

School Bus Use for Non-School Transportation

A REPORT OF THE
TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE
OF THE

URBAN
CONSORTIUM
FOR TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES



Supported by



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Washington, D.C. 20590

SEPTEMBER 1980

HE
308
.936

S.C.R.T.D. LIBRARY

URBAN CONSORTIUM FOR TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES

Member Jurisdictions

ATLANTA, GEORGIA
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
CLEVELAND, OHIO
COLUMBUS, OHIO
DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
DALLAS, TEXAS
DENVER, COLORADO
DETROIT, MICHIGAN
HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA
HOUSTON, TEXAS
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA
JEFFERSON COUNTY, KENTUCKY
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA
MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE
MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
NEW YORK, NEW YORK
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA
PHOENIX, ARIZONA
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA
PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON
WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Urban Consortium for Technology Initiatives was formed to pursue technological solutions to pressing urban problems. The Urban Consortium is a coalition of 37 major urban governments, 28 cities and 9 counties, with populations over 500,000. These 37 governments represent over 20% of the nation's population and have a combined purchasing power of over \$25 billion.

Formed in 1974, the Urban Consortium represents a unified local government marketplace for new technologies. The Consortium is organized to encourage public and private investment to develop new products or systems which will improve delivery of local public services and provide cost-effective solutions to urban problems. The Consortium also serves as a clearinghouse in the coordination and application of existing technology and information.

To achieve its goal, the Urban Consortium identifies the common needs of its members, establishes priorities, stimulates investment from Federal, private and other sources and then provides on-site technical assistance to assure that solutions will be applied. The work of the Consortium is focused through 10 task forces: Community and Economic Development; Criminal Justice; Environmental Services; Energy; Fire Safety and Disaster Preparedness; Health; Human Resource Management, Finance and Personnel; Public Works and Public Utilities; and Transportation.

Public Technology, Inc. is the applied science and technology organization of the National League of Cities and the International City Management Association. It is a nonprofit, tax-exempt public interest organization established in December 1971 by local governments and their public interest groups. Its purpose is to help local governments improve services and cut costs through practical use of applied science and technology. PTI sponsors the nation's largest local government cooperative research, development, and technology transfer program.

PTI's Board of Directors consists of the executive directors of the International City Management Association and the National League of Cities, plus city managers and elected officials from across the United States.



School Bus Use for Non-School Transportation

September 1980

Prepared by

PUBLIC TECHNOLOGY, INC.
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Secretariat
to the

**URBAN CONSORTIUM
FOR TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES**



URBAN
CONSORTIUM
FOR
TECHNOLOGY
INITIATIVES



Supported by



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Washington, D.C., 20590

02676

HE
308
.S36

PREFACE

This is one of ten bulletins in the fourth series of Information Bulletins produced by the Transportation Task Force of the Urban Consortium for Technology Initiatives. Each bulletin in this series addresses a priority transportation need identified by member jurisdictions of the Urban Consortium. The bulletins are prepared for the Transportation Task Force by the staff of Public Technology, Inc. and its consultants. In 1980, Transportation of Hazardous Materials was identified as a priority need by both the Transportation and the Fire Safety and Disaster Preparedness Task Forces of the Urban Consortium. The Information Bulletin addressing that need was prepared under their joint direction.

Nine newly identified transportation needs are covered in this fourth series of Information Bulletins:

- Economic Impacts of Transportation Restrictions
- Parking and Traffic Enforcement
- Pedestrian Traffic Safety
- School Bus Use for Non-School Transportation
- Street Management Information Systems
- Taxicabs as Public Transit
- Transportation Construction Management
- Transportation of Hazardous Materials
- Transportation System Management, Air Quality, and Energy Conservation

One Information Bulletin covering a need identified in 1979 is being updated and expanded:

- Transportation Energy Contingency Planning

The needs highlighted by Information Bulletins are selected in an annual process of needs identification used by the Urban Consortium. By focusing on the priority needs of member jurisdictions, the Consortium assures that resultant research and development efforts are responsive to local government problems.

Each bulletin provides a nontechnical overview, from the local government perspective, of issues and problems associated with each need. Current research efforts and approaches to the problem are identified. The bulletins are not an in-depth review of the state-of-the-art or the state-of-the-practice. Rather, they serve to identify and raise issues and as an information base from which the Transportation Task Force selects topics that require a more substantial research effort.

The Information Bulletins are also useful to those, such as elected officials, for whom transportation is but one of many areas of concern.

The needs selection process used by the Urban Consortium is effective. Priority needs selections have been addressed by subsequent Transportation Task Force projects:

- Five Transit Actions regional meetings were held between January 1979 and May 1979 to address the need for Transit System Productivity. The product of these meetings is a Transit Actions Workbook that features techniques currently being used to improve transit system performance and productivity.
- To facilitate the provision of Transportation for Elderly and Handicapped Persons, five documents were developed: one on local government approaches, a planning checklist, an information sourcebook, a series of case studies, and a chief executive's summary.
- To help improve Center City Circulation, two new projects have been completed. Center City Environment and Circulation: Transportation Innovations in Five European Cities is the second of three volumes showing how cities use transportation and pedestrian improvements to help downtown revitalization. Another project, addressing the coordination of public transportation investments with real estate development culminated in a national conference--the second Joint Development Marketplace in Washington, D.C., in June 1980. The Marketplace was attended by over 500 persons, including exhibitors from cities and counties around the country and representatives of private development and financial organizations.
- A series of documents relating to the need for Transportation Planning and Impact Forecasting Tools has been prepared: (1) a management-level document for local officials describing manual and computer transportation planning tools available from the U.S. Department of Transportation, (2) a series of case studies of local government and transit agency applications of these tools, and (3) a guide describing ways local governments can gain access to these tools. Additional documents are being prepared on how local governments can use U.S. Census information more effectively through these U.S. Department of Transportation computer tools.

- To help meet the need to Accelerate Implementation Procedures, a conference on the Federal-Aid Urban System (FAUS) was held in Baltimore, Maryland, in May 1980, for Federal Highway Region 3. The conference was aimed at developing communication between local, State, and Federal officials to improve implementation of and clear up misunderstandings about the FAUS program.
- To meet the need to promote use of Transportation System Management (TSM) measures, a series of five regional meetings are being held in 1980 to provide local, State, and Federal officials, and representatives of transit agencies and the business community with the opportunity to exchange information about low-cost TSM projects to improve existing transportation systems.
- To facilitate the dissemination of information on local experiences in Parking Management, a technical report describing the state-of-the-art is being prepared.
- A National Transit Pricing Forum was held at Virginia Beach, Virginia, in March 1979 to address the need for more information on Innovative Fares. Much of the Forum was directed to technical advances in areas of pricing research and practice. The proceedings of this conference are available.
- Two projects were undertaken to pursue the need for Taxicabs for Public Transportation. A handbook, Taxicabs and Federal Programs, was prepared, and five regional meetings were held in March and April of 1980. In May 1980 the Transportation Task Force sponsored the National Conference on Taxicab Innovations: Service and Regulations.

Ongoing Task Force Information Dissemination and Technology Sharing needs are currently addressed by a series of SMD Briefs. These one-page reports provide up-to-date information about on-going UMTA Office of Service and Methods Demonstrations projects. In addition, the SMD HOST Program allows transportation officials from selected jurisdictions to visit one of these projects for on-site training.

Additional Technology Sharing occurs through the National Cooperative Transit Research Program (NCTRP) which was organized jointly by Public Technology, Inc., the American Public Transit Association, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, and the Transportation Research Board to address problems relating to public transportation identified by local and state government and transit administrators.

The support of the U.S. Department of Transportation's Technology Sharing Division in the Office of the Secretary, Federal Highway Administration, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and Urban Mass Transportation Administration has been invaluable in the work of the Transportation Task Force of the Urban Consortium and the Public Technology, Inc. staff. The guidance offered by the Task Force members will continue to ensure that the work of the staff will meet the urgent needs identified by members of the Urban Consortium for Technology Initiatives.

The members of the Transportation Task Force are:

- George Simpson (Chairperson)
Assistant Director
Department of Engineering
and Development
City of San Diego
San Diego, California
- Ron Borowski
Head, Transportation Planning
Denver Planning Office
City of Denver
Denver, Colorado
- Gerald R. Cichy
Director of Transportation
Montgomery County
Rockville, Maryland
- James E. Clark III
Assistant Director
D.C. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Kent Dewell
Deputy Director, Public Works
Department/Transportation
Division
City of San Jose
San Jose, California
- David Gurin
Deputy Commissioner
New York City Department of
Transportation
New York, New York
- Edward M. Hall (Vice Chairperson)
Street Transportation
Administrator
City of Phoenix
Phoenix, Arizona
- William K. Hellmann
Chief, Interstate Division
for Baltimore City
Baltimore, Maryland
- Robert Hicks
Administrator
Planning and Traffic
Engineering Division
Department of Transportation
City of Detroit
Detroit, Michigan
- Rod Kelly
Director, Office of
Transportation
City of Dallas
Dallas, Texas
- Frank Kiolbassa
Director of Public Works
City of San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas
- Alan Lubliner
Center City Circulation
Project Manager
Department of City Planning
City of San Francisco
San Francisco, California
- Edward A. Mueller
Executive Director
Jacksonville Transportation
Authority
Jacksonville, Florida
- Jim Parsons
Chief Transportation Planner
Office of Policy and Evaluation
City of Seattle
Seattle, Washington
- Julie Sgarzi
Director of Research
Mayor's Office
City of Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California
- Stephen Villavaso
Chief Planner, Transportation
Policy Development
Mayor's Office
City of New Orleans
New Orleans, Louisiana

Project Sponsors

- Jim Bautz
Chief, Paratransit and Special
User Group Division, UPM-30
Urban Mass Transportation
Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Milton Criswell
Chief, Implementation Division,
HDV-20
Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Brian Cudahy
Director, Office of Transit
Management, UPM-40
Urban Mass Transportation
Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Robert Dial
Director, Office of Planning
Methods and Support, UPM-20
Urban Mass Transportation
Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Barry Felrice
Associate Administrator, Office
of Plans and Programs
National Highway Traffic Safety
Administration, NPP-20
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Ronald J. Fisher
Director, Office of Service and
Methods Demonstrations, UPM-30
Urban Mass Transportation
Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Charles Graves
Director, Office of Planning
Assistance, UPM-10
Urban Mass Transportation
Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Phil Hughes
Director, Office of Policy
Research, UPP-30
Urban Mass Transportation
Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Robert J. Kreklau
Office of Engineering, Special
Procedures Branch, HNG-11
Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Alfonso B. Linhares
Director, Office of Technology
Sharing, I-25
Office of the Assistant Secretary
for Governmental Affairs
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Henry Nejako
Acting Associate Administrator
Office of Technology Development
and Deployment, UTD-5
Urban Mass Transportation
Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- Norm Paulhus
Office of Technology Sharing, I-25
Office of the Assistant Secretary
for Governmental Affairs
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.
- James Yu
Office of Policy Research, UPP-30
Urban Mass Transportation
Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
Washington, D.C.

Table of Contents

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	ISSUES AND PROBLEMS	1
	School Bus Availability	5
	Regulatory Environment--Federal and State	6
	Local Support	11
	Insurance	13
	Safety	15
	Design and Comfort	15
	Added Maintenance	18
	Labor	18
	Administration--Coordination and Financing	20
2	CONTACTS AND CURRENT PROGRAMS	29
	Contacts	29
	U.S. Department of Transportation	29
	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	30
	Community Services Administration	32
	U.S. Department of Agriculture	32
	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development	32
	U.S. Department of Labor	32
	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	33
	National Association for Pupil Transportation	33
	National School Transportation Association	33
	Current Programs	34
3	ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY	51
	General	51
	Elderly and Handicapped Transportation	53
	Emergency Transportation	54
	Feasibility Studies	54
	Insurance	55
	Rural and Exurban Transportation	56
	APPENDIX	59
	Crisis-Related Use Supplementing Regular Transit: Dade County	59
	Non-Crisis Related Use for Special User Groups: Johnson County, Kansas, and Rhode Island	61
	Non-Crisis, Publicly-Operated Service for Special Users: Arlington County, Virginia	62
	Non-Emergency, Regular Use, No Existing Transit: Klamath Falls, Oregon, and Morehead, Kentucky	63
	Employer Sponsored, Regular Transit: Inland Steel Corporation	66

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Comparison of School Buses and Transit Buses	2
2	School and Commuter Travel Peak Period Overlaps	6
3	Summary of State Legislation Governing Non-Pupil Use of Publicly Owned School Buses Under Normal Conditions	9
4	States Primarily Served by Privately Owned School Bus Fleets	10
5	Local Support Elements	12
6	A Comparison of School Bus and Transit Bus Physical Specifications	16
7	Possible State Funding Sources for School Bus Transportation Programs	26
8	Possible Local Funding Sources for Non-School School Bus Transportation Programs	27

CHAPTER 2

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	State Contacts For Sections 16(b)(2) and 18 Public Transportation Programs	37
2	UMTA Field Offices	41
3	Public Health Service--Regional Health Administrators	42
4	Community Services Administration--Regional Director	43
5	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Field Offices	44
6	State Directors of Pupil Transportation	47

CHAPTER 1

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

At a time when the reliability of our energy supply is uncertain, when the emissions from too many automobiles threaten to endanger our environment, and when inflation makes the cost of supplying new forms of mass transit prohibitive, making better, more efficient use of what we already have seems a logical ethic to live by. In light of this logic and Federal support in recent years of using Transportation System Management (TSM) measures rather than costly experimental technology or heavy capital investment to alleviate our transportation needs, school buses appear to be a reasonable source of auxiliary transportation.

- 1980 figures show that more than 80% of all U.S. registered buses are either privately-or publicly-owned school buses (see Table 1).
- School buses are an on-hand resource and can represent an immediate solution to some of our most pressing transportation needs.
- School buses are often idle during the day, night, holidays, school vacations, weekends, and the summer months.
- Of all buses, school buses have the greatest efficiency of route planning and, according to a Rural Pennsylvania Feasibility Study, are one of the least expensive modes of alternative transportation in a rural area when compared with other forms of public transit on a total cost per seat-mile basis.¹

In certain instances, then, school buses appear to offer extra transportation services at minimal financial, energy, and planning expense.

School buses can be used for other-than-school transportation in a number of ways:

- by the general public when buses are not being used for school service, either for special trips or regular transit service (i.e., to grocery stores, shopping malls, etc.).
- by special user groups, such as elderly, handicapped, young people, or poor people, to specific destinations, such as the grocery store, or employment, medical, or recreational centers.
- by commuters, either simultaneously with school children on regular school bus routes, or separately in school buses specifically set aside for feeder service to park-and-ride lots or already existing transit lines.

¹Governor's Task Force on Rural Transportation, Rural Transportation in Pennsylvania, Problems and Prospects, p. 127.

Table 1
COMPARISON OF SCHOOL BUSES AND
TRANSIT BUSES

	SCHOOL BUSES	TRANSIT BUSES
Number of vehicles	391,000	54,000
Daily riders (1 way)	23,000,000	15,000,000
Locations	16,000	900 (one third of these with populations in excess of 50,000)
Miles per year	3 billion	1-6 billion
Gallons of fuel	401,000,000	403,000,000 (diesel primarily)
Cost	\$3 billion	\$4.5 billion

Source: Bud Giangrande, Chief, Technology Sharing Office, U.S. Department of Transportation, Transportation Systems Center, Cambridge: 1980.

This Information Bulletin discusses the fundamental issues involved in using school buses for non-school transportation in either a crisis or non-crisis situation. The degree to which the issues that will be discussed represent obstacles to school bus use varies from state to state and from county to county. It also varies depending upon the context in which the need emerges to implement such use. Broadly speaking, there are five pairs of contexts, the former in each pair listed below being the easier scenario in which to implement a school bus use program.

- Energy crisis or other emergency condition vs. Non-crisis situation
- Service is needed for elderly and handicapped or other special user group vs. Regular, fixed-route or feeder service is needed for commuters or general public.
- School buses are owned and operated by a private company vs. School buses are owned and operated by the public sector.
- The need for transportation arises in a rural area vs. The need arises in a suburban or an urban area.
- Service is needed for offpeak periods vs. Service is needed during the peak periods.

The difference in the set of circumstances in each pair changes the perspective with which the need is viewed by those who would be responsible for initiating and implementing such programs. The problems and obstacles are generally accentuated in the latter scenario in each case.

- In a crisis, regulations restricting school bus use generally can be easily relaxed. In some cases, contingency plans exist that provide for the use of school buses in a crisis even if regulations forbid it during non-crisis periods. In others, a declaration of a state of emergency by the governor or other official is enough to waive prohibitive or restrictive regulations impacting non-school use of school buses.
- Elderly, handicapped, young, and low-income persons have mobility needs that are often not met by regular transit service. A more customized, less expensive, and less intimidating service provider may be more attractive to them. In addition, their transportation needs could more easily be accommodated at mid-day, when school buses are generally idle.² Commuters and the general public, on the other hand, may be reluctant to use uncomfortable, bright, yellow school buses, and the times of day when they need transportation conflict almost directly with the times when school buses are in use for transporting children.

²However, elderly and handicapped accessibility is as much a problem with school buses as it is with regular transit buses.

- Private owners have more flexible and complete control over how their buses are used when they are not in use for school children than public sector operators, and the profit motive acts as an incentive in many cases for them to find as many uses of their school buses as possible. School districts, however, are not profit-minded; their sole concern is to provide safe transportation for school children. In addition, public ownership implies that there will be more regulations with which to contend. Finally, school districts will probably be unwilling to cede some of their authority to outside groups wishing to get greater use out of the school buses, especially since these districts and their respective school boards must work with PTAs that often link the use of school buses by non-school groups with a reduction in the emphasis on maintaining their safety for school children.
- The lack of public transportation resources appears to be more critical in isolated, rural areas than in suburban areas where the likelihood that some other mode of transportation exists, whether public transit or ridesharing, is greater.³ In addition, traffic conditions in a rural area are likely to be less congested and therefore not as debilitating to the life of a school bus as traffic conditions are in an urban or suburban area. Finally, a draft memorandum by Multisystems, Inc. notes that school bus driver wage rates in an urban area tend to be higher than those in a more rural area⁴, thus making expanded school bus use in the latter a somewhat less costly proposition.
- Off-peak period use of school buses does not generally conflict with school transportation; peak period use does, and presents an additional disincentive for school boards to adopt such an idea.

³It is important to note, though, that school buses may be too large to be used efficiently in rural areas, depending upon the service offered. According to a report on rural passenger transportation prepared by the Transportation Systems Center in 1976, "in many low density areas no more than 5 or 10 passengers can be expected on any route. This results in higher operating expenses per passenger which may more than offset any savings from using the school bus." (TSC, Rural Passenger Transportation - State of the Art, p.14.) On the other hand, a subscription bus service using school buses in suburban St. Louis carries McDonnell Douglas employees to and from work along low density routes. It operates at capacity and is financially self-supporting. (Kirby, et.al., Paratransit, pp. 236-237.)

⁴Multisystems, Inc., "Factors Impacting Non-Pupil School Bus Use," p. 24.

These are only some of the concerns that deter widespread acceptance of the idea of using school buses for non-school transportation. In this Information Bulletin, the following issues and problems will be discussed:

- School Bus Availability.
- The Regulatory Environment.
- Local Support.
- Insurance.
- Safety.
- Design and Comfort.
- Added Maintenance.
- Labor.
- Administration - Coordination and Financing.

The discussion of these issues will be highlighted by a brief look at the experiences of several jurisdictions which have tried using school buses for non-school transportation.

SCHOOL BUS AVAILABILITY

Are school buses as readily available or as underutilized as we think? In many cases, they are not. In the past, school buses were used two to three hours a day to transport children to and from school. Now they are used for a multitude of other purposes: to transport different shifts of children, mostly for kindergarten classes; to make extra, late afternoon runs for children who must stay after school; and for extracurricular activities. In addition, some States' maintenance standards require that buses be used on a staggered basis, so that thorough inspections may be made regularly on the unused buses. Other regulations mandate that a certain number of buses be available at all times as backup buses. With all this taken into consideration, studies have estimated that school buses are used an average of 6 to 10 hours a day excluding holidays, weekends, and summers.⁵

A major limitation on availability is the fact that commuter travel times conflict with school travel times, especially during the morning peak period (see Table 2).

⁵Wilbur Smith and Associates, Bus Utilization for Non-Pupil Transportation Programs, p. 15.

Table 2

SCHOOL AND COMMUTER TRAVEL PEAK
PERIOD OVERLAPS

	A.M.	P.M.
School travel peaks	7:00-9:00	2:30-5:30
Commuter travel peaks	6:00-9:00	3:00-6:00

Source: W.C. Gilman and Co., The School Bus, pp. 13-14.

In order to reconcile these peak period conflicts, school districts or employers would have to adopt new or flexible hours, or operators would have to consolidate bus routes to make pickup and delivery even more efficient than it currently is, thereby freeing more buses for additional routes or more frequent service. It is likely that under normal circumstances, the option in which school hours would be made flexible would meet with either legal or parental opposition. One jurisdiction considered delaying school one to two hours in an emergency situation as a way of circumventing the peak conflict more expeditiously than changing business hours. However, parents did not support the idea because it meant leaving their children alone in the house after they had left for work.

Finally, if school bus utilization is assessed in terms of miles traveled, school buses really aren't being underutilized at all. A school bus will only travel a limited number of miles. The number of years it takes to reach that limit becomes insignificant. However, what may be significant is that more frequent and vigorous use could reduce appreciably the life of the bus and necessitate purchasing new school buses more often.

Once the school buses are secured, is there any guarantee that there will be enough gasoline to fuel them? In part, there is. During an energy emergency, the U.S. Department of Energy's Special Rule #9 guarantees 100% of the diesel fuel requirements for surface passenger mass transportation, including school buses used for school or non-school transportation. Generally speaking, public and school transportation services receive high priority during an energy shortage among State energy offices, which have a reserve energy supply for such times, as well. However, the red tape involved in getting to this fuel can sometimes offset the advantage of being first in line for it.

REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT -- FEDERAL AND STATE.

Non-school use of school buses is only negligibly restricted by Federal regulations. It is largely the responsibility of the States to

administer and regulate school bus use as they see fit, either by delegating the power to control such use to the individual localities or by retaining it themselves at the State level.⁶ However, there are three Federal regulations that apply to school buses and school bus transportation.⁷

- The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's Highway Safety Program Standard No. 17 makes certain specifications as to the identification, operation, and maintenance of school buses, training of personnel, and administration of school transportation programs. Specifically, all school buses must
 - have "SCHOOL BUS" painted on the front and rear of buses in letters eight inches or taller.
 - be painted "National School Bus Yellow".
 - have the 8-light warning signal system.
 - have a mirror configuration that allows the driver to see clearly all around the bus.

These regulations do not apply as rigidly to those school buses, either publicly or privately operated, used primarily to serve the non-school public. When school buses are used only to serve the non-school public, none of these regulations applies, and the buses must be painted a color other than school bus yellow.⁸

- Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) regulations require operators in a "for hire" situation to obtain an interstate "certificate of convenience and necessity" from the ICC and to meet additional requirements concerning safety, licensed bus drivers, fare levels, etc. when transporting passengers across state lines or commercial zones.

⁶NHTSA's Highway Safety Program Standard No. 17, February, 1973.

⁷Some public transportation programs using school buses (any subsidized by Federal operating assistance money) may eventually have to comply with other Federal regulations, such as the section 504 regulation that requires accessibility to public transit systems for elderly and handicapped persons and the 13(c) labor clause that restricts the worsening of transit workers' positions due to new service in the same service area.

⁸See "Design and Comfort", p. 15, for the impact of Federal Highway Safety Standard No. 17 school bus design stipulations on the non-school use of school buses.

These regulations do not apply in a city, county, or intra-state situation. In these instances, the operator would apply for local public utility commission rights when necessary. In some States, just purchasing commercial plates and using them in lieu of school plates is sufficient.

- A 10% Federal excise tax used to apply to school bus contractors who provided both school and non-school transportation, or just the latter. Before November 1978, these contractors could be exempted from this tax by signing an affidavit stating that buses being purchased would only be used for school transportation during the period of the initial contract between the contractor and the school district. Subsequently, the law was changed to exempt all school bus purchases from the excise tax. However, since the bill was not retroactive, affidavits signed before the effective date of the legal change cannot be waived until the initial contracts to provide school transportation expire.⁹ This does not affect many buses, and none has any obligation beyond 1981.

State Laws

Aside from the fact that most States share the cost of pupil transportation with the local areas, thereby giving the former a certain degree of inherent control over school bus uses, State regulations pertaining to publicly-owned school buses vary widely from restrictive to permissive. Some allow non-school use, some leave the decision up to the local school districts, some impose a set of conditions for such use (e.g., only for the elderly and handicapped, only if no other available transportation exists, only if such use won't interfere with existing carriers or regular school transportation), and some directly prohibit it (see Table 3). Within the parameters set by these categories of State regulations, the permissiveness or restrictiveness may vary additionally, depending upon--

- how narrowly or broadly the laws are interpreted in each State.
- whether, as is likely, the State, either through specific legislation, gubernatorial declaration, or informal abrogation, will waive some or all of the restrictions during emergency.

In addition, in some states, the regulations don't have a noticeable effect one way or the other because the majority of school transportation is provided by private operators (see Table 4) who escape many

⁹Multisystems, "Factors Impacting Non-Pupil Use," p. 4.

Table 3

SUMMARY OF STATE LEGISLATION GOVERNING NON-PUPIL USE OF
PUBLICLY OWNED SCHOOL BUSES UNDER NORMAL CONDITIONS

STATUS OF LEGISLATION	NUMBER	STATES
Allow non-pupil use of school buses	10	DE, DC, HI, MA, MN, MT, NY, OR, RI, SD
Delegate use decision to local education authorities:		
● Publicly owned buses are school property to be used as school district desires.	3	AL, AR, TN
● Absence of governing legislation.	2	CA, ND
● Local educational authority has option to decide use.	9	AK, AZ, DT, MD, NH, UT, TX, VT, WY
Allow restricted non-pupil use of school buses:		
● Use by elderly-sometimes limited by area, destination, or purpose.	8	CO, ID, IN, KS, NE, NY, WA, WV
● Contracts with governmental agencies and/or non-profit organizations to transport elderly and handicapped and/or other persons.	8	ME, NM, VA, FL, GA, IA, MI, NJ, KY*
Prohibit non-pupil use of school buses:		
● Explicitly prohibited by legislation.	3	MO, OH, SC
● Narrow interpretation of legislation.	5	IL, NC, OK, PA, WI
● Absence of governing legislation disallows unspecified use.	2	LA, MS

Source: Multisystems, "Factors Impacting Non-Pupil Use," p. 4.

*The Kentucky DOT is authorized to sponsor projects demonstrating the general non-pupil use of school buses. See Appendix, p. 64, "Morehead, Kentucky."

Table 4

STATES PRIMARILY SERVED* BY PRIVATELY OWNED SCHOOL BUS FLEETS
(1977-1978)

STATE	NUMBER OF SCHOOL BUSES		TOTAL
	PUBLICLY OWNED	PRIVATELY OWNED**	
ALASKA	110	495	605
CONNECTICUT	420	3784	4204
DELAWARE	176	884	1060
HAWAII	15	664	679
MASSACHUSETTS	422	8011	8433
NEW HAMPSHIRE	360	1448	1808
NEW MEXICO	259	1774	2033
RHODE ISLAND	72	1317	1389

*When privately owned school bus fleet represents at least 80% of statewide school bus apply.

**Excludes school buses owned by private and parochial schools.

Source: School Bus Fleet: Fact Book, Volume 24 Number 6, p. 64, as reprinted in Multisystems, "Factors Impacting Non-Pupil Use," p. 8.

restrictions regarding non-school use by virtue of their private status.¹⁰

Beyond this regulatory framework, a number of other types of restrictions may apply.

- Most States require that the "SCHOOL BUS" signs and other markings be covered and that flashing warning lights be deactivated when school buses are being used for non-school transportation.
- Some States, although not many, impose safety and design specifications above and beyond those required in Highway Safety Program Standard No. 17.
- Where public transportation is being provided by school buses some states require operators to meet regular transit regulations. Depending upon the type of services being offered by the school buses and the means of financing these services, this may mean acquiring additional bus licensing and Public Utilities Commission authorization, and meeting additional passenger carrier regulations. In most cases, the latter will already have been met in complying with pupil carrier regulations.¹¹

This imposing array of regulations may discourage the development of programs using school buses for non-school transportation.

It is important to note that there is some feeling among school bus operators and organizations like the National School Transportation Association that the regulatory atmosphere may be relaxing in light of recent concerns about our limited energy supply and the need to make better use of our existing transportation resources. However, there seems to be more evidence of this relaxation in cases where special users are involved¹² than there is in regulations pertaining to regular fixed-route service for the general public.

LOCAL SUPPORT

Though in most cases no formalized local government policies exist with respect to using school buses for non-school transportation (though they have the authority to develop such policies), the informal support of local officials (school board members, city councils, etc.) is a crucial element in implementing and sustaining a successful program.

¹⁰Some States do prohibit however, the provision of school transportation by private operators, thereby limiting the number of private school bus operators the State is likely to have.

¹¹U.S. Department of Transportation, Energy Contingency Strategies: Use of School Buses, p. 25.

¹²In view of the recent upholding of the Section 504 regulation, public officials may begin to see expanded use of school buses for elderly and handicapped transportation as a way of meeting interim 504 full accessibility requirements.

At least one project failed for lack of this type of support (see Appendix, p. 63, "Klamath Falls"). Table 5 notes some general elements of local support. The favorableness or unfavorableness of any one of these elements could, depending upon the degree, impact the facility with which a school bus program is implemented and sustained. These apply more to programs using public rather than private school buses.

Table 5

LOCAL SUPPORT ELEMENTS

FORMAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Local policies and regulations● Local financing or subsidy● School board or district policies (where school board or district has formally been granted the power by the State to decide such policies--13 States have done this).
INFORMAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● PTA or school board or district disposition (where they don't have the State delegated authority to regulate school bus use)● Community ridership

Informal local opposition is not to be underestimated. It can be as intransigent as statutory opposition because it is fed by parental and school board concern for the safety of the children and the precedence of their needs. There is an unspoken concern that, despite agreements to the contrary, the control of the school board over the use of the buses will gradually erode, and the needs of the school children will gradually become secondary, as more and more non-school users get into the act.

In order to soften school board and community opposition, it is necessary to:

- stress the potential financial gains to school districts and the tax-paying public through additional fare-revenues.
- stress the potential financial savings inherent in areas where no transit exists to test the market and community need for transit services before investing in transit buses, which cost approximately \$80,000 to \$100,000.¹³
- show that funds for school travel will not be used for non-school travel.

¹³Lawrence C. Cooper, The Use of School Buses for Public Transportation, p. I-3.

- explain that school buses can be used to complement existing transit services, rather than to compete with them.
- utilize good public relations and marketing techniques.¹⁴
- insure that all additional costs will be reimbursed.

INSURANCE

As long as school buses are used only to transport school children for school-related activities, insurance premiums are relatively low for a number of reasons.

- School bus safety records are generally good due to the Federal and State regulations with which any bus transporting school children must comply.
- Fixed routes and schedules for school buses keep them more removed from commuter traffic and hazards.¹⁵
- People driving in the vicinity of school buses are required to exercise more caution.
- Damage claims involving children do not cause loss of income.¹⁶

Insurance rates for buses used exclusively for school transportation normally amount to 2 1/2 to 3 percent of the school bus operator's gross revenues.¹⁷ When school buses are used for non-school transportation, however, this rate can climb to as much as seven times the regular school bus premiums¹⁸ (See Appendix, p. 59, "Dade County").

In 1979, the White House and the National Governor's Association co-hosted a conference to initiate cooperative efforts between the States, the insurance industry, and the Federal government to ease the financially and institutionally inhibiting restrictions relating to obtaining insurance for social service and public transportation. At the root of these restrictions, the conference found, were

¹⁴Ibid., p. III-20.

¹⁵Ibid., p. III-8.

¹⁶U.S. Department of Transportation, Energy Contingency Strategies: Use of School Buses, p. 15.

¹⁷Gilman, The School Bus, p. 43.

¹⁸The Institute of Public Administration, Planning Handbook, Transportation Service for the Elderly, p. IX-12.

...State laws and regulatory practices which were written before the emergence in the last 10-15 years of a wide variety of new institutions and approaches for providing social service and public transportation--institutions and approaches which cannot be fitted under the traditional classification of "for-hire" or private carriage," and which do not enjoy the kinds of immunities from regulatory and common law once enjoyed by governments and charitable organizations.¹⁹

As a result of that conference and subsequent actions that have been or are being taken to bring about regulatory relaxation, State regulations are becoming more flexible regarding school buses (and other potential social service and public transportation providers), and insurance companies are easing the once prohibitive costs of additional premiums for non-school use. Some of the actions include:

- developing legislation that recognizes the new forms of social service and public transportation.
- developing legislation to compensate for gaps and deficiencies in passenger coverage, brought about by existing laws and regulations (e.g. when another vehicle is at fault or for passenger assistance outside the vehicles).
- developing a new classification scheme for new forms of social service and public transportation programs, to remove some of the uncertainty about rates and the consequent unwillingness of the local agent to write insurance.
- modifying the traditional vehicle use classification to expedite the sharing of vehicles by different programs and agencies.
- developing an alternative rate basis to facilitate the multiple use of vehicles.²⁰

Until the practical application of these policies begins to take shape, non-school use of school bus policies will generally be resolved, as they have been in the past, on a case-by-case basis in one of the following ways:

- Include a non-school use clause in the school bus premium.
- Attach a rider to the school bus premium.
- Require a separate general passenger service premium for non-school use.²¹

¹⁹William W. Dotterweich, The University of Tennessee, Proceedings, White House Workshop on Transportation Insurance, p. 1.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 2-3.

²¹Cooper, The Use of School Buses, p. III-9.

In addition, the National School Transportation Association (NSTA), the association for private school bus operators, now has its own national insurance plan that insures up to 10% of other-than-school-related trips at the same rate as that for providing school service only. NSTA also provides additional coverage for non-school use at the same basic rate.

Ultimately, officials hope premiums for school buses engaged in non-school transportation will settle around those required for airport limousines, city sight-seeing buses, and other similar services.²²

SAFETY

Concern for safety regarding non-school use of school buses is partly a perceptual problem and partly a real one. The perceptual problem involves the concern that any commercialization taking place where school buses are involved will undermine the integrity of the buses in terms of their ability to transport children safely to and from school. While using school buses for other-than school-related transportation would not cause a reduction in safety standards, it would involve an increase in exposure and risks. The real safety problem lies in using school buses for purposes other than those for which they were intended. School buses were not designed to handle stop-and-start traffic, normal traffic speeds, quick accelerations and decelerations, complicated maneuvering, or constant use. A great deal more money is spent on regular transit buses for more durable materials and parts so that they can be made to withstand these normal traffic conditions. To the extent that proposed expanded use of school buses would involve driving in these conditions, though, the overall safety of the school bus might be appreciably affected.

A second legitimate safety concern is that once school buses start being used for non-school transportation, other drivers' perceptions of them will change. Forty-six states have laws requiring that school bus signs be covered and flashing lights deactivated when buses are being used for on-school transportation in order to distinguish their appearance from those times when they're transporting children. However, the most distinguishing school bus characteristic is its color, which can't be changed when it is in use for non-school purposes. The concern is that the identifiability and uniqueness--the alarm the color is supposed to create in other drivers--will be diluted once school buses become a fixture of the traffic system.

DESIGN AND COMFORT

Standard design features of the school bus may themselves restrict the uses of school buses for non-pupil transportation. School buses are designed for agile youngsters, who are more amenable to maneuvering in cramped, uncomfortable conditions and who do not need handrails or other special accommodations. In addition, the nature of school trips necessitates only one door, whereas regular transit service needs two for simultaneous loading and unloading. Ceiling heights, seat spacing, aisle widths, step heights, and the absence of handrails, an extra door, and other equipment make it impracticable, if not unsafe, for some people, especially the elderly and handicapped, to use school buses, and

²²The Institute of Public Administration, Planning Handbook, p. IX-13.

extremely uncomfortable and unappealing for others. Table 6 compares school bus and transit bus specifications and is illustrative of the design differential that would have to be accepted by potential adult school bus passengers. In addition, the bright yellow color of the bus, required by Highway Safety Program Standard No. 17, may severely affect the appeal of using school buses and may be part of an overall stigma under which the non-school public associates school bus transportation with some sort of "poor people's transit".²³ This, of course, would not be the case during periods of severe energy shortages.

Table 6
A COMPARISON OF SCHOOL BUS AND TRANSIT BUS
PHYSICAL SPECIFICATIONS

	SCHOOL BUS	TRANSIT BUS	MINIMUM SPECIFICATIONS FOR ELDERLY & HANDICAPPED
Aisle width	12"	18-20"	19" (32" for wheel-chairs)
Seat length (two abreast seating)	39"	36"	40"
Seat pitch (width)	28"	30"	27"
Headroom	72-74"	78"	72"
Step height	12-16"	12-14"	7"
Door arrangement	front	front, rear	front, rear
Seat capacity	66 children	45-50 adults	not specified

Source: Cooper, *The Use of School Buses*, p. III-13, and Multisystems, "Factors Impacting Non-School Use," p. 12.

²³Montgomery County, Maryland DOT, "Department Memorandum," p. 1.

Remedying these inadequacies, aside from being costly, would, in the minds of some, create new hazards for children. For example, creating more legroom between seats might affect the perceived safety feature that closer seats provide in being able to rebound children in the event of an abrupt stop or crash.²⁴ On the other hand, adding design and comfort features to accommodate and appeal to adults could enhance, or at least leave unaffected, the safety of the bus for children. Certainly this would be the case if more seat padding were added to school bus seats.

The school bus industry is also considering making some changes standard for school bus design that would better meet adult needs. One of these, which would increase headroom from 76 to 78 inches, would have no effect on children's safety. Another would allow more space between seats. Sled tests recently completed by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration revealed that spreading seat distances two to four inches--enough to accommodate adult passengers--does not cause any appreciable difference in impacts and still meets force requirements.²⁵ If the 28 inch rule is waived as a result of these tests, one significant barrier to non-school use of school buses will be removed.

Another design impediment is the limited steering and maneuvering capability of the traditional (not the van-type) school bus, which is built on a truck chassis. Much of the apparent non-school need for school buses involves transporting elderly and handicapped persons who require door-to-door service. This necessitates traveling to tiny residential streets where school buses will have a difficult time negotiating tight turns.

Other design and comfort drawbacks relate to the lack of equipment on school buses that is standard on regular transit buses. Adding a second door in the rear of the bus to facilitate passenger loading and unloading, a device for signaling when a passenger wants to get off a bus, air conditioning, two-way radios, and a fare collection system²⁶ would add considerable expense to the cost of a school bus, although some school bus operators have said this would still be under the cost of a regular transit

²⁴This theory is called compartmentalization. Twenty-eight inches was thought to be the optimal spacing for rebounding a child safely.

²⁵U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, School Bus Passenger Seat and Lap Belt Sled Tests, p. I-54.

²⁶Some of these equipment inadequacies could be circumvented by non-capital means. The Multisystems, Inc. memo referenced throughout this Bulletin, notes four ways, for example, of collecting fares without investing in expensive equipment: (1) prepaid transit passes, (2) prepaid transit coupons, (3) exact fare to the driver in exchange for a receipt, or (4) exact fare into a bucket which is then transferred to another vehicle, a system that Dade County used during its emergency (see Appendix, p. 59, "Dade County").

bus. It is important to note that although extra costs may be incurred by making design and comfort changes for adult passengers, these costs may be partially or wholly compensated by the savings realized in energy gained and new passenger revenue. There is also a need to communicate the fact that school buses need not be exactly like regular transit buses but can be supplied with different equipment as demand--and need--dictates.

ADDED MAINTENANCE

Inevitably, if school buses are going to be used more, they are going to need maintenance more often. In addition, a change in the type of service school buses provide will take a greater toll on a bus's life than school transportation does, resulting in a need for more frequent vehicle replacement. Although this would not be the case so much with buses used by elderly and handicapped riders, it is significantly problematic if buses are being considered for regular transit service; some feel school buses aren't capable of withstanding the substantially greater wear and tear induced over a period of years by traveling in stop-and-go traffic.

The question of who should pay for extra maintenance also needs to be resolved. How can bus operators determine what percentage of maintenance needed was caused by non-school use and what percentage was caused by regular school transportation? This question has generally been resolved by including estimated maintenance costs in the leasing contracts, or by having the leasing organization provide its own maintenance directly.

Finally, expanded use of school buses implies the need for more maintenance resources in the form of maintenance personnel and supplies. If overtime work is needed to accommodate more frequent use during the day, wage payments will increase. If the operator cannot afford to pay overtime or hire extra mechanics, then more buses will be tied up during regular hours for extra maintenance and safety checks, precluding their use for non-school transportation. Often the length of service interruption for added maintenance and repairs due to expanded service is more directly related to the length of time it takes to obtain replacement parts, regardless of the availability of personnel to perform the maintenance.

Even if the additional maintenance costs incurred could be covered by user revenues, the administrative reshuffling that would have to take place to provide for the extra maintenance might not be worth the effort to some operators.

LABOR

Most school bus drivers are hired part-time. They are usually housewives or people with part-time jobs who can afford to put in one or two hours a day driving a bus. Expanding the use of school buses presents a number of labor-related problems rooted in the need to hire more drivers. First, who should provide, train, and pay any additional drivers (see section on ADMINISTRATION, p. 20)? Second, should part-time or full-time drivers be employed? The more informal and customized the new service, the more the need will be to hire more part-time drivers, creating the problems of frequent labor turnover and perennially un-

trained new drivers. The more regular the service--i.e., for public transportation--the more the need will be to hire full-time drivers, which creates a set of problems all its own.

Currently, most school boards negotiate independently with their own bus drivers. The flexibility and convenience in terms of working hours offered by a job driving a school bus allows school boards to hire drivers more cheaply than any other transportation system can. Hiring new full-time drivers or shifting part-time drivers to a full-time basis would require--

- offering wage incentives to make school bus driving their full-time job.
- paying them on a per-hour basis rather than on the basis of the number of runs and the length of each run made.²⁷
- guaranteeing a minimum pay and granting other benefits akin to those of unionized transit drivers.
- finding some way to compensate extra drivers during the slower summer months when school is out.

One feasibility study portrayed the labor obstacle in a multi-staged scenario:

(1) A contract operator continually promotes contract commuter hauling, midday shopping, etc., successfully [resulting] in full fleet utilization for an 8 to 10 hour period of each weekday; (2) the original corps of drivers--all part-time--experience growing difficulty working the hours required by the owner; (3) the owner experiences more difficulty in hiring, training, and managing 2 to 3 sets of "part-time" drivers; (4) [the owner decides] to employ a corps of full-time drivers; (5) existing part-time drivers are offered full-time jobs...; (6) in order to hire well-qualified, reliable drivers on a new full time basis, the owner must also raise his hourly wages to correspond to local industrial wage rate scales; (7) several months into full-time operation, the employees become interested in the benefits associated with unionization; (8) sometime after being unionized, the employees demand an increase in hourly wages, increased medical insurance benefits, a life insurance program, etc...²⁸

²⁷U.S. Department of Transportation, Energy Contingency Strategies: Use of School Buses, p. 19.

²⁸Gilman, The School Bus, p. 42.

In most cases, or at least in those so far, the uses of school buses for non-school transportation will be fairly limited in scope, making it difficult to imagine any labor situation being carried to this extreme.

In addition, providing public transit service with school buses and non-unionized school bus drivers could be opposed by regular, unionized transit drivers, who might invoke 13(c)-type complaints relating to a potential worsening of their positions resulting from new competition for their traditional market. Actual compliance with the 13(c) labor clause need only be achieved where Federal operating money is involved, however.

Finally, part of the attractiveness of part-time drivers is the fact that in most cases they are housewives or others who are perceived as having a nice way with children. Certainly the idea of some full-time transit driver (who is accustomed to dealing with adults) driving their children to school is not as appealing to parents.

It appears as if the advantages of a small school bus operation, that is, inexpensive labor costs and relatively minor labor entanglements, would not be enjoyed as the operation expands. Where the need to hire full-time drivers arises, the labor costs and complications could conceivably increase to the level of those of a regular transit system.

ADMINISTRATION--COORDINATION AND FINANCING

Two questions of an administrative nature need to be resolved before the non-school use of school bus picture is complete:

- Who should coordinate non-school transportation programs using school buses?
- How should such programs be financed?

Coordination

If the school district owns the school buses, it will probably be the most expedient body for operating a non-school use program (where State law permits such programs) as well, since the school district's transportation office performs the planning, hiring, scheduling, routing, dispatching, operating, and maintenance functions for the school district already.

If a private operator owns and operates the school buses for local school districts, the same principle applies: he or she will probably be the appropriate person to coordinate non-school use programs. In fact, most private operators, when queried about problems encountered in providing non-school as well as school transportation, react unthinkingly. They generally see it as a natural extension of their capabilities to provide non-school as well as school transportation, and not as something requiring a great deal of thought or effort.

As a third alternative, an outside agency may contract with school districts or private operators for the use of their buses. That agency is then responsible (aside from the general scheduling of bus availability done by the school district or contractor) for coordinating the service. Experience has revealed the following possible outside leases or coordinators of school bus transportation programs:

- City, county, or other local government bodies.
- Transit properties.
- For-profit companies.
- Private, non-profit social service organizations.
- Neighborhood or community associations.
- Employers (see Appendix, p. 66, "Inland Steel Corporation").

Financing

Throughout this Information Bulletin, the question of money has been the unspoken bottom line issue. Where can an organization operating a school bus transportation program get the money for extra fuel, insurance, safety, design and comfort modifications, maintenance, labor, and administration, to say nothing of extra school buses needed to replace the old ones that are deteriorating more rapidly from more frequent use? Clearly, the money is not available from school transportation coffers.

As has been noted, even though the initial capital purchase of a 44-passenger school bus is substantially less than that of a 40-passenger regular transit bus (there is a difference in price of about \$75,000), the attractiveness of this price differential is diminished when one looks at the differences in life expectancies. The average life of a school bus is 10 years, with some of them traveling 10,000 miles per year and others 25,000. Newer school bus models claim a life expectancy of 20 to 30 years. However, some States mandate a limit on the number of years school buses can be used for school transportation. On the other hand, the life expectancy of transit buses should be about 20 years, although poor transit industry maintenance often sharply reduces the actual useful life. The money saved in a school bus purchase is additionally negated by the costs incurred in trying to get the school bus to begin to do what the transit bus was built to do in the first place, and the school transportation providers to perform the functions of a transit property. Even so, a school bus transportation system will generally be less enticing to most of the non-school public than a regular transit system in jurisdictions where the latter exists. While regular transit systems have established funding sources, school districts, private contractors, counties, cities, social service agencies, and other possible school bus transportation program coordinators often do not have money specifically set aside for transportation and must therefore piece together funds from a variety of sources.

The most obvious source of financial support is from the users themselves, either through direct fares or membership dues.²⁹ However, user revenue often does not cover a very significant portion of operating costs, especially when the users are elderly, handicapped, or low-income persons who are often exempt from paying for transportation services. In those cases, funds can be obtained from private, Federal, State, and local sources.

Private Sources

Social service agencies or private organizations can subsidize non-school school bus transportation in one of two ways.

- They can contract directly with school bus owners (public or private) for the use of a certain number of buses at certain times (charter service). All costs for the service would be paid by the leasee as stipulated in the contract. (The leasee in turn may be supported by other funding sources, whether larger private organizations or the State or Federal governments--see below).
- Sponsoring organizations may be billed for the transportation of their clients. In this case the service is not chartered. Rather, the service may be fixed-route, regularly scheduled, or advanced reservation, used individually by riders with mobility needs.

Typical of the private organizations that directly or indirectly subsidize this type of transportation service are the American Cancer Society, the American Red Cross, United Cerebral Palsy, the Easter Seal Society, national or local religious groups, or employers.³⁰

Federal Sources

None of the Federal funding sources that follow constitutes a gold mine. In most cases, the amount of money available for non-school school bus use programs is minimal. However, often substantial financing can be amassed by combining some of these sources. A program in Cape May County, New Jersey, which uses publicly owned school buses (not used for transporting school children) to transport the elderly and handicapped to a variety of social service programs, has pieced together funding from the following:

- The county
- Section 18 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act, as amended

²⁹Multisystems, "Factors Impacting Non-Pupil Use," p. 26.

³⁰The Institute of Public Administration, Transportation for Older Americans: State-of-the-Art Report, pp. 232-234.

- Titles XIX and XX and the Social Security Act of 1935
- Titles III and VII of the Older Americans Act
- The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973
- Title II of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, Sections 201 and 211: ACTION'S Retired Senior Volunteer and Foster Grandparent Programs
- Title XVIII of the Social Security Act of 1973.

The following provides a brief overview of the primary Federal funding sources.

- Department of Health and Human Services

- The Older Americans Act

- (1) Title III - grants to public or non profit agencies sponsoring social service programs that provide transportation to their elderly clientele.
- (2) Title IV - transportation programs and demonstration projects.³¹
- (3) Title VII - a formula grant program through the states for transportation of the elderly to nutrition programs.
- (4) Title IX - administered by the Department of Labor to provide transportation for the elderly to part-time work.

- The Public Health Service Act

- (1) Title III, section 314(e) - transportation to community health centers.
- (2) Title XII - funds available for planning emergency medical transportation service.

- The Social Security Act of 1935

- (1) Title XIX - transportation for Medicaid recipients to medical service.
- (2) Title XX - a Federal-State formula grant program providing transportation to individuals and families meeting income requirements.

³¹Multisystems, "Factors Impacting Non-Pupil Use," p. 28.

-- The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 - provides transportation for beneficiaries of skills-training and medical therapy programs.

● Department of Transportation

-- The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended

- (1) Section 3 - capital grants to States or local public agencies within a State for purchase of land as well as vehicles and supporting facilities in an urban area.
- (2) Section 5 - capital and operating assistance formula grants.
- (3) Section 6 - for transportation demonstrations.
- (4) Section 8 - for transportation planning and technical studies.
- (5) Section 16(b)(2) - discretionary capital assistance grants and loans to private, non-profit organizations for the purchase of equipment necessary to transport elderly and handicapped persons.
- (6) Section 18 - capital and operating formula grants for transportation in other-than-urbanized areas.

-- Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973

- (1) Section 147 - for rural transportation demonstrations.³²

-- Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1978

- (1) Section 146 - for ridesharing projects.

● Department of Agriculture

-- Title III of the Agricultural Act of 1972, section 360(a)- provides loans for essential community facilities (including transportation) in rural areas.

● Department of Labor

-- Title III of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 - reimburses chronically unemployed, older workers for transportation expenses related to work duties.

³²Program money for this has run out. All new rural transportation programs will fall under Section 18 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 as amended.

- Community Services Administration

- Title II of the Community Services Act of 1974

- (1) Sections 212 and 221 - support transportation services to the poor in conjunction with other Federal programs.

- (2) Section 222(a)(7) - supports transportation of persons 61 years or older in conjunction with existing health, work and volunteer, and recreational services.

- Other acts

- Title II of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 - provides reimbursement for transportation of Senior Volunteers and Foster Grandparents.

- Title I of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. Capital and operating assistance (where none is available from other Federal sources) for the provision of transportation to persons of low or moderate income as part of an effort to develop viable urban communities.³³

State and Local Sources

Many of the Federal funds noted above are distributed through States and local government bodies, and require their involvement in planning or grant applications. Other State and local funding sources are included in Tables 7 and 8, respectively.

³³Source for the above: Institute of Public Administration, Planning Handbook, pp. VIII-9 - VIII-17.

Table 7

POSSIBLE STATE FUNDING SOURCES FOR SCHOOL BUS
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

TYPE OF FUNDING	EXAMPLES OF STATES WHERE SUCH FUNDING EXISTS	DESCRIPTION
Direct Budget Allocation	All states	Funds for social services as part of general funding
Special funds	Illinois	State authorizes grants for mass transit facilities
Bond issues	Massachusetts	State pays 90% of yearly debt service on bonds authorized to finance mass transit equipment
Special taxation	Michigan Massachusetts	States make monies available from motor fuel increases and cigarette taxation, respectively, to support public transit
Sales tax	Florida California	States make monies available from gasoline sales tax for the support of local transportation systems
Utilities tax		States could make monies available from a tax on utilities for support of local transportation systems
Tax relief	16 states 27 states	Motor fuel exemptions or refunds Property, income, and/or Bond exemptions
Lottery	Pennsylvania New Jersey	Lottery revenues used to support local transportation systems

Source: Institute of Public Administration, Planning Handbook, p. VIII-19.

Table 8

POSSIBLE LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR NON-SCHOOL
SCHOOL BUS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

(Tax sources expressly authorized for Transit Support)

TYPE OF TAX	STATES AUTHORIZING THE LOCAL TAX
Property tax	AZ, CO, IL, IN, IA, KS, MA, MI, NB, ND, OH, OR, UT, WA
Motor vehicle tax	AK, CA, HI, WA
Tax on gross receipts of parking lots	CA, IL
Gasoline sales tax	CA, HI, IL, FL, MI, MD
Transaction (Sales) and Use tax	CA, WA, OR, GA, MO
Highway and Fund Allocations	IN, MA
Cigarette Tax Fund	IN, MA
Ad Valorem tax	OR, CA, KS
Business License tax	OR, WA
New Income tax	OR
Public Utilities tax	WA
Payroll or wage tax	OR, PA
Special Transit District	CA, FL(Pinellas County)
Income tax deductible contributions	PA

Source: Institute of Public Administration, Transportation for Older Americans: State-of-the-Art Report, pp. 232-234.

Chapter 2

CONTACTS AND CURRENT PROGRAMS

CONTACTS

Responsibility for Federal programs that could indirectly provide for the use of school buses for non-school transportation is shared by a number of agencies and departments. It should be noted that few of these contacts or programs address transportation needs directly. Instead, transportation is viewed as one of many services that could be provided for as part of an overall program. In addition, though school buses are not mentioned in many of these contacts and programs, it is implied that by the nature of the programs and their respective beneficiaries, school buses would be a viable--and likely--source of transportation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

The code following each name is for identification purposes and should be included in all written correspondence.

Federal Highway Administration

- Office of Highway Planning, Public Transportation Management Division
Concerned with public transportation, particularly in non-urbanized areas. Administers UMTA Section 18 funds for transportation in non-urbanized areas. For State contacts, see Table 1.
Contact: S.G. Strickland
Rural and Small Urban Public Transportation Branch, HHP-31
Room 3303
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-0153
- Transportation System Management Branch
Contact: Gary Maring, HHP-32
Room 3303
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 425-0210

Urban Mass Transportation Administration

- Office of Planning Assistance. Administers planning assistance programs. Most questions regarding these should be directed to the regional representatives (see Table 2). For further assistance:
Contact: Robert F. Kirkland
Chief, Planning Assistance Division, UPM-11
Room 6417
400 Seventh Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-4991

- Office of Service and Methods Demonstrations
Sponsors projects demonstrating innovative transportation service techniques.

Contact: James Bautz
Paratransit and Special User Groups, UPM-31
Room 6418
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-4984

- Office of Transit Assistance
Administers capital and operating assistance programs.
Contact: UMTA Regional Representative (see Table 2).

Administers the "16(b)(2) program", which provides capital assistance to private, non-profit groups that operate transportation programs for elderly and handicapped persons. For State contacts, see Table 1.

Contact: Catherine Regan
Office of Program Guidance, UTA-12
Room 9306
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 472-7037

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

- Administration on Aging
Administers programs under the Older Americans Act, several titles of which many indirectly offer assistance for transportation of older Americans to essential community services. Questions should be addressed to area Agencies on Aging. For further information:

Contact: Willis Atwell
Associate Commissioner for Program Development
Administration on Aging
Department of Health and Human Services
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 4754 - HEW North
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 245-0724

- Public Health Service
Administers programs under the Public Health Service Act, which may provide funds indirectly for transportation to community health services and emergency medical services. Questions should be addressed to regional offices (see Table 3). For further information:

Contact: Harold Dame
Public Health Service
Health Services Administration
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD
(303) 443-1360

- Rehabilitation Services Administration
Administers programs under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation at the State level should be contacted to find out what resources are available for transportation under this act. For more general questions concerning programs under this act:

Contact: Kathleen Arneson
Director, Legislation and Congressional Relations
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
330 C Street, S.W.
Room 3014
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 245-0771

- Medicaid Bureau
For any question regarding resources available for transportation for medicaid recipients, contact State Medicaid Agency or local welfare office. For other questions:

Contact: Karen Williams
Special Assistant
Bureau of Program Policy
Medicaid Bureau
305 H. Humphrey Building
300 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 245-8036

- Office of Human Development Services
Administers programs under Title XX of the Social Security Act of 1935, which provide services, such as transportation, to individuals and families meeting income requirements. For specific information about what services are available, contact the State Title XX agency, which will usually be the public welfare agency housed in a Department of Human Services, or consult the Comprehensive Annual Services Plan, published by each State, which provides a description of all the services available under Title XX and where they are provided.

For further assistance:

Contact: Mrs. Johnnie Brooks
Office of Policy Control
Administration for Public Services
Office of Human Development Services
Department of Health and Human Services
Room 2225, South Building
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 245-9415

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

- Administers programs under the Community Services Act, portions of which may make available limited funds for transportation of poor or elderly persons to community services sponsored by this act. Contact regional offices (see Table 4). For further information:

Contact: John Macomber
Community Services Administration
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506
(202) 254-5840

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

- Farmers Home Administration
Makes loans available through the States for provision of community facilities, such as transportation, in rural areas. All information on these loans can be obtained through local Farmers Home Administration offices, of which there are 1800 at the county level all over the country. For general questions about programs in the Farmers Home Administration:

Contact: John Bowles
Director, Community Facilities Program
14th and Independence Avenues, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20250
(202) 447-7667

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

- Office of Block Grant Assistance
Administers programs under Title 1 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, which is concerned with providing capital and operating assistance for the provision of services, such as transportation, to persons of low or moderate income as part of an effort to develop viable urban communities.

Contact: Regional Offices (see Table 5) or
James Brougham
Director, Entitlement Cities Division
Office of Block Grant Assistance
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Room 7282
451 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20410
(202) 755-9267

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

- Under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA), transportation to and from CETA programs, either training programs or subsidized work programs, may be covered as a supportive service where transportation is a necessary part of an individual's involvement in such programs. Officials interested in learning more should contact the office of the chief elected official in their city (such as the mayor's office) to find out the name of the CETA prime sponsor in their area, or

Contact: Mr. Jess C. Raymaker
Director, Office of Community Employment
Programs
Department of Labor
601 D Street, N.W.
Room 5402
Washington, D.C. 20213
(202) 376-6366

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

- Office of Transportation and Land Use Policy
Encourages the use of transportation alternatives as a way of reducing air pollution from mobile sources. Makes money available to metropolitan planning organizations or regional councils of government for transportation and air quality planning, and has produced a number of documents encouraging the use of transportation alternatives.

Contact: Bill Houck
Office of Transportation and Land Use Policy,
ANR - 445
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, S.W.
Room 727
Washington, D.C. 20460
(202) 755-0853

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

- Represents public school transportation operators.
Contact: Carlisle Beasley, NAAPT President
Metropolitan Public Schools
336 Woodcrest Avenue
Nashville, TN 37211
(615) 259-5254

NATIONAL SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION

- Represents private school bus owners and operators.
Contact: Ms. Billie Reynolds
Executive Director
National School Transportation
Association
P.O. 324
Fairfax, VA 22030

CURRENT PROGRAMS

At the Federal level, very few programs exist that relate directly to investigating the uses of school buses for public transportation.

- A study, sponsored by the Office of Environment and Safety in the Office of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation, has just been completed by Shaw University in Raleigh, North Carolina. The purpose of the feasibility study was to look at possible uses of school buses as a means of transportation for elderly and handicapped non-wheelchair users. The study was done in two parts: various agencies, such as Departments of Education and Transportation, and Public Utilities Commissions, were surveyed in all States with respect to their policies regarding such use of school buses. The findings were compiled and used as the basis for the second part of the study, which developed a manual for jurisdictions considering using school buses for transporting elderly and handicapped non-wheelchair users during non-peak hours. The final report of the study is still being reviewed at the Federal level, and has not yet been released. For further information,

Contact: Ira Laster
Environmental Coordination
Division, P-23, Room 9422g
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-4380

- The Office of Service and Methods Demonstrations is sponsoring a study to examine the current and potential role of school buses in urban, suburban, and rural public transportation. The study, which is being conducted by Multisystems, Inc. in Cambridge, Massachusetts, is looking at the uses of school buses for non-school transportation as well as the uses of transit buses for school transportation and at the potential for coordinating the two systems. The documentation will include:

- a review of existing literature on this subject
- an inventory of constraints and regulations
- an inventory of programs in which school buses have been used or are still being used for public transportation
- an inventory of the institutional and physical barriers of public use of school buses
- suggestions for possible demonstrations using school buses for public transportation

Multisystems, Inc. has completed several draft memoranda on the work in progress (see Chapter 3). For more information,

Contact: Joseph Goodman
Office of Service and Methods Demonstrations, UPM-32
Room 6418
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590
(202) 426-4984

At the local level, many of the programs that currently exist using school buses for non-school transportation are discussed or noted in the Appendix. The following list provides contacts only for those programs that are still in operation.

- Arlington County, Virginia
 - Ken Hook
 - Public Works Planning Supervisor
 - Arlington County Courthouse
 - Room 221
 - 1400 N. Courthouse Road
 - Arlington, VA 22201
 - (703) 558-2941

 - George Allin
 - Director of Auxiliary Services
 - 1426 N. Quincy Street
 - Arlington, VA 22207
 - (703) 558-2588

- Inland Steel Operation
 - James Grunewald
 - Staff Methods Engineer
 - Administrative Services,
 - Wage and Salary, 8225
 - Inland Steel Corporation
 - 3210 Watling
 - East Chicago, IN 46312
 - (219) 392-5437

- Latah County, Idaho
 - Joan Gosse
 - Supportive Service Coordinator
 - Area Agency on Aging
 - 1032 Bryden Avenue
 - Lewiston, ID 83501
 - (208) 746-3351

- Johnson County, Kansas
 - Jim Meyers
 - General Manager
 - A. T. Meyers and Sons, Inc.
 - 6420 Carter Street
 - Merriam, Kansas 66203
 - (913) 722-4076

- Morehead, Kentucky
 - Bruce S. Siria
 - Assistant Director, Division of
 - Urban and Regional Planning
 - Kentucky Department of Transportation
 - State National Building, Fifth Floor
 - Frankfurt, Kentucky 40622
 - (502) 464-7700

Dave Evans
City Administrator, City of Morehead
168 E. Main
Morehead, Kentucky 40351
(606) 784-8505

- Rhode Island
John Murphy
United Truck and Bus Service Co.
325 Melrose Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02907
(401) 467-8844

- Ryegate, Montana
Sarah Coleman
Project Director, Golden Valley County
Box 23
Ryegate, MT
(406) 568-2206

Other examples exist in which school buses have been used for paratransit services. However, in those cases that are not noted, the school buses generally have been purchased and remodeled by private parties. They are used only for non-school transportation, and therefore are not subject to the institutional conflicts discussed in this paper that uniquely impinge upon the idea of using school buses for regular paratransit operations. These cases include a subscription bus service sponsored by McDonnell Douglas Corporation operated privately for transporting McDonnell Douglas employees to and from their homes in suburban St. Louis to the McDonnell Douglas plant (on trip-lengths as long as 52 miles one way in low density areas), and Aspen, Colorado, which operates a year-round fixed route transit service and also provides a skier's shuttle during the winter season, with school buses purchased expressly for these purposes. These examples and others illustrate how various individual issues discussed above, such as part time labor, financing, administration, and design and comfort, can be handled effectively where school buses are concerned. But they are not illustrative of how the total institutional environment can be dealt with in cases where the operator also provides school transportation.

Table 1

STATE CONTACTS FOR SECTIONS 16(b)(2) AND 18
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

	SECTION 16(b)(2) CONTACT	SECTION 18 CONTACT
ALABAMA	Bob Jackson Alabama Commission on Aging 740 Madison Avenue Montgomery AL 36104 205/832-6640	Charles Simpson, Bureau of Urban Planning, Alabama Highway Department 11 South Union Street Montgomery AL 36104 205/832-5345
ALASKA	Dennis Dooley, Director Transportation Planning Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities PO Box Z Juneau AK 99801 907/465-3900	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
ARIZONA	Bob Thake, Program Manager Department of Transportation 206 S. 17th Avenue Phoenix AZ 85007 602/261-7434	Ronald Ross, Section Manager, Transit Department of Transportation 206 S. 17th Avenue Phoenix AZ 85007 602/261-8333
ARKANSAS	Mary Wilson State Highway Department PO Box 2261 Little Rock AR 72203 501/569-2286	Jim Head, State Transit Administrator Highway & Transportation Department PO Box 2261 Little Rock AR 72203 501/569-2286
CALIFORNIA	Charles Davis California Department of Transportation PO Box 1499 - 1120 N Street Sacramento CA 95807 916/322-5480	Ron Hollis, Chief Financial Programs & Analysis Division of Mass Transportation Department of Transportation PO Box 1499 Sacramento CA 95807 916/445-4229
COLORADO	Richard A. Evans, Director, Division of Planning 4201 E. Arkansas Avenue Denver CO 80222 303/757-9266	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
CONNECTICUT	Len Lapsis, Manager Mass Transportation Planning Division Connecticut DOT 24 Wolcott Hill Road PO Drawer A Wethersfield CT 06109 203/566-3961	James Sanders, Transportation Planner Mass Transportation Planning Division Department of Transportation 24 Wolcott Hill Road Wethersfield CT 06109 203/566-4675
DELAWARE	William Osborne, Director of Trans. Authority for Specialized Trans. 221 S. Dupont Highway Newcastle DE 19720 302/571-2995	John Richter, Chief of Surface Transit Department of Transportation PO Box 778 Dover DE 19901 302/678-4593
FLORIDA	Dave Duffy Division of Mass Transit Department of Transportation 605 Suwannee Street Tallahassee FL 32304 904/488-7390	Richard Rossell, Program Manager Bureau of Surface Transit Department of Transportation 605 Suwannee Street Tallahassee FL 32304 904/488-1586
GEORGIA	Wayne Jackson, Chief Project Development Branch Bureau of Mass Transportation Department of Transportation 2 Capitol Square Atlanta GA 30334 404/656-6000	Same as Section 16(b)(2)

	SECTION 16(b)(2) CONTACT	SECTION 18 CONTACT
HAWAII	David Kawasaki Statewide Trans. Planning Office Department of Transportation 869 Punchbowl Street Honolulu HI 96813 808/548-6934	An Leong Kam, Transportation Planner Department of Transportation 869 Punchbowl Street Honolulu HI 96813 808/548-6526
IDAHO	Stuart Gwin Public Transportation Supervisor Transportation Department 3483 Rickenbacker Street Boise ID 83705 208/334-3183	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
ILLINOIS	Enid Magidson Div. of Public Transportation Department of Transportation 300 North State Street Chicago IL 60610 312/793-2111	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
INDIANA	John Niemi, Transportation Coord. Indiana Commission on Aging 215 N. Senate Avenue Indianapolis, IN 46202 317/633-5948	John Parsons, Administrator Planning Services Agency Division of Public Transportation 143 W. Market - Suite 300 Indianapolis IN 46203 317/232-1470
IOWA	Kate Hoagland Public Transit Division Dept. of Public Transportation Municipal Airport Office Bldg. Des Moines IA 50321 505/281-4298	Frank Sherkow, Deputy Director Public Transit Division Dept. of Public Transportation 5268 Northwest Second Avenue Des Moines, IA 50313 515/281-4299
KANSAS	Ron Stansbury Department of Transportation State Office Building Topeka KS 66612 913/296-3841	Verne Craig, Department Head Planning & Development Department of Transportation State Office Building Topeka KS 66612 913/296-3841
KENTUCKY	Thomas R. Layman, Director Division of Urban & Regional Planning Department of Transportation High Street Frankfort KY 40601 502/564-7700	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
LOUISIANA	Charles Lazare Department of Trans. & Development PO Box 44245 Baton Rouge LA 70804 504/389-6621	Harry Reed, Public Transit Associate Office of Public Transit PO Box 44245 Baton Rouge LA 70804 504/342-7793
MAINE	Linwood Wright, Bureau of Planning Department of Transportation Transportation Building Capitol Street Augusta ME 04333 207/289-2841	William Fernald, Director Bureau of Public Transportation Department of Transportation State Office Building Augusta ME 04333 207/289-2481
MARYLAND	Horbert Wagner, Director Public Trans. Devel. Div. Planning & Program Development Mass Transit Administration 109 E. Redwood Street Baltimore MD 21202 301/383-6409	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
MASSACHUSETTS	Adrienne Marvin Executive Office of Trans. & Const. 1 Ashburton Place, 16th Floor Boston MA 02108 617/727-8955	Mike Sharaff, Senior Transit Planning Engineer Executive Office of Trans. & Const. 1 Ashburton Place, 16th Floor Boston MA 02108 617/727-2373
MICHIGAN	Les Sinclair Dept. of Highways & Transportation PO Drawer K Lansing MI 48904 517/374-9183	Mike Peterson, Public Trans. Specialist Bus Transportation Division Department of Transportation PO Box 30500 Lansing MI 48909 517/374-9180
MINNESOTA	Robert Works, Director Office of Transit Administration Department of Transportation 419 Transportation Building St. Paul MN 55155 612/296-2533	Same as Section 16(b)(2)

	SECTION 16(b)(2) CONTACT	SECTION 13 CONTACT
MISSISSIPPI	Vicki Runyan Mississippi Council on Aging 510 George Street, Suite 340 Jackson MS 39216 601/354-6590	Peter Walley, Director Office of Energy Governor's Office PO Box 10586 Jackson MS 39209 601/961-5099
MISSOURI	Scott Williams Division of Transit Department of Transportation PO Box 1250 Jefferson City MO 65102 314/751-4922	Phil Richardson, Director Division of Transit Department of Transportation PO Box 1250 Jefferson City MO 65102 314/751-2523
MONTANA	Patricia Saindon, Program Manager Department of Community Affairs Capitol Station Helena MT 59601 406/449-3757	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
NEBRASKA	Dolyce Rannou Department of Roads PO Box 94759 Lincoln NB 68509 402/473-4694	Derald S. Kohles, Engineer Planning Div., Dept. of Roads PO Box 94759 Lincoln NB 68509 402/473-4519
NEVADA	Ivan Laird Department of Highways 1263 South Stewart Street Carson City NV 89701 702/885-5610	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Paul Wenger, Public Trans. Director Transportation Authority Morton Bldg., 85 Loudon Road Concord NH 03301 603/271-2564	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
NEW JERSEY	Joseph Huggler Department of Transportation 1035 Parkway Avenue Trenton NJ 08625 609/292-3540	Terry Boyle, Project Specialist Department of Transportation Office of Special Programs 1035 Parkway Avenue Trenton NJ 08625 609/984-7965
NEW MEXICO	Ron Forte, Planner Highway Department PO Box 1149 Santa Fe NM 87503 505/983-0600	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
NEW YORK	Richard Perry Motor Carrier Operations Assistance Section Building 4, State Campus Albany NY 12232 518/457-7245	Jere Fiedler, Assoc. Motor Carrier Transportation Specialist Department of Transportation Building 4, State Campus Albany NY 12232 518/457-7245
NORTH CAROLINA	David Robinson Mass Transit Division Dept. of Trans. & Highway Safety PO Box 25201 Raleigh NC 27611 919/733-4713	Rich Garrity, Rural Program Coordinator Department of Transportation PO Box 25201 Raleigh NC 27611 919/733-4713
NORTH DAKOTA	William Weimer Transportation Services Division Highway Department Building Bismark ND 58505 701/224-2512	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
OHIO	R. Scott Elias, Grant Administrator Bureau of Public Transportation Department of Transportation 25 Front Street Columbus OH 43215 614/466-8955	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
OKLAHOMA	Roy Keene State Unit on Aging Department of Institutions PO Box 25352 Oklahoma City OK 73125 405/521-2281	Robert W. Dafforn, Engineer Public Trans. Planning Division Department of Transportation 200 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City OK 73105 405/521-2584
OREGON	Vicki Gates Department of Transportation Public Transit Division 304 Transportation Building Salem OR 97310 503/378-8200	Gennis Moore Public Transportation Division Department of Transportation 1220 Transportation Building Salem OR 97310 503/378-8201

	SECTION 16(b)(2) CONTACT	SECTION 18 CONTACT
PENNSYLVANIA	Joe Dabersa Bureau of Mass Transit Department of Transportation 1215 T & S Building Harrisburg PA 17120 717/737-7540	William H. Morris, Manager, Rural & Intercity Public Transportation Department of Transportation 1215 T & S Building Harrisburg PA 17120 717/783-3990
PUERTO RICO	Edwin Cuebas, Director Dept. of Transportation & Public Works Box 8218 San Juan PR 00910 809/726-4095	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
RHODE ISLAND	John J. Donaldson Mass Transit Coordinator Department of Transportation 245 State Office Building Providence RI 02903 401/277-2694	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
SOUTH CAROLINA	Carroll McDuffie Budget & Control Board Division of Motor Vehicle Management 300 Gervais Street Columbia SC 29201 803/758-7816	Joseph Lee, Director Governor's Office, Div. Econ. Dev. & Trans. Edgar A. Brown Bldg, Room 308 1205 Pendleton Street Columbia SC 29201 803/758-3306
SOUTH DAKOTA	Frank Cournoyer, Program Engineer Department of Transportation Transportation Building Pierre SD 57501 605/773-3155	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
TENNESSEE	Don K. Davis Department of Transportation 417 Transportation Building Nashville TN 37219 615/741-2781	Malcolm Baird, Director Bureau of Mass Transit Department of Transportation 812 Highway Building Nashville TN 37219 615/741-3227
TEXAS	Margo Massey Dept. of Highways and Public Transportation PO Box 5051 Austin TX 78763 512/475-7466	Dale Steitle, Manager Public Transportation Grants Dept. of Highways & Public Transportation PO Box 5051 Austin TX 78763 512/475-7466
UTAH	Lowell Elmer, System Planning Div. Department of Transportation 405 South Main Street Salt Lake City UT 84114 801/533-5987	Same as Section 15(b)(2)
VERMONT	Langdon Cummings Agency for Transportation 133 State Street Montpelier VT 05602 802/828-2636	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
VIRGINIA	George Connor Dept. of Highways & Transportation 1401 East Broad Street Richmond VA 23219 804/786-1058	Charles Badger, Asst. Division Head Public Transportation Division Department of Highways & Transportation 1221 East Broad Street Richmond VA 23219 804/786-1154
WASHINGTON	Gordon Kirkemo Department of Transportation Highway Administration Bldg. Olympia WA 98504 206/753-3407	Garry L. Cowan, Mgr. Transit Branch Department of Transportation Highway Administration Bldg., KF01 Olympia WA 98504 206/753-3407
WEST VIRGINIA	Rod Jenkins, Director Department of Finance & Administration Public Transportation Division 1900 Washington St., Room A-863 Charleston WV 25305 304/348-0428	Same as Section 16(b)(2)
WISCONSIN	Frank E. Potts Planning Division Department of Transportation PO Box 7913 Madison WI 53702 608/266-1650	John Hartz, Acting Director Bureau of Transit Department of Transportation PO Box 7913 Madison WI 53707 608/266-0658
WYOMING	Jack McClintle, Director Planning Division Highway Department PO Box 1708 Cheyenne WY 82001 307/777-7552	Same as Section 16(b)(2)

Table 2

UMTA FIELD OFFICES

Region I	Peter N. Stowell, Regional Director, Transportation Systems Center, Kendall Square, 55 Broadway, Suite 904 Cambridge, MA. 02142, Tel: (617) 494-2055; FTS 837-2055.
Region II	Hiram Walker, Regional Director, Suite 14-130, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, NY. Tel: (212) 264-8162; FTS 264-8162.
Region III	Franz K. Gimmler, Regional Director, Suite 1010 434 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA. 19106 Tel: (215) 597-8098; FTS 597-8098.
Region IV	Carl B. Richardson, Acting Regional Director, Suite 400, 1720 Peachtree Road, N.W., Atlanta, GA, 30309;
Region V	Theodore Weigle, Regional Director, Suite 1740, 300 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago IL 60606, Tel: (312) 353-2789; FTS 353-2789.
Region VI	Glen Ford, Regional Director, Suite 9A32, 819 Taylor Street, Fort Worth, TX 76102, Tel: (817) 334-3787; FTS 334-3787.
Region VII	Lee Waddleton, Regional Director, Suite 100, 6301 Rock Hill Road, Kansas City, MO 64131 Tel: (816) 926-5053; FTS 926-5053.
Region VIII	Lou Mraz, Regional Director, Suite 1822, Prudential Plaza, 1050 17th Street, Denver, CO 80265 Tel: (303) 837-3242; FTS 327-3242.
Region IX	Dee Jacobs, Regional Director, Suite 620 Two Embarcadero Center, San Francisco, CA 94111 Tel: (415) 556-2884; FTS 556-2884.
Region X	Terry Ebersole, Acting Regional Director, Suite 3142 Federal Building, 915 Second Avenue, Seattle, WA 98174, Tel: (206) 442-4210; FTS 399-4210.
TTC	Transportation Test Center, Gunars Spons, UMTA Programs Director, Pueblo, CO 81001, Tel: (303) 545-5660; FTS 326-9111

Table 3

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE--REGIONAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATORS

Edward J. Montminy
 Region I
 John F. Kennedy Federal Building
 Boston, Massachusetts 02203
 (617) 223-6827

Acting Regional Health Administrator
 Region VI
 1200 Main Tower Building
 Dallas, Texas 75202
 (214) 767-3879

Karst J. Besteman
 Region II
 26 Federal Plaza
 New York, New York 10007

Youn Bock Rhee
 Region VII
 601 East 12th Street
 Kansas City, Missouri 64106
 (816) 374-3291

H. McDonald Rimple, M.D., M.P.H.
 Region III
 P.O. Box 13716
 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101
 (215) 596-6637

Hilary H. Conner, M.D.
 Region VIII
 19th and Stout Streets
 Denver, Colorado 80294
 (303) 837-4461

George A. Reich, M.D.
 Region IV
 101 Marietta Tower, Suite 1007
 Atlanta, Georgia 30323
 (404) 221-2316

Sheridan L. Weinstein, M.D.
 Region IX
 50 United Nations Plaza
 San Francisco, California 94102
 (415) 556-5810

E. Frank Ellis, M.D.
 Region V
 300 South Wacker Drive
 Chicago, Illinois 60606
 (312) 353-1385

Dorothy H. Mann
 Region X
 1321 Second Avenue
 Arcade Plaza Bldg.
 Seattle, Washington 98101
 (206) 442-0430

Table 4

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADMINISTRATION--REGIONAL DIRECTORS

Region I	Ivan R. Ashley, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, E-400 John F. Kennedy Federal Bldg., Boston, Massachusetts 02203, Tel: (617) 223-4080.
Region II	Josephine Nieves, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, 26 Federal Plaza, 32nd floor, New York, New York 10007, Tel: (212) 264-1900.
Region III	W. Astor Kirk, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, P.O. Box 160, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19105, Tel: (215) 597-1139.
Region IV	William L. (Sonny) Walker, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, 101 Marietta St., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30323, Tel: (404) 221-2717.
Region V	Glenwood A. Johnson, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, 300 South Wacker Drive, 24th floor, Chicago, Illinois 60606, Tel: (313) 353-5562.
Region VI	Ben T. Haney, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, 1200 Main Street, Dallas, Texas 75202 Tel: (214) 729-6125.
Region VII	Wayne C. Thomas, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, Old Federal Office Building, 911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106 Tel: (816) 374-3761.
Region VIII	David E. Vanderburgh, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, Tremont Center Bldg., 333 West Colfax Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80204, Tel: (303) 837-4767.
Region IX	Alphonse Rodriguez, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36008, San Francisco, California 94102, Tel: (415) 556-5400.
Region X	N. Dean Morgan, Regional Director, Community Services Administration, 1321 2nd Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101, Tel: (206) 442-4910.

Table 5

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
FIELD OFFICES

Region I
Boston, MA, Area Office, Bulfinch Building, 15 New Chardon Street, Boston, MA 02114 (617-223-4111).
Hartford, CT, Area Office, 1 Financial Plaza, Hartford, CT 06103 (203-244-3638).

Region II
Buffalo, NY, Area Office, Statler Building, Suite 800, 107 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, NY 14202 (716-855-5755).
Newark, NJ, Area Office, Gateway 1 Building, Raymond Plaza, Newark, NJ 07102 (201-645-3010).
New York, NY, Area Office, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10019 (212-399-5290).
San Juan, PR, Caribbean Area Office, Frederico Degetau Federal Building, U.S. Courthouse, Room 428, Carlos E. Chardon Avenue, Hato Rey, PR 00918 (809-753-4201).

Region III
Pittsburgh, PA, Area Office, Two Allegheny Center, Pittsburgh, PA 15212 (412-644-2802).
Washington, D.C., Area Office, Universal North Building, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009 (202-673-5837).
Baltimore, MD, Area Office, Two Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, MD 21203 (301-962-2121).
Philadelphia, PA, Area Office, Curtis Building, 625 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106 (215-597-2645).
Richmond, VA, Area Office, 701 East Franklin Street, Richmond, VA 23219 (804-782-2721).

Region IV
Atlanta, GA, Area Office, 230 Peachtree Street, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30303 (404-221-4576).
Birmingham, AL, Area Office, Daniel Building, 15 South 20th Street, Birmingham, AL 35233 (205-245-1617).
Louisville, KY, Area Office, Children's Hospital Foundation Building, 601 South Floyd Street, Louisville, KY 40201 (502-582-5251).
Jackson, MS, Area Office, 101c Third Floor, Jackson Mall, Avenue West, Jackson, MS 39213 (601-969-4703).
Greensboro, NC, Area Office, 415 North Edgeworth Street, Greensboro, NC 27401 (919-378-5363).

Columbia, SC, Area Office, 1801 Main Street, Jefferson Square, Columbia, SC 29201 (803-765-5591).

Knoxville, TN, Area Office, One Northshore Building, 1111 Northshore Drive, Knoxville, TN 37919 (615-637-9300).

Jacksonville, FL, Area Office, Peninsular Plaza, 661 Riverside Avenue, Jacksonville, FL 32204 (904-791-2626).

Region V

Detroit, MI, Area Office, Patrick V. McNamara Federal Building, 477 Michigan Avenue, Detroit, MI 48226 (313-226-7900).

Chicago, IL, Area Office, 1 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60602 (312-353-7660).

Indianapolis, IN, Area Office, 151 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, IN 46207 (317-269-6303).

Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN, Area Office, 6400 France Avenue, South Minneapolis, MN 55435 (612-725-4701).

Columbus, OH, Area Office, 200 North High Street, Columbus, OH 43215 (614-469-7345).

Milwaukee, WI, Area Office, 744 North Fourth Street, Milwaukee, WI 53203 (414-291-1493).

Region VI

Dallas, TX, Area Office, 2001 Bryan Tower, Fourth Floor, Dallas, TX 75201 (214-749-1601).

San Antonio, TX, Area Office, 410 South Main Avenue, San Antonio, TX 78285 (512-229-6800).

Little Rock, AR, Area Office, 1 Union National Plaza, Suite 1400, Little Rock, AR 72201 (501-378-5401).

New Orleans, LA, Area Office, Plaza Tower, 1001 Howard Avenue, New Orleans, LA 70113 (504-589-2063).

Oklahoma City, OK, Area Office, 200 N.W. 5th Street, Oklahoma City, OK 73102 (405-231-4891).

Region VII

Kansas City, KS, Area Office, 2 Gateway Center, Fourth and State Streets, Kansas City, KS 66117 (816-374-4355).

Omaha, NB, Area Office, Univac Building, 7100 West Center Road, Omaha, NB 68106 (402-221-9301).

St. Louis, MO, Area Office, 210 North 12th Street, St. Louis, MO 63101 (314-425-4761).

Region VIII (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming), - Executive Towers, 1405 Curtis Street, Denver, CO 80202 (303-837-4513).

Region IX Honolulu, HI, Area Office, 300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3318, Honolulu, HI 96850 (808-546-2136).

San Francisco, CA, Area Office, 1 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94111 (415-556-2238).

Los Angeles, CA, Area Office, 2500 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90057 (213-688-5973).

Table 6

STATE DIRECTORS OF PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

Norman N. Loper, Coordinator
Pupil Transportation
State Office Building-Room 515
Montgomery, AL 36130
(205) 832-3984

Greg S. Thies
Pupil Transportation Officer
State Department of Education
Pouch F
Juneau, AK 99811
(907)465-2890

Gene Larson, Manager
Pupil Transportation
Office of Highway Safety
1655 West Jackson Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 261-7692

Jim Bohannon, Supervisor
School Transportation
State Department of Education
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501)371-1560

Jack P. Lieberman, Chief
Bureau of Management Services
State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-9466

August Cambell, Consultant
State Department of Education
State Office Building
201 E. Colfax
Denver, CO 80203
(303) 839-2214

John L. O'Connell
Pupil Transportation
Administrator
Department of Motor Vehicles
60 State Street
Wethersfield, CT 06109
(203) 566-4511

Leon Hart, Supervisor
Pupil Transportation
Department of Public
Instruction
Townsend Building
Dover, DE 19901
(302) 678-4697

William C. French
Transportation Officer
D.C. Public Schools
2115 5th Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 832-3786

Earl H. Wright, Administrator
School Transportation
Department of Education
Knott Building, Room 377
Tallahassee, FL 32304
(904) 488-4405

Al F. King, Administrator
Pupil Transportation Section
State Department of Education
156 Trinity Avenue, S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 656-2467

Henry Imanaka, Administrator
Pupil Transportation Safety
1037 S. Beretania St.
State Department of Education
Honolulu, HI 96818
(808) 548-2364

D.L. Hicks, Supervisor
Pupil Transportation
L.B. Jordan Building
650 West State Street
Boise, ID 83720
(208) 384-3225

Ted B. Randall, Coordinator
Program Planning and Development
Illinois Office of Education
100 N. First Street
Springfield, IL 62701
(217) 782-7484

Richard E. Pea, Director
Division of School Traffic Safety
Department of Public Instruction
120 West Market Street-16th Floor
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 633-4694

Dwight R. Carlson, Director
School Transportation and Safety
Education
Department of Public Instruction
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
(515) 281-5811

Dennis R. Newton, Supervisor
School Transportation
Safety Department Kansas DOT
State Office Building, 10th Floor
Topeka, KS 66612
(913) 296-3551

Paul E. Jones, Director
Division of Pupil Transportation
State Department of Education
Capital Plaza Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601
(502) 564-4718

Glen Bowman, Director
School Transportation
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
(504) 342-3606

Fred Cole, Director
Pupil Transportation
Department of Education and
Cultural Service
State Office Complex
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 289-2061

Robert W. Gaddis, Coordinator
Safety and Transportation
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 8717, BWI Airport
Baltimore, MD 21240
(301) 796-8300 ext. 241

Leo Toro, Director
Bureau of Management Services
State Department of Education
31 St. James Street
Boston, MA 02111
(617) 727-5790

Phillip J. O'Leary
Supervisor
Safety and Traffic Programs
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 373-3314

Gerald Pavek, Director
Pupil Transportation
State Department of Education
Capitol Square Building-Room 810
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
(612) 296-2839

Leonard Cain, Director
School Transportation
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205
(601) 354-6921

W.E. "Bill" Haynes, Director
Pupil Transportation
State Department of Education
Jefferson Building P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2626

Terry Brown, Consultant or
Robert W. Stockton, Director
Financial Aid and Transportation
Office of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 449-3167

Pete Soderquist
Transportation Specialist
State Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
P.O. Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509
(402) 471-2452

Jim Menath, Assistant Director
Office of Technical Assistance
State Department of Education
400 West King Street
Carson City, NV 89710
(702) 885-5700

Robert F. McConnell
Administrator
Pupil Transportation Safety
Department of Safety
Division of Motor Vehicles
James H. Hayes Building, Hazen Dr.
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-3484

John J. Giesguth, Director
Bureau of Pupil Transportation
1676 N. Olden Avenue
Trenton, NJ 08638
(609) 292-8534

Bill Loshbough, Director
School Transportation
State Department of Education
Education Building
Santa Fe, NM 87503
(505) 827-2617

Richard Ahola, Supervisor
Bureau Special Education Management
Services
State Department of Education
99 Washington Avenue
Room 1711 Twin Towers
Albany, NY 12230
(518) 474-3384

William Tillett, Director
Division of Transportation
State Board of Education
Room 132, Education Building
Raleigh, NC 27611
(919) 733-3071

Rolland J. Larson, Director
Pupil Transportation
Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Bismarck, ND 58505
(701) 224-2270

Herman L. Massie, Chief
Pupil Transportation
State Department of Education
School Finance-Room 811
65 S. Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215
(614) 466-4230

J. Pat Odell, Director
Transportation Section
State Department of Education
2500 N. Lincoln
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
(405) 521-3472

Jack W. Sperr, Coordinator
Pupil Transportation Services
State Department of Education
942 Lancaster, N.E.
Salem, OR 97310
(503) 378-3577

John McElhany, Asst. Chief
Pupil Transportation Division
Room 411, Transportation and
Safety Building
Harrisburg, PA 17123
(717) 787-6453

Stanley M. Jendezjec
Administrator
Registry of Motor Vehicles
State Office Building, Room 100
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 277-2986

Ralph M. Hendrix, Director
Office of Transportation
Room 522-Rutledge Building
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 758-2762

Elwin R. Schmidt, Director
Pupil Transportation
Division of Elementary and
Secondary Education
Office Building 3
Pierre, SD 57501
(605) 773-3247

Ernest Farmer, Director
Pupil Transportation
State Department of Education
117 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, TN 37219
(615) 741-2927

Gabe Gilley, Director
School Transportation
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 475-2631

Duane S. Carr, Specialist
Pupil Transportation
State Department of Education
250 E. 500 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801) 533-5436

Edward Ryan, Chief
Education Field Services
State Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05602
(802) 828-2445

R.A. "Buster" Bynum, Supervisor
Pupil Transportation
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 60
Richmond, VA 23216
(804) 786-2618

Donald Carnahan, Supervisor
Pupil Transportation
Office of State Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Olympia, WA 98504
(206) 753-0235

Paul Stewart, Director
School Transportation
State Department of Education
1900 Washington St., East
Charleston, WV 25305
(304) 348-2711

Del A. Kobs, Supervisor
Pupil Transportation Services
Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, WI 53702
(608) 266-2853

Robert D. Riley, Coordinator
Driver Education and Pupil
Transportation
Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002
(307) 777-7293

Brian Riehl
Pupil Transportation Operations
511-1181 Partage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3G 0T3

Chapter 3

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The preceding information was gleaned from telephone conversations with school bus transportation project managers, operators, school bus manufacturers, city and county personnel involved with non-school transportation using school buses (see Chapter 2: "Contacts and Current Programs"), and the following documentation.

GENERAL

Cooper, Lawrence C. The Use of School Buses for Public Transportation, Prepared for the North Central Texas Council of Governments. Arlington, Texas: 1978.

Examines the current and potential use of school buses to provide non-pupil transportation. The report looks at experiences involving the use of school buses for nonpupil transportation in various areas of the United States and at feasibility studies that have considered public use of school buses. The report concludes that the potential for public use is there, although hindered by physical and institutional problems.

Government Accounting Office. Hindrances to Coordinating Transportation of People Participating in Federally Funded Grant Programs, Volume I. Washington, D.C.: GAO, 1977.

Identifies 114 Federal programs that provide financial assistance for the transportation of people, including one or two programs in which school buses are used, and discusses the barriers to coordination among program activities. The most significant barrier appears to be confusion at all government levels about the extent of transportation coordination possible under existing legislation. GAO recommends that the Congress reduce the confusion by endorsing transportation coordination when feasible, providing there is appropriate cost sharing and service accountability.

Kirby, Ronald F., Bhatt, Kiran V., Kemp, Michael A., McGillivray, Robert G., and Wohl, Martin. Para-Transit, Neglected Options for Urban Mobility. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Transportation, Urban Mass Transportation Administration and Federal Highway Administration. Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute, 1976.

Assesses the potential of paratransit modes for serving urban travel demands and recommends ways in which paratransit can be applied more fully and systematically in supplying those services. This is followed by a review of paratransit operating experiences.

Multisystems, Inc. "Factors Impacting Non-Pupil Use of School Buses." Draft memorandum. Cambridge: 1980.

Identifies, discusses, and classifies factors impacting non-pupil use of school buses. This supplements the "Literature Review and Data Assembly" memorandum annotated below (see also Chapter 2, "Contacts and Current Programs," of this Information Bulletin).

Multisystems, Inc. "Literature Review and Data Assembly." Draft memorandum, Cambridge: 1980.

This is part of the UMTA-sponsored project discussed in Chapter 2, "Contacts and Current Programs." Details the status (through February 1980) of the literature review, identifies the data still to be obtained, and describes the approach to assembling the outstanding data in two areas: the current pupil transportation environment and nonpupil school bus use. This memorandum discusses the literature and data available and to be obtained on using regular transit buses for pupil transportation as well as using school buses for public transportation.

Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. The Need for a Pupil Transportation Research and Technical Assistance Center in the Northwest. Concept paper. Portland: 1979.

Discusses the need, as a result of the increasing costs of fuel, personnel, and parts and equipment, for making school transportation systems even more efficient than they already are, and examines potential areas of monetary savings: fuel conservation, routing, scheduling and ridership management, maintenance and operations, training and safety, personnel costs, fleet size and management, administration and supervision, and multiple uses of school buses. To help school administrators learn how to make school transportation more efficient, the Laboratory recommends the establishment of a Research and Technical Assistance Center.

School Bus Fleet: Fact Book, Volume 24, Number 6. Redondo Beach, California: Bobit Publishing Company, 1979.

School Bus Fleet is published six times a year. The Fact Book is a special edition of the publication describing the 1980 bus models and listing school bus distributors and manufacturers, pupil transportation officials, school bus chassis specifications, and industry statistics relating to the number of pupils transported, accidents, fatalities, factory sales, and the growth of school transportation from 1954 through 1978.

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Highway Planning. Energy Contingency Strategies: Use of School Buses. Washington, D.C.: 1980.

Discusses the uses of school buses for public transportation in both emergency and non-emergency situations, with an emphasis on the former, and identifies the major issues confronting the use of school buses for non-school use. The report concludes that although there is an untapped transportation resource available in our country's school bus fleet, putting this resource to work is substantially easier in an emergency than in normal conditions. Even so, the peak period conflict is a significant impediment when school bus use is being considered as a way to augment regular transit during an emergency. The report also makes a few recommendations with respect to compensating for some of the barriers to non-school use of school buses discussed throughout the report.

U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. School Bus Passenger Seat and Lap Belt Sled Tests. Final report. Washington, D.C.: 1978.

Provides statistical results, analysis, and evaluation of extensive testing performed to determine the response of dummies in simulated frontal collisions with and without lap belts on two different types of school bus seats and the effect of increased passenger seat spacing on occupant protection. The report concludes, among other things, that spreading seat spacing appears to have only a negligible effect on the response characteristics of the adult and child dummies.

ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED TRANSPORTATION

Institute of Public Administration. Planning Handbook: Transportation Services for the Elderly. Prepared for the Administration on Aging. Washington, D.C.: 1975.

Provides guidance and assistance in the designing, implementing, and operating of special transportation services. This includes information on how to build a data base on the transportation needs of prospective passengers, how to select the vehicles, what some of the problems are with different vehicles, how to prepare a budget for the service, how to monitor and evaluate it, and how to finance it. The document also includes sample survey forms for building a data base, a list of vehicle suppliers, and a sample layout for operating expenses analysis.

Institute for Public Administration. Transportation for Older Americans-The State of the Art. Prepared for the Administration on Aging. Washington, D.C.: 1975.

Provides information relating to problems with transporting the elderly, transportation needs of the elderly, the present urban and rural transport delivery system for the elderly, present program funding and funding prospects, institutional problems and constraints involved in providing transportation for the elderly, and future directions for programs and research. This text is supplemented by a set of technical annexes that supplies much of the detailed information on which the report is based, i.e., case studies, a bibliography, State school bus and driver licensing laws, and a summary of characteristics of 24 transportation projects for elderly persons.

Public Technology, Inc. Elderly and Handicapped Transportation: Information Sourcebook. Washington, D.C.: 1979.

Represents a compendium of information sources for transportation of elderly and handicapped persons, including Federal agency and interest group contacts and vehicle manufacturers. It also includes an annotated bibliography and capsule descriptions of selected approaches to providing transportation for elderly and handicapped persons.

Transportation Systems Center, U.S. Department of Transportation. Transportation and the Elderly and Handicapped - A Literature Capsule. Cambridge: 1977.

Provides a review of much of the literature on elderly and handicapped transportation. The document provides summaries of five selected documents and an annotated bibliography for others, categorizing the latter into five subheadings: Overview, Needs, Programs, Planning and Policy. This document provides a source of information on ways to accommodate elderly and handicapped transportation needs. Using school buses may be one of these ways, but it is referred to only briefly in this literature capsule.

EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION

La Plant, Suzanne J. "Using School Buses for Mass Transit: Miami's Energy Emergency." Prepared for the Metropolitan Dade County Transit Agency. Miami: December 1979.

Describes Dade County's 3 1/2-day experience using school buses for public transportation during a severe gas shortage brought on by a trucker's strike. The report concludes that the program could not have lasted longer than a maximum of ten days in view of the numerous complications that were temporarily overlooked due to the emergency.

North Central Texas Council of Governments. A Metropolitan Transportation Plan for National Energy Contingencies. Arlington, Texas: 1977.

Provides a plan by which the workers of the North Central Texas region would still have access to transportation in the event of a fuel shortage. The report considers the use of school buses as a transportation alternative for a suburban area, and concludes that obtaining drivers, maintaining the vehicles, and providing fuel, to say nothing of the complications involved in altering the structure and purpose of the public school transportation system, are the greatest obstacles to implementing such an alternative.

FEASIBILITY STUDIES

Green International of Ohio. Use of School Buses for Public Transportation, A Feasibility Study. Prepared for the Ohio Mid-Eastern Governments Association. Martins Ferry, Ohio: 1978.

A feasibility study examining the use of school buses in Belmont County, Ohio. The study determines the extent to which school board-owned transportation equipment can be used to provide public transportation either in areas where none is available or service coverage is thin. This study discusses the general issues surrounding the concept of using school buses for public transportation, highlighting these with rural transportation case studies from comparable jurisdictions, assesses the demand for public transportation in Belmont County as indicated by results of extensive surveying, and makes recommendations for implementing a public transportation program using school buses.

Montgomery County Government, Department of Transportation. "Potential [School Bus] Use in Montgomery County." Department memorandum. Rockville, Maryland: 1978.

Lists potential non-school uses of school buses as well as hindrances to their use in Montgomery County. The memorandum also describes briefly four local programs in which school buses are or were in use.

W. C. Gilman and Company. The School Bus: A Transportation Resource for Northeastern Illinois. Prepared for the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission. Evanston, Illinois: 1975.

Explores the prospects of more extensive use of school buses in Northeastern Illinois. The study is presented in four parts: (1) putting the school bus resource in the six-county area into perspective; (2) examining the potential market for additional transit service; (3) identifying the principal constraints in using school buses for non-student transportation purposes; and (4) developing conclusions regarding areas of opportunity for the broader use of school bus equipment. The study concludes that in order to make better use of the school buses in the region, a sense of entrepreneurship must be created among the area's school bus contractors.

Wilbur Smith and Associates. Feasibility Study: School Bus Utilization for Non-Pupil Transportation Programs. Prepared for Arlington County, Virginia. Richmond, Virginia: 1974.

Determines how school buses can best be used to serve additional transportation needs throughout Arlington County, Virginia, in view of certain site-specific and non-site-specific issues and constraints. The report was based on field surveys conducted to determine the status of the existing school bus transportation system. Included in these field surveys were an inventory of the existing bus fleet and an evaluation of the maintenance capabilities of the school bus shops. Current administration of the bus program was also reviewed. The results of this study indicated the feasibility of using school buses by various departments and agencies of Arlington County. An administrative program that details recommended procedures for program implementation is presented.

INSURANCE

Davis, Frank W. Jr. National Work Plan to Resolve the Transportation Insurance Problems. Prepared for U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Human Development Services. University of Tennessee, Transportation Center, Knoxville: 1979.

Highlights the issues involved in obtaining insurance for social service and public transportation programs and identifies the goals and objectives of a cooperative effort between States, the insurance industry, and the Federal government to resolve the problems facing these transportation programs.

Davis, Frank W. Jr., and Burkhalter, David A. New Insurance Programs For Human Service Transportation Providers, Technical Advisory No. 1. Prepared for U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Human Development Services, Administration for Public Services. University of Tennessee, Knoxville: 1979.

Describes the components of two insurance programs filed in 47 States in 1979 by the Insurance Services Office (ISO) of New York that provide a new classification scheme to facilitate rate setting for new forms of social service and public transportation programs.

Davis, Frank W. Jr., Burkhalter David A., Dotterweich, William W., and Cleary, Tim. The Social Service Insurance Dilemma: Problems, Analysis, and Proposed Solutions. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Transportation, Office of University Research. University of Tennessee, Transportation Center, Knoxville: 1978.

Investigates insurance as a major barrier to the efficient operation of transportation programs for social service agencies, charitable institutions, and volunteers. The report also makes six recommendations for improving the plight of these transportation programs, and concludes that changing State laws and insurance practices will result in greater involvement by the private sector and the reduced need for government funding and ownership of transportation since more efficient use of existing equipment could be made.

Dotterweich, William W., Editor. Proceedings, White House Workshop on Transportation Insurance. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Human Development Services, Administration for Public Services. University of Tennessee, Knoxville: 1979.

Highlights the proceedings of the January 23, 1979, joint White House - National Governors' Association conference to define and find solutions to insurance problems confronting the providers of social service and public transportation. The report looks at how three States have dealt with the insurance problem, some of the evolving Federal and State objectives for transportation programs, some legislative approaches towards dealing with the insurance problem, and ways in which the insurance industry and State governments can work together to respond to evolving transportation needs by easing the insurance burden.

RURAL AND EXURBAN TRANSPORTATION

Governor's Task Force on Rural Transportation. Rural Transportation in Pennsylvania: Problems and Prospects, Vol. II. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: 1974.

Looks at the paucity of transportation services provided in rural areas of Pennsylvania and the possible - though few - transportation alternatives for rural Pennsylvania residents. The study includes an examination of existing conditions and facilities, relevant legislation and regulations, and possible funding sources, and also discusses some of the problems involved in trying to implement rural transportation programs. One of the main alternatives given consideration in the report is the use of school buses.

Siria, Bruce S., Smith, David E., and Smith, William A. II. "Morehead Kentucky, School Bus Demonstration Project." Transportation Research Board 696 - Rural Public Transportation. Washington, D.C.: Transportation Research Board, 1978.

Describes the background components and some of the results of the Morehead, Kentucky, demonstration using school buses for public transportation. The article describes service characteristics, ridership trends, costs and revenue, and community reactions to the program.

Transportation Systems Center, U.S. Department of Transportation. Rural Passenger Transportation: State-of-the-Art Overview. Cambridge: 1976.

Presents an overview of rural passenger transportation, including the modes currently used and the transportation needs of the rural transportation disadvantaged. The report places special emphasis on the issues and considerations associated with improving the mobility of the rural disadvantaged and looks at several small, specialized rural passenger transportation systems. Using school buses is discussed as one means of improving rural resident mobility, and the Klamath Falls, Oregon, demonstration is used as an example. The document also provides supplementary material that serves as a source for further information and is helpful in presenting an overall picture in which rural transportation programs exist or may be implemented.

APPENDIX

The experiences of a number of jurisdictions in which school buses have been used for non-school transportation are illustrative of the kinds of issues that emerge and that have been discussed in the preceding pages.

CRISIS-RELATED USE SUPPLEMENTING REGULAR TRANSIT: DADE COUNTY

In one day in the summer of 1979, ridership on Metrobus, Dade County's transit system, jumped from a 200,000 weekday average to 265,092 passengers. A severe gas shortage brought on by a truckers' blockade of the port receiving and storing gasoline, and the subsequent overload it caused on the transit system, provided the impetus for the Metropolitan Dade County Transit Agency's (MTA's) consideration of using school buses to augment the regular bus fleet.

To expedite the implementation of emergency measures, the Governor and county manager, each within a few days of the other, declared a state of emergency to be in effect. In this framework, negotiating an agreement for school bus use was made much easier, and a number of potentially insurmountable problems were momentarily overlooked. For example--

- State statutes allow non-school use of school buses only for elderly and handicapped persons and only if such use does not interfere with school transportation.
- Public Utilities Commission approval would have had to have been obtained for charging an outside agency (the MTA) for using the school buses.
- Under normal circumstances, the Metrobus drivers' and school bus drivers' unions would have had to have given their approval. Even so, both unions were reluctant to waive their objections and eventually relented only in view of the emergency.

The agreement ultimately reached between the MTA and the school board stipulated that--

- school buses could only be used when no Metrobuses were available.
- only school bus drivers could drive school buses.
- the MTA pay

-- \$6.85 per hour per driver to the school board for administrative and overhead costs as well as the driver's salary.¹

¹Metrobus drivers made less than \$6.85 an hour. The higher wage paid school bus drivers for the same job presented a problem until it was carefully explained that the \$6.85 paid for more than just salary.

- \$.50 per vehicle-mile rental.
- for any extra insurance coverage needed.

- school bus drivers have a four-hour minimum work day, as opposed to the two-hour minimum guaranteed Metrobus drivers.

Obtaining and paying for extra insurance coverage was the most troublesome-- and expensive-- part of this agreement. The State of Florida requires that school board insurance levels be set at \$100,000 for all claims resulting from the same accident. Because Metrobus was self-insured, and therefore without an insurance company, it had to negotiate with the school board's insurance company for a special binder of \$150,000 in excess of the \$100,000 existing coverage. The agreement required that

- the school board be held harmless for everything.
- Metrobus pay a \$4,500 premium with a weekly (or portion of a week) rate of \$1,500 and a minimum earned premium of \$3,000.

For the 3 1/2 days of school bus use, the amount Metrobus paid for insurance coverage alone was \$7,500.

Operations

School buses were used only on certain severely crowded express routes. Fares were collected at a designated stop before going closed-door to various destinations. Metrobus officials used a can with the fare schedule painted on the outside for fare collection. At the designated stop, a Metrobus supervisor would board the bus with the can, collect the fares, get off the bus, and take the money to a locked farebox in a minibus parked nearby.

All school bus drivers were given Metrobus maps, but were instructed to follow regular Metrobuses during the peak periods. If the Metrobus did not show up for its scheduled run, the school bus drivers were instructed to go ahead and do the best they could with maps, landmarks, and passenger assistance.

Public Reaction

The attitude of the public towards using school buses was one of gratitude for having a way to get home, but amenable only, according to Metrobus officials, because of the widely believed impermanence of the situation. Some patrons did object to having to pay the full bus fare when riding a school bus.

As a result of their 3 1/2 days' experience with school buses, MTA officials have for the most part abandoned the idea of incorporating their use into any kind of regular program for a number of reasons:

- labor problems
- insurance
- driver availability

- wear and tear on school buses not built for heavy use
- conflict with school hours
- fare collection equipment
- general lack of long-term acceptance by Metrobus riders.²

Other similar programs:

- Boston, Massachusetts (February, 1978) - privately owned buses were used to augment regular commuter transit during a blizzard.
- Lake Placid, New York (February, 1980) - publicly owned buses were used for shuttling spectators to and from parking lots at the 1980 Olympics.³
- Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania (June, 1973) - fixed route transportation was provided to augment regular transit buses after a flood.

NON-CRISIS RELATED USE FOR SPECIAL USER GROUPS: JOHNSON COUNTY, KANSAS, AND RHODE ISLAND

In Merriam, Kansas, school buses used for non-school transportation are owned by a private operator and are used to transport elderly, underprivileged, and mentally handicapped groups to and from workshops and employment centers. This same contractor operates about one-half of the school district's buses.

The contractor is not hemmed in by numerous regulations restricting non-school use of school buses by virtue of his private status. He need only apply to the Kansas Corporation Commission, which regulates intra-state commerce, and pay an annual fee of \$10 per vehicle used for non-school transportation outside a fixed area. All costs incurred, including maintenance, the permit fee, insurance, and driver salaries, are covered in the contracts negotiated with the social service agencies requesting service on behalf of their elderly, underprivileged, or mentally handicapped clients.

Currently, two buses operate, under KCC permit, for these special users. The other buses may be used without a permit for school transportation and non-school transportation within a 25 mile radius. Both non-union part-time and non-union full-time drivers are employed.

² Suzanne J. LaPlant, "Using School Buses for Mass Transit: Miami's Energy Emergency," pp. 9-10.

³ Multisystems, Inc., "Literature and Data Assembly," Exhibit 3.

A similar program is in effect in Rhode Island. There, most school children get to school via privately owned and operated school buses. One major contractor in the State commands a fleet of between 300 and 400 school buses that are used, in addition to transporting school children, to provide for the shopping, medical, and recreational needs of special users, primarily elderly groups, and to transport workers to a factory located in an outlying area. The number of buses available allows for non-school use even during regular school hours.

When transporting non-school persons, the operator covers the school bus markings and pays an additional registration fee. School bus registration for buses used only to transport school children is \$3 per year; for non-school use, it is \$66 per year. For handicapped riders, the operator uses the specially equipped school buses used for handicapped school children.

Though insurance rates have been extremely high for the non-school service, the operator is able to cover most of the extra cost in the contract agreements made with leasing organizations. Contract fees range from \$18.00 to \$25.00 per hour, depending upon the size of the vehicle and the driver's salary, which ranges from \$3.50 to \$4.00 per hour. In addition, a \$.30 per mile operating fee is charged.

In neither the Merriam nor the Rhode Island cases must the private operators comply with State school transportation regulations when the buses are not in school use or obtain school board approval. The private status affords more freedom to use the school buses as needs for mobility arise.

Other similar existing programs:

- Ryegate, Montana (1972-) - privately owned school buses operate on contract to a local organization of elderly persons for transportation to a nearby town where banking, medical, and other services are available.⁴

NON-CRISIS, PUBLICLY-OPERATED SERVICE FOR SPECIAL USERS: ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA

In 1974, legislation was passed in the State of Virginia authorizing the neighboring counties of Arlington and Fairfax to use school buses for local county or city agency and department purposes.⁵

Currently, about twenty buses are available for a variety of purposes during non-school use hours (9:30 AM to 2:00 PM) in Arlington County. Three of those buses transport 40 senior citizens to and from three nutrition centers daily. The agency sponsoring the nutrition bus service pays \$8.14 per hour plus \$.48 per mile, which covers drivers' wages, depreciation, and operating costs.⁶

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Two years later, legislation extended this authorization to all counties in Virginia.

⁶ This rate is the same rate paid by all agencies leasing the bus service. Part of it is set aside in a fund that is eventually used to help finance new buses.

Other county agencies in need of bus service request it through the county office one week in advance. The county office then determines the availability of buses at the time and for the period requested and dispatches them accordingly.

Obtaining insurance coverage for this program, which has been in effect since 1974, was simply a matter of shopping around for an insurance company that would include a clause in the contract allowing for non-school use of the school buses. A major design impediment -- the high step at the entrance of the bus -- is compensated for by the use of a wooden step placed beneath the bus step. Also, agencies leasing the buses must supply aides to assist the elderly and handicapped in getting on and off the buses. In cases where persons in wheelchairs are using the service, lift-equipped vans are used.

Fairfax County had a similar program using school buses to transport senior citizens to and from nutrition centers. However, the agency in charge of the nutrition program has subsequently replaced the school buses with vans funded by the Older Americans Act because of the increasingly exorbitant costs charged by Fairfax County for using the school buses.⁷ The county also had a fixed route school bus service for the general purpose transportation needs of the county's elderly persons. This service was replaced with door-to-door, advanced reservation service using vans and taxis. Officials felt the fixed-route feature was unattractive to elderly patrons.

Other similar existing programs

- Latah County, Idaho (1975-) - publicly owned school buses operate on contract to an area agency on aging to transport elderly and handicapped persons to community services.⁸

NON-EMERGENCY, REGULAR USE, NO EXISTING TRANSIT: KLAMATH FALLS, OREGON, AND MOREHEAD, KENTUCKY

Klamath Falls

The Klamath Falls, Oregon, and Morehead, Kentucky, demonstrations using school buses for regular transit are two of the few instances in which school buses have been used this way during a non-emergency. Though the situations in which each program took place appear to be similar, one was successful, and one was not.

Klamath Falls is an area (population 36,000) without existing transit service. The demonstration, which took place over a 13-month period in 1972 and 1973, was partly intended to test the feasibility of using school buses as a preliminary public transit service to assess the need and support for a permanent expanded service in the Klamath Falls community, and partly to test the workability of using school buses during non-school-use hours.⁹

⁷ The Fairfax County School Board passed a rule that prevents it from subsidizing non-school use of its school buses by charging less than what it actually costs to operate the buses for such use.

⁸ Multisystems, Inc., "Literature Review and Data Assembly," Exhibit 3.

⁹ The project was jointly funded by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration and the State Mass Transit Division.

Klamath Area Transit (KART) was formed to conduct the demonstration. Using a school bus leased from a local school district, it operated fixed-route, regularly scheduled service from 9:00 AM to 1:30 PM and 4:30 PM to 6:30 PM during the first 9 1/2 months of the demonstration. The second phase of operation involved using two buses and provided service from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM. Ridership initially averaged 33 riders a day and then rose to 110 a day when service was expanded in the latter 3 1/2 months of the demonstration.

A \$.25 fare was charged throughout the demonstration. KART leased the buses by paying \$.40 per mile, which exceeded the actual costs of operation by \$.07 to \$.13 and allowed the school district to profit from the operation.

Despite this, and despite the fact that ridership levels appeared to be steady, KART was forced to discontinue the program when the demonstration terminated in 1973 for two reasons:

- Although the city agreed to provide half the funding for continued service, the county would not agree to fund the other half.
- The local school districts were uncooperative in allowing more than a very limited number of buses to be used in the program. Limited buses meant limited ridership, and officials could make no favorable prognosis for system growth.¹⁰

Morehead

In 1977, the Kentucky State Department of Transportation (KYDOT) began looking for a place in Kentucky in which a demonstration using school buses for regular transit could be staged. Three stipulations prevailed in deciding on the site.

- The services provided by the program could not be restricted to a certain market segment.
- Since the KYDOT does not provide public transportation operating assistance, the site selected would have to be one that could share 25% of the demonstration costs, in increasing increments over the course of the demonstration, and would also be prepared to provide local funding for the service after the demonstration expired. In addition, to insure that the grant was not mistaken for operating assistance, the length of the demonstration was set at twelve months.
- Since KYDOT can not assume ownership of any school district equipment, any school buses used in the program would still be owned by the school district. That body's strong endorsement of the project would therefore be necessary.¹¹

¹⁰ Lawrence C. Cooper, Uses of School Buses for Public Transit, pp. II-2 - II-3.

¹¹ The local school superintendent was the staunchest supporter of the idea and, in fact, contacted KYDOT before KYDOT had even started considering Morehead.

Aside from complying with the above requirements, Morehead was chosen for two other reasons: need ("a study identified an unsatisfied daily demand...of about 40 trips per day, a level that could potentially strain the capabilities of the single local taxi operator but could hardly justify large expenditures on capital equipment..."¹²) and the lack of dissension from the taxi operator on the issue.

After a city bus certificate was obtained, service began December 1, 1977. KYDOT, the Rowan County Board of Education, and the City of Morehead shared management responsibilities: the school board was primarily responsible for day-to-day operations, KYDOT contributed technical planning and transit management assistance, and the city planning aide was responsible for engendering and sustaining support in the community. A new, 36-passenger schoolbus, set aside by the school district for extracurricular transportation needs, was used along a 7.5 mile circuitous, highly rural route from 7:30 AM to 4:30 PM on weekdays and from 9:30 AM to 2:30 PM on Saturdays. This bus, which operated at one-hour headways, connected the central business district, various housing projects, the hospital, and Morehead State University. One way fares were \$.25.

Ridership was very low at first, about 36 passengers weekly. During the ensuing winter, ridership climbed to an average of 300 weekly passengers. Officials credit the unusually severe weather and the success of promotional activities for the increase in ridership. Ridership dropped off somewhat as the weather got warmer, but remained well above the pre-winter level.

Community reaction to the project was very favorable, despite the fact that ridership figures never reached the level predicted by KYDOT before the demonstration began.¹³ City and school board support for the project, both as a substantive issue and a financial one, was steadfast. As evidence of that support, as of May 8, 1980, the service continues without demonstration funding. Though still only one bus is being used, service has been expanded to a new suburban shopping center and ridership has slowly but steadily increased to a strong, 50-passenger-a-day average. The fare is still \$.25, with some variations for senior citizens and monthly bus passes. Officials are now applying for Section 18 funds to expand the program further, help defer some of the operating deficit and administrative costs, and possibly to buy a new bus.

It is easy to see that the missing link in Klamath Falls was the lack of community, city, and school board support. To explain why the support was strong in one case and absent in the other, however, is a bit more difficult. The answer probably lies in three areas:

¹² Bruce Siria, et.al., "Morehead, Kentucky School Bus Demonstration Project," in Transportation Research Record 696, p. 74.

¹³ Local Morehead officials felt the predicted level was too high an estimate.

- the predilections of local officials. In Klamath Falls, the force behind the project was the Federal government. When its involvement ended, the motivation and enthusiasm needed to continue the project were not there. In contrast, the motivating force in Morehead was Morehead itself.
- the existence of local funding ability. Klamath Falls' project was financed by the State and Federal governments with little or no consideration of the local ability to provide funding when Federal and State funds ran out or diminished. On the other hand, Morehead's ability to provide local funding was a prerequisite to its being selected as the site for the demonstration.
- the "luck" of the severe winter weather. Because of the weather, Morehead citizens were forced, for a time, to ride the school bus. Having tried it, they seemed to have found their original negative perceptions wrong, and began using the bus on a regular basis.

At the beginning of the project, there were several perceived problems with the use of school buses as transit vehicles. These perceptions were based on both intuitive feelings and reported prior experiences and were concerned with the physical limitations of the vehicles, e.g., high steps, rough ride, and the absence of air-conditioning.

Consumer research conducted during the early phases of the demonstration period showed that these initial perceptions of potential problems were essentially unfounded. Actual problems with the use of school buses have been more a matter of psychological rather than physical limitations.¹⁴

EMPLOYER SPONSORED, REGULAR TRANSIT: INLAND STEEL CORPORATION

Inland Steel Corporation in East Chicago, Indiana, provides regularly-scheduled, fixed-route transportation services for its employees with thirteen school buses leased from a private operator.

The school buses pick up between 700 and 950 Inland Steel employees (more when the weather is bad) from a parking facility located conveniently off a main artery and transport them to the plant eight miles away and back to the lot at night. Buses run at five-minute headways

¹⁴Siria, "Morehead, Kentucky School Bus Demonstration Project," p. 76.

from 5:15 AM to 7:45 AM and 2:15 PM to 4:45 PM every weekday, with an extra bus available until midnight to transport employees who must work late.

Coordination of the services, including routing and scheduling, is done by Inland Steel. Start-up consultation was provided by the school bus contractor, and traffic control expertise (how to insure a free lane on the freeway for the buses, how drivers could negotiate some difficult turns) was contributed by one or two Inland Steel engineers.

Drivers are, of course, provided by the contractor. One of the drivers acts as a coordinator and supervisor of the other drivers and is responsible for ensuring that they know route and schedule changes when they are made and for the late night bus service. The entire program is financed by Inland Steel, which pays approximately \$1.00 per vehicle mile in operating costs to the contractor.

The service has, according to Inland Steel personnel, in the year it has been operating, noticeably alleviated traffic congestion on the major arterial route leading to the plant. Inland Steel employees are all too happy to park their cars in a secure lot and travel to work and back cost- and trouble-free.

SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Public Technology, Inc.



Department of Transportation



Public Technology acts as Secretariat to the Urban Consortium. The UC/PTI Transportation Project consists of the following PTI staff and consultants:

● PTI Project Staff:

Gary Barrett, Director	David Perry
Doris Ballenger	Kathy Perry
Rosalyn Dortch	Michael Replogle
Lisa Jolly	Peggy Schwartz
Lynn Mitwol	Carolene Smith
Helene Overly	Leigh Stokes
Edith Page	Erwin Young
	Judy Zimmerman

● Project Consultants:

William B. Hurd
Debbie Newman, Systan, Inc.

Special acknowledgement is due the following people and offices of the U.S. Department of Transportation for their invaluable support of this project:

Al Linhares, Director
Norm Paulhus, Technical Coordinator
Office of Technology Sharing
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs

U.S. Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590

Public Technology, Inc.
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/452-7700

MTA DOROTHY GRAY LIBRARY & ARCHIVE
School bus use for non-school transpor
HE308 .S36



100000031862



S.C.R.T.D. LIBRARY