments of technical specifications. The purpose for the adoption of uniform State standards for school bus equipment and prescribing regulations for its operation is to insure safe, economical and comfortable transportation for all pupils who are transported. Minimum standards are applicable to all purchases of school bus equipment, new or used, whether the buses are owned by the school board or operated by contract or both.<sup>2</sup> Pupil Transportation Service continually evaluates the performance of the school bus equipment and improves the standards so that high quality service is maintained.



During the academic year 1972-73, the last year for which published data is available, 668,008 students were transported daily on school buses used in the public school system.<sup>3</sup> This represents more than 60 percent of the total school enrollment. Statewide, 7,506 school buses were used daily to transport students a total of 61,288,687 miles for the year on regular routes. School buses operate 180-182 class days, which is the length of the regular session. As a result, school buses travel forty-five miles per day, on a statewide average.<sup>4</sup> For a complete statistical breakdown by school division, see Appendix C.

Portions of the bus fleet are in operation in the morning, usually between 6:30 to 9:30 a.m., and in the afternoon between 1:30 to 4:00 p.m. The time of the day the buses are used varies with each school district. The same number of buses are used each day, but vary with extra-curricular activities.

School buses also transport students for other purposes. Athletic and educational trips are scheduled during the day and evening. In addition, school buses are used to bring students from several schools to one location for academic classes such as language, art and music.

The procedure the school division uses to pick up and deliver students, affects the availability of buses during the day. The distance each bus travels every day for transporting pupils affects its availability for other uses. Also, if each bus is used only on one run in the morning and afternoon, it is likely to be available more hours of the day; however, if increased utilization for school purposes is exercised, (a bus used on two or three runs during the morning and the afternoon) its availability for other uses is reduced. The situation varies with each school district and, therefore, each must be considered individually.

### State Expenditures

The Commonwealth has been supporting the transportation of pupils since 1930. From 1930 to 1942, funds were appropriated by the legislature for school expenditures which included transportation. By the year 1942, funds were appropriated directly for transportation in an amount of \$500,000 annually. The funds were distributed on the basis of one-half on number of miles and one-half on number of buses.<sup>5</sup> Due to a continuous growth in population and the consequent increase in the number of school age children, the cost of pupil transportation has increased significantly during the past thirty years.

In 1972-73 the total cost for statewide school bus transportation was \$33,092,265.81. The category breakdown is as follows:<sup>6</sup>

a.	for School Bus Transportation	
	Operational Cost	\$27,114,438.47
b.	for School Bus Replacement Cost	4,340,103.23
c.	New School bus Capital Outlay Fund	<u>1,637,724.11</u>
	T O T A L	\$33,092,265.81

The support appropriated by the State for the operational cost accrued by the localities was \$11,800,000.00.<sup>7</sup> The State does not have

a policy of allocating funds for the replacement of capital equipment or the acquisition of the new equipment. Therefore, each school division pays for the total cost of the buses they buy.

Since pupil transportation requirements vary from one school division to another, an equitable distribution of State funds must be based on a formula that takes several factors into account. Consideration is given to the number of students in each public school system, the distance they have to travel to reach school, and the number and types of vehicles used for pupil transportation. At present, the pupil transportation funds of the State are distributed to school divisions on the basis of a formula established by the State Board of Education, as follows:

1. Forty percent of the fund is distributed on the basis of an equal amount for each mile traveled in transporting pupils to and from the public schools in school buses meeting the standards and specifications of the State Board of Education.

Average daily mileage is computed for each bus only from the points where the first pupil is picked up in the morning to the point where the last pupil is discharged in the afternoon, excluding all special trips or excursions. If the length of a bus route is changed during the year, the average of the daily mileage shall be used.

2. Forty percent of the fund is distributed on the basis of an equal amount for each pupil transported in average daily attendance (average number transported daily) in school buses meeting the standards and specifications of the State Board of Education.

3. Twenty percent of the fund is distributed on the basis of an equal amount for each school bus in daily use during the current year which meets the standards and specifications of the State Board of Education and which is operated in the transportation of pupils a minimum of sixteen miles per school day; provided, that the minimum operation of sixteen miles per school day shall not be applicable to small buses with a pupil capacity of twelve or less.<sup>8</sup>

Local public school divisions must comply with State laws and regulations as a prerequisite for eligibility of the State pupil transportation funds. The laws and regulations include safety maintenance inspections, minimum standards for school bus equipment, and insurance requirements. No reimbursements will be made for a bus which does not pass the regular inspections required by law and by regulations of the State Board of Education. Also, no reimbursements will be made for school buses unless the body and the chassis meet the standards and specifications of the State Board of Education.<sup>9</sup>

Compliance with insurance requirements are more strict, since the failure to comply necessitates withholding all State school aid funds distributable to the locality. Section 22-293 states that the Superintendent of Public Instruction is to withhold any further

distribution of State school aid funds when a school division violates the School Bus Insurance Laws (Article 2, Chapter 13, Title 22). Once the superintendent of Public Instruction receives an assurance that all vehicles are insured, he may again distribute the funds. Section 22-287 of the Code states that the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall obtain the insurance for all vehicles used to transport pupils and personnel by using the funds appropriated to the locality if the locality fails to obtain the necessary insurance by August 1, or fails to notify the Superintendent by August 10. Section 22-292 states that if insurance is obtained but lapses while the vehicle is still used to transport pupils and personnel, the remaining funds to be distributed are withheld until insurance is reapplied.

### OPERATIONAL COST

The total operational cost for providing regular pupil school bus service consists of the following components:

- Compensation of Clerical Employees;
- Compensation of Supervisors;
- Compensation of Bus Drivers;
- Compensation of Garage Employees;
- Transportation Insurance;
- Other Transportation Costs;
- Repairs, Tires, Parts, Tubes and Supplies;
- and Gasoline, Oil, and Other Lubricants.<sup>10</sup>

Every school division that provides school bus transportation accumulates operational costs for each of the above items on an annual basis. At the end of the academic year, these costs are converted to a "cost per mile" figure. This conversion allows comparisons to be made between the public school divisions. Analysis of the data after it has been tabulated shows the cost per mile figure for each item varies widely from one school division to another. The reasons for the wide range of figures in each category are often unique only to that particular school division's transportation service operation.

The range of cost and average cost for four components of the total operational cost for one hundred-fourteen school divisions in the State are as follows:<sup>11</sup>

Cost per Mile for each School Division	High	Low	Average
Total Cost of Operation	\$1.230	\$0.261	\$0.442
Average Garage Employee's Salary	0.124	0.030	0.047
Average Driver's Salary	1.264	0.124	0.269
Average Tires and Repair Parts Cost	0.395	0.023	0.077
Average Cost: Gas and Oil	0.161	0.030	0.046

A breakdown of operating cost by school division is found in Appendix D.

The wide range of cost for garage employees' salaries is dependent on two major factors. First, the number of employees needed, relative to the number of buses in the fleet, depends on the amount of work done outside the shop. Second, the salary schedule for the garage employees affects the cost. In some counties, relatively low wages may be paid, whereas in other counties, competition for skilled labor is high, and therefore wages are high.

The largest factor affecting the cost of gasoline is the purchase procedure. Those school divisions with large storage facilities can make bulk purchases, thereby effecting savings of 3-4 cent per gallon. The smaller divisions buying directly from a service station pay a higher price. Other factors include the age and type of vehicle and the frequency of maintenance. Since the 1972-73 academic year the price of gas has increased by fifty percent.

Average tire and repair parts costs vary for some of the same reasons as the other operational expenses. The quantity of the part purchased would determine whether there were any discount savings. Also, the age of the vehicle and the maintenance schedule would determine the type of replacement parts needed. An upward adjustment is necessary for these items due to inflation.

The bus driver's salary is the largest single cost factor for the school divisions, accounting for an average of fifty-six percent of the total school bus transportation service cost. The condition affecting this variable is whether or not the drivers are unionized. This closely relates to the location characteristic of a school division. Rural counties can pay lower wages than the more urbanized counties of the State. Also, the rates depend on whether the drivers are full or part time employees. Those drivers working more than forty hours are paid overtime rates.

#### School Bus Driver Requirements

During the year 1972-73, the local school divisions employed a total of 7,515 bus drivers. Approximately sixty-two percent of the total were adult women who were mostly housewives. Many drivers supplement their regular income by driving a school bus. The number of hours each driver is employed per week depends on the number of runs and the length of each run he makes. The breakdown of drivers between male or female and adult or student is as follows:

#### **Bus Driver Characteristics<sup>12</sup>**

	Adult		Student		All Drivers
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
State Total	2511	4623	350	21	7515
% of Total	33.5%	61.5%	4.7%	.3%	100%

Several requirements have been set up for selecting, training and supervising school bus drivers. The applicant must have driving experience and pass a special examination pertaining to the ability of driving a school bus. The applicant must submit two certificates stated that (1) the applicant is free of tuberculosis, and (2) that he has no signs of any diseases and is physically able. The School Board has the option requiring the applicant to furnish a certificate stating he successfully completed the American National Red Cross First Aid Course. The applicant must furnish a statement that he has not been convicted of driving while under the influence of alcohol or guilty of a felony involving a motor vehicle for a five year period. He must also submit a statement signed by two reputable citizens of the county or city stating that he is of good moral character. Finally, the driver must be between the ages of 16 and 65.<sup>13</sup>

### Maintenance Requirements

A thorough maintenance program keeps school buses in peak mechanical condition. The Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of State Police, requires all passenger carrying vehicles to pass a safety inspection twice a year. The inspection includes checking brakes, lights, and other safety equipment. Also, the State Board of Education requires each school bus to be thoroughly inspected at least once a month. In addition, personnel from the State Board of Education inspect each bus annually to make sure all State safety and operation requirements are met.<sup>14</sup>

At present there is no statewide school bus replacement policy. The State Board of Education recommends buses should be replaced at least every twelve years. Most school divisions strive for a ten year or 100,000 mile replacement program. After twelve years, the mechanical components of the vehicle need substantial repair and replacement.

As stated earlier, the State does not subsidize capital expenditures by localities for school buses. The locality must replace old buses and buy additional buses with its own funds. Each locality may request bids locally from dealers, or buy buses through the State Office of Purchases and Supply. The most favorable bid can come from either source and often gives the locality a reasonable choice.

### Insurance

According to Section 22-285 of the Code of Virginia, every vehicle used for the transportation of school pupils and personnel must be covered in a policy of public liability and property damage insurance. The same statute provides for the amounts of coverage:

Public liability, bodily injury, including death:

a. per person, or lower limit \$ 50,000.00

- b. per accident, or upper limit 200,000.00
- c. property damage 10,000.00
- d. medical expense payment 1,000.00

The policy must include provisions for the uninsured motorist and have the same amount of coverage. Section 22-284 states that any public school division that does not comply with the above insurance coverage law or any other section of Article 2-School Bus Insurance Laws shall not receive any State school funds. Other insurance requirements were discussed in the section on State Expenditures and are summarized in Appendix E.

Insurance is purchased individually by each school division. Insurance companies are requested to bid on the policy the locality needs to cover the school bus fleet. The insurance premium for each locality is based on the previous three years of accident experience, the number and type of vehicles in the fleet, and their age distribution.

Before June 1, 1973, the insurance division of the State Corporation Commission regulated insurance rates. At the present time, insurance rates are determined by competition in a free market. The State Corporation Commission's role is to ensure free market competition.

#### Pupil Transportation Safety

The major purpose of Pupil Transportation Service is to promote safe transportation of pupils. Minimum standards for buses are established to provide maximum safety for students. The regulations governing the selection of school bus drivers, as well as vehicle operation procedures, ensure a strong safety program. In addition, new ideas are continually being studied by the State to increase the safety of pupils.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration of the U. S. Department of Transportation has developed Pupil Transportation Safety Standard 17. The purpose is to improve State programs for transporting pupils by setting requirements for proper and safe equipment; selection, training, and supervision of drivers and maintenance of personnel; and administrative provisions in the field of pupil transportation. Virginia presently has regulations covering several of the federal requirements.

In order to develop a comprehensive pupil transportation safety program, the federal standard has requirements in five general categories: administration; identification and equipment of school vehicles; operation; and vehicle maintenance. The administration category provides for a single State agency that has the primary administrative responsibility for pupil transportation. Identification and equipment of school vehicles calls for proper lettering on buses, and utilization of mirrors and National School Bus glossy yellow paint. Operator requirements include standards for selecting and training personnel, pupil safety instruction, and vehicle operation

procedures. Finally, the vehicle maintenance requirement requires semiannual inspections and daily pre-trip inspections.

Regulations governing pupil transportation, as well as, the minimum standards for school buses in Virginia either meet or exceed the Federal requirements.

### Summary

In summary, the pupil transportation system in Virginia has numerous desirable characteristics that must be brought to focus in the context of this study.

- The system is safe—this is ensured by a series of State regulations concerning the design standards and specifications for vehicles, the qualifications imposed upon drivers, and the operational regulations that have been established.
- The system is capably administered by the State Department of Education. Information about the number of buses, the number of students transported, the operating cost, and many other revealing and relevant data is compiled and updated annually.
- Generally speaking, the system is uniformly operated, maintained and supported in the Commonwealth in direct proportion to population density.
- The system is publicly-owned and lends itself to changes in governmental policies. In addition, the State's participation in subsidizing the operational cost provides ample incentives compliance with the State guidelines and regulations.
- The system is exempt from the State Corporation Commission regulations. Section 56-338.51(c) states that vehicles "owned and operated" by municipalities and other political subdivisions of the State need not comply with the Motor Carrier Laws.
- Finally, the system is often under utilized and in many cases there exists excess capacity that, within certain constraints, may be used to serve other transportation needs.

## FOOTNOTES

1. State Department of Education. Division of Special Services. Pupil Transportation in Virginia School Systems: A State of the Art Study. (Richmond, Virginia, 1974), p. 20.
2. State Department of Education, Division of Special Services, Pupil Transportation Service, Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation and Minimum Standards for School Buses in Virginia. (Richmond, Virginia, 1969) p. 1.
3. State Department of Education, Division of Special Services, Pupil Transportation Service, Pupil Transportation, 1972-73, (Richmond, Virginia, 1973), p. 6.
4. Ibid.
5. Pupil Transportation in Virginia School Systems: A State of the Art Study, (Richmond, Virginia, 1974), pp. 2-3.
6. State Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Commonwealth of Virginia, School Year 1972-73, (Richmond, Virginia, 1973) p. 159.
7. Pupil Transportation in Virginia School Systems: A State of the Art Study, (Richmond, Virginia, 1974), p. 3.
8. Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation and Minimum Standards for School Buses in Virginia, (Richmond, Virginia, 1969), pp. 4-5.
9. Ibid ., p. 3.
10. Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Commonwealth of Virginia, School Year 1972-1973, (Richmond, Virginia, 1973) p. 203.
11. Pupil Transportation, 1972-73, (Richmond, Virginia, 1973), pp. 13-17.
12. Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation and Minimum Standards for School Buses in Virginia, (Richmond, Virginia 1969), pp. 6-8.
13. These requirements come from Sections 22-249 and 276.1, and 46.1-169 and 370 of the Code of Virginia. For a more detailed explanation of the laws, see Appendix E.
14. Wilbur Smith and Associates, Feasibility Study: School Bus Utilization for Non-Pupil Transportation Programs , Report to the Department of Transportation, Arlington County, Virginia, July, 1974, p. 12.



### **Chapter III**

#### **POSSIBLE INCREASED UTILIZATION OF SCHOOL BUSES**

During the course of the study, as various transportation needs were identified, the operational elements of school buses were analyzed and certain constraints became apparent that tend to limit their widespread use, especially by the general public. One such constraint is the fact that the travel demands generated by the peak-hour work trip coincides with the use of buses for transporting students. Also, transporting the general public would probably necessitate charging a fare which would create substantial accounting and insurance problems, while extending the level of equipment utilization to a point that would endanger the integrity of the "school bus" concept and compromise the safety of pupil transportation.

Pupil reaction to the extensive use of school buses for adult transportation can effectively establish the practical and political realities of the transportation service that can be considered for this equipment. The concept of using school buses for public transportation has been used in some localities in Virginia, but the idea has yet to receive statewide acceptance.

Economic constraints, as well, place limits on the type of system that can be logically proposed. Many existing transit companies are going out of business because of the lack of revenue paying customers. A school bus transit system will most likely be operated in rural areas where the problem of attracting large numbers of revenue producing passengers is even more acute. There is a demand for public transportation, especially in rural areas, but it is felt that this demand does not justify the operation of school buses for general public transportation. Some of these unmet transportation demands will be addressed in an anticipated study by the Secretary of Transportation and Public Safety, in conjunction with the Division of State Planning and Community Affairs, dealing with transportation needs in small urban areas.

There is, however, one use for which school buses appear to be readily suited. These vehicles can support public and semi-public agencies offering road ranges of services to various segments of a community. Identification and discussion of the nature of the demand for transportation service of this type can be made. Within the limits of this investigation, it was not intended, nor was the time available to contact every agency of state government, or many of the private organizations who may be potential users of school buses. A number of state agencies were approached to determine whether or not they had a need for transportation service which is not now being met by conventional means. An attempt was made to identify specific programs that may lend themselves to school bus utilization.

In almost every instance there was an indication that the lack of

transportation is a significant factor inhibiting the delivery of social services. Likewise, there were cases where social service agencies were forced to resort to transportation services they would not have selected, if the agencies were given an alternative choice. In some cases, programs were postponed or discontinued due to the lack of transportation service.

The agency programs that follow provide a brief summary of selected transportation requirements. Once again, it is emphasized that in addition to the agencies included, there are others that were not investigated; however, those that are described are quite typical and clearly indicate the type of need that exists.

## OFFICE ON AGING

### Summary of Nutrition Program for the Elderly

The program is sponsored by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and funds are appropriated by Title VII of the Older Americans Act. The Office on Aging administers the program throughout the State.

The purpose of the program is to transport the elderly to and from their home to a dining site for a meal. In addition to providing sustenance, a wide variety of social and health services are offered. These services include health and welfare counseling, recreation, arts and crafts, nutrition education, shopping services, and information and referral service.

### Transportation Needs

Theoretically, nutrition sites are to be located within walking distance; however, the sites are too few for this goal, so the participants must provide their own transportation, or have a friend, relative, or neighbor bring them. A lack of available transportation forces some programs to operate only two or three days per week. In Goochland County, for example, a request for the program cannot be filled because there is no means of transporting the participants.

The Office on Aging coordinates and provides technical assistance to communities that implement volunteer service programs from ACTION, a federal agency. The Retired Senior Volunteer Program and the Foster Grandparent Program are two volunteer service programs that provide services and opportunities for the elderly. Both have transportation needs.

### Summary of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program

Through the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), anyone over 60 years of age can volunteer their time, experience, and interests to others in their own communities. In Virginia, there are presently over 1,000 volunteers enrolled in RSVP. The program also benefits participants by offering a free accident insurance plan while they serve, lunch while they volunteer, and transportation when available.

## Transportation Needs

With the seventeen RSVP projects in Virginia, transportation is undoubtedly the greatest problem. Most of the volunteers do not drive, and most of the rural programs have no form of public transit; therefore, almost all volunteers need transportation to and from their volunteer assignment. As often as possible, group assignments are encouraged to minimize needs.

To overcome many of the program's transportation needs, several of the projects have purchased a mini-bus to transport senior volunteer groups. The various projects have a limited amount of money to reimburse volunteers for driving their own cars or transporting other senior volunteers. If a public system is available and its use is feasible, the Office on Aging encourages senior volunteers to utilize such a system. This, however, is the exception rather than the rule.

In many of the RSVP projects, transportation needs are still unmet. Since the program is a matching share system, local funds are often not available to purchase a vehicle. This leaves staff cars and volunteer drivers to transport the bulk of volunteers. With this system, all personal liability falls on the individual driver. The program also has groups of volunteers within a project area (usually a county) who need transportation on the same day, at the same time, in different areas of the county. Available vehicles cannot handle this overload.

## Summary of the Foster Grandparent Program

The Foster Grandparent Program (FGP) provides older adults with a useful way to serve their communities in their retirement years. Foster Grandparents must be over 60 years of age, have a low income and possess good health. They receive an hourly stipend, a transportation allowance, daily hot lunches where feasible, annual physical examinations, accident insurance and uniforms if necessary.

## Transportation Needs

Foster Grandparents volunteer five days a week for four hours, in a group, at an institution for children. This program, along with the other Office on Aging programs could utilize a vehicle which is large enough to transport 30 to 60 volunteers at one time. Presently, this is not feasible. Either a program must have more than one minibus or depend on public transportation and volunteer drivers. To low income seniors, this presents a large obstacle and limits those who can participate.

## EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

### Summary of the Work Incentive Program

The Work Incentive (WIN) Program is a federal manpower program, created by an amendment to the Social Security Act. WIN's purpose is to place welfare recipients into gainful

employment. In a joint effort, the Employment Commission and Welfare Department train the welfare recipient and make him a productive worker.

The WIN Program has as its major objective the placement of over 2,500 recipients in gainful employment during Fiscal Year '75. Over one-half of these placements will be direct job placements, but the remainder will need training and/or supportive service to enter the job market.

Transportation Needs

The lack of transportation has traditionally been one of the major barriers to employment and training for disadvantaged people and minority groups. Essentially, these groups constitute a majority of the clients of the Virginia Employment Commission.

WIN is presently attempting to meet its transportation needs through contracts with other agencies. Half of the WIN projects now have transportation contracts, but their cost effectiveness is questionable. Available publicly financed transportation could more economically serve the needs of these four projects. The resulting savings created by the partial or total elimination of transportation contracts would make for better service to clients at a more realistic price.

The Virginia Employment Commission anticipated the following client population to be in need of transportation service.

Geographic Area	Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) Families
Richmond	8,000
Roanoke	1,852
Norfolk	7,563
Northern Virginia	909
Charlottesville	430
Chesapeake	1,231
Hampton	1,720
Lynchburg	542
Martinsville	226
Newport News	2,249
Portsmouth	3,203
Radford	19
Suffolk	968
	28,912

In the near future, WIN expansion will include the principal cities of Petersburg (1,250 ADC families) and Virginia Beach (1,226 ADC families), adding a total of 2,476 ADC families.

Approximately thirty counties in addition to the principal cities listed will come under the proposed WIN expansion. These thirty counties embrace an additional 5,700 individual ADC families.

A large number of these ADC recipients could potentially benefit from the transportation system created by the wider

utilization of school buses. The majority of these additional families will be in rural areas where adequate public transportation has traditionally been lacking.

The Virginia Employment Commission envisions school buses primarily providing transportation to WIN offices and to training components so that clients can be properly prepared for job market entry and subsequent economic independence. The only alternative to the use of public-owned school buses is to continue transportation contracts or to explore leasing agreements with private sector transportation companies. Both are expensive.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

### Summary of Programs

The Department of Health has several programs where citizens require assistance in reaching facilities that provide needed health care service. The Virginia Medical Assistance program (Medicaid) pays the cost of health care service for approximately 280 thousand indigent citizens, about half of whom are children. Such service includes both medical and dental care.

Additional health services concentrate on children's health problems. These include the Child Development Clinics and Crippled Children Clinics that are scattered throughout Virginia, with locations and frequency of services limited by availability of specially trained physicians and other staff. The Crippled Children Clinic services include treatment for hemophilia, cystic fibrosis, and burns, as well as pediatric surgery and other medical techniques. These clinics serve children from all economic levels.

### Transportation Needs

Many of the Medicaid eligibles reside in rural areas, and because of their indigent status do not have personal means of transportation at their disposal. To provide non-emergency routine (taxi and bus) transportation from home to sources of medical care in rural and urban areas, the Virginia Medical Assistance Program expended \$840,000 between July 1, 1973 and June 30, 1974. The largest portion (two-thirds) of this figure was for personal taxicab services for people in rural areas. Over the past five years, rapid growth has occurred in the number of taxicab operators throughout rural Virginia due to the prospect of Medicaid reimbursement; but yet there remain several counties where transportation in any form for Medicaid recipient's use is rare. Surry County and Isle of Wight County are typical of areas void of transportation. In other counties some type of taxi service is available, an alternative public system could offer a less costly solution to the transportation problem.

At the present time, the Commonwealth has 12 approved areawide health planning councils that cover most of Virginia's 22 planning districts. In each of these areawide agencies, a special report has been recently undertaken, or is presently under way, to identify health deficiencies, needs, or problems. From these plans, the capability should exist to identify the geographical areas where

transportation would be especially important in augmenting transportation deficiencies to assure that citizens have adequate means to reach sources of medical care.

## OFFICE OF RECREATION

### Summary of Programs

The major objective of the Office of Recreation is to help develop and enrich total recreation opportunities, programs and facilities to meet the many varied interests of the citizenry of the Commonwealth. The Office assists and aids the locality with professional expertise in developing and implementing recreational programs and facilities.

Community park and recreation departments attempt to provide an extensive recreation program for local citizens. Programs are in progress for the physically handicapped, mentally retarded, and senior citizens, as well as the more common programs for healthy children and adults. The nature and location of the program determines whether or not a form of public transportation is necessary. Some of the current recreation programs which could be affected by the use of school buses include, but are not limited to:

- pre-school children programs including trips and visits, special events, and others;
- youth athletic programs;
- youth hobby and crafts classes;
- playground programs offering a variety of games, crafts, music and dance, field trips, and special activities year-round;
- programs for exceptional children including special Saturday programs for the retarded and handicapped individuals, special programs for retarded and handicapped adults, swimming programs for retarded children and adults, special trips and tours, and others;
- special events or celebrations including Fourth of July, adult tours, theatrical productions, and others;
- adult recreation programs including classes in crafts, physical activities, drama, ballet, special interests, and others;
- after school programs for youth and adults;
- programs for senior citizens including lectures, trips, bowling, luncheons, and other interesting events; and
- youth clubs and events including after school, Saturday and Sunday programs.

### Transportation Needs

As seen from the above information concerning programs now being implemented, the utilization of school buses could definitely enhance the ability of local parks and recreation departments to meet all the park and recreation needs of its citizens. Several localities would provide additional programs if the lack of transportation were not a hindrance. Some community recreation departments have acquired vans or buses, or rent them in order to implement some of their programs that are dependent upon providing transportation. This service must be available before many programs are successful.

## COMMISSION FOR THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED

### Summary of Programs

The Commission offers several services to the more than 12,000 visually handicapped people in Virginia. The Vocational Rehabilitation Department provides vocational counseling and personal adjustment, physical restoration, and training. Training includes on-the-job, vocational, technical and college. The ultimate goal is job placement coupled with follow-up services.

The Richmond Workshop for the Blind provides specific vocational training and employment for blind adults. In some areas of the State, rehabilitation instruction classes are held twice a month.

### Transportation Needs

Visually handicapped individuals must either depend on family, friends, or public transportation to meet their transportation needs. A large number of the 3,600 visually handicapped who receive service from the Commission are members of Virginia's older population and could likely benefit from transportation to day care centers for the aged, senior citizen centers, shopping centers and recreation facilities. In Richmond, Danville, Roanoke, Lynchburg, Portsmouth and Arlington, the Commission has regular Rehabilitation Training programs for visually handicapped individuals who meet in community facilities for specific training and recreational activities. At present, volunteers are used to provide transportation for these individuals. Since only 3,600 of the more than 12,000 blind persons in the State are presently serviced, it is evident that a much greater need for transportation service could soon develop.

## DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

### Summary of Programs

The State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation works with about 50,000 disabled citizens each year for the purpose of helping them to enter or remain in gainful employment.

The delivery of vocational rehabilitation services to disabled individuals is accomplished through four principal service programs. These are:

- A. The General Field Program
- B. Cooperative Programs and Special Projects
- C. Facility Programs
- D. The Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center

The general field program consists of 32 offices located throughout the State. The staff assigned to these field offices serve physically or mentally disabled persons in their localities on an individual basis. Referrals are received from a wide range of sources including physicians, hospitals, social workers and schools.

Cooperative programs operate in three basic areas, corrections, mental health and public schools. Special projects vary from time to time depending upon areas of special emphasis.

There are close to 60 privately operated non-profit sheltered workshop facilities throughout the State in which the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation sponsors disabled clients. These facilities are quite diverse in size and in the scope of services offered, but, for the most part, their programs are geared to the mentally retarded. With few exceptions, clients utilizing these workshops live at home and must travel each day to and from a facility.

Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center is a comprehensive State-owned facility located at Fisherville. It has dormitory housing for both male and female rehabilitation clients. It serves close to 2,000 disabled individuals each year. Its program is aimed toward the more severely disabled and includes a combination of psychological, social, vocational evaluation, medical, and other related services.

#### Transportation Needs

In practically every instance, transportation is a key element in the vocational rehabilitation of a handicapped individual. The handicapped must go somewhere to receive required services. They must report to doctors' offices, medical clinics and hospitals for diagnostic and other medically related services. They must often go to a vocational evaluation center for an assessment of their vocational potential. If one is a candidate for job training, he or she must go to a training site. If some form of therapy is needed, or an artificial appliance required, one must go to those resources which provide such services. Transportation, therefore, is vital to the vocational rehabilitation process.

Because disabled rehabilitation clients, in the main, must depend upon some other person to operate a vehicle to transport them to wherever they need to go, they are, as a group, almost totally immobile unless they can avail themselves of some form of transportation that is operated by someone else. Public transportation is not adequate anywhere in the State to meet the needs of handicapped individuals. Even in those places where public



transportation is considered better than average, the structural barriers of the vehicles often preclude their use by disabled persons who need special accommodations.

In each of the programs operated by the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, transportation is a vital service that is not always readily available. Often, when the transportation resources are generally present, they are not timely or scheduled in accordance with the needs of disabled persons.

In two particular programs, the facility program and the Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center program, regularly scheduled transportation designed for "day student" use would greatly enhance their utilization by disabled people in those localities who are not now able to commute to and from their homes.

In each of the other programs, improved and expanded transportation service would clearly increase the disabled citizens' chances for successful rehabilitation.

#### DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE

The public welfare system is designed to provide income maintenance and social service programs for individuals and families in need and to help these people attain eventual independence from public assistance. Generally, in each city and county of the State there is a local welfare board or a director of public welfare who administers the many different welfare programs. Virginia has 123 local agencies with a staff of approximately 4,500 persons.

#### Summary of Programs

The welfare system consists of two types of programs, assistance programs and social service programs. The assistance programs include General Relief, Food Stamps, Medicaid, and others. Social services programs include Adult Services, Family Planning Services, Vocational Services and others. A summary of six programs, three assistance types and three social service types, provide an example of the Department's activities.

The General Relief Program provides limited assistance to a person or persons who meet eligibility criteria that there is financial need; that eligibility for aid in a federal assistance program has not been established; and that the person is unemployable. General relief funds may also be used to provide assistance to persons temporarily ill or disabled; emergency temporary aid to persons in acute need because of unemployment; medical care to the indigent when this is not available through other sources; burial of indigent persons and aid to stranded transients.

Funding is 62.5% State and 37.5% local money; administrative costs are shared on the basis of 80% State and 20% local. The monthly cost of maintenance cases is \$712,727.00. Medical care (\$16,301), and burial and transients (\$5,427) expenditures increase

the total monthly cost of General Relief to \$734,455.00.

The Food Stamp Program is designed to supplement the food budgets of (1) recipients of public assistance and (2) low income families, by helping them secure additional food. A total of 55,200 households and 184,101 persons participated in this program in May 1974. The total value of coupons issued was \$5,729,638.00. Administrative costs for this program are shared 26% federal, 54% State and 20% local.

Medicaid is a federally reimbursed program that provides for the cost of medical care for specified needy individuals. The program is administered by the State Health Department; the Welfare Department determines eligibility and provides Social Services.

The Public Welfare System offers the following social services. Some of these services are designed especially for recipients of public assistance, but many are available to other eligible persons.

Adult Services provides many persons receiving financial assistance with special services they often need. These services fall into five broad categories as follows:

1. Protection - If a person is unable to act in his own behalf due to physical or mental limitations, the local agency may take appropriate legal or social action to protect the client from exploitation.
2. Self-Support - Referral to rehabilitation and employment agencies; assistance in finding employment.
3. Information and Referral - Assist client to use available community resources, follow-up to assure that appropriate services were given.
4. Health Care - Assist client in making best use of the available medical services. Assist clients when needed to secure appropriate nursing home or domiciliary care.
5. Living Arrangements - Assist client to obtain adequate housing, help client to improve personal, home and money management.

Family Planning Services must be offered and provided to all families and individuals served by departments of public welfare. Such services include information giving, instruction, counseling and referral with follow-up to other appropriate agencies.

Vocational Services provide employable clients with assistance in securing employment or vocational training. A Work-Incentive Program (WIN), available in some localities, provides persons with work, training and education to help them secure the best paying jobs for which they can be qualified.

Transportation Needs

Almost every welfare program described above has its effectiveness limited because of the inadequacies of transportation. An applicant for assistance programs can be assisted with funds for transportation to have access to the agency determining eligibility, as well as for access to medical resources for determination of incapacity or ability to work. This is an allowable administrative cost. The Medicaid program assumes the cost and provides vendor payments to commercial carriers. The limited availability of public transit service necessitates a dependency on the more expensive commercial taxis. Where both types of service are lacking, the poor, aged, and disabled must either walk, hitchhike, secure rides with neighbors or relatives, or pay for nonlicensed service, none of which can be costed to the programs. It is not at all uncommon for agency personnel to provide transportation in agency vehicles to clients in order to give them access to social service programs available at the agency, or to other human services available at referral agencies, such as home extension programs, senior citizens programs and recreational programs. This method allows for administrative reimbursable cost; however, the practice is known to be costly although the specific cost factor is not identifiable as a client transportation service cost.

The welfare client population represents every age and is located in every geographic area of the Commonwealth. The clients are poor and often disabled, which even makes grocery shopping a difficult task. There is no particular time of day, or day of the week that the client must schedule his or her use of the Department of Welfare's services. Clients can be placed on a timetable that would be designed to utilize available transportation.

### Summary

The variety of services and the related transportation needs of public agencies present a broad spectrum of possible opportunities to further utilize school buses. If, within a particular jurisdiction, these needs are perceived to be significant and a desire to implement a program of using school buses in this regard is expressed, there is evidence that some transportation arrangements could be successfully established. The expanded use of school buses by public bodies has been implemented in several Virginia localities, as well as elsewhere in the United States. Their experiences can offer an example of how the mechanics of implementing such use may be addressed and to what extent service is provided.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **NON-PUPIL USE OF SCHOOL BUSES IN VIRGINIA**

Non-pupil use of school buses already occurs in Virginia. Both the counties of Arlington and Fairfax have been using school buses for other activities related to the operations of the county governments. It is worth noting that both counties are highly urbanized and located within the Washington, D. C. metropolitan area. Arlington County owns and operates approximately 150

school buses to transport approximately 8,400 pupils daily. Fairfax County, having the Nation's fifteenth largest public school system, operates 648 school buses to transport approximately 82,900 pupils daily. What follows is a summary of the experiences of these two counties related to the non-pupil use of school buses.

### Arlington County Program

For a number of years various individuals and groups have asked the Arlington County Board of Supervisors and the Arlington School Board for the use of school buses during periods of the day and days of the year when these buses were not needed for transporting school children. Available records indicate that as far back as 1963 requests from the School administration to the State Supervisor, Pupil Transportation, State Board of Education, to use school buses for non-student purposes were initiated.

In January 1973, the Arlington County Board and Arlington School Board requested members of the Arlington Delegation to the Virginia General Assembly to sponsor legislation which would permit the use of school buses for non-school use. House Bill No. 1392, offered January 16, 1973, passed the General Assembly of Virginia. Section No. 22-151.2 provides:

**The school boards of Arlington and Fairfax Counties may enter into agreements with the governing bodies of their respective counties providing for the use of County school buses by departments, boards, commissions or officers of their respective counties for county purposes for a period of two years from the effective date hereof. When such school buses are in use for non-school purposes, the flashing red lights shall not be used and the "School Bus" inscription on the front and rear of such buses shall be covered.**

Following passage of this bill, the Chairman of the Arlington County Board requested that a study be made to determine how buses could be used to meet County government and public transportation needs. He indicated that funds could be made available to pay an outside consultant to make such a study.

To comply with the Chairman's request, a steering committee was formed, composed of staff members of the County government and the School administration. County departments represented included the Recreation Division, the Department of Human Resources, and the Department of Transportation. This steering committee decided that a consultant should be hired to recommend ways in which school buses could be used for non-pupil transportation. The study, costing about \$14,000, was completed in July 1974. County and School officials are presently considering the consultant's recommendations which included a primary suggestion that non-school use of buses be limited to the support of County programs.

While waiting for completion of the consultant's study, the schools provided bus support for the County Division of Recreation.

Approximately ten buses each week day have been used this summer in transporting adults and children to recreational activities within a 50-mile radius. One night each week, handicapped Boy Scouts have been transported to an Arlington school for Scout meetings. In addition, since last winter two buses have been used in transporting elderly citizens to a school where they receive free lunches under a Title VII program. These activities are programs of, or are sponsored by, the County's Recreation Division.

A major problem encountered in implementing expanded transportation services was securing insurance coverage. The carrier used by the Arlington Public Schools refused to extend the fleet insurance policy to cover buses used in transporting elderly citizens last winter. Arrangements were made on an interim basis for the insurance carrier covering the County's vehicles to insure ten school buses used in support of County programs. Meanwhile, the School Board solicited bids from insurance companies for a new fleet policy to become effective on August 1, 1974. Specifications included coverage of 15 unspecified buses to be used for transporting persons participating in County programs. Four insurance companies submitted bids; the low bidder, St. Paul's Fire and Marine Insurance Company, was awarded the contract for the period from August 1, 1974 to August 1, 1975. The total premium, paid in advance, is \$22,642. Coverage is as follows:

		<u>Premium</u>
Bodily Injury - each person	\$ 250,000	
Bodily Injury - each occurrence	1,000,000	
Property Damage - each occurrence	50,000	\$15,430
Uninsured Motorist		4,032
Medical Payments - each person	1,000	2,072
Automobile Physical Damage		1,108
Total Premium		\$22,642

This policy covers all vehicles owned by the School Board, approximately 150. In addition, it covers 15 buses for non-pupil use as specified below:

**“In consideration of the premium charged, it is agreed that coverages provided under this policy shall include up to 15 undesignated school buses, to be used for local transportation from time to time in support of programs by departments, boards, commissions or officers of Arlington County.”**

The inclusion of the term “undesignated” allows flexibility in scheduling the service in case of maintenance or replacement.

The operational procedures used to implement this program are set forth as follows:

1. The user, e.g., the Recreation Division sends its transportation requirements on a request form by Wednesday of each week for the following week. This request includes for each trip, the pick up place and time, number of passengers,

destination, and return time.

2. The School Transportation Department integrates these requirements with school trips.

3. At the end of each month, the School staff submits a request for reimbursement to the user, listing for each trip the pick up point, destination, total mileage, driver's hourly rate, total driver's time and cost per trip. Trip cost is a total of mileage times \$.43 per mile plus driver's hourly rate times total driver's time. The \$.43/mile factor includes overhead costs in addition to operating costs.

4. The user then reimburses the School Board for the amount requested.

Drivers employed by the School Board receive an average hourly wage of about \$4.80, as of July 1, 1974. The turnover rate among drivers has been extremely low. These drivers are in Local 2240 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO; not all drivers are dues-paying members, but all are covered by the union's contract.

When school buses are used to transport other than school children, it is necessary that the "School Bus" lettering be covered. The Transportation Department has improvised a canvas snap-on arrangement so that the driver can comply with this requirement. A magnetic covering is being investigated. It has been found necessary to provide an auxiliary step for boarding of elderly persons.

Thirty-eight of the school buses are equipped with surplus two-way radios that were obtained from the County Police Department. A contract for maintenance of the radios and base station at \$320 per month exists with a local firm.

Two new small school buses equipped with electrically-operated lifts for persons in wheelchairs are being purchased by the School Board to replace two old buses. When these buses are not needed for school children, they can be used for transporting adults. Each bus cost \$8,892, of which about \$1,000 is for the lift.

There have been no accidents thus far and operationally, drivers on non-student trips apparently have adhered to all regulations pertaining to school buses, including keeping within established maximum speed limits.

#### Fairfax County Program

Public and private organizations in Fairfax County have long requested the use of school buses. The program was ultimately established in Fairfax County in a manner similar to Arlington County's, whereby the rationale that public facilities, such as school buildings, are open to community groups led to the acceptance of the idea of increased utilization of school buses.

On July 26, 1973, the Fairfax County School Board adopted

School Board Policy No. 5960, which allows implementation of Section 22-151.2 of the Code of Virginia. The Fairfax County Board of Supervisors approved the same policy on August 6, 1973, making it possible for school buses to be used by County agencies for non-pupil transportation. The policy states:

**Fairfax County School Board buses will be made available to Fairfax County departments, boards, commissions, or offices to support activities approved by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. The buses will be provided at the request of these Fairfax County sponsors on the same basis as, and using the same procedures that are used in, supporting school field trips. School uses, including field trips, will take precedence over other county requests.**

**The sponsoring Fairfax County agency will be required to reimburse Fairfax County School Board for the driver's salary at field trip rates, with a two-hour minimum, and for operating costs, including depreciation, as may be determined proper by Equipment Management Transportation Agency.**

In March, 1973, a steering committee was established by the Support Services Department, Department of Education, to implement Section 22-151.2 of the Code of Virginia. The Department of Education had representatives from the Office of Management, the Transportation Division, the Financial Services Department, and the Personnel Department. The Department of Recreation and the Equipment Management Transportation Agency were also represented on the committee. The committee was coordinated with the Office of the County Executive, the County Board of Supervisors and the Fairfax County School Board. The committee conducted an in-house study and reported its findings through the Division Superintendent of Fairfax County Public Schools.

In May, the Division Superintendent reported some of the findings of the committee to the Board of Supervisors. The Committee was aware that policies and regulations would be needed to meet the anticipated demand for school buses. The Superintendent of Schools was interested in providing special transportation services to other users without detracting from the basic purpose of transporting students to and from school and home.

One major difficulty faced by the committee was the lack of arrangements for obtaining volunteer drivers and the nonavailability of buses during certain hours of the day. Trips could be scheduled during the school day only if the buses were not needed for pupil transportation. Trips of long duration would have to be scheduled at night and on weekends.

At present the Support Services Department has established a comprehensive request handling system. The Director, Transportation Division, will approve requests for nonschool use of school buses provided:

1. The request is in writing from a Fairfax County agency and indicates an assurance of reimbursement of applicable drivers' pay and mileage rates and/or charges. The authorized user agency must identify the office to which the bill will be sent, and the funds from which the bill will be paid.
2. The requested service will not interfere with the support rendered to the school system.
3. A driver can be identified who will perform the requested service.

If the request cannot be approved, the Transportation Division notifies the requesting agency. If the request is approved, after completion of service, the Transportation Division bills the requesting county agency by preparing a County of Fairfax Transfer Voucher. The transfer voucher is forwarded to the Business Affairs Department for processing. For uses that are continuous rather than occasional, transfer vouchers are prepared at the close of each calendar month and at the termination of the service.

The cost of the user agency includes a mileage fee and the driver's salary. The mileage fee is computed from the operating cost of the vehicle which includes gasoline, oil, depreciation, maintenance, and maintenance overhead (light and heat). The present per mile charge is 28 cents.

The driver's salary, based on five years experience, is now, \$4.29 per hour (includes a July 1, 1974, 9 1/4 percent pay increase). The actual driver pay rate is used in the billing process. All drivers are regular part-time employees who work fifteen hours per week. An effort is made to recruit drivers with less than forty hours work time to drive buses for non-school related trips. The driver is guaranteed a two-hour minimum pay for each run. Usually, recruiting drivers has not been a problem.

The Transportation Division uses their standard Field Trip form to acquire all the necessary information to properly bill the user agency. (See Appendix F.)

The agency requesting the service has certain responsibilities it must meet. The request must be presented either five working days before the usage date, or by Wednesday of the preceding week. The agency must also cancel trips in advance. The agency must ensure that load conditions are met by not having more than 44 seated adults on a 66 passenger bus, and no more than 24 seated adults on a 36 passenger bus. Also, the user agency is requested to chaperone the bus riders.

School buses were put to immediate use after School Board Policy No. 5960 was adopted in August, 1973. The County Department of Recreation is the largest user. During the summer of 1974, they used 35 buses per day. The Department of Recreation submitted a request for 35 buses every Saturday during the previous winter.



The Adult Mental Health and Retardation agency uses 14 buses daily throughout the year, while servicing four different parts of the county.

The Department of Recreation is sponsoring a Pilot Model of one bus per day for elderly citizens. The bus operates Monday through Friday the year-round, and transports citizens to nutrition sites.

The Department of Recreation often requests six school buses equipped with hydraulic lifts. The lifts are designed to handle a 700 pound minimum load and are specially designed for wheelchairs. When the seats are removed, a 54 passenger bus is able to hold 16 wheelchairs. The County is developing plans for a pilot study to expand the system by having the specially equipped bus in each area of the County each day. An additional three buses are on order to augment the pilot study. Additional sporadic requests are made by other agencies and by members of the County Board of Supervisor.

School buses operate at many different times. At night they are used for adult recreation programs, and may enter the District of Columbia for cultural events. On the weekend there is no limit to the distance the bus may travel. The regulations allow for overnight trips if certain conditions are met.

After twelve months of operation, there have been no accidents. The County is not limited to the number of buses that may be used for nonschool purposes and all of the passengers are insured on any bus used by a County agency.

The Fairfax County School Board has an insurance contract that provides the additional coverage needed to insure the new nonpupil transportation program. The additional school buses are covered by the County's general liability policy since it is retrospective. A retrospective insurance policy allows the premiums to be adjusted upward or downward depending on the previous three years of insurance claim experience. The retrospective policy made it possible to avoid an immediate increase in the premiums paid. The ultimate additional insurance costs will depend on the number of nonschool related accident claims filed with the insurance company.

The County School Board has adopted a strategy to manage the number of claims that may arise. They feel the number of claims will be minimal when trained personnel are employed. Well trained bus drivers who meet State and County School Board qualification requirements can reduce the risk involved with additional usage. Increased risk leads to additional claims which result in higher insurance premiums.

To comply with the Code of Virginia, the lettering on each bus is covered when used to transport nonstudents. A flexible plastic material called magnetic sheeting is placed over the lettering. It is acquired by the County in large rolls and cut to fit each bus. Magnetic sheeting withstands the elements and remains fixed at

normal driving speeds. It has a service life of several months.

All County school buses are serviced by the Equipment Management Transportation Agency of Fairfax County. The County agency maintains a vehicle maintenance garage system for several county organizations. Twenty-two buses have two-way radios, but they are not used for the non-pupil transportation program. The Fairfax County School Board vehicle replacement policy has school buses replaced between seven and ten years with one-eighth of the bus fleet being replaced annually.

## SUMMARY

The examples of nonpupil use of school buses in the counties of Arlington and Fairfax provide an opportunity to examine the potential for such use throughout the State, as well as offering a test of the impact these programs might have upon highway safety. The experience of these localities, both urban in character, would appear to favorably suggest that similar arrangements could be implemented in other jurisdictions where the use would be less intense and the traffic less congested. Both counties have been operating school buses in this manner for a relatively short period of time; however, to this point no serious shortcomings have surfaced. Based upon the findings obtained in the investigation of the variety of issues set forth in this report, a series of recommendations regarding the non-pupil use of school buses have been formulated in the concluding chapter.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **NATIONAL TRENDS**

Since 1973, six states besides Virginia, (Iowa, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, South Dakota, and Washington) have passed enabling legislation allowing departments of education and local governments to use idle school buses for the transportation of either the general public, the needy or some other specific class of clientele. A description of the objectives of each state's enabling legislation, as well as any actual school bus programs that may have developed, affords some indication of school bus utilization outside of Virginia.

#### Iowa

The General Assembly passed Chapter 197 which gives the board of directors of every school district the discretion of furnishing a bus and qualified driver to "an organization of, or sponsoring activities for, senior citizens, children, handicapped persons..." The school board is authorized to charge and collect an amount sufficient to reimburse all costs of furnishing the bus and driver. The board must attain sufficient liability insurance to cover the additional usage.

#### New Mexico

The legislature passed Chapter 38, titled The Emergency Transportation Act. According to the provisions in the Act, the state corporation commission may approve a permit application of a school district operating its own buses or of an independent school bus operator who operates buses under contract, for the operation of school buses for general public transportation if the commission determines: (1) the school district operating its own buses or the independent school bus operator complies with the laws regulating transportation of the general public; (2) existing public or private transportation systems will not be adversely affected by the use of school buses for general public transportation; and (3) an emergency exists creating the need for using school buses for public transportation.

A permit will be approved by the state transportation director provided: (1) students transported by the school bus are not adversely affected; (2) the service of public transportation by school buses will not duplicate other public service; and (3) all state corporation commission laws for public transportation are adhered to.

### New York

Section 1502 of the New York State Education Law allows for the increased utilization of idle school buses. The board of education of any school district has the power and authority to rent or lease school buses from its school district to any senior citizen center or organization that is recognized by the office for aging or any nonprofit incorporated organization serving senior citizens or the physically or mentally handicapped.

### Oregon

Oregon Revised Statute 332.427 enables school districts to enter into agreements to use school buses for experimentation in local transportation systems. In January 1971, the Mass Transit Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation announced it would conduct a pilot project using school buses for public transportation. The city of Klamath Falls was chosen. The community/school bus project was funded by a demonstration grant from the U. S. Department of Transportation, Urban Mass Transportation Administration, with matching funds from the State of Oregon, the city of Klamath Falls and several local organizations.

Klamath Falls is a small urban community (approximately 36,000 population) lying in the heart of a sparsely populated agricultural and lumber region. It is the only community within a one-hundred mile radius that offers professional services and more than minimal shopping facilities.

Three types of service were offered by the nonprofit corporation that was set up to implement the demonstration project. The service included regular, Sunday and intercity routes. Regular service was provided by operating a single school bus on a fixed route with one hour headways. The routes were designed with primary emphasis upon the needs of the senior citizens and low-income persons with

limited transportation alternatives.

The Sunday service operated exclusively for the purpose of taking people to and from church. Since one bus was used, only those churches close together were serviced. It was felt that if additional demand were generated, more buses could be leased.

A single bus makes a round trip one day each week between Klamath Falls and a smaller town dependent on Klamath Falls for shopping and professional services.

The demonstration project was considered successful for its research value. The researchers developed several conclusions including:

- school buses offer very real potential for non-commuter service;
- the only restrictions on the number of buses available during idle hours are the financial conditions of the community and the attitudes of the school boards whose buses would be used;
- using school buses for public transportation needs has the advantages of low capital outlay and short term commitment;
- great care and planning must be exercised in obtaining insurance coverage, especially when the service is a pilot project and where senior citizens constitute a large segment of the user group;
- the high step on school buses provided a problem for senior citizens and people with minor physical limitations;
- and it is recommended that research effort be put into the development of a bus that is acceptable for use by students and adults from the perspectives of comfort, appearance, and safety.

As a result of the pilot project, the Oregon State Legislature passed four bills making it easier for other communities to implement similar projects.

#### South Dakota

South Dakota law states that school buses may be rented by, or their use may be granted to, a nonprofit club, group, organization, association or corporation for the transportation of persons under 21 and over 65 years of age. The motor vehicle must be operated by a person who meets the requirements of the State. Also, the motor vehicle must be covered by an insurance policy with the limits no lower than required when students are transported.

#### Washington

House Bill No. 1282 gives the superintendent of public instruction the authority to initiate a cooperative school

transportation pilot program so the students and other people of the district may be transported. Several objectives must be met by each pilot program. The programs shall look into:

1. the feasibility of reducing potential duplication among common transportation routes;
2. potential for cost reductions through establishment of consolidated maintenance activities;
3. advantages of cooperative equipment and insurance purchases;
4. an examination of transportation activities on the local level not receiving State support;
5. an exploration of cooperative transportation services for related community needs; and
6. the effect of centralized assistance on improved maintenance, safety, and procurement of new buses.

To date, the mechanism made available by the above enabling legislation is not being used. The superintendent of public instruction and other state officials are presently not certain about how the pilot programs should be implemented.

### Summary

Three of the six states, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington, have enabling legislation providing for general public transportation. In each state, a need for public transportation must be expressed by the community before the program can be instituted. Also, care must be taken to avoid duplication of service. This type of system usually requires fixed routes with time tables and frequent stops at the curb.

The states of Iowa, New York and South Dakota, as well as Virginia, allow school buses to be provided for use by specific organizations and/or governmental agencies. All four states aim the service at senior citizens, the young and/or handicapped. New York allows only senior citizen groups, whether governmental or private, if they are recognized by the office for aging. Virginia limits the use to only governmental agencies and offices within two localities, but covers a broader spectrum of health and social service transportation needs. Furthermore, in Virginia programs have been put into operation and have proven to be quite successful in meeting certain transportation needs.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The use of school buses owned by school systems in the periodic scheduled transportation of citizens in Virginia can be accomplished to a limited extent without altering the primary purpose of moving

children to and from school. The following recommendations set forth the format under which further consideration of such use should be made.

I. School buses should not be used to serve the general public. Regularly scheduled service, on fixed routes, open to any fare-paying citizens would overstress equipment needed for pupil transportation. It would also tend to diminish the motoring public's reaction to school bus safety laws since the vehicle traditionally used to transport children would frequently be seen serving another function. To constantly expect the motoring public to distinguish between the yellow vehicle's role at a particular moment and act accordingly would eventually compromise overall highway safety. In addition, costs, administrative complexity, insurance and other issues would place a burden on local school boards that they are not responsible for. Finally, the school bus is not primarily designed for use by the general public and, therefore, should not be considered to be a substitute for a general transit vehicle.

II. Investigation has indicated, however, that there is a need for transportation, especially in rural areas, that the school bus may help to meet. There are presently numerous public agencies whose function it is to provide a wide-range of community service to a variety of eligible citizens. As has been pointed out, transportation from where clients of social service agencies reside to where the service is provided is often one of the more troublesome problems to overcome. Also, it is usually true that those people who are served by these agencies are most in need of some form of public transportation. It is, therefore, recommended that localities be given the opportunity to utilize the school bus, within established guidelines, to help solve a locally perceived problem. Again, such expanded use should be limited to governmental agencies or for programs sponsored by a governmental agency and would be a voluntary decision made by local officials. If access to desirable social programs can be improved, their success and ultimate worth will be enhanced.

III. The operation of any expanded service to public agencies provided by school buses should be conducted within certain guidelines established by both legislation and regulations set forth by appropriate State agencies. The following recommendations related to operation are made:

A. On any occasion when a school bus is not being used in normal pupil transportation activities, all markings related to school use will be concealed and the flashing red signal lights will not be operative.

B. The concealed school bus markings should be covered by appropriate wording or acronyms that would identify the non-student nature of the use. It would also be appropriate for statewide markings for the non-student use of school buses to be developed for uniformity and safety.

C. Drivers for non-school use should be limited to regular school bus drivers or drivers trained and qualified in the same manner

as regular school bus drivers and the vehicle should be operated in the same manner set forth for its use as a school bus.

D. Vehicles selected for non-school service should operate exclusively for that purpose until the assigned trip is completed. There should not be simultaneous joint use of buses.

E. Insurance coverage must continue to meet minimum standards for student use and minimum standards of coverage for non-student use should be established. Obtaining additional insurance coverage is not a major problem as is generally believed. The experiences of Arlington and Fairfax Counties serve as examples of how the insurance problem has been solved. In addition, a response from the Insurance Services Office of Virginia reveals that the non-pupil use of school buses is adequately covered under Rule 47(d) of the Commercial Automobile Manual. This rule provides that for an additional premium charge an extension of a policy covering a public automobile (bus) to cover special trips not contemplated by the classification under which the automobile (bus) is rated can be made.

F. The non-student service undertaken by a local school bus system should be limited to a number of buses equal to, or less than, 20% of the total fleet size.

G. The non-student use of a school bus system should be financed by the user agencies on a per mile basis to cover the increased costs associated with expanded service.

H. Under no circumstances should the non-student use of a school bus reduce the ability of a locality to provide pupil transportation, or diminish the safety and security of the student rider.

IV. The Commonwealth can provide varying levels of leadership to encourage the wider use of school buses and to make it easier for localities to implement expanded transportation service. This would be especially useful to the more rural areas whose governmental systems are not readily able to assume expanded administrative responsibilities. This leadership could come largely from the State Department of Education and other agencies who may wish to establish certain policies regarding school bus utilization. The following recommendations are made:

A. To encourage wider use of school buses as outlined, the Commonwealth should consider financial incentives such as:

1. Bearing the initial costs incurred to accomplish any modifications to the vehicle or the supporting system required to initiate expanded service.
2. Increase the subsidy available to school divisions who choose to participate in providing expanded service.
3. Assist school divisions who wish to provide expanded service

in obtaining certain equipment, such as two-way radios. State and local police departments and the military often have surplus units that may be made more readily available at a reduced price through a central State source. The Commonwealth could also assist in providing existing base facilities, whenever it is practical, to school divisions utilizing radios.

B. The Commonwealth could promote and educate people about the concept of expanded utilization of public transportation equipment.

C. The uniform design of markings suggested previously could be developed and distributed by the Commonwealth.

D. A policy committee should be appointed to:

1. Consider the operational recommendations presented as well as others that would be deemed desirable to help in establishing necessary State regulations.

2. Evaluate the extent of State participation in any expanded service provided by school buses and make appropriate recommendations to the Administration and General Assembly.

3. Monitor and evaluate the operation of any such system to ensure that pupil service is maintained, safety is not compromised, and the program is properly administered.

V. The General Assembly should consider amending State statutes covering school buses as follows:

22-151.2 Local school boards may enter into agreements with the governing bodies of their respective localities providing for the use of not more than twenty(20) percent of the school buses under their authority to periodically transport citizens who are recipients of social services offered or sponsored by public departments, boards, commissions, or agencies. When such school buses are used for nonschool purposes, the flashing red lights shall not be used and the "School Bus" inscription on the front and rear of such buses shall be covered.

46.1-169.1 It shall be unlawful for any motor vehicle licensed in Virginia having a seating capacity of more than fifteen persons to be operated on the highways of this State if it be yellow in color, unless such motor vehicle is used in transporting students who attend public, private or parochial schools, or for the purposes specified in paragraphs 22-151.2 and 46.1-287.1 and meets the requirements for motor vehicles used in the transportation of pupils in the public schools. This section will not apply to motor vehicles which transport passengers as well as school children for hire in the cities of Bristol and Charlottesville. Violators of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

The recommendations set forth should provide the background necessary to further consider the utilization of school buses for the



periodic transportation of citizens.

APPENDIX A

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 89

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

Offered February 11, 1974

*Directing the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Education to conduct a study and report on methods by which school buses might be used in the periodic scheduled transportation of citizens.*

Patrons—Messrs. Guest, Pendleton, Mrs. McDiarmid, Messrs. DeBruhl, Thomas, Dickinson, and Mann

Referred to the Committee on Education

Whereas, school systems throughout Virginia have a considerable investment in school buses purchased with public funds; and

Whereas, these buses are not in use throughout each day, and

Whereas, there are questions as to liability, insurance, and availability of drivers; and

Whereas, many persons in rural areas have no means of transportation to nearby towns for essential purposes; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, The Senate concurring, That the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Education are directed to initiate a study to determine by what methods school buses owned by school systems might be used in the periodic scheduled transportation of citizens.

The Secretaries shall conclude their study and make their report to the Governor and the General Assembly by September one, nineteen hundred seventy-four.

Official Use by Clerks

Agreed to By  
The House of Delegates  
with amendment  
without amendment

Agreed to By The Senate  
with amendment  
without amendment

Date: .....

Date: .....

Clerk of the House of Delegates

Clerk of the Senate

APPENDIX B  
TRANSIT COMPANIES IN VIRGINIA

Location and Name of Transit Service	Owner	No. of Buses
Bristol - Bristol City Bus Company	Public	24
Charlottesville - Yellow Cab and Transit Service	Private*	10
Danville - Danville Traction and Power Co.	Private*	13
Fredericksburg - Colonial Transit Co.	Private	50
Grundy - Black & White Transit Co.	Private	17
Hampton - Citizens Rapid Transit Co.	Private*	97
Hampton Roads Tunnel Bus	Public	2
Lynchburg - Greater Lynchburg Transit Corp.	Public	40
Martinsville - Martinsville City Transit	Public	7
Norfolk - Tidewater Metro Transit	Public	234
Elizabeth River Tunnel Commission	Public	12
Petersburg - Tri-City Coaches	Private*	18
Portsmouth - Community Motor Bus	Private*	42
Radford - Radford City Lines	Private	4
Richmond - Greater Richmond Transit Corp.	Public	219
Bon Air Transit Co.	Private	1
Commonwealth Transit Co.	Private	1
Fairfield Transit Co.	Private	1
Roanoke - Roanoke City Lines	Private	72
Pendleton Bus Line	Private	2
Wright's Bus Line	Private	1
Staunton - Staunton Transit Service	Public	15
Washington, D. C. - Northern Virginia-Metro	Public	519
Williamsburg - Colonial Virginia Tours, Inc.	Private	9
Winchester - Winchester City Bus Co.	Public	9

\*In these areas, transit technical studies have or will recommend public acquisition of the transit companies.

PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

YEAR 1972-73

1  COUNTIES	2		3	4	5	6	7	8				9	10	11	12	13		14	15	16
	Average Daily Attendance of Transported Pupils			Total No. of Buses Operated	Total No. of Miles Pupils Transported on Reg. Route	No. of Days Buses Operated	Number of Drivers				Average Pupils Per Bus	Average Miles Per Bus Per Day	Cost Per Pupil Per Year	Cost Per Mile	Total Cost of Operation Less Gas Tax Refund	Cost of Replacement	Capital Outlay	Total of Columns 13, 14 & 15		
	Elementary	Secondary	Total				Adult		Student											
				M	F	M	F													
Accomack Publicly-owned	3,256	1,620	4,876	77	564,480	180	25	52	--	--	63	41	\$49.71	\$ .430	\$ 242,429.07	\$ 60,096.44	\$ -----	\$ 302,525.51		
Albemarle Publicly-owned	4,965	2,653	7,618	126	1,076,796	180	66	41	19	--	60	47	65.73	.465	500,710.14	62,381.97	23,051.70	586,143.81		
Alleghany Publicly-owned	1,745	1,085	2,830	32	290,736	180	29	3	--	--	88	50	47.57	.463	134,610.77	21,848.81	-----	156,459.58		
Amelia Publicly-owned	1,035	592	1,627	25	239,580	180	4	16	5	--	65	53	47.27	.321	76,905.18	15,062.12	-----	91,967.30		
Amherst Publicly-owned	2,937	1,656	4,593	*65	511,560	180	25	35	5	--	70	43	52.26	.460	240,054.81	61,728.10	-----	301,782.91		
Appomattox Publicly-owned	1,299	781	2,080	36	258,224	180	17	16	3	--	57	40	49.04	.395	101,998.48	21,789.34	-----	123,787.82		
Arlington Publicly-owned	4,477	3,935	8,412	81	509,864	184	61	20	--	--	104	34	74.55	1.230	627,132.72	-----	-----	627,132.72		
Augusta Publicly-owned	6,020	3,621	9,641	116	880,812	180	38	22	55	1	83	42	32.16	.352	310,045.82	67,277.07	22,425.69	399,748.58		
Bath Publicly-owned	723	400	1,123	20	181,926	180	18	1	1	--	56	51	67.71	.418	76,045.07	22,544.36	-----	98,586.43		
Bedford Publicly-owned	4,182	2,954	7,136	101	1,002,726	180	21	68	11	1	71	55	40.60	.289	289,727.41	76,706.04	-----	366,433.45		
Bland Publicly-owned	622	342	964	19	124,452	180	17	1	1	--	51	36	56.27	.402	50,029.70	7,615.71	-----	57,645.41		
Botetourt Publicly-owned	2,417	1,506	3,923	52	411,354	180	26	22	4	--	75	44	42.78	.408	167,832.43	23,172.12	20,411.39	211,415.94		
Brunswick Publicly-owned	1,889	1,067	2,956	60	677,804	180	40	20	--	--	49	63	66.72	.291	197,240.96	41,390.00	-----	238,630.96		
Buchanan Publicly-owned	5,473	2,730	8,203	92	598,284	180	75	15	2	--	89	36	31.07	.426	254,270.70	-----	-----	254,270.70		
Buckingham Publicly-owned	1,599	806	2,405	42	431,244	180	22	14	6	--	57	57	49.84	.278	119,885.83	32,099.93	-----	151,985.76		
Campbell Publicly-owned	6,008	3,693	9,701	121	840,060	180	30	83	8	--	80	39	32.30	.373	313,342.38	55,906.72	29,962.84	399,211.94		
Caroline Publicly-owned	2,152	1,083	3,235	49	377,424	180	5	44	--	--	66	43	48.49	.416	156,879.88	22,547.55	7,515.85	186,943.28		
Carroll Publicly-owned	2,844	1,657	4,501	74	720,000	180	57	13	4	--	61	54	43.34	.271	195,054.19	15,081.11	-----	210,135.30		
Charles City Publicly-owned	1,054	508	1,562	28	211,765	180	4	19	5	--	56	42	56.80	.419	88,729.54	19,221.39	2,000.00	109,950.93		
Contract	56	45	101	2	15,875	180	2	--	--	--	50	44	61.66	.392	6,228.00	-----	-----	6,228.00		
Total	1,110	553	1,663	30	227,640	180	6	19	5	--	55	42	57.10	.417	94,957.54	19,221.39	2,000.00	116,178.93		
Charlotte Publicly-owned	1,615	907	2,522	45	424,350	180	29	16	--	--	56	52	61.08	.363	154,039.05	32,635.00	-----	186,674.05		
Chesterfield Publicly-owned	12,863	6,502	19,365	201	1,645,628	180	11	190	--	--	96	45	38.16	.449	738,886.97	70,960.84	24,399.08	834,246.89		

Columns 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16 are totals. Columns 9, 10, 11, 12 are averages.

APPENDIX C

PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

YEAR 1972-73

1 COUNTIES	2 Average Daily Attendance of Transported Pupils			5 Total No. of Buses Operated	6 Total No. of Miles Pupils Transported on Reg. Route	7 No. of Buses Operated	8 Number of Drivers				9 Average Pupils Per Bus	10 Average Miles Per Bus Per Day	11 Cost Per Pupil Per Year	12 Cost Per Mile	13 Total Cost of Operation Less Gas Tax Refund	14 Cost of Replacement	15 Capital Outlay	16 Total of Columns 13, 14 & 15
	Elementary	Secondary	Total				Adult		Student									
							M	F	M	F								
	COURTIES																	
Clarke Publicly-owned	1,000	606	1,606	14	125,280	180	3	10	1	--	114	49	\$30.58	\$.392	\$ 49,109.76	\$ 15,395.14	-----	\$ 64,504.90
Craig Publicly-owned	435	263	698	11	119,285	180	10	1	--	--	63	60	62.37	.365	43,539.39	8,045.71	-----	51,585.10
Culpeper Publicly-owned	2,512	1,175	3,687	50	439,308	180	19	26	5	--	74	49	43.73	.367	161,226.04	41,211.60	22,405.56	224,843.20
Cumberland Publicly-owned	979	471	1,450	25	267,840	180	15	7	3	--	58	60	48.07	.250	69,707.40	8,260.83	-----	77,968.23
Dickenson Publicly-owned	2,324	1,395	3,719	51	388,080	180	51	--	--	--	73	42	51.13	.490	190,159.20	78,727.65	7,154.95	276,041.80
Dinwiddie Publicly-owned	2,936	1,627	4,563	82	699,120	180	12	64	5	1	56	47	53.47	.349	243,992.88	37,169.35	-----	281,162.23
Essex Publicly-owned	1,035	477	1,512	26	265,500	180	8	17	1	--	58	57	69.29	.395	104,768.98	13,654.11	-----	118,423.09
Fairfax Publicly-owned	43,783	39,154	82,937	648	5,882,664	184	63	577	5	3	128	49	36.90	.520	3,060,124.54	621,887.99	81,624.94	3,763,637.47
Fauquier Publicly-owned	3,784	1,930	5,714	86	652,266	180	25	61	--	--	66	42	51.01	.447	291,488.17	77,656.62	7,628.87	376,773.96
Floyd Publicly-owned	1,181	753	1,934	34	306,900	180	21	10	3	--	57	50	70.14	.442	135,649.80	36,184.37	-----	171,834.17
Fluvanna Publicly-owned	1,257	625	1,882	27	211,176	180	25	2	--	--	70	43	44.88	.400	84,470.40	16,759.86	-----	101,230.26
Franklin Publicly-owned	3,920	2,063	5,983	89	741,420	180	50	23	14	1	67	46	43.12	.348	258,014.16	69,228.23	-----	327,242.39
Frederick Publicly-owned	4,262	2,047	6,309	56	527,328	180	33	21	2	--	113	52	36.39	.435	229,581.11	22,189.59	7,369.36	259,140.06
Giles Publicly-owned	2,131	1,211	3,342	39	269,100	180	25	3	11	--	85	38	37.60	.467	125,669.70	18,953.03	-----	144,622.73
Gloucester Publicly-owned	1,787	802	2,589	42	408,960	180	3	39	--	--	62	54	54.71	.346	141,637.78	22,716.66	22,716.66	187,071.10
Goochland Publicly-owned	1,402	820	2,222	37	331,164	180	14	23	--	--	60	50	52.01	.349	115,576.24	22,730.87	-----	138,307.11
Grayson Publicly-owned	1,748	1,022	2,770	50	328,207	181	44	4	2	--	55	36	49.88	.421	138,175.15	12,077.28	-----	150,252.43
Greene Publicly-owned	819	353	1,172	16	140,400	180	8	7	1	--	78	48	38.69	.323	45,349.20	28,322.84	-----	73,672.04
Greensville Publicly-owned	1,936	1,090	3,026	29	368,892	180	11	18	--	--	104	71	42.50	.349	128,595.75	22,306.56	-----	150,902.31
Halifax Publicly-owned	3,893	3,231	7,124	116	944,784	180	40	34	33	9	61	45	51.88	.391	369,595.17	90,847.07	-----	460,442.24
Hanover Publicly-owned	5,541	2,864	8,405	95	750,780	180	9	88	--	--	88	44	36.60	.412	309,321.36	74,475.04	14,895.04	398,691.44
Henrico Publicly-owned	12,409	11,46	23,655	232	1,443,635	181	35	185	12	--	102	34	34.85	.571	824,315.59	-----	-----	824,315.59
Henry Publicly-owned	7,369	3,547	10,916	133	950,544	180	59	74	--	--	82	39	38.31	.440	418,429.47	81,808.10	31,927.24	532,164.81

APPENDIX C

PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

YEAR 1972-73

COUNTIES	Average Daily Attendance of Transported Pupils			Total No. of Buses Operated	Total No. of Miles of Buses Transported on Reg. Route	7 No. of Buses Operated	8 Number of Drivers				9 Average Pupil Age Per Mile Per Year	10 Cost Per Pupil Per Year	12 Cost Per Mile	13 Total Cost of Operation Less		14 Cost of Replacement	15 Capital Outlay	16 Total of Columns 13, 14, 15				
	Elementary	Secondary	Total				M	P	Student					M	P							
									M	P												
Highland Publicly-owned	269	196	465	10	102,924	180	10	--	--	47	57	\$69.57	\$.314	\$	32,349.01	\$	8,506.70	\$	-----	\$	40,855.71	
Ide Publicly-owned	2,543	1,207	3,750	65	425,448	180	9	56	--	58	36	50.48	.445		189,324.36		6,724.00		46,028.00		242,076.36	
James City Publicly-owned	2,958	1,296	4,254	57	461,160	180	15	42	--	75	45	41.52	.383		176,624.28		6,921.22		31,521.72		215,067.22	
King George Publicly-owned	1,195	648	1,843	27	224,280	180	3	24	--	68	46	48.92	.402		90,160.56		22,294.50		-----		112,455.06	
King & Queen Publicly-owned	685	333	1,018	20	257,220	180	2	18	--	50	71	71.75	.284		73,050.48		6,624.58		-----		79,675.06	
King William Publicly-owned	810	420	1,230	24	233,820	180	5	19	--	51	54	63.11	.332		77,628.24		7,852.87		7,448.87		92,929.98	
Lancaster Publicly-owned	1,049	564	1,613	30	274,990	180	3	27	--	54	51	54.25	.318		87,511.81		-----		6,579.13		94,090.94	
Lee Publicly-owned	2,412	1,434	3,846	54	408,600	180	54	--	--	71	42	43.55	.410		167,526.00		50,586.85		-----		218,112.85	
Loudoun Publicly-owned	5,220	3,113	8,333	119	765,734	180	7	110	2	70	36	53.21	.579		443,359.99		173,360.00		133,960.00		750,679.99	
Louisa Publicly-owned	2,094	1,079	3,173	49	538,560	180	12	35	2	65	61	54.31	.320		172,339.20		17,833.01		22,478.12		212,650.33	
Lunenburg Publicly-owned	1,579	784	2,363	39	364,536	180	22	17	--	61	52	51.16	.331		120,895.44		-----		6,800.00		127,695.44	
Madison Publicly-owned	1,265	654	1,923	29	241,648	180	14	13	2	66	46	47.29	.376		90,934.85		11,788.05		-----		102,722.90	
Mathews Publicly-owned	799	473	1,272	20	153,900	180	3	16	1	64	43	42.41	.350		53,948.91		7,894.57		7,544.96		69,388.44	
Mecklenburg Publicly-owned	3,285	2,299	5,584	95	851,940	180	36	39	16	4	59	50	48.97	.321		273,472.74		64,174.21		-----		337,646.95
Middlesex Publicly-owned	769	442	1,211	21	170,073	180	--	20	1	57	45	66.30	.472		80,288.10		21,078.49		-----		101,366.59	
Montgomery Publicly-owned	4,614	2,116	6,730	69	437,256	180	59	9	1	98	35	39.05	.601		262,790.86		42,852.25		39,312.55		344,955.66	
Nelson Publicly-owned	1,599	961	2,560	51	504,054	180	27	24	--	50	55	81.32	.413		208,174.30		54,063.00		-----		262,237.30	
New Kent Publicly-owned	873	487	1,360	26	284,022	180	1	23	2	52	61	60.98	.292		82,934.42		17,750.00		8,727.00		109,411.42	
Northampton Publicly-owned	1,575	1,048	2,623	36	288,234	180	29	7	--	73	44	41.76	.380		109,528.92		33,993.24		-----		143,522.16	
Northumberland Publicly-owned	1,049	637	1,686	38	306,036	180	2	36	--	44	45	62.80	.346		105,888.45		19,737.39		-----		125,625.84	
Nottoway Publicly-owned	1,316	907	2,223	34	242,352	180	8	24	2	65	39	43.98	.403		97,764.80		22,383.95		-----		120,148.75	
Orange Publicly-owned	1,805	945	2,750	38	351,756	180	5	27	6	72	51	45.15	.353		124,169.87		22,616.61		-----		146,786.48	
Page Publicly-owned	2,067	1,188	3,255	32	210,654	180	12	19	1	102	37	31.52	.487		102,588.49		-----		28,041.42		130,629.91	

APPENDIX C

Columns 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16 are totals. Columns 9, 10, 11 and 12 are averages.

PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

YEAR 1972-73

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16						
							Number of Drivers		Average Pupils Per Bus	Average Miles Per Bus Per Day									Cost Per Pupil Per Year	Cost Per Operation Mile	Total Cost of Operation Less Gas Tax Refund	Cost of Replacement	Capital Outlay	Total of Columns 13, 14 & 15
							Adult																	
							Elementary	Secondary	Total	Total No. of Buses Operated									Total No. of Miles Pupils Transported on Reg. Route	No. of Days Buses Operated	M	F	M	F
Patrick																								
Publicly-owned	1,959	1,133	3,092	50	429,120	180	46	4	--	62	48	854.40	\$.392	\$ 168,215.04	\$ 42,000.44	-----	\$ 210,215.48							
Pittsylvania																								
Publicly-owned	7,868	4,788	12,656	202	1,885,716	180	91	85	26	--	63	52	.336	633,600.58	129,263.02	-----	762,863.60							
Powhatan																								
Publicly-owned	978	436	1,414	25	188,168	181	5	20	--	--	57	42	.413	77,712.97	25,248.00	-----	102,960.97							
Prince Edward																								
Publicly-owned	1,080	649	1,729	25	243,900	180	14	--	11	--	69	54	.327	79,755.30	22,838.68	-----	102,594.16							
Prince George																								
Publicly-owned	2,903	1,561	4,464	72	651,360	180	16	55	1	--	62	50	.402	261,846.72	-----	6,704.00	268,550.72							
Prince William																								
Publicly-owned	14,512	9,066	23,580	204	1,580,149	180	9	195	--	--	116		.632	996,654.17	14,740.24	141,040.29	1,154,434.70							
Pulaski																								
Publicly-owned	3,427	1,501	4,928	50	319,175	181	35	4	11	--	99	35	.465	148,446.75	53,883.12	16,083.22	218,383.09							
Rappahannock																								
Publicly-owned	719	375	1,094	18	154,656	180	17	--	1	--	61	47	.40	61,862.40	6,980.80	-----	68,843.20							
Richmond (County)																								
Publicly-owned	909	459	1,368	22	180,198	180	5	16	1	--	62	45	.339	61,087.12	7,000.00	-----	68,087.12							
Roanoke (County)																								
Publicly-owned	13,294	7,072	20,366	159	1,423,440	180	36	123	--	--	128	50	.427	607,808.88	117,242.96	62,273.26	787,325.10							
Rockbridge																								
Publicly-owned	1,749	1,056	2,805	40	330,198	181	23	17	--	--	70	46	.396	130,758.41	3,200.00	-----	133,958.41							
Contract	309	169	478	7	59,603	181	7	--	--	--	68	47	.506	30,153.10	-----	-----	30,153.10							
Total	2,058	1,225	3,283	47	389,801	181	30	17	--	--	70	46	.413	160,911.81	3,200.00	-----	164,111.81							
Rockingham																								
Publicly-owned	5,863	3,467	9,330	111	784,656	180	63	48	--	--	84	39	.430	337,564.95	57,178.00	7,525.94	402,268.89							
Russell																								
Publicly-owned	3,497	2,089	5,586	65	474,840	180	64	1	--	--	86	41	.519	246,441.96	82,102.52	-----	328,544.48							
Scott																								
Publicly-owned	2,790	1,749	4,539	62	564,300	180	60	1	--	--	73	51	.382	215,562.60	51,504.01	-----	267,066.61							
Shenandoah																								
Publicly-owned	2,878	1,746	4,624	55	444,564	180	26	29	--	--	84	45	.379	168,489.76	12,922.38	22,705.33	204,117.47							
Smyth																								
Publicly-owned	3,820	2,100	5,920	43	335,101	180	43	--	--	--	138	43	.432	144,739.48	26,615.48	42,724.82	214,079.78							
Southampton																								
Publicly-owned	2,423	1,055	3,478	75	657,468	180	10	53	12	--	46	48	.349	229,156.33	32,560.40	-----	262,016.73							
Spotsylvania																								
Publicly-owned	2,929	1,470	4,399	54	501,768	180	2	47	5	--	81	52	.375	188,312.56	37,174.22	14,869.68	240,356.46							
Stafford																								
Publicly-owned	3,938	1,881	5,819	60	462,672	180	7	49	3	1	97	43	.414	191,546.21	52,682.09	-----	244,228.30							
Surry																								
Publicly-owned	816	338	1,154	18	189,145	181	4	12	2	--	64	58	.266	50,312.57	23,952.00	-----	74,264.57							
Sussex																								
Publicly-owned	1,482	776	2,258	40	472,536	180	7	32	1	--	56	66	.261	123,331.90	15,165.92	15,165.92	153,663.74							
Tazewell																								
Publicly-owned	5,662	3,001	8,663	80	607,680	180	61	11	7	--	108	42	.533	323,832.67	60,128.87	-----	383,961.54							

APPENDIX C

FUPIL TRANSPORTATION

YEAR 1972-73

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16												
							Average Daily Attendance of Transported Pupils			Total No. of Buses Operated									Total No. of Miles Pupils Transported on Reg. Route	No. of Days Buses Operated	Number of Drivers				Average Pupils Per Bus	Average Miles Per Bus per Year	Cost Per Pupil Per Mile	Total Cost of Operation Less Gas Tax Refund	Cost of Replacement	Total of Columns 13, 14 & 15
							Elementary	Secondary	Total												Adult		Student							
																					M	F	M	F						
Warren Publicly-owned	1,964	994	2,958	26	177,480	180	14	12	--	114	38	\$26.24	\$.437	\$ 77,612.00	\$ 10,424.38	-----	\$ 88,036.38													
Washington Publicly-owned	5,934	2,982	8,916	84	734,742	180	68	16	--	106	49	32.55	.395	290,223.09	-----	38,225.15	328,448.24													
Westmoreland Publicly-owned	1,589	709	2,298	40	352,980	180	2	38	--	57	49	50.73	.330	116,589.29	34,579.00	7,571.98	158,740.27													
Wise Publicly-owned	4,516	2,479	6,995	72	519,651	181	65	2	5	97	40	31.64	.426	221,371.33	48,133.70	33,228.50	302,733.53													
Wythe Publicly-owned	2,490	1,387	3,877	41	303,300	180	38	3	--	95	41	39.72	.508	153,977.62	42,033.22	-----	196,010.84													
York Publicly-owned	4,659	2,939	7,598	90	917,460	180	3	87	--	84	57	42.62	.353	323,863.38	59,846.25	-----	383,709.63													
COUNTY TOTALS																														
Publicly-owned	326,100	201,361	527,461	6,316	52,527,523	180	2375	3570	349	21	64	46	42.53	.427	22,430,548.76	3,839,105.81	1,072,049.03	27,341,703.60												
Contract	365	214	579	9	75,478	160	9	--	--	--	64	47	62.83	.482	36,381.40	-----	36,381.40													
Total	326,465	201,575	528,040	6,325	52,603,001	180	2384	3570	349	21	83	46	42.55	\$.427	\$22,466,930.16	\$3,839,105.81	\$1,072,049.03	\$27,378,085.00												
TOWNS																														
Colonial Beach Publicly-owned	170	82	252	2	14,094	180	2	--	--	126	39	\$18.51	\$.331	\$ 4,665.11	\$ 8,616.41	-----	\$ 13,281.52													
Poquoson Publicly-owned	888	558	1,446	17	94,660	180	--	17	--	85	53	29.92	.430	40,712.40	6,346.45	6,346.45	53,405.30													
West Point Publicly-owned	378	233	611	5	21,384	180	--	5	--	122	24	23.04	.659	14,082.62	-----	-----	14,082.62													
TOWN TOTALS	1,436	873	2,309	24	130,158	180	2	22	--	96	30	25.75	.457	59,460.13	14,962.86	6,346.45	80,769.44													

Columns 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16 are totals. Columns 9, 10, 11, 12 are averages.



PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

YEAR 1972-73

1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8				9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
	Average Daily Attendance of Transported Pupils			Total No. of Buses Operated	Total No. of Miles of Pupils Transported on Reg. Route	No. of Days Buses Operated	Number of Drivers				Average Miles Per Bus Per Year	Cost Per Pupil Per Year	Cost Per Mile	Total Cost of Operation Less Gas Tax Refund	Cost of Replacement	Capital Outlay	Total of Columns 13, 14 & 15				
	Elementary	Secondary	Total				Adult		Student												
				M	F	M	F														
Alexandria Publicly-owned	1,445	---	1,445	13	71,424	180	6	7	---	111	30	\$58.81	\$1.19	\$	84,994.56	\$	15,201.42	\$	100,195.98		
Chesapeake Publicly-owned	11,132	6,538	17,670	162	1,028,520	180	---	162	---	109	35	29.30	.503		517,808.77		63,819.84		51,626.61	633,255.22	
Covington Publicly-owned	503	289	792	2	16,126	180	2	---	---	396	45	14.01	.688		11,094.69		---		---	11,094.69	
Falls Church Publicly-owned	245	---	245	3	10,247	184	---	3	---	62	19	62.34	1.492		15,272.98		---		---	15,272.98	
Franklin Publicly-owned	1,014	626	1,640	15	77,544	180	2	13	---	109	29	19.86	.420		32,568.48		15,169.62		---	47,738.10	
Fredericksburg Contract	726	---	726	6	23,220	180	1	5	---	121	22	52.34	1.640		38,000.00		---		---	38,000.00	
Hampton Publicly-owned	7,690	171	7,861	91	519,167	180	1	90	---	86	32	35.11	.532		275,969.17		38,397.50		114,563.67	428,950.34	
Lynchburg Publicly-owned	2,574	1,099	3,673	37	169,260	182	19	18	---	99	25	31.66	.687		116,213.92		---		---	116,213.92	
Nansemond Publicly-owned	4,588	2,726	7,314	78	799,200	180	12	66	---	94	57	33.98	.311		248,551.20		91,492.02		---	340,043.22	
Newport News Publicly-owned	14,715	9,875	24,590	226	1,541,160	180	23	203	---	109	38	35.85	.572		881,543.52		207,260.02		---	1,088,803.54	
Norfolk Publicly-owned	---	726	726	5	---	180	---	5	---	---	---	---	---		---		---		---	---	
Norton Publicly-owned	548	138	686	3	15,768	180	3	---	---	228	29	9.01	.392		6,181.06		---		16,238.87	22,419.93	
Portsmouth Publicly-owned	7,464	---	7,464	70	353,011	180	13	57	---	107	32	30.69	.653		230,587.98		---		345,772.00	576,359.98	
Richmond (City) Publicly-owned	12,698	7,284	19,982	166	1,886,925	181	38	128	---	120	63	56.75	.601		1,134,041.93		---		---	1,134,041.93	
Roanoke (City) Publicly-owned	2,507	198	2,705	17	113,994	180	8	9	---	159	37	26.51	.629		71,723.72		3,973.00		---	75,696.72	
Virginia Beach Publicly-owned	24,836	15,697	40,533	268	1,970,320	180	4	263	1	151	20	23.92	.492		969,397.44		42,876.14		---	1,012,273.58	
Winchester Publicly-owned	599	313	912	10	58,320	180	3	7	1	91	32	31.21	.488		28,460.16		---		31,127.48	59,587.64	
<b>CITY TOTALS</b>																					
Publicly-owned	92,558	45,680	138,238	1166	8,631,006	180	134	1031	1	119	41	33.45	-.536		4,624,429.58		486,034.56		559,328.63	5,661,947.77	
Contract	726	---	726	6	23,220	180	1	5	---	121	21	52.34	1.637		38,000.00		---		---	38,000.00	
<b>Total</b>	<b>93,284</b>	<b>45,680</b>	<b>138,964</b>	<b>1172</b>	<b>8,654,226</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>1036</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>33.55</b>	<b>-.539</b>		<b>4,662,429.58</b>		<b>486,034.56</b>		<b>559,328.63</b>	<b>5,699,947.77</b>	
<b>STATE TOTALS</b>																					
Publicly-owned	420,094	247,911	668,008	7506	61,288,687	180	2511	4623	350	21	89	45	\$40.59	\$	4,425,271.14		438,478.44		340,103.23	\$1,637,724.11	\$33,092,265.81
Contract	1,091	214	1,305	15	98,698	180	10	5	---	87	37	57.00	.754		74,381.44		---		---	74,381.44	
<b>Total</b>	<b>421,185</b>	<b>248,125</b>	<b>669,313</b>	<b>7521</b>	<b>61,387,385</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>2521</b>	<b>4628</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>\$40.62</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>4,433,271.88</b>		<b>438,819.88</b>		<b>340,103.23</b>	<b>\$1,637,724.11</b>	<b>\$33,166,647.21</b>

APPENDIX C

STATISTICAL DATA AND COST ANALYSIS - 1972-73

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
COUNTY	Percent of Operation Cost Received From State Funds 1972-73	RANK	Average Drivers Salary Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Garage Employees Salary Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Tires, Repair Parts Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Cost-Gas & Oil (Less Gas Tax) Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average No. of Pupils Per Mile	Percent of Drivers			
								Adult		Student	
								M	F	M	F
Accomack	41.92	81	.251	.053	.065	.056	3.10	32.5	67.5	0	0
Albemarle	35.44	96	.274	.051	.076	.047	2.54	52.5	32.5	15.0	0
Alleghany	38.07	94	.388	---	.086	.038	3.50	90.6	9.4	0	0
Amelia	47.75	39	.162	.068	.049	.037	2.44	16.0	64.0	20.0	0
Amherst	38.66	90	.264	.026	.098	.043	3.23	38.5	53.8	7.7	0
Appomattox	44.73	60	.245	.053	.029	.033	2.90	47.2	44.4	8.4	0
Arlington	20.82	108	.983	.185	.112	.047	5.93	75.3	24.7	0	0
Augusta	56.74	7	.206	.082	.051	.044	3.94	32.8	19.0	47.4	8
Bath	35.35	98	.344	.040	.042	.051	2.22	90.0	5.0	5.0	0
Bedford	58.96	4	.177	.043	.059	.036	2.56	20.8	67.3	10.9	1.0
Bland	44.40	63	.255	.072	.038	.048	2.79	89.5	5.3	5.2	0
Botetourt	45.32	52	.257	.053	.059	.054	3.43	50.0	42.3	7.7	0
Brunswick	48.64	31	.156	.032	.051	.040	1.57	66.7	33.3	0	0
Buchanan	54.03	12	.355	.050	.070	.058	4.94	81.5	16.3	2.2	0
Buckingham	53.36	15	.163	.042	.031	.030	2.01	52.4	33.3	14.3	0
Campbell	53.91	14	.251	.042	.038	.039	4.16	24.8	68.6	6.6	0
Caroline	42.85	72	.227	.056	.063	.052	3.08	10.2	89.8	0	0
Carroll	57.70	5	.192	.035	.042	.033	2.25	77.0	17.6	5.4	0
Charles City	42.00	80	.216	.070	.097	.049	2.66	20.0	63.3	16.7	0
Charlotte	42.48	75	.217	.030	.078	.041	2.14	64.4	35.6	0	0
Chesterfield	42.24	77	.264	.040	.085	.044	4.24	5.5	94.5	0	0
Clarke	53.05	15	.228	---	.105	.058	4.61	21.4	71.4	7.2	0
Craig	38.66	91	.225	.050	.046	.038	2.11	91.0	9.0	0	0
Culpepper	46.25	46	.221	.053	.054	.045	3.02	38.0	52.0	10.0	0
Cumberland	55.49	9	.124	.044	.032	.039	1.94	60.0	28.0	12.0	0
Dickenson	41.01	84	.352	.060	.082	.044	3.45	100.00	0	0	0

STATISTICAL DATA AND COST ANALYSIS - 1972-73

COUNTY	Percent of Operation Cost Received From State Funds 1972-73	RANK	Average Drivers Salary Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Garage Employees Salary Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Tires, Repair Parts Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Cost-Gas & Oil (Less Gas Tax) Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average No. of Pupils Per Mile	Percent of Drivers			
								Adult		Student	
								M	F	M	F
Dinwiddie	48.37	34	.197	.037	.058	.047	2.35	14.6	78.0	6.2	1.2
Essex	40.92	85	.189	.038	.092	.048	2.05	30.8	65.4	3.8	0
Fairfax	38.56	92	.312	----	.158	.037	5.08	9.8	89.0	.7	.5
Fauquier	39.99	68	.239	.049	.069	.055	3.15	29.1	70.9	0	0
Floyd	36.13	95	.202	.069	.096	.055	2.27	61.8	29.4	8.8	0
Fluvanna	45.22	54	.261	.050	.054	.066	3.21	92.6	7.4	0	0
Franklin	48.95	29	.212	.035	.046	.044	2.90	56.8	26.1	15.9	1.2
Frederick	44.90	59	.241	.055	.081	.060	4.30	58.9	37.5	3.6	0
Giles	45.82	48	.279	.093	.072	.059	4.47	64.1	7.7	28.2	0
Gloucester	42.57	74	.175	.055	.038	.051	2.28	7.1	92.9	0	0
Goochland	48.90	30	.210	.051	.043	.044	2.42	37.8	62.2	0	0
Grayson	45.64	49	.251	----	.135	.052	3.04	88.0	8.0	4.0	0
Greene	52.47	17	.168	.039	.089	.045	3.01	50.0	43.7	6.3	0
Greensville	47.75	40	.173	.017	.070	.062	2.95	37.9	62.1	0	0
Halifax	43.18	70	.202	.041	.073	.043	2.71	34.5	29.3	28.4	7.8
Hanover	48.31	36	.242	.041	.064	.044	4.03	9.3	90.7	0	0
Henrico	42.09	78	.324	.068	.087	.051	5.90	15.1	79.7	5.2	0
Henry	50.57	23	.273	.057	.081	.055	4.13	44.4	55.6	0	0
Highland	44.90	58	.198	----	.064	.067	1.63	100	0	0	0
Isle of Wight	42.85	73	.275	.054	.054	.045	3.17	13.8	86.2	0	0
James City	42.38	76	.205	.041	.077	.058	3.32	26.3	73.7	0	0
King George	41.82	82	.250	.050	.050	.042	2.96	11.1	88.9	0	0
King and Queen	42.32	77	.138	.051	.056	.040	1.42	10.0	90.0	0	0
King William	43.34	69	.176	.052	.066	.036	1.89	20.8	79.2	0	0
Lancaster	44.10	65	.180	.033	.043	.040	2.11	10.0	90.0	0	0
Lee	48.43	34	.298	.049	.050	.066	3.39	100.0	0	0	0
Loudoun	34.47	100	.324	.127	.073	.049	3.92	5.9	92.4	1.7	0
Louisa	46.54	44	.187	.032	.051	.040	2.12	24.5	71.4	4.1	0

STATISTICAL DATA AND COST ANALYSIS - 1972-73

COUNTY	Percent of Operation Cost Received From State Funds 1972-73	RANK	Average Drivers Salary Per Mile Pub.Owned Buses	Average Garage Employees Salary Per Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Tires, Repair Parts Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Cost-Gas & Oil (Less Gas Tax) Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average No. of Pupils Per Mile	Percent of Drivers			
								Adult		Student	
								M	F	M	F
Lunenburg	47.16	42	.176	.031	.046	.032	2.33	56.4	43.6	0	0
Madison	43.92	66	.182	.034	.063	.062	2.86	43.3	44.8	6.9	0
Mathews	49.39	27	.188	.044	.046	.042	2.98	15.0	80.0	5.0	0
Mecklenburg	49.99	25	.179	.038	.053	.037	2.36	37.9	41.1	16.8	4.2
Middlesex	35.42	99	.222	.067	.073	.067	2.56	0	95.2	4.8	0
Montgomery	39.80	89	.395	.081	.070	.044	5.54	85.5	13.0	1.5	0
Nelson	35.34	93	.231	.052	.074	.052	1.83	52.9	47.1	0	0
New Kent	45.23	53	.149	.047	.055	.035	1.72	3.8	98.5	7.7	0
Northampton	48.64	32	.251	.061	.034	.040	3.28	80.6	19.4	0	0
Northumberland	45.40	51	.202	.046	.049	.052	1.98	5.3	94.7	0	0
Nottoway	45.44	50	.247	.056	.050	.044	3.30	23.5	70.6	5.9	0
Orange	46.86	43	.170	.050	.080	.043	2.81	13.2	71.1	15.7	0
Page	47.23	41	.305	.077	.086	.060	5.56	37.5	59.4	3.1	0
Patrick	42.97	71	.229	.049	.042	.052	2.59	92.0	8.0	0	0
Pittsylvania	44.42	62	.199	.022	.065	.041	2.42	45.0	42.1	12.9	0
Powhatan	40.02	87	.241	.065	.069	.050	2.71	20.0	80.0	0	0
Prince Edward	49.46	28	.143	.056	.050	.041	2.55	56.0	0	44.0	0
Prince George	46.14	47	.207	.047	.075	.047	2.47	22.2	76.4	1.4	0
Prince William	33.42	101	.360	.124	.071	.060	5.37	4.4	95.6	0	0
Pulaski	50.91	20	.241	.076	.066	.062	5.56	70.0	8.0	22.0	0
Rappahannock	41.45	82	.233	.048	.043	.072	2.55	94.4	0	5.6	0
Richmond	51.13	19	.204	.019	.055	.065	2.73	22.7	72.7	4.6	0
Roanoke	48.53	32	.276	.070	.031	.035	5.15	22.6	77.7	0	0
Rockbridge	44.47	61	.259	.029	.078	.051	3.03	63.8	36.2	0	0
Rockingham	47.89	37	.300	.056	.037	.052	4.28	56.8	43.2	0	0
Russell	40.73	86	.386	.063	.059	.062	4.24	98.6	1.4	0	0
Scott	46.45	45	.238	.048	.041	.048	2.90	98.4	1.6	0	0
Shenandoah	50.04	24	.251	.045	.050	.040	3.74	47.3	52.7	0	0

APPENDIX D

STATISTICAL DATA AND COST ANALYSIS - 1972-73

COUNTY	Percent of Operation Cost Received From State Funds 1972-73	RANK	Average Drivers Salary Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Garage Employees Salary Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Tires, Repair Parts Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Cost-Gas & Oil(Less Gas Tax) Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average No. of Pupils Per Mile	Percent of Drivers				
								Adult		Student		
								M	F	M	F	
Smyth	56.81	6	.323	----	.109	.050	6.36	100	0	0	0	0
Southampton	43.81	67	.190	.043	.052	.050	1.90	13.3	70.7	16.0	0	0
Spotsylvania	45.10	55	.212	.052	.052	.039	3.16	3.7	87.0	9.3	0	0
Stafford	48.32	35	.269	.064	.041	.044	4.53	11.7	81.7	5.0	1.4	0
Surry	56.06	8	.165	.049	.028	.039	2.20	22.2	66.7	11.1	0	0
Sussex	53.36	16	.164	.038	.023	.035	1.72	17.5	80.0	2.5	0	0
Tazewell	42.02	79	.342	.066	.078	.057	5.13	77.2	13.9	8.9	0	0
Warren	54.82	10	.278	.022	.063	.048	6.00	53.8	16.2	0	0	0
Washington	49.92	26	.274	.030	.049	.041	4.37	81.0	19.0	0	0	0
Westmoreland	47.89	38	.203	.040	.035	.058	2.34	5.0	95.0	0	0	0
Wise	50.59	22	.271	.061	.156	.071	4.65	90.3	2.8	6.9	0	0
Wythe	43.49	68	.321	.081	.094	.051	4.60	92.7	7.3	0	0	0
York	45.09	56	.205	.041	.056	.046	2.98	3.3	96.7	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL COUNTIES</b>	<b>43.93</b>		<b>.257</b>	<b>.046</b>	<b>.073</b>	<b>.045</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>.3</b>	
<b>TOWNS</b>												
Colonial Beach	73.58	1	.230	----	.042	.077	6.43	100	0	0	0	0
Poquoson	53.91	13	.266	.026	.074	.050	5.50	0	100	0	0	0
West Point	48.56	33	.373	----	.183	.098	10.29	0	100	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL TOWNS</b>	<b>54.19</b>		<b>.280</b>	<b>.026</b>	<b>.088</b>	<b>.060</b>	<b>6.39</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>91.7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

STATISTICAL DATA AND COST ANALYSIS - 1972-73

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
CITIES	Percent of Operation Cost Received From State Funds 1972-73	RANK	Average Drivers Salary Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Garage Employees Salary Per Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Tires, Repair Parts Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average Cost-Gas & Oil(Less Gas Tax) Per Mile Pub.-Owned Buses	Average No. of Pupils Per Mile	Percent of Drivers			
								Adult		Student	
								M	F	M	F
Alexandria	23.36	106	1.264	----	.177	.075	7.28	46.2	53.8	0	0
Chesapeake	50.60	21	.294	.085	.083	.049	6.18	0	100	0	0
Covington	70.48	2	.662	----	.068	.044	17.68	100	0	0	0
Falls Church	24.57	105	.535	----	.395	.161	8.59	0	100	0	0
Franklin	65.57	3	.282	----	.049	.043	7.61	13.3	86.7	0	0
Fredericksburg	22.96	109	----	----	----	----	----	1.7	8.3	0	0
Hampton	44.72	83	.291	.068	.142	.049	5.45	1.1	98.9	0	0
Lynchburg	44.15	64	.475	.053	.091	.062	7.81	51.4	48.6	0	0
Nansemond	54.44	11	.160	.034	.032	.048	3.29	15.4	84.6	0	0
Newport News	44.92	57	.346	.083	.062	.041	5.74	10.2	89.8	0	0
* Norfolk	26.97	103	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Norton	12.80	110	.294	----	.173	.073	15.66	100	0	0	0
Portsmouth	25.94	104	.391	.053	.061	.051	7.61	18.6	81.4	0	0
Richmond	27.14	102	.376	----	.186	.043	3.51	22.9	77.1	0	0
Roanoke	49.58	27	.436	.043	.177	.099	8.54	47.1	52.9	0	0
Virginia Beach	52.31	18	.304	.065	.045	.043	7.41	1.5	98.1	.4	0
Winchester	38.24	93	.482	.048	.101	.081	5.62	27.3	63.6	9.1	0
TOTAL CITIES	39.09		.344	.053	.102	.050	5.80	11.5	88.4	.1	0
STATE	43.12		.269	.047	.077	.046	3.92	33.5	61.5	4.7	.3

APPENDIX D

62

\* Between Schools only

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
22-9. 2:1		7	Each handicapped child shall be transported by existing school buses, or if not feasible, the school board will pay for other means of transit (40% of cost by school division and 60% by the State)
22-72. 1		37	County school boards may provide for transportation of pupils, but it is not a requirement.
22-97. 1		47	City school boards may provide for transportation of pupils, but it is not a requirement.
22-151. 2	2	59	School boards of Arlington and Fairfax Counties may allow governing bodies of their respective counties use of school buses for transporting departments, boards, commissions or officers for county purposes. When buses are used in such a manner, the flashing warning lights will not be used and the words "school bus" must be covered on front and rear of the vehicle. Act is to be for a two-year period from enactment.
22-275. 3		103	Compulsory education distances shall be measured or determined by the nearest practical routes from school entrances to residence of students. Not applicable to mentally retarded, handicapped or students suffering contagious or infectious diseases. Also, for children under 10 who live 2 miles from a public school (unless public transportation is provided within 1 mile of residence) or children between 10 and 17 who live 2 - 1/2 miles from a public school (unless public transportation is provided within 1 - 1/2 miles of residence).

SECTION	SOURCE	PAGE NO	<u>APPENDIX E</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
22-276		107		The State Board of Education may make all needful laws and regulations regarding school bus construction design, operation, equipment and color. They shall have authority to prohibit the operation of any vehicle not meeting these regulations (enforced by State Police).
22-276.1		108		<p>No school board or superintendent of schools or any County or City shall hire any school bus drivers unless they meet the following qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Obtain a signed certificate by a physician stating that potential driver has no signs or symptoms of hypertension, cardiac disease, diabetes, epilepsy, paralysis and is physically and mentally capable of operating a school bus. Such a certificate must be furnished annually within 30 days prior to anniversary of employment.</li> <li>b) Furnish a statement from D. M. V. that shows applicant, in the past 5 years, has not been convicted of intoxicated driving by liquor or drugs or a felony. He must provide such a statement annually with annual health certificate.</li> <li>c) Furnish a statement signed by 2 reputable citizens showing applicant is of good moral character</li> <li>d) Have a license showing applicant has successfully undertaken the exam for operation of a school bus.</li> <li>e) Be between the ages of 16 and 65.</li> <li>f) Possess a Red Cross First Aid Certificate.</li> </ul>
22-276.2		109		Same requirements as set forth in § 22-276.1 except for



APPENDIX E

<u>SECTION</u>	SOURCE	PAGE NO.	DESCRIPTION
22-277		109	It is unlawful to charge a toll for a school bus for purpose of transportation of students.
22-279		109	Buses shall be heated and be able to maintain 50° F. interior temperature when outside temperature is 20° F. with a half load.
22-280.1		109	It is unlawful to operate a school bus on the public highway for other than transporting school children with the traffic warning devices and lettered identification uncovered.
22-280.2		110	There must be a school bus emergency exit drill at least once within the first 90 calendar days of each school session in order that pupils and drivers be familiar with exiting buses in an emergency.
22-282		110	Counties may expend funds for the construction and maintenance of bus shelters on school bus routes.
22-283		110	Same as § 22-282 except work Cities or Towns substitute Counties.
22-283.1		110	The State Board of Education shall pay any City, Town, or County which does not have a public school transportation system an amount equal to the average per pupil cost of a County, City or Town that operates a school bus system.
22-284			No County, City or public school unit which transports students or personnel at public expense to or from any public school supported in whole or in part by State funds, shall receive any State funds unless it complies with all applicable insurance requirements set forth.

APPENDIX E

SECTION	SOURCE	PAGE NO.	DESCRIPTION
22-285		111	<p>Every vehicle shall be covered by an insurance policy of the following minimums:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) \$50,000 for injury including death to one person</li> <li>b) \$200,000 for injury including death to all persons injured in any one accident</li> <li>c) \$10,000 for damage, including destruction to the property of any person other than the insured.</li> <li>d) \$5,000 loss or damage caused by an uninsured motorist.</li> <li>e) \$1,000 medical expense payment.</li> </ul> <p>This insurance is not required when pupils are transported on a common carrier, if it covered by a policy affording similar coverage as required by this article.</p>
22-286		111	<p>When a vehicle transports less than 10 pupils the policy of insurance may be in the following amounts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) \$15,000 for injury including death to one person</li> <li>b) \$50,000 for injury including death to all persons in any one accident</li> <li>c) \$1,000 for damages including destruction to property of any person except that of the insured.</li> </ul> <p>This section is subject to other provisions of this article.</p>
22-287		111	<p>In every case in which a locality fails to obtain the requisite insurance for vehicles transporting school pupils or personnel by August 1 of any year or fails to notify the Superintendent of Public Instruction of this by August 10, it shall be his duty by September 10 to obtain insurance complying with the requirements of this article on all vehicles to be used to transport pupils using funds that are distributable or becoming distributable to the particular locality so in default.</p>

APPENDIX E

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>PAGE_NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
22-288		111	<p>Every policy of insurance issued in compliance with other requirements of this article shall cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Injury including death to school pupils and personnel (except the driver when not a pupil) riding as passengers on any of the vehicles so insured.</li> <li>b) Injury, including death to any persons not passengers on any such vehicle.</li> </ul>
22-289		112	<p>In such cases where any school pupil or personnel except the driver when not a pupil whether riding in the vehicle or not, or any other person suffers injury, death or property damage through use or operation of vehicle, it shall be sufficient in such cases to prove such facts to recover damages, caused by the negligent operation of privately-owned motor vehicles in Virginia, provided that such pupils and personnel shall not be considered guests.</p>
22-290		112	<p>A school board is subject to action up to the limits of insurance in force to cover accident claims. In no case, however, are school funds to be used to pay any claim or judgement.</p>
22-291		112	<p>If vehicle is not owned by locality or school board, but is operated under contract and involved in an accident, then recovery of damages shall be done within § 22-289.</p>
22-292		112	<p>If insurance is obtained, but lapses while vehicle is used to transport school pupils or personnel, then remaining school funds to be distributed are withheld until insurance reapplied.</p>

APPENDIX E

SECTION	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>	DESCRIPTION
22-293		112	Superintendent of Public Instruction is to withhold any distribution of State school aid funds when he has to effect insurance as stated in this article. Once he receives assurances that all vehicles are insured he may again distribute funds.
22-294	1	113	The provisions set forth in this article apply to all vehicles used in transporting school pupils and personnel at public expense to any public free school whether or not vehicles have been approved or State aid is available.
46.1-1(37)	3	87	A school bus is any vehicle except a commercial bus, station wagon, automobile or truck, which is designed and used primarily to transport pupils. It is painted yellow and has "School Bus, Stop, State Law" in black letters on front and rear, and has light warning devices.
46.1-169.1	3	156	It is unlawful for anyone under 18 years of age to operate a school bus, however, a driver between 16-18 may operate a bus with approval of the school board served by the bus.
46.1-169.1	3	156	It is unlawful for any motor vehicle yellow in color with more than a 15 person seating capacity to operate on State highways, unless such motor vehicle is used in transporting students who attend public, private or parochial schools. This section does not apply to vehicles which transport passengers as well as school children for hire in the cities of Bristol and Charlottesville.
46.1-169.2	4	75	School buses are to be routed so as pupils who are picked up or discharged have to cross a divided highway to reach such bus or return to his residence

APPENDIX E

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>P AGE NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
46.1-190(C)	3	170	It is unlawful to operate a vehicle when so loaded as to obstruct the driver's view of the front and sides or to interfere with driver's control.
46.1-190(E)	3	170	It is unlawful to pass any other vehicle going in the same direction at any railway grade crossing or any intersection of highways unless highway is 2 or more lanes or designated one way. It is also unlawful to pass when pedestrians are about to pass in front of such vehicles.
46.1-190(f)	4	80	It is unlawful not to stop when approaching a school bus from any direction when said bus is taking on or discharging children. This does not apply to vehicles approaching the bus on a divided highway.
46.1-193d	4	82	On roads other than interstate, vehicle speed for a school bus is 35 m. p. h. or the minimum allowable speed on the highway. On the interstate a maximum speed of 45 m. p. h. with no stops to pick up or discharge children.
46.1-213	3	188	The driver of a bus shall not follow another motor truck or bus within 200 feet on any highway outside of cities or towns. At other times a reasonable and prudent distance must be kept.
46.1-245	3	210	A school bus carrying any school child shall, before crossing at any grade, any railroad tracks, stop within 50 feet but not less than 15 feet from the nearest rail. While stopped, driver shall look and listen in both directions before proceeding. Driver will cross track in such gear of the vehicle so as to avoid necessity of shifting while traversing the crossing.

## APPENDIX E

SECTION	SOURCE	PAGE NO.	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
46.1-250	3	214	Only school buses are allowed to stop on the traveled portion of any highway outside of cities and towns for the purpose of taking on or discharging passengers unless the operator cannot leave the roadway safely. School bus should only stop at points which are clearly visible from a safe distance in both directions.
46.1-255	3	216	A disabled bus stopped on any portion of traveled portion of any highway in the State, except within corporate limits of cities or upon street or highways which are artificially lighted at night is required to place three red reflector flares or torches in the direction of approaching traffic at specified distances from the disabled vehicle.
46.1-257	3	217	Same as § 46.1-2555 except concerning use of red flags for disabled bus during daylight hours.
46.1-286.1	4	97	All motor vehicles except commercial buses, station wagons, automobiles or trucks transporting pupils to and from public, private or parochial schools must be painted yellow with the words "school bus, stop State law" on front and rear in letters at least 6 inches high and have warning devices front and rear too.  Only school buses as defined in § 46.1-1(37) may be painted yellow, identified by words front and rear, and be equipped with the specified warning devices. A vehicle which merely transports pupils, residents at a school from one point to another without intermittent stop for the purpose of picking up or discharging pupils, need not comply with these requirements.

<u>APPENDIX E</u>			
SECTION	SOURCE	PAGE NO.	DESCRIPTION
46.1-287	3	226	Every school bus must be equipped with approved warning device which shall indicate when bus is stopped, is about to stop or when it is taking on or discharging children.
46.1-287.1	3	226	Any private, individual, corporation or civic, charitable or eleemosynary organization for the purpose of transporting children to or from school, camp or any other place during any part of the year may contract to hire school buses provided they are operated in the same manner as specified.
46.1-370	3	269	No person is permitted to drive a school bus unless such person has met the following qualifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) had a reasonable amount of experience driving motor vehicles</li> <li>b) shall have satisfactorily passed a special examination pertaining to the ability of such person to operate a school bus</li> </ul> <p>The Division of Motor Vehicles shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary to provide for the examination and for the granting of permits to qualified applicants.</p>

<sup>1</sup>Code of Virginia, Vol. 5

<sup>2</sup>Feasibility Study of School Bus Utilization by Wilbur Smith and Associates

<sup>3</sup>Code of Virginia, Vol. 7

<sup>4</sup>Code of Virginia, Vol. 7, 1974 Supplement

APPENDIX F  
**FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS**  
**FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA**  
**REQUEST FOR FIELD TRIP & PAYMENT VOUCHER**

School \_\_\_\_\_ School Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (TYPE OR PRINT WITH BALL POINT PEN)

<b>TO BE COMPLETED BY TEACHER</b> DESTINATION _____ AGENCY _____ ADDRESS _____ DATE OF TRIP _____ TIME OF DEPARTURE _____ OF RETURN _____ NUMBER OF STUDENTS _____ UNIT OR STUDY TO WHICH TRIP IS RELATED: _____ _____ _____ DATE _____ TEACHER _____	<b>TO BE COMPLETED BY PRINCIPAL</b> TRIP APPROVED <input type="checkbox"/> DISAPPROVED <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLETE A SEPARATE REQUEST FOR EACH SCHOOL BUS NEEDED. TO BE FUNDED: SCHOOL BOARD FUNDS <input type="checkbox"/> 1 SCHOOL ACTIVITY FUNDS <input type="checkbox"/> 2 FEDERAL PROJECT FUNDS <input type="checkbox"/> 3 COUNTY RECREATION <input type="checkbox"/> 4 OTHER <input type="checkbox"/> 5 COMMENTS _____ _____ _____ DATE _____ PRINCIPAL _____																													
<b>TO BE COMPLETED BY AREA SUPERINTENDENT (OTHER THAN LOCAL FIELD TRIP)</b>																														
APPROVED <input type="checkbox"/> DISAPPROVED <input type="checkbox"/> COMMENTS _____ DATE _____ AREA SUPERINTENDENT _____																														
<b>FIELD TRIP VOUCHER: (TO BE COMPLETED AFTER TRIP IS COMPLETED)</b> DRIVER'S NAME: _____ (PRINT NAME) BUS NUMBER _____ DRIVER'S SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER _____ TIME EMPLOYED: _____ BEGAN TRIP _____ ENDED TRIP _____ TOTAL HOURS _____ MILES TRAVELED - ODOMETER READING _____ BEGIN TRIP _____ END OF TRIP _____ TOTAL MILES _____ I AM REGULAR DRIVER <input type="checkbox"/> SUBSTITUTE DRIVER <input type="checkbox"/> DATE OF TRIP _____ I CERTIFY THAT ABOVE IS CORRECT: _____ _____ SIGNATURE OF BUS DRIVER I CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE TRIP REPORT IS CORRECT: COMMENTS _____ DATE _____ PRINCIPAL / TEACHER _____ (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON BACK)	<b>KEY PUNCH DATA</b> NO. 43449 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> </table> HOURS TENTHS  <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> </table> MILES TENTHS  <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> </table> MONTH DAY YEAR  <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td> </tr> </table> SCHOOL NUMBER  <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td> </td><td> </td> </tr> </table> PAY PERIOD  <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td> </td> </tr> </table> FUNDED BY																													

**PAYMENT VOUCHER COPY**



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

State Department of Education. Division of Special Services. Pupil Transportation Services. Pupil Transportation in Virginia School Systems: A State of the Art study. Richmond, Virginia, 1974.

State Department of Education. Division of Special Services. Pupil Transportation Service. Pupil Transportation, 1972-73. Richmond, Virginia, 1973.

State Board of Education. Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Commonwealth of Virginia, School Year 1972-1973, Richmond, Virginia, 1973.

State Department of Education. Division of Special Services. Pupil Transportation Service. Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation and Minimum Standards for School Buses in Virginia. Richmond, Virginia, 1969.

Institute of Defense Analyses. Economic Characteristics of the Urban Public Transportation Industry, February 1972. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing office, 1972.

Iowa. 65th General Assembly, 1973 Acts, Chapter 197-School Buses

Central Virginia Health Planning Council, Inc. Draft of Grant Application for Rural Highway Public Transportation Demonstration Program, 1974.

James City County, Va. Rural Highway Public Transportation Demonstration Program. Office of the Administrator. 1974.

Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. Rural Transportation Demonstration Project for the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. Charlottesville, Virginia, 1974.

LENOWISCO Planning District Commission. A Rural Public Transportation Proposal. Duffield, Virginia, 1974.

New Mexico. Emergency Transportation Act - Chapter 38 , 1974.

New York. State Education Law, Section 1502 .

Proposal for A Cooperative Rural Transportation Program for the New River Valley Planning District Rural Highway Transportation Program, 1974.

Rappahannock-Rapidan Planning District. Proposal for a Cooperative Rural Transportation Program for the Rappahannock-Rapidan Planning District under the Rural Highway Public Transportation Program: Preliminary Proposal. Culpeper, Virginia,

Richmond Regional Planning District Commission. A Preliminary Proposal for a Rural Transportation Demonstration Project. Richmond, Virginia, 1974.

Dickey, John, W. Rural Public Transportation Needs and Recommendations. Report to the Virginia Metropolitan Area Transportation Study commission, 1973.

Greater Richmond Transit Company. -A FY 1975 - FY 1979 Transit Development Program for Richmond, Virginia, April 1974. Richmond, Virginia, 1974.

Mix, Charles Van Schaik. The Need for and Design of a Rural Transportation System for Madison County, Virginia. Published major paper, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1974.

South Dakota Code. Title 49 Public Utilities and Carriers.

State of Oregon, Mass Transit Division. Community/School Bus Project: A Pilot Project Using School Buses for Public Transportation. Final Report, December, 1973.

Stroemple, Richard B. Proposal Rural Transportation for the Sixth Planning District: A demonstration Project. Prepared for Valley Program for Aging Services, Inc. and Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission, 1974.

Virginia. Code Annotated.

Voorhees, Alan M. and Associates, Inc. A Transit Development Program for the Lynchburg Urban Area. Prepared for the City of Lynchburg, Virginia, 1974.

Washington. 43rd Legislature. 3rd Extraordinary Session, House Bill No. 1282 .

Wilbur Smith and Associates. Feasibility Study: School Bus Utilization for Non-Pupil Transportation Programs. Report to the Department of Transportation, Arlington County, Virginia, 1974.

Wilbur Smith and Associates. Public Transportation Needs in Virginia's Metropolitan Areas. Prepared for Virginia Metropolitan Areas Transportation Study Commission, 1971.



