Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Transportation
3. Survey Results
4. Topics for upcoming meetings
TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES

Seeking Input for Continuous Improvement
OBJECTIVES FOR TODAY

1. Understand current student transportation services, including use of 2016 MLO funds for student transportation

2. Raise awareness of the challenges currently facing District transportation system

3. Begin to gather feedback and direction from the Board on District priorities for student transportation
DPS STUDENT TRANSPORTATION BY THE NUMBERS

- **14,370**: Average Miles Driven Per Day
- **5**: Modes of Transportation Used – traditional yellow buses, zone, RTD, outsourced, non-CDL
- **399**: Total Number of Yellow Buses
- **$26M**: Annual Student Transportation Budget
MAJORITY OF ELIGIBLE DPS STUDENTS UTILIZE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES DAILY

SY 17-18 Total # of Transportation-Eligible DPS Students: 31,746

- Average # of DPS Students Riding/Day
- Average # of Transportation Eligible DPS Students Not Riding

- 1250
- 7
TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

We manage pick up and drop off at 176 DPS schools with 83 different school calendars

108 Elementary/K-8 schools
35 Middle Schools
33 High Schools

We also support recurring Early Release or Late Start schedules for 63 schools
WHICH STUDENTS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION?

District Policy & Regulation EEA-R1:

“Students [are] eligible to receive transportation provided by the school District if they attend the school serving their residential area and are enrolled in:

1. Elementary schools more than one mile walking distance from their home
2. Middle schools more than two and one-half miles walking distance from their home
3. High schools more than three and one-half miles walking distance from their home

Exceptions may exist in the following circumstances:

• Shared enrollment zones and/or specific identified regions may include alternate transportation solutions;
• Special educational programs may include individualized transportation options for qualifying individuals.
STUDENTS WHO PARTICIPATE IN THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMS ARE ALSO ELIGIBLE FOR TRANSPORTATION ACCORDING TO BOE POLICY

- Special Education
- Transitional Native Language Instruction
- Newcomers
- English Language Acquisition
- McKinney-Vento (Homeless)
- Magnet
- Highly Gifted & Talented (HGT)
- Montessori
- International Baccalaureate
- Fundamental Academy
CURRENT DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Total # of DPS High School Students: 20,623

- Yellow Bus-Eligible
- District-Funded RTD Pass-Eligible
  - Walk 3.5 Miles or Less (Not Transportation Eligible)
  - Choice School (Non-Boundary, Not Transportation Eligible, <3.5 mi)
  - Choice School (Non-Boundary, Not Transportation Eligible, 3.5 mi+)

- 3,889
- 4,913
- 4,862
- 4,394
- 2,565
Each year we are faced with **reducing** existing transportation services or **diverting** general funds from other student services or schools’ per pupil revenue.

DPS has approximately 40 fewer CDL drivers on staff this year:

- Thriving economy increases competition for drivers
- Nationwide shortage in commercial drivers licensed (CDL) drivers
- Unique needs put us at a competitive disadvantage in attracting/retaining CDL operators

Maintaining services requires us to outsource service at higher costs:

- This year we have approximately 78 more special needs students that require transportation and are being served by 3rd party transportation providers (outsourced) in order to meet the need.
DPS recommends that any changes to current transportation programs be planned in alignment with RTD pricing and Strengthening Neighborhoods recommendation timelines.

* See Appendix for RTD Pass Working Group Timeline
**UNDERSTANDING TRADEOFFS**

When considering any changes to our transportation system (e.g., boundary elimination, new enrollment zones with transportation,...), it’s necessary to first fully understand the priority problem(s) we are trying to solve as well as the opportunities we are trying to create for students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Trade-Offs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should we provide transportation access to all students regardless of cost?</td>
<td>Assistance to choose where you want to attend regardless of where you live</td>
<td>Students endure longer ride times, earlier departure requirements at increased cost and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should we rely solely on RTD’s Student Program instead of expanding our DPS Developed Program w/ RTD as one of the resources for students?</td>
<td>Equitable, simple program that may have cost/ops benefits for DPS</td>
<td>Inability for RTD’s routes, schedule, and fleet to meet DPS’s needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should we rely solely on RTD for student transportation within enrollment zones (w/ ELA, SPED exceptions) rather than utilize District-provided EZ Transportation?</td>
<td>Equitable, simple program that may have cost/ops/resource benefits for DPS</td>
<td>Significant change impacts, redundant service need (MS, Elem), inability for RTD to meet need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should we provide service for all Programs, Athletics, Excursions, and Schools regardless of increased operational complexity &amp; costs?</td>
<td>Meet all needs of schools</td>
<td>$ &amp; resources will need to be diverted from an existing funding source, limiting services elsewhere in the District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEXT STEPS

➢ Continue discussions with Board of Education on long term priorities

➢ Incorporate future decisions by RTD as well as recommendations from Strengthening Neighborhoods Initiative

➢ Currently planning for 2019-20
  ➢ Propose potential transportation service changes to reflect policy and program priorities
  ➢ Create a detailed implementation / ongoing operations plan.
  ➢ Communicate and implement recommended changes (starting summer 2018 or summer 2019).
EXPLORING LONG-TERM PRIORITIES

- How can transportation help us meet the Denver Plan 2020 goals?

- Should DPS prioritize transportation/resources for low-income students above other students?

- What changes / improvements / enhancements would you like to see? What impacts are you seeking?

- What is most important in addressing tradeoffs (e.g. equity vs. cost vs. policy vs. participation)?
Appendix
$400K of 2016 Mill Levy Proposal Was Set Aside for Improved Access to Education Opportunities for High School Students.

- A 75-member citizens’ advisory group identified mill levy items ultimately approved by the Denver school board.

- In May 2016, DPS board pledged to work with community stakeholders in a two-year effort focused on “improved access to educational opportunities: increased transportation for high school students.”
  - DPS’ approval stressed the importance of community stakeholders working to secure matching funds from the city, RTD and foundations.
  - It noted that if these matching funds were not secured, the mill levy funds may be reallocated to other efforts to provide greater access to educational opportunities.
  - DPS is an active participant in the RTD Pass Working Group, which is expected to present recommendations to the RTD governing board in November.
ALL $400K IN MILL LEVY FUNDS ARE BEING USED FOR STUDENT TRANSPORTATION

In addition to **$800,000 already invested** in RTD passes for eligible high school students, in 2017-18:

- **$273,000** has already been allocated for additional bus passes for 630 high school students
- **$127,000** will be made available immediately for bus passes for approximately 370 additional high school students
  - Considering prioritizing passes for Pathways students
  - Interested to hear other ideas and reactions

We will also continue to work with RTD and the City of Denver on broader efforts to provide reduced fare bus passes to students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DPS Pathway RTD Pass Schools</th>
<th>Monthly Distribution/November order only*</th>
<th>Newly identified and additive passes provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion Road</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC-21 @ Wyman</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA (Career @ GW)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Montessori</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSISD</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Griffith HS</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel Academy</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flo Crittenton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montbello Career Tech</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North HS Engagement Center</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep Academy HS &amp; MS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Academy</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit HS &amp; MS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pass Distribution</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOTAL TRANSPORTATION COSTS HAVE INCREASED OVER 30% OVER THE 6 YEARS

Budget FY13 to FY18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>FY13 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY14 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY15 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY16 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY17 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY18 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Compensation</td>
<td>17,206,274</td>
<td>18,672,847</td>
<td>18,264,499</td>
<td>19,720,621</td>
<td>19,295,214</td>
<td>19,428,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Salary</td>
<td>2,624,340</td>
<td>2,378,047</td>
<td>3,340,597</td>
<td>3,432,748</td>
<td>5,603,318</td>
<td>6,850,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>19,830,614</td>
<td>21,050,894</td>
<td>21,605,096</td>
<td>23,153,369</td>
<td>24,898,532</td>
<td>26,278,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligibility vs Actual Ridership

Transportation uses historical Eligible data to build routes for the actual riders.

Actual riders are riders that are anticipated to ride the bus on a daily basis.
DRIVER SHORTAGES HAVE DRIVEN AN ESTIMATED INCREASE OF $5.6 MILLION IN OUTSOURCED TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES IN 5 YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>FY13 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY14 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY15 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY16 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY17 Amended Budget</th>
<th>FY18 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Salaries</td>
<td>6,704,723</td>
<td>6,862,373</td>
<td>7,853,158</td>
<td>8,582,676</td>
<td>7,891,003</td>
<td>7,865,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Salaries</td>
<td>6,026,988</td>
<td>6,537,020</td>
<td>4,862,274</td>
<td>5,743,232</td>
<td>5,569,342</td>
<td>5,298,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime</td>
<td>312,749</td>
<td>437,388</td>
<td>498,897</td>
<td>560,278</td>
<td>740,009</td>
<td>570,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional/Extra Duty/Stipends</td>
<td>558,455</td>
<td>718,006</td>
<td>1,005,562</td>
<td>996,967</td>
<td>1,066,935</td>
<td>1,346,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>3,603,359</td>
<td>4,118,060</td>
<td>4,044,608</td>
<td>3,837,468</td>
<td>2,584,766</td>
<td>2,731,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,443,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Compensation</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,206,274</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,672,847</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,264,499</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,720,621</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,295,214</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,428,537</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>18,688</td>
<td>119,200</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Purchased Services</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>6,517</td>
<td>4,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Purchased Services</td>
<td>793,982</td>
<td>693,409</td>
<td>1,911,695</td>
<td>1,947,624</td>
<td>4,286,301</td>
<td>6,357,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>2,896,468</td>
<td>2,779,200</td>
<td>2,483,902</td>
<td>3,237,074</td>
<td>3,076,500</td>
<td>2,644,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td>57,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non Salary</td>
<td>(1,100,260)</td>
<td>(1,146,400)</td>
<td>(1,227,500)</td>
<td>(2,028,500)</td>
<td>(2,032,000)</td>
<td>(2,246,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Salary</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,624,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,378,847</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,340,597</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,422,748</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,603,318</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,850,149</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,830,614</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,050,894</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,605,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,153,369</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,898,532</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,278,686</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From FY13 to FY16, Benefits and Flex were combined*
### HS STUDENT COUNTS BY TRANSPORTATION GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS students with district-funded RTD Pass</th>
<th>HS students with DPS yellow Busing</th>
<th>HS students who Walk</th>
<th>Choice HS Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less than or equal to 2.5 miles</td>
<td>Between 2.5 and 3.5 miles</td>
<td>less than or equal to 2.5 miles</td>
<td>Between 2.5 and 3.5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>2,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-FRL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>2,877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **FRL** refers to Free and Reduced Lunch status.
- **Non-FRL** refers to Non-Free and Reduced Lunch status.
- **Unknown** refers to students whose eligibility status is unknown.

*This chart represents all current DPS high school students as of January 2017.*

**Choice HS students mean they are attending a school where they are not eligible for transportation because they do not attend a boundary/zone HS or one of the magnet schools that receive transportation.

***“Walking” is not first-hand student survey knowledge, but refers to students attending their boundary/zone HS and live less than 3.5 miles from that HS. But, we do not know within this set of students if they are driving themselves, a family member drives, buying their own RTD pass, or walking/biking.
Pass Program Working Group Meetings have convened since March 2017 and every month thereafter to develop recommendations on changes to RTD transit pass programs. The remaining meetings will guide group to final recommendations to RTD Board.

**September 2017**
- Agenda for Sept. 19
  - 3 Pass Options Presented For Fare Modeling

**October 2017**
- Agenda for Oct. 24
  - Revenue, Ridership, Ability to Meet Guiding Principals

**November 2017**
- Agenda for Nov 14
  - How Might RTD Improve Most Promising Option Consensus Building

**December 2017/ January 2018**
- Conclusion of RTD Pass Program Work
- RTD Leadership
The RTD Pass Program Working Group is comprised of 26 members who will make recommendations to RTD-Denver staff on revisions to all RTD pass programs. They will:

- Revisit and refine goals for each pass program,
- Refine pricing and administration of each pass program,
- Recommend pass program policy revisions, and
- Recommend criteria for RTD to use in evaluating future proposals for new pass programs.

Options – Find three ideas for testing.

- One easy to load, easy to use transit card – the more value you load, the lower the price; organizations can load value onto the card.
- Day pass and monthly pass with youth discount, low-income discount - employer and colleges contract with RTD to provide monthly passes or to create a system for charging the organization/institution for the rides its employees/students/constituents take.
- Improve what we have with youth discount, all-in (insurance-type) program for schools, employers, colleges, neighborhoods – fee added to the all-in-program pass to help with costs of marketing and to add funds to a low-income program.

Next Steps

- RTD to test all 3 to estimate ridership, total revenue, impact on cash fare. Work to put together a consensus recommendation with the details of goals, pricing, administration (end of 2017 / early 2018).
**Option B** - 50% off for all young people, 17 and under or in high school (e.g., someone who is 18 and still in high school would qualify)

**Option C** - Individual young people (or their parent) can buy a card at a 50% discount. If a county or organization wants to buy the pass, they can get them in bulk. They pay the same price/pass that someone pays when buying them one at a time. If an organization wants to sell them at an even deeper discount, they can do that, they can pass them along at the price they paid, or they can give them away for free.

**Option E** - Keep unlimited use, annual passes based upon the all-in concept. Expand program to include schools and year round option.
- School program would mimic the business Eco Pass. Schools would be priced based upon the Service Level Area in which the school is located and the size of the school. In terms of # of students, shift in year two to actual ridership.
- Individual schools could join the program or an entire district could join.
- Administration of the program (creating passes, replacing lost passes, terminating old passes, etc.) occurs at the school level from school staff. Taking on this program is a school district decision.
- Goal: revenue neutral
SURVEY RESULTS

- Laurence and Michelle Update
SCHEDULING
Potential Topics for Discussion

- Charter Mill Levy use of funds
- Principal Pipeline
- Maintenance
- Scorecard prep
- Scorecard finalization
- Joint bond/mill meeting in May or June

Follow Ups:
- Whole Child
- TLC
- Career Connect