# • Commonwealth of Kentucky • EDUCATIONAL BULLETIN

# SOME PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS

# OF CHOOL TRANSPORTATION

President Frank L. McVey University of Kentucky Lexington, Kentucky



Published by

# EPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

H. W. PETERS
Superintendent of Public Instruction

ISSUED MONTHLY

Entered as second-class matter March 21, 1933, at the post office at Frankfort, Kentucky, under the Act of August 24, 1912

Vol. VII July, 1939 No. 5

370.61 K419 v.7 1939 no.5 Copy2 FOREWORD

Each morning and evening during the school year a fleet of approximately 1,500 vehicles of transportation move out upon the highways carrying approximately 100,000 children 30,000 miles to the schools of this Commonwealth. County boards of education expend annually a little less than \$1,120,000 for this service. When we add to this sum the amount spent by independent school districts, the annual expenditure is more than one and one-half million dollars.

So vast a business involves many problems. Among the most important is the one providing for safe transportation. During the school year 1938-39, there were only three fatalities in connection with school bus transportation. A comparison of the fatalities in school bus transportation with the fatality experience in the report of the Secretary of the Kentucky State Safety Commission, indicates that even though these children take their chances with traffic hazard in inclement weather and unfavorable road conditions, they are much safer on school busses in Kentucky than are the people who are traveling in motor vehicles on the highways of the State.

If so great a school program, which is being conducted on the public highways, is to be carried out with even more safety, every precaution must be taken by those responsible for the enterprise. No school bus is safer than the driver who operates it.

With the hope that safety of the school children of this Commonwealth may be promoted thereby the suggestions contained in this bulletin have been prepared by Gordie Young, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction. I recommend it for the careful consideration of all those who are interested in the problems of school transportation.

H. W. Peters Superintendent Public Instruction

#### PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

## A New Educational Responsibility

et of 1 the

es to

ation

Vhen

ricts.

llars.

most

; the

etion

s in

port

eates

zard

uch

are

the

pre-

No

lon-

this

rin-

on-

lool

ion

It is only within recent years that transportation has served as a means of getting school children to better and larger schools in rural communities. In turning to this means of solving the problems of the small inadequate school, administrators have assumed new responsibilities in an educational program.

This method of school attendance has enabled children to go to schools beyond a reasonable walking distance from their homes. It has enabled them to have the advantages provided by larger and more effectual school centers. Recognition of these advantages has brought about the consolidation of entire school communities. It is a method of equalizing educational opportunities. It has become more generally valuable by the construction of improved highways and larger school busses. There has been a phenomenal increase in the enrollment in both the elementary and high schools of our state as a result of providing this school service. Ample equipment and especially trained teachers have been brought within the reach of pupils of many rural communities by means of school busses.

The development of such school centers has brought on new problems in the field of safety of school pupils. New safety standards are necessary as a result of such school facilities. This involves safety standards in school bus and chassis construction and for operators upon the highways. Wherever school busses are used, it is necessary to extend the safety program to the loading places along the bus routes.

The responsibility for safeguarding the pupils rests upon the shoulders of board members and superintendents. These officials are often faced with the enforcement of some policies against the demands of many parents who desire special privileges which are not authorized by law or a safe public school program. It should be the policy of these officials to limit school activities to functions legally authorized and only these activities and services in which safety standards and safety precautions are fully observed.

The adoption and enforcement of such regulations in each county is the responsibility of the officials of each district and is, in fact, a school program conducted on the public highways by public school officials.

#### I. THE SCHOOL BUS DRIVER

#### Selection of the Driver.

One of the most important functions of school officials in operating a successful transportation program consists of the employment of school bus drivers. A dependable driver for every school bus is absolutely essential for the successful operation and maintenance of busses. The best driver obtainable is none too good for the safety of the school children. School officials should use every precaution in their selection of a school bus driver.

Basic qualifications should be prescribed by the State Board of Education in order to make it easier to weed out undesirable applicants. It will usually be necessary for local boards to have supplementary regulations. They must exercise good judgment, too, in evaluating personal traits of applicants for driving positions.

Every school board should adopt a definite set of regulations and policies relating to the employment of bus drivers. Among the things most important to be considered in these regulations are:

- 1. Contractors who own and operate busses which they do not drive should be required to select persons and pay salaries only on approval of the board of education and superintendent.
- 2. Preference should be given to experienced drivers with clean safety records, who have been successful in hauling children on a bus and who have shown their ability to cooperate with principals of the schools they serve and with parents of the children of the district which their busses serve.
- 3. A fair salary should be determined for each route in the district.
- 4. Applicants should be examined at designated intervals by a designated authority to determine whether they are physically and emotionally sound, and thereby fitted for first or continued employment.
- 5. New applicants should be given road tests and an examination in first aid by a designated and unprejudiced authority.

#### Qualifications of the Driver.

- 1. Age. The driver should not be less than twenty-one years of age nor more than sixty. Thirty-three states require drivers to be twenty-one years of age when they drive public motor busses. Ninety-seven per cent of the drivers of public busses are from twenty-one to forty-five years of age.
- 2. \*Health Certificate. Drivers should have no communicable disease. They should have normal use of body as to use of both hands, both feet, both eyes and both ears. They must present a certificate for such from a reputable physician, after careful examination by him, annually, before beginning each year's contract.
- 3. Vision. Drivers must present, annually, a certificate from a

reputable oculist, after a careful examination, showing that his vision is suitable for bus driving.

- 4. \*Morals. Drivers cannot be employed as such or kept in service as drivers if they use intoxicating liquors. They must not use tobacco while on the bus or on the school grounds. They must refrain from the use of profane and indecent language.
- 5. \*Character. Drivers must be fairly reliable and of good repute; a person whom the children will respect and whose actions should result in constructive influence over the pupils; he must be capable of maintaining order.
- 6. \*Experience. He shall satisfy the employing authority of his ability to drive a school bus by citing driving experience and by giving reliable references.
- 7. \*License. He must hold a driver's license. No one should be employed as a school bus driver who has had a driver's license revoked.
- 8. \*Contract. He must sign the driver's contract furnished by the school board, which contract covers regulations for drivers furnished by school authorities.
- 9. \*Personal appearance. Drivers should be required to keep clean and neat while operating a school bus.
- 10. \*First aid. Bus drivers should be expected to retain a reasonable degree of efficiency in the use of first aid treatment. They should be regularly instructed concerning the best way to render first aid by someone thoroughly qualified to give instruction. The American Red Cross advises that they are prepared to train all bus drivers and issue first aid certificates to all successful applicants. This service may be obtained by applying to the local chairman of the Red Cross Chapter. The complete Red Cross course consists of ten lessons of two hours each.
- 11. Driving habits. An examination to determine the driving habits of bus drivers and applicants is an important measure to prevent accidents.

#### Paying the Driver

oper-

ploy-

1 bus

nance

ty of

n in

rd of

pplipple-

o, in

and

the

drive

y on

afety

s and

f the

strict

strict.

desig-

and inued

on in

f age

o be

usses.

from

sease.

both

e for

him,

m a

The driver should be selected with the same care that teachers are selected. It is never wise to put the selection of a driver on a competitive basis, with the job awarded to the lowest bidder. If it is awarded by bid, it should be the lowest and best bidder, and much care should be used in determining the qualifications of the proposed driver. Where a person runs two or more busses, it may be wise to let the contract by bids, but exceeding care should be used in the agreement between the contractor of the fleet and the board on who will be the drivers of the different busses.

Drivers of school busses may meet the letter of every requirement adopted by those in authority and still prove incompetent because of

<sup>\*</sup>The star after a number indicates a requirement of the State Board of Education

indifference, carelessness, or unsafe driving practices. The driver's safety record and an intimate knowledge of his customary driving practices should be regarded as the ultimate test of his fitness for continuance in service or re-employment.

#### School Bus Discipline.

In fairness to all drivers, we must remember his side of the driving situation. In consolidated schools, where children are transported daily, new problems in discipline present themselves as a result of such transportation. All day the classroom teachers hold pupils in check. When school closes, they make a mad rush for the bus in order to sit beside a friend. Unless some orderly procedure is required, this scramble becomes terrific.

When the bus starts, the driver must sit with his back to the pupils, in order to observe roadside hazards, as well as traffic regulations. Many situations may arise which need his attention. Besides this, sometimes his bus is not in the best running condition. It may not be hitting on all cylinders. All this shows the necessity for teachers and other school officials calling attention of pupils to the hazards involved in such a plan of going to and from school. There are certain courtesies due him and they are very necessary to the happines and safety of all the passengers. The bus driver needs such aid from pupils, parents and officials, in order that he may concentrate properly upon the big job of safe driving. Most teachers are instructing their pupils on safe and sane bus conduct at more or less frequent intervals. Infrequent campaigns will not be enough. Keeping everlastingly at it is not too much for adequate safety. It requires the wholehearted support and work of parents, pupils, teachers and school officials, as well as drivers.

## II. TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT

The problem of safe, well-built school busses is now as serious as was the problem of safe and more suitable school buildings twenty-five or more years ago. Rapid increase in school transportation and the feeling that cheaper and safer busses could be had if more uniformity was followed in their construction, has led to a rather definite study of the situation.

In 1939 the National Council of Chief School Executives requested the survey staff of Columbia University to present its findings in this connection to the Council. This resulted in the calling of a conference of representatives of the Departments of Education of the forty-eight (48) states. The National Conference of School Bus Standards was held at Columbia University, April 10–16, 1939, with

all states represented. The outstanding achievements of this conference were:

- 1. Agreement as to the characteristics of an acceptable school bus standard.
- 2. Adoption of standards governing school bus chassis, school bus bodies, and school bus equipment.
- 3. The publication of an official report which described the work of the conference.

#### Chassis Standards.

er's

ving

for

the

ansis a

nold

the

lure

the

ula-

ides

nay

for

the

iere

the

uch

cenare

less

eep-

ires

and

s as

five the

nity udy

ives

its

ı of

Bus

vith

The conference agreed upon seventeen (17) items of chassis construction. Some idea of the treatment of the point of view may be found in the following standards regarding chassis frames:

- 1. Each frame side member should be of one piece construction. If the frame side members are extended, such extension shall be designed and furnished by the chassis manufacturer with his guarantee, and the installation shall be made by either the chassis or the body manufacturer and guaranteed by the company making the installation. Extensions of frame lengths are permissible only when such alterations are behind the rear hanger of the rear spring.
- 2. No additional holes not provided in the original chassis frame shall be permitted in the top flanges of the frame side rails. There shall be no welding to the frame side rails except by the chassis manufacturer.

#### Body Standards.

Twenty-six (26) standards governing school bus bodies were adopted by the Conference, such as aisles, body sizes, construction, doors, first aid kits, identification, mirrors, sub-rails, seats, steps, ventilators, wheel clearance, wiring, etc., plus such optional equipment as skid chains defrosters and heaters.

In developing these standards, the Conference strongly recommended: Forward facing seats with 27 inch seat centers; provisions for all-metal construction, uniform school bus color, and safety glass; and prescribed that adaptations of the body standards are necessary in case of smaller type vehicles.

As an example of the type or standard of body specifications, we quote from the one on doors:

#### 1. Service door:

- a. Shall be manually operated and of the hand lever type, under the control of the driver and so designed as to prevent accidental opening when leaned against.
- b. Shall be located on right side near the front of the bus. At least two-thirds of its opening width shall be ahead of a point opposite the back of driver's seat.

- c. Shall have a minimum horizontal clearance opening of 24 inches.
- d. Shall be of folding type. If one leaf opens in and the other out, the front leaf shall open outward.
- e. Lower panels as well as upper panels shall be of safety glass to permit driver to see children who are waiting to enter bus, and the ground where children step off.
- f. Vertical closing edges of door shall be equipped with rubber or rubberized materials to protect children's fingers.
- g. There shall be no door at the left of the driver.
- h. A stanchion shall be required at the rear of the entrance step well from roof to floor. Placement shall not restrict passageway to less than 24 inches.
- i. A safety bar shall be installed from the stanchion and wall at a height of approximately 30 inches to prevent children in front seat from being thrown into step well in case of sudden stop.

#### 2. Emergency door:

- a. Shall be located in center of rear of bus.
- b. Shall have a minimum horizontal clearance of 24 inches, a minimum vertical height of 48 inches, and be marked "Emergency Door" on both the inside and outside.
- c. Shall be equipped with a fastening device which may be quickly released, but is designed to offer protection against accidental release. Control from driver's seat shall not be permitted. Provision for opening from the outside shall consist of either a square hole in which a screw driver or other object may be inserted, or a device of such design as to prevent "hitching" but that will permit opening when necessary.
- d. Shall be hinged on the right side of the body, shall open outward and shall be designed to open from both inside and outside of the bus
- e. There shall be no steps leading to the emergency door.
- f. Glass used in the emergency door shall be safety glass.

These standards are listed as examples that one may get some idea of what these representatives believed should be workable standards for the country as a whole. Superintendents and boards of education should look forward to standards of this kind, even though they are unable at present to meet such standards. The present minimum standards of the State Board of Education in regard to the transportation of school children will undoubtedly be raised in the near future.

#### III. TRANSIT PRACTICES

#### 1. Crossing the Highway.

One of the most serious transportation hazards is experienced when a child crosses the highway to get to the bus in the morning or to go home after leaving the bus in the afternoon. Many accidents occur here and a high per cent of them are fatal. This is one of the reasons for the law requiring passing motors to stop when approaching a school bus that is receiving and discharging pupils. Passing motorists are not always at fault. The driver must assume considerable responsibility and should exercise whatever authority necessary to guarantee safe crossing of the highway. On certain points there seems to be general agreement.

a. The school bus should load and unload passengers at the extreme right of the highway.

b. Busses should be loaded and unloaded only at designated stopping places.

c. Busses should not stop on curves or hills to let pupils off or on unless the road is visible at least five or six hundred feet in both directions.

d. Pupils should not stand on the roadway while waiting for the bus.

The bus driver should always give proper signals before stopping the bus.

2. Safe Driving Speed.

hes.

ther

lass

bus,

ober

step

l at ront

top.

nini-

ency

be

inst

per-

t of ject

rent

outside

me

nd-

of

1gh

ini-

the

the

ced

or

the

It is said that about twenty-five per cent of all motor vehicle accidents are attributed to fast driving and that nearly thirty per cent of those killed in motor vehicle accidents were in accidents caused by excessive speed. It is very difficult to establish for the state as a whole what should be the speed limit for school busses. In the absence of state regulations, each board of education should establish a maximum speed limit for the school busses which it operates. If necessary the maximum speed limit could be made a part of the driver's contract.

# 3. Transportation Laws for School Busses.

a. Railroad Crossings.

ACT REGULATING SCHOOL BUSSES.—All drivers of motor vehicles transporting school children are hereby required to stop each and every such motor vehicle before crossing over any steam or electric interurban railroad main tracks at a grade, stop to be made at not less than ten (10) feet nor more than thirty (30) feet from the nearest railroad over which the highway crosses, except where such crossing is guarded, crossing protected by gates or a flag controlled or operated by employees of such railroad. After making the stop herein required, the driver or operator of a motor vehicle shall carefully look in each direction for approaching cars or trains and shall not start his vehicle until it is ascertained that no cars or trains are approaching in either direction. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten dollars nor more than one hundred dollars for each offense. (1930, c. 83, p. 251.) Sec. 1376r-10, Ky. Stat.)

b. Age of School Bus Driver.

It shall be unlawful for any person, whether licensed under

this Act, or not, under the age of twenty-one years to drive a motor vehicle while in use as a school bus in transportation of pupils to or from school, or to drive a motor vehicle while in use as a public passenger carrying vehicle. (Section 2739m-38, 1936 Kentucky Statutes.)

#### c. Passing Stopped School Bus.

Whenever any school bus is stopped upon a public highway for the purpose of receiving or discharging passengers, every operator of a vehicle approaching from any direction shall bring said vehicle to a complete stop and shall not start up or attempt to pass until the said school bus has finished receiving or discharging passengers; that the driver of said bus after having stopped for the purpose of receiving or discharging passengers shall permit all vehicles stopped as required herein to proceed before again putting school bus in motion and anyone found guilty of violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and punished upon conviction by a fine of not more than Five Hundred (\$500.00) Dollars or imprisoned in jail for not more than six months or both so fined and imprisoned. (1938. c. 117, Sec. 1.) Acts 1938, c. 117. Eff. May 31, 1938. (Sec. 2739g-46a, Ky. Stat.)

#### d. Overtaking and Passing School Bus.

- (1) The driver of a vehicle upon a highway outside of a business or residence district upon meeting or overtaking any school bus which has stopped on the highway shall come to a complete stop and then may proceed with due caution for the safety of any children and in no event in excess of ten miles per hour in passing such school bus.
- (2) This section shall be applicable only in the event the school bus shall bear upon the front and rear thereon a plainly visible sign containing the words "school bus" in letters not less than four inches in height which can be removed or covered when the vehicle is not in use as a school bus. (1938 c 106 p. 505, Sec. 13 [12].) Acts 1938. c. 106. Eff. May 31, 1938. (Sec. 2739g-69L. Ky. Stat.)

#### e. Regulations Relating to School Busses.

- (1) The State Board of Education by and with the advice of the State Highway Patrol shall adopt and enforce regulations not inconsistent with this act to govern the design and operation of all school busses used for the transportation of school children when owned and operated by any school district or privately owned and operated under contract with any school district in this State and such regulations shall by reference be made a part of any such contract with a school district. Every school district, its officers and employees, and every person employed under contract by a school district shall be subject to said regulations.
- (2) Any officer or employee of any school district who violates any of said regulations or fails to include obligations to comply with

said regulations in any contract executed by them on behalf of a school district shall be guilty of misconduct and subject to removal from office or employment. Any person operating a school bus under contract with a school district who fails to comply with any said regulations shall be guilty of breach of contract and such contract shall be canceled after notice and hearing by the responsible officers of such school district. (1938, c. 106, p. 505, Sec. 13 [13].) Acts 1938, c. 106. Eff. May 31, 1938. (Sec. 2739g-69m, Ky. Stat.)

#### f. Regulations by Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, and submit for approval and adoption by the State Board of Education rules and regulations concerning the transportation of children to and from school. (Sec. 4384–25, Ky. Statutes.)

# IV. LIABILITY OF BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Many questions have arisen as to the liability of boards of education in case of accidents in and around the school or during transportation of the children to and from school. This matter has been taken into advisement by the office of the Attorney General and he has given an opinion which indicates that boards of education have no authority to expend funds for liability insurance. This opinion is quoted below.

#### (COPY)

Commonwealth of Kentucky
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
Frankfort, Ky.
May 11, 1938

Hon. Harry W. Peters, State Supt. of Public Instruction, Frankfort, Kentucky.

#### Dear Sir:

re a

n of

use

1936

for

ator

nicle

intil

pas-

the

all

ting pro-

and dred

nths

1938,

ness

hool

lete y of

r in

bus

sign

four

the . 13

69L.

the

not

tion

chil-

or

iool

nce

ict.

erv

be

any

rith

Mr. Gordie Young has just referred to me a letter from a county superintendent wherein the superintendent inquires: "whether the Board of Education has a right to pay the premium on insurance policies to provide liability and property damage insurance on school busses", and, "May a county board be sued for damage in case of an accident to pupils or the general public in case such accident takes place in connection with the school property?"

Members of boards of education of the public school system of the State are state officers and exercise the functions of a branch of the State Government in carrying out the purpose of the state institution. (Middleton vs. Middleton, 239 Ky. 759; Commonwealth by Board vs. Louisville National Bank, 220 Ky. 89). As such state officers the duties of the board are limited by statute and the board cannot act beyond

the statutory authority conferred upon it. School districts are mere agents of the state in the performance of public or governmental functions, and the rules governing the liability of school districts must necessarily be the rules governing liability for the state or branches of the government thereof, or municipal corporations.

flytte for the first first frage of the first first first first first frage for the first first

It is a general rule in almost all the jurisdictions of this country that a school district, a municipal corporation, or a school board is not, in the absence of a statute imposing it, subject to liability for injuries committed by the agents or servants of the district or municipal corporation.

In this case the school board is acting as an agent for the state, and is performing a purely public, or governmental duty imposed upon it by law for the benefit of the public and for the performance of which duties it receives no profit and no advantages. Applying the rule of liability that exists as to any governmental agency or function, the common law rule is that school districts or municipalities are not liable for injuries. In order to hold a school district liable it is necessary that a statute specifically provide such liability. Kentucky has followed the rule that a school board was not liable for injuries occasioned by the neglect or wrongdoing of the school employees or servants.

In the case of Ernst vs. City of West Covington, 116 Ky. 850; 76 S. W. 1089; 63 L. R. A. 652, a child while legally on the school grounds was injured in falling over a wall, and suffered a broken arm. The wall was in a dangerous condition, and was known to be so by the board. The court refused to allow damages, saying, in quoting from the general rule:

"The duty of providing means of education at the public expense by building and maintaining school houses, employing teachers, etc., is purely a public duty in the discharge of which the local body as the State's representatives is exempt from corporate liability for the faulty construction or want of repair of its school building, or the torts of its servants, employed therein."

And again in the same case:

"The ground of exemption from liability is not that the duty or service is compulsory, but that it is public and that a municipal corporation in performing it is acting for the State or public in a matter in which it has no private or corporate interest."

In another Kentucky case, Clark vs. City of Nicholasville, 87 S. W. 300; 27 K. L. R. 974, a child fell down a stairway and broke an arm because the railing of the stairway was defective. The court in holding that the board was not responsible said:

"The duty of providing public education at the public expense by building and maintaining school houses and conducting public schools therein is purely a public or governmental duty in the discharge of which school districts act as the representatives of the State and are exempt from property liability for the improper construction of the houses, or want of proper repair, or the wrongs of the servants employed." (Emphasis ours).

The rule in these cases is the general rule followed by all of the states of which we are familiar, with the possible exception of New York, wherein a statutory provision requires such liability. The lia-

bility of the board in case of an accident while the children are being transported has never been passed upon in this jurisdiction, although the same rule would apply.

ere

unc-

ces-

the

itry

not.

ries

pal

and

by

ies

lity

aw

les.

ute

nat

or

76

ds

all

rd.

ral

lic

ng

ch or-

its

ty

al

a

V.

m

g

e

c

e

ıf

r

e

The State of West Virginia, which follows the same common law rule as our State, has passed upon the matter of liability of the district board in its operation of school busses. (Board of Education vs. Commercial Casualty Insurance Company, 182 S. E. 87). The school code of West Virginia, 1931, Section 18-5-13, vests the board of education with "general control and management of all the schools and school interests of its district", with authority "to provide at public expense for the transportation of pupils to and from consolidated schools or other schools where transportation of pupils may be necessary." The court held in that case that the school board was not liable for injuries resulting to the pupils, or others, and that the board had no right or authority to purchase liability insurance "because it is a public agency and arm of the State, a school board is not liable for damages for personal injury, even though such injury may arise from neglect or nonfeasance. Krutili vs. Board of Education, 99 W. Va. 466, 129 S. E. Nor can a board of education by the acquisition of indemnity insurance or otherwise change its status as a governmental agency. Boyce vs. Board of Education, 111 W. Va. 95, 160 S. E. 566."

The court went on to point out that since the board was not liable and no recovery could be had in event of suit, then the money was not properly spent to indemnify itself against an occurrence for which it could not be held liable.

The West Virginia Court in the Boyce case, supra, stated that the board is purely a statutory creation, and had no authority whatever to change the mould in which it was fashioned by the legislature. "It cannot alter the fact that it is a governmental agency; neither can it step down from its pedestal of immunity, for that immunity is incident to a governmental agency. Such a recession must come from the legislature and not from an act of the board, and we have no statute affecting the situation."

We might add parenthetically that the Legislature of the State of West Virginia in 1935 passed a law which permits boards of education to purchase liability insurance, to cover the operation of its school busses.

The Court of Appeals of Kentucky has often held that immunity from suit is a prerogative of sovereignty and that this applies to state agencies, commissions and subdivisions. (Kentucky State Park Commission vs. Wilder, et al., 260 Ky. 190, 84 S. W. (2d) 38, and cases cited therein.

It is very clear that a school board cannot be sued in this Commonwealth for any injury occasioned by the torts of its agents, servants or employees. Since the school board is not liable for the torts of its agents, servants or employees insurance purchased to indemnify for same is valueless, and could not be collected in a court of competent jurisdiction. A school board in paying out funds for liability insurance is paying for something for which nothing can be received. At the present time the only manner or method by which a school board or other branch or agency of a state government may be sued is by special

resolution of the Legislature, wherein specific authority is given to the one injured to bring the action. The Legislature could, if it desires, enact a law similar to the one in West Virginia which would make the school board liable for the torts of its servants.

In the absence of such legislative enactment, it necessarily follows, therefore, that the board of education not being liable for its injuries, and not being able to guarantee indemnity for wrongdoing is without authority to expend school moneys for liability insurance, and likewise a board is immune from any suit brought for damage occasioned by accident caused by torts of its servants or employees.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT MEREDITH, Attorney General.

BY:

(Signed) W. OWEN KELLER W. OWEN KELLER, Asst. Atty. General.

WOK: MK.

It may be seen that this opinion indicates that a law could be passed which would authorize boards of education to purchase such insurance. There is some question as to whether it is a desirable thing to be done. Many articles are contained in print presenting arguments both for and against making boards of education liable under such circumstances.

An argument against such liability is to the effect that there never has been a time when the general public is more claim conscious than at present. In any number of cases where accidents have occurred, the operator of the school bus has either been without insurance or carried insurance in an insufficient amount to cover the claim with the result that the school board has been a co-defendant and has had to assume either the entire judgment or a portion of it. It would be possible for a board of education to have claims sufficient to increase its annual expenditure much over its income where considerable transportation is being done. There are many situations around the school where accidents may occur such as water heaters, boilers, slick places where children have been sliding, etc. All of these are hazardous to the general public.

In arguing for such liability, one may present some such argument as follows: "Why should not the state, as a matter of social justice, subject itself and agents to liability for certain classes of tort or for all torts? Should the innocent individual who is injured as a result of such negligence be required to bear alone this inevitable consequence of the operation of government? Why are not the injuries which the state inflicts on its citizens in the conduct of its

business as much a part of the cost of government as are the roads it builds or the schools it maintains? Should those who suffer the consequences of the negligence of government agents continue to receive no compensation from society because the state is sovereign, or supposed to be so, and not subject to suit in the courts of its own creation?"

the

es.

the

WS,

les,

out

ise

by

be

 $^{
m ch}$ 

le

ıg

le

er

n

ı,

r

h

de

1

Whether or not it is wise to make a board of education liable is open to question.

#### V. OTHER USE OF BUSSES

Frequently questions arise concerning the use of school busses for other purposes than transporting children directly to and from school. A strict interpretation of the law indicates that the authority and privileges granted are only for the purpose of transporting children to and from school or to any exercises in connection with or in carrying out the program of the school which they attend. The Motor Transportation Division of our State agrees that transporting members of the school who participate in school projects or the teachers in connection therewith may be rightly considered as a school transportation job and may be done by the school forces with school equipment. They argue that the school bus should not transport people other than those belonging to the school or those working in connection with the school program when it deprives the regular bus line which pays the usual fees and taxes of its right to transport these people. Those who operate school transportation equipment which is tax free or is operated under special laws and at low tax rates made especially for transporting school children should recognize this right of the people who operate common carriers for transporting the general public.

#### VI. OWNERSHIP OF BUSSES

#### District-owned vs. Privately-owned Busses.

Reports from twenty states and the District of Columbia show that privately owned busses are more numerous by 2.3 to 1 than are publicly owned and operated busses.

Information collected as of January 1, 1939, for the State of Kentucky, shows 880 privately owned busses in use to 425 publicly owned, or a ratio of 2.1 to 1 in favor of privately owned busses. Whether a school district should purchase and operate its own busses or contract with private owners for transportation of pupils is a problem that cannot be definitely determined at present. The amount of money available to be used for transportation is one of the reasons

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Herbert Hogan, Authority of School Boards to Carry Liability Insurance.

why more privately owned busses are in operation in this State than publicly owned. Evidence throughout the country and experience of a number of the boards of education in the districts where most transportation is being done favors the use of district owned vehicles. Until sufficient funds are available so that boards of education may own their equipment, we will be forced to use privately owned equipment even though economy and safety might indicate that publicly owned busses are preferred.

te

av

in

gi

# VII. TRANSPORTATION COST FACTORS

When contemplating a system of transportation, every school board rightly wants to know what it will cost. Very little information is available to indicate just what transportation should cost. It will vary from community to community and from year to year in the same community.

Some districts may be forced to use unsatisfactory equipment for the same reason that they must use obsolete equipment for their buildings and pay substandard salaries for their teachers. Under such circumstances, the best that can be done with pupil transportation is to secure equipment just as safe as is possible under the circumstances. The existence of such districts does not argue for lower school bus standards. It merely indicates that there is a need for better distribution of the cost of education. It shows the territory in which the need for state and federal aid is urgent.

Costs may be classified under three types of expenditure.

- 1. Cost of driving.
- 2. Replacement of equipment.
- 3. All other operating costs, including fuel, tires, maintenance.

A recent proposed cost schedule for Florida suggests that on the average about forty (40) per cent of the total cost of transportation is for driving and that in the average county this statement indicated that the cost of operation other than driving is a little more than forty (40) per cent of the total cost of transportation. It indicates that about ninety per cent of these expenditures are for gasoline, oil, tires and maintenance. Road conditions and frequency of bus stops, of course, have considerable effect on the cost of fuel, tires, repairs, etc., but the cost of operation in this calculation increases directly in proportion to the increase in the total school bus mileage. This statement of factors and costs sets (20) twenty per cent of the annual cost of transportation in Florida for capital outlay for new school busses. They set as a reasonable expectancy for an average school bus chassis five years on dirt roads and nine years on pavements. They say that

ten years appears to be the minimum life for a steel body under average conditions and with proper maintenance the body should be in use from twelve to fifteen years.

A proposed schedule in Florida has been set up under the formula given below:

"The following formula is offered as a simple method of determining the maximum cost allowable for any route. The figures used in this schedule and in applying the schedule to a typical route are approximately average for the State of Florida. They should be adjusted to apply to the situation in each county. The suggested formula is as follows:

#### SCHEDULED COST = DRIVING + OPERATION + DEPRECIATION.

"Driving: Fair salary for 20 days of about three and one-half hours each day for a person thoroughly qualified for responsibilities involved.

"Operation:  $5\phi$  to  $8\phi$  per mile according to the size of bus and the type of road as shown by the following table:

	Lineal	Seating Space	e of Bus
	15-30 ft.	30-60 ft.	Over 60 ft.
"Dirt Grade or Trail	6¢	7¢	8¢
Shell, Marl, Clay Surfaced			
Road	5½¢	6½¢	7½¢
Pavement	5¢	$6\phi$	7¢

"Depreciation.  $50\phi$  a month for each foot of seating space (minimum of \$18); allow one-half this amount for chassis only.

"Example: 20 mile route with pupils, 11 pavement, 5 clay, 4 ungraded; seating space, 50 feet; uniform salary set by board, \$50.

"Scheduled Cost:

Driving	Operation	Depreciation
\$ 50.00	\$50.60	\$25.00
\$125.60"		

#### VIII. DISTANCE OF TRANSPORTATION

#### 1. Elementary Pupils.

The school law of Kentucky provides that pupils of the elementary grades shall be transported when they live beyond a reasonable walking distance from the schools which they must attend. Each board of education has authority to determine what is a reasonable walking distance. They may legally designate which pupils in a district must walk to school. In order to do so they must determine that they do not live beyond a reasonable walking distance as set up by the policies of the board. It is possible that the hazard to which a child is exposed in walking to and from school should be considered in determining whether or not he lives within a reasonable walking distance of the school.

#### 2. High School Pupils.

Boards of education may transport high school pupils but they are not required to do so if they maintain a high school in the district of the child's residence. If high school privileges are furnished beyond the district line, the board must pay both the tuition and transportation charges. Where there is not a sufficient number of pupils of high school age in a district to maintain an accredited high school, the board of education may pay, in addition to the tuition, the board of pupils in another school district. The maximum sum which a board of education may pay in lieu of transportation is one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per year per pupil.

## 3. Certain Pupils Should Walk.

Considerable saving can be made if boards of education require pupils within a short distance of the school to walk. Some boards of education do not transport any pupils who live within a mile or two of the school building except when special permission is granted for children who may occupy any vacant seats remaining in the bus after it has picked up its load or for transporting very small children during their first years of attendance at school. With the increased costs for transportation facing most boards of education, this becomes a real factor in providing educational facilities for the children who must be transported.

#### IX. SAFETY PROMOTION

Each board of education and the school officials of the district should plan some program of safety in the transportation of its pupils. The best drivers and the most careful pupils need to be constantly reminded of the hazards involved and of the safe practices which they know and should observe but sometime fail to observe. The chances of serious injury to children who ride school busses may be reduced materially when pupils learn in school how to assume proper responsibility for their own safety. Daily school bus experiences can be used as a basis for a large number of safety lessons. Instruction of this type should occupy an important place in the school instruction program. Games, posters, stories, songs, slogans, essays, dramatizations, exercises, and assembly programs of various types are among the instructional devices that can be employed.

#### 1. Objectives of Safety Education.

The broad objectives of safety education as outlined by a committee on safety education of the White House Conference on Child

Health and Protection are applicable to safety instruction in school bus experiences. They are as follows:

a. Habits of personal safety.

y

ct

 $^{\rm ed}$ 

d

f

h

10

h

d

- b. Consciousness of responsibility for the safety of others.
- c. Responsibility for community regulation.
- d. An understanding of the cause of accidents and the knowledge of how to meet them.

# 2. School Bus Accidents in Kentucky for the School Year 1938-39.

The facts presented below were collected from approximately one hundred counties of the State, eighty-six of which had no accidents. They make a very interesting study.

a. Date of accidents.—The school year begins July 1. Transportation begins in some schools in August and runs until the following May. It will be noted that accidents occurred in every month of the year except May, June and July. The total number of accidents in the fourteen counties reporting accidents were twenty-three and were distributed as follows:

2-September

7-October

2-November

2-December

6-January

1-February

1-March

1-April

1—August

b. Time of day.—A summary of this item shows that between

7 and 8 A. M. there were 7 accidents;

8 and 9 A. M. there were 2 accidents;

2 and 3 P. M. there were 2 accidents;

3 and 4 P. M. there were 8 accidents;

4 and 5 P. M. there were 2 accidents; and

6:30 P. M. there was 1 accident.

c. Weather conditions.

17—Clear day

3-Rain

2-Snow

1—Dusty Road

d. Kind of surface.

16-Macadam

3-Gravel

3-Concrete

1-Dirt

e. Straight or curved road.

13-Straight road

6-Curved road

4-Intersection

f. Injury.

10 accidents—36 people slightly injured

5 accidents—15 people seriously injured

2 accidents— 3 people fatally injured

6 accidents-Property damage.

It is interesting to note that two of these fatalities were the result of poor vision due to a dusty road on a curve at 6:30 P. M. The other fatality was caused from a collision of the school bus with a truck that was reported to have a sleepy driver.

g. Bus construction.

18-All metal busses

4—Composition busses

1-Wood

h. Previous accident record. This was the first accident of the driver in twenty cases; three had had previous accident.

The following form was used in collecting the information which has been tabulated herein.

#### SCHOOL BUS ACCIDENT REPORT

10	UNTY DATE
1.	Date of accident Time of day
2.	Weather conditions—a. Rain b. Clear c. Snow
3.	Road condition—a. Kind of surface—
	(1) Dirt(2) Macadam(3) Concrete
	b. On a curve c. Intersection d. Blind hill
	e. Narrow road f. Straight road
4.	Injured—a. Slightly b. Seriously c, Fatally
	d. Total injured
5.	Driver—a. Regular b. Substitute c. Over twenty-one
	years of aged. Under twenty-one years of age
	e. Pupil
6.	Speed—a. Of bus at the time of accident b. Maximum speed
	permitted when bus is loaded with children
7.	Body construction—a. All metal b. Composition (wood and
	metal) d
8.	Bus—a. Regular school bus b. Truck c. Touring
	card.,
9.	Capacity—a. Seating capacity of bus b. Number on bus when
	accident occurred
	Has the driver had a school accident before this one?
11.	Cause of accident
12.	Nature of accident
	(SIGNED)

County Superintendent

ılt er ck eh .e d d g n

#### SCHOOL BUS ACCIDENTS

						Road
Name of County	Accid	ent	Time	of Day	Weather Conditions	a.
	(1)		(	2)	(3)	(4)
Ballard	Jan.,	1939	7 and	8 A.M.	Fog and snow	Gravel
Bullitt	Oct.,	1938	3:30	P.M.	Clear	Gravel
Boyle	April,	1939	7:30	A.M.	Clear	Macadam
Carter	Nov.,	1938	2:30	P.M.	Clear	Dirt
Carter	Dec.,	1938	7:00	A.M.	Clear	Concrete
Carter			7:00	A.M.	Rain	Macadam
Crittenden	No accid	ents w	hile in	nile in motion. One girl jumpe		d from a truck
Garrard	Oct.,	1938	8:15	A.M.	Clear	Macadam
Harrison	Jan.,	1939	3 and	4 P.M.	Clear	Concrete
Jefferson	Sept.,	1938	2:45	P.M.	Clear	Macadam
Jefferson	Oct.,	1938	3:15	P.M.	Clear	Macadam
Jefferson	Oct.,	1938	8:15	A.M.	Clear	School yard
Jefferson	Sept.,	1938	3:00	P.M.	Clear	Macadam
Jefferson	Nov.,	1938	3:30	P.M.	Clear	Macadam
Jefferson	Jan.,	1939	7:45	A.M.	Clear	Macadam
Jefferson	Feb.,	1939	7:30	A.M.	Snow	Macadam
Jefferson	Jan.,	1939		A.M.	Rain	Macadam
Jefferson	Jan.,	1939	7:30	A.M.	Rain	Macadam
Jefferson	Jan.,	1939	3:40	P.M.	Clear	Concrete
Laurel	March,	1939	3:00	P.M.	Clear	Macadam
McCracken	Oct.,	1938	3:30	P.M.	Clear	Concrete
Meade	Oct.,	1938	4:40	P.M.	Clear	Macadam
Ohio	Oct.,	1938	6:30	P.M.	Dusty	Rock
Washington	Dec.,	1938	4:00	P.M.	Rain	Macadam
Whitley	Aug.,	1938	3:30	P.M.	Clear	Macadam
	Sept. Oct. Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. March April May June July Aug.	2 7 2 2 6 1 1 1	7-8 A.M 8-9 A.M 2-3 P.M 3-4 P.M 4-5 P.M 6:30 P.D	I. 2 I. 2 I. 8	Clear 17 Rain 3 Snow 2 Dusty 1	Gravel 1 Macadam 1 Concrete 2 Dirt 1

79 Counties—No accidents. 14 Counties—Accidents. 27 Counties—No report.

#### SCHOOL YEAR, 1938-39

Conditions							
b.	e.	Injured	Driver		Speed (9)		
(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)				
On curve	Narrow road	No injury	Regular	21	10	_	20
	Straight	Slightly	Regular	21	10	_	35
	Straight	[4 slightly ]	Sub.	21			
School yard		12 seriously Seriously	Regular	21	3		
	Straight		Regular	21	45		
	Straight		Regular	21	Stopp	ed	
while stopped an	d broke ankle b	one.					
Intersection	Narrow	2 slightly	Regular	21	25	-	30
On curve		Seriously	Regular	21	Stopp	ed	25
	Straight	1 slightly	Regular	21	Stopp	ed	25
	Straight	1 seriously	Regular	21	15	-	25
	Straight	1 slightly	Regular	21	Stopp	ed	25
	Straight	Property damage	Regular	21	15	_	25
Intersection		Property damage	Regular	21	20	-	25
On a curve		Property damage	Sub. under	21	15	-	25
Intersection		Property damage	Regular	21	Slow		25
Intersection		Property damage	Regular	21	5	_	25
Making	Turn	Property damage	Sub. over	21	Slow		25
	Straight	10-15 slightly	Regular	21	Slow		25
	Straight	3 slightly	Regular	21	20	-	35
Blind hill		Slightly	Regular		Stop	ped	35
	Straight	1 seriously	Regular	21	5-10		38
On a curve	Blind hill	{ 12 slightly 7 seriously 2 fatally	Regular	21	25	-	3
	Straight	No injury	Regular	21	Still		3
	Straight	{2 seriously} {1 fatally}	Regular	21	10		
Curve 6 Intersection 4	Straight 13	Slightly 10 Seriously 5 Fatally 2 Property damage 6					

#### SCHOOL BUS ACCIDENTS

Name of County Body Type of Bus		of Bus	a.	apacity b.	Previous Accident
	(10)	(11)		(12)	(13)
Ballard	Wood	School Bus	30	17	No
Bullitt	Wood and metal	School Bus	30	28	No
Boyle	Passenger car		5	8	No
Carter	All metal	School Bus	60		No
Carter	All metal	School Bus	60	0	Yes
Carter	All metal	School Bus	42		No
Crittenden		4			
Garrard	Wood and metal	School Bus	45	49	No
Harrison	All metal	School Bus	55	20	No
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	60	Full	No
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	36		No
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	50		No
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	35	25	1
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	53		No
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	36	None	No
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	40	Driver	No
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	42	17	No
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	40		No
Jefferson	All metal	School Bus	35	17	1
Laurel	All metal	School Bus	50	30	No
McCracken	Wood and metal	School Bus	50	45	No
Meade	Wood and metal	School Bus	45	10	No
Ohio	All metal	School Bus	40	37	No
Washington	All metal	School Bus	40	2	No
Whitley	All metal	School Bus	34	16	No
	Metal 18 Composition 4 Wood 1			•	No 20 Yes 3

### SCHOOL YEAR, 1938-39—Continued

Nature of Accident
(15)
Bus turned over and rolled down hill Bruised head, no bones broken Ran into ditch broken leg dd Sideswiped with truck Damages to bus body ling out of on school bus. No fault of driver
stefous head injury hild getting siss bus and hild by car com- be on wrong sus standing leaf to stop hit bus started when up when bus before it had st st of car of car sp and drove  ge and drove  get and drove  Serious head injury  Froperty damage Property damage Proper

# X. PRESENT STATUS OF SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION IN KENTUCKY AS OF JANUARY 1, 1939

#### SUMMARY

1.	Schools to which pupils are tran	sported	959
2.	Number of busses		1,400
	wagons		24
	trucks		7
	cars		12
3.	Average Seating Capacity		40
4.	County owned busses		425
	wagons		15
5.	Privately owned busses		880
	wagons		2
	trucks		3
	cars		2
6.	Common Carrier		7
7.	Private Chassis—County body		
8.	Other means for transporting		
9.	Total length of routes		
10.	Number children transported da		
11.	Cost 1937-38		
12.	Estimated Cost for 1938-39	\$1,	
13.	Regulations		21
14.	How driver's salary determined-	—By board of education	
		By bids	
		By bids and board	
		By mileage	
		By salary schedule	6
15.	Carry liability insurance		
16.	Traffic law obeyed		
17.	Safety regulations		66
18.	Drivers under 21 years of age		
19.	High school boys as drivers		
20.	Counties with transportation		
	Counties with no transportation.		7

#### PRESENT STATUS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

Districts Transported. This study of public school transportation was made as of January 1, 1939. The information was secured from a questionnaire sent to all county school districts of the state. Answers were received from each of the 120 superintendents. A tabulation

IIN

> 425 15

40

7 99 63

9,393 5,965 3,033

3,517 21

> 40 10

51

2 6

66

113 7

was

was nty ved Average Seating Capacity

Ownership. PrivatelyOwned Busses—
County-Owned
Busses—Common
Carrier—Privately
Owned Chassis—
County Body.
Other Means of

Length of Bus Routes.

Transporting.

Number of children.

Cost.

Regulations.

Salaries of Drivers.

Liability Insurance.

of the information contained in this questionnaire may be found in the following pages. It was found that of the 120 counties, 113 have some transportation and seven no transportation of any kind. The seven counties with no transportation are Casey, Clay, Clinton, Estill, Menifee, Taylor and Wolfe. The 113 counties transport children to 959 schools. They use 1,400 busses, cars, wagons, trucks and other means of transportation such as railroads, electric lines, etc. Jefferson County uses 53 busses, which is the largest number used by any other unit. Graves and Mason Counties tie for the next place with 46 busses each.

The average seating capacity for these busses is 40. The largest average number hauled in any one county is found in Kenton. This average is 65. The second largest seating capacity, which is 60, is found in Simpson, Woodford and Fulton Counties. This tabulation shows that there are 425 vehicles used in transporting children, that are county-owned; 880 are privately owned. There are seven common carriers used in transporting children, while 99 vehicles have the chassis owned by a private individual and the body by the board of education.

Of the 113 counties, 63 used some other means of getting the children to school than the regular school bus.

The school busses of the state cover a total of 29,393 miles of school route one way or a total of approximately twice this many miles daily.

These busses take to the different schools in the state 95,965 children daily.

The cost for this service in 1937-38 was \$1,116,033. It was estimated that the cost for 1938-39 will be \$1,116,517.

Ninety-two counties have adopted no regulations concerning transportation of children other than those set up in the regulations of the State Board of Education for the state at large.

The salaries of drivers of these busses were set by the board in 51 counties, by bids in 40 counties, bids and board in 10 counties, salary schedule in six counties and on the mileage basis in two counties.

Liability insurance is carried on the vehicles of transportation in 43 districts; 70 of the districts carry no liability insurance. The Attorney General has ruled that boards of education are not liable and for that reason are not legally empowered to

pay for liability insurance. Most of such protection is paid for by private owners.

Traffic Law Obeyed.

Fifty-one districts indicated that the traffic laws are fairly well obeyed. The other districts were of the opinion that there was considerable lack of such observance of the laws governing school transportation.

Safety Regulations.

Sixty-six of the 113 districts have adopted some regulations governing the safety of pupil transportation while 47 had adopted no regulations at all looking toward safety of pupil transportation.

Age of Drivers.

Although the law requires that the bus driver be 21 years of age, eleven districts indicated they had some people employed who were under 21 years of age. Seven districts had high school boys as drivers. It would, therefore, seem that of the eleven drivers under age, seven of them were high school pupils.

Very few regulations concerning the safety and comfort of the pupils transported have been made by local boards of education. About 25 per cent of the boards have adopted some regulations in this connection.

The salaries of bus drivers are determined in approximately 50 per cent of the cases by bids. Only six reported that a drivers' salary schedule was in operation.

The present traffic laws of the state are fairly well observed in about sixty per cent of the districts.

Although the type of bus designed for comfort and safety of the pupils has increased considerably in the past three years, much needs to be done yet to provide a bus which will meet present needs for safety and comfort. Most districts are doing the best they can with the money they have at their disposal for transportation. There is much need for additional funds to be used for transporting pupils in order that the type of bus may be had that will meet present needs for comfort and safety of the pupils. ection

laws ere of ck of school

some transns at ion.
er be 
y had 
ars of 
s as 
the 
high

the tion.

y 50 lary

d in

of of eds can here pils

eeds

DDECENT	OTATILO	OF PUBLIC	

TOOHOS	TRANSP	ORTATION

					or robbit	- 10000		
Name of County	Schools to Which Pupils Trans- ported	Number Busses	Average Seating Capacity	County Owned	Privately Owned	}	Common Carrier	Pri Ch Co.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		(6)	
Adair Allen Anderson Ballard Barren	2 5 1 9	2 (cars) 18 1 16 9	5 30 50 42 40	0 0 1 14 0	2 18 0 1 4		0 0 0 0 0	
Bath Bell Boone Bourbon Boyd	3 4 9 14 9	6 5 20 21 8	39 55 40 40 40 45	5 0 15 0	1 5 5 21 5		0 0 0 0 0	
Boyle Bracken Breathit Breckinridge Bullitt	7 17 3 6 9	8 26 4 10 19	50 0 45 42 35	8 0 4 3 0	0 25 0 7 19		0 0 0 0 0	
Butler Caldwell Calloway Campbell Carlisle	2 3 8 5 6	3 4 15 18 6	40 40 45 45 50	3 4 9 0	0 0 1 18 6		0 0 0 0 0	
Carroll Carter Casey Christian Clark	7 6 0 9 29	24 5 0 9 18	35 42 0 42 40	0 5 0 7 0	24 0 0 2 18		0 0 0 0	
Clay Clinton Crittenden Cumberland Daviess	0 0 5 1 16	0 0 3 3 3 36	0 0 50 40 50	0 0 2 1 5	0 0 0 2 2		0 0 0 0	
Edmonson Elliott Estill Fayette Fleming	11 1 0 19 13	12 1 0 33 33	30 40 0 45 40	0 0 0 8 0	12 1 0 25 33		0 0 0 0	
Floyd Franklin Fulton Gallatin Garrard	20 8 5 3 15	6 22 6 7 20	55 50 60 55 45	6 18 6 2 0	0 3 0 0 20	*	0 0 0 0	
Grant Graves Grayson Green Greenup	8 24 3 3 4	25 46 2 1 5	56 45 50 20 40	25 0 0 0 5	0 46 2 1		0 0 0 0	
Hancock Hardin Harlan Harrison Hart	3 11 14 10 11	8 27 12 20 16	50 58 35 50 25	8 19 5 15 0	0 9 5 3 16	*	0 0 2 0 0	
Henderson Henry Hickman Hopkins Jackson	17 14 12 9 3	37 17 9 13	50 50 40 40 20	0 5 4 0 0	37 12 5 13		0 0 0 0 0	
Jefferson Jessamine Johnson Kenton Knott	28 17 3 11 3	53 7 3 31 3	38 50 45 65 50	0 7 3 29 3	51 0 0 1		2 0 0 1	
Knox	36	8	36	7	1		0	

Common Carrier	Private Chassis Co. Body	Other Means for Transporting	Total Length Routes	Number Children Daily	Cost 1937-38
(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 5	No No Yes Yes Yes	9 318 34 360 175	7 507 68 625 400	\$ 439.00 10,026.00 1,038.00 8,276.00 6,541.00
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 3	No Yes No Yes Yes	122 285 278 714 120	300 275 1,235 1,429 787	4,949.00 12,300.00 18,027.00 21,761.00 6,441.00
0 0 0 0	0 1 0 1	Yes No No Yes Yes	168 336 102 151 161	1,050 1,040 463 500 665	10,386.00 13,765.00 4,905.00 6,343.00 7,158.00
0 0 0 0 0	0 0 4 0 0	Yes Yes Yes No No	105 75 554 190 202	160 350 1,108 900 612	2,200.00 5,900.00 8,400.00 13,825.00 2,782.00
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	No Yes 0 Yes Yes	218 241 0 246 456	880 784 0 618 1,560	13,664.00 5,489.00 0 6,404.00 15,339.00
0 0 0 0	0 0 1 1 1 29	0 0 Yes No Yes	0 0 40 56 835	0 0 425 175 2,799	5,116.00 1,125.00 35,143.00
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	No Yes 0 Yes No	120 0 850 275	495 0 3,227 1,400	3,558.00 900.00 0 43,443.00 20,346.00
0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 5 0	Yes No No Yes Yes	319 352 143 150 300	1,700 1,900 625 600 1,376	6,414.00 16,514.00 2,580.00 8,451.00 13,300.00
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	No Yes Yes Yes Yes	513 770 50 36 243	1,603 2,311 120 50 433	26,892.00 21,859.00 627.00 5,144.00
0 0 0 2 0	0 0 0 2 8	Yes Yes Yes Yes No	118 418 178 500 150	1,661 1,035 1,660 450	4,800.00 16,737.00 16,496.00 18,808.00 9,300.00
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	No Yes Yes Yes No	450 397 135 358 60	2,220 1,116 776 1,241 64	28,767.00 16,499.00 5,579.00 19,100.00 663.00
0 2 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	No Yes No No Yes	1,325 270 60 17 55	3,734 870 500 2,488 450	64,331.00 6,430.00 5,517.00 21,598.00 2,905.00
U	0	200	919	1.875	8,346.00

	TRANSPORTATION-Continued
CHOOL	TRANSPORTATION CONTENTS

Name of County	Estimated Cost 1938-39	Regulations Other than State Board	How Salary of Driver Determined	Carry Liability Insurance
	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Adair	\$ 616.00	No	Bids	No
Allen	11,000.00	Yes	Bids	No
Anderson	1,350.00	Yes	Board	Yes
Ballard	9,633.00	No	Board	No
Barren	8,000.00	No	Bids	No
Bath	5,000.00	No	Board	No
Bell	8,100.00	No	Bids	Operator
Boone	16,138.00	No	Board	No
Bourbon	28,000.00	Yes	Mileage	No
Boyd	9,000.00	No	Board	Yes
Boyle	11,700.00	No	Board	No
Bracken	13,050.00	No	Bids and Board	No
Breathitt	4,700.00	No	Board	Yes
Breckinridge	7,500.00	Yes	Board	Yes
Bullitt	9,293.00	No	Bids	Yes
Butler	2,500.00	No	Board	No
Caldwell	6,000.00	No	Board	No
Calloway	8,900.00	No	Board	No
Campbell	20,000.00	Yes	Bids	Contractor
Carlisle	5,571.00	No	Board	Driver
Carroll	12,961.00	No	Bids Bids and Board 0 Bids Bids Bids	No
Carter	5,370.00	No		No
Casey	0	0		0
Christian	7,250.00	0		No
Clark	17,000.00	No		Yes
Clay Clinton Crittenden Cumberland Daviess	3,600.00 2,065.00 35,550.00	0 0 0 0 Yes	0 0 Bids Bids Board	0 0 Yes No Drivers
Edmonson	4,043.00	0	Bids	Yes
Elliott	944.00	0	Bids	No
Estill	0	0	0	0
Fayette	0	No	Board	Operator
Fleming	20,500.00	No	Bids	No
Floyd	7,550.00	No	Board	Yes
Franklin	16,300.00	No	Board	No
Fulton	3,500.00	No	Board	No
Gallatin	7,000.00	No	Bids	Yes
Garrard	15,500.00	No	Board	No
Grant	20,000.00	Yes	Board	No
Graves	23,000.00	No	Board	No
Grayson	2,640.00	No	Bus Owner	Owner
Green	13,000.00	No	Board	No
Greenup	6,000.00	No	Board	No
Hancock	5,000.00	No	No Salary Bids and Board Board Board Mileage	No
Hardin	21,000.00	Yes		Yes
Harlan	15,000.00	No		No
Harrison	19,688.00	No		Drivers
Hart	7,300.00	No		No
Henderson	29,000.00	No	Bids	No
Henry	15,000.00	No	Board	No
Hickman	5,850.00	No	Bids and Board	Yes
Hopkins	20,000.00	Yes	Bids	Owner
Jackson	600.00	No	Board	No
Jefferson	7,000.00	No	Salary Schedule	Yes
Jessamine	7,500.00	Yes	Board	No
Johnson	7,500.00	No	Board	No
Kenton	21,000.00	No	Salary Schedule	No
Knott	3,300.00	No	Board	No
Knox	7,300.00	Yes	Board	No

Traffic Law Obeyed	Safety Regulations	Drivers under 21 Years of Age	Any High School Boys as Drivers
(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Instructed Yes School Patrol Yes No	Yes No Yes Yes No	No No Yes No No
Yes No Partly Partly No	Std. Regulations Yes School Boy Patrol Yes Yes	No No No No No	No No No No No
Yes No Yes No No	No Yes No Yes No	No No Yes No Yes	No No No No Yes
No No Partly Yes Partly	No Yes No School Boy Patrol Yes	No No No No Yes	No No No No
Partly Yes 0 Partly No	School Bus Patrol Yes 0 Yes No	No No 0 No No	No No O No No
0 0 Yes Partly Partly	State Requirements No Yes	0 0 No No No	0 0 No No No
No No 0 Yes No	No No 0 Yes No	No No 0 No No	No No No No
Partly Yes Partly Yes No	Yes No State Regulations No School Patrols	No No No No No	No No No No
Yes Yes No Yes Yes	First Aid No No No No State Regulations	No No Yes No No	No No Yes No No
Yes Yes Yes No Yes	State Regulations School Bus Patrol No No State Regulations	No No No No No	No No No No
Partly Yes Yes Yes No	State Regulations Set by Patrol Yes No State Regulations	No Yes No No No	No No No No
Yes No No Yes Yes	Safety Patrol School Patrol No School Boy Patrol No	No No No No No	No No No No
No	Safety Patrol	No	No

PRESENT	STATUS	OF	PURI	10

Name of County	Schools to Which Pupils Trans- ported (1)	Number Busses	Average Seating Capacity	County Owned	Privately Owned
Larue Laurel Lawrence Lee Leslie Letcher Lewis Lincoln Livingston	1 3 5 2 2 2 2 5 16 16 16	1 4 5 5 2 2 35 24 12	40 45 48 25 90 40 40 20 20	0 4 5 2 1 5 15 15 9	1 0 0 0 3 1 1 0 20 15 12
Logan Lyon Madison Magoffin Marion Marshall Martin Mason MacCracken	8 0 33 2 2 22 5 5 2 13 6	15 0 23 4 11 5 2 46 15	48 0 50 40 40 35 40 40 35	2 0 5 4 0 0 0 2 0	13 0 4 0 11 5 2 44 15
McCreary McLean Meade Menifee Mercer Metcalfe Monroe Montgomery Morgan	3 6 3 0 29 3 3 3 5	5 10 8 0 14 4 2 9	30 50 40 0 40 33 40 39 35	3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2 10 8 0 14 0 2 9
Muhlenberg Nelson Nicholas Ohio Oldham Owen Owsley Pendleton	8 6 7 12 10 11 0 7	9 7 16 7 16 18 0 21	48 35 45 50 45 45 45 45	0 0 0 0 16 0 0 19	4 7 16 1 0 18 0 2
Perry Pike Powell Pulaski Robertson Rockcastle Rowan Russell	8 12 2 5 2 0 4 1	6 14 2 11 5 0 7	43 40 48 33 25 0 35 20	6 13 0 8 0 0 0	0 0 2 2 5 0 7 3
Scott Shelby Simpson Spencer Taylor Todd Trigg Trimble	13 12 5 2 0 7 4 2	21 20 11 2 0 6 14 9	50 50 60 25 0 30 25 40	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 2	17 20 11 2 0 6 11 7
Union Warren Washington Wayne Webster Whitley Wolfe Woodford	14 23 5 4 13 4 0	9 37 8 9 12 4 0 23	40 40 40 35 50 42 0 60	6 0 4 7 0 0 0 0 23	35 35 22 12 4 0
Totals	959	1,400	4.557	425	880

#### SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION-Continue

SHOOL !	HAROT CITY				
Common Carrier	Private Chassis Co. Body	Other Means for Transporting	Total Length Routes	Number Children Daily	Cost 1937-38
(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No No	18 200 102 40 75 280 304 468 100	50 425 598 13 125 692 1,542 1,246	\$ 840.00 2,965.00 6,383.00 850.00 1,270.00 10,041.00 19,246.00 18,800.00 4,500.00
0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 14 0 0 0 0 0	No Yes No No Yes No Yes No No	313 14 510 53 217 45 70 521 563	1,119 9 2,493 160 660 163 128 1,700 1,513	10,702.00 537.04 18,773.00 0 8,161.00 3,103.00 1,988.00 3,200.00 14,505.25
0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 4 0	No No Yes 0 No No No Yes No	65 281 145 0 478 223 79 137 60	321 978 530 0 1,350 200 155 599 160	2,882.00 8,674.00 8,000.00 0 19,000.00 3,500.00 4,950.00 8,673.00 1,500.00
0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5 0 0 6 0 0	Yes No No No No No Yes Yes	227 110 235 270 191 438 0 890	1,274 250 553 1,100 491 1,144 12 1,610	12,703.00 3,204.00 13,437.00 10,285.00 9,070.00 16,977.00 0
0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 1 0 0	No Yes No No No Yes No	136 1,000 30 324 54 56 99 25	365 1,200 140 618 112 188 672 40	4,761.00 15,921.00 2,660.00 10,602.00 1,848.00 1,763.00 4,960.00
0 0 0 0 0 0	4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Yes Yes Yes No 0 No No Yes	317 547 227 20 0 156 225 96	1,455 1,744 617 30 0 429 450 508	25,174.00 25,737.00 7,415.00 800.00 0 3,104.00 4,531.00 4,251.00
0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 2 1 0 0 0 0	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes O	357 650 227 200 250 200 0 1,000	1,365 2,169 666 315 1,100 552 0 1,500	8,920.00 24,400.00 6,541.00 3,600.00 12,000.00 5,300.00
7	99	No 50 Yes 63	29,393	95,965	\$1,116,033.0

SCHOOL TRA	NSPORTATION—Continued
------------	-----------------------

Name of County	Estimated Cost 1938-39	Regulations Other than State Board	How Salary of Driver Determined	Carry Liability Insurance
	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Larue Laurel Lawrence Lee Leslie Letcher Lewis Lincoln Livingston	\$ 1,260.00 6,250.00 8,000.00 2,000.00 1,500.00 10,000.00 17,000.00 17,000.00 6,000.00	No No No Yes No No No	Board Board Board Bids and Board Board Board Bids Salary Schedule Board	No Yes No Yes Yes No Owners No
Logan Lyon Madison Magoffin Marion Marshall Martin Mason McCracken	13,450.00 200.00 19,464.00 2,100.00 9,529.00 3,000.00 32,500.00 14,000.00	Yes No No Yes No No No No Yes	Bids Bids Bids and Board Salary Schedule Bids Board Bids Board Board Salary Schedule	NQ No Drivers No No Yes NQ NQ Yes
McCreary McLean Meade Menifee Mercer Metcalfe Monroe Montgomery Morgan	3,400.00 8,874.00 10,894.00 0 19,500.00 3,700.00 911.00 8,770.00 4,500.00	No Yes Yes O No No No No No	Board Board Bids 0 Bids Board Bids Bids Bids	No Drivers Owners 0 No Yes Yes Yes Yes
Muhlenberg Nelson Nelson Ohio Oldham Owen Owsley Pendleton	10,500.00 5,044.00 14,300.00 12,850.00 10,000.00 17,000.00 100.00 13,000.00	No No No No No No No	Bids Bids Bids Bids Board Bids No Board	No No Yes No No No No No
Perry Pike Powell Pulaski Robertson Rockcastle Rowan Russell	5,200.00 17,700.00 2,275.00 2,650.00 2,149.00 1,800.00 5,550.00 441.00	No Yes Yes No No Yes No	Board Board Bids Bids and Board Bids No Bids Bids Bids	No No Yes No No No Contractor
Scott Shelby Simpson Spencer Faylor Fodd Frigg Frimble	26,174.00 25,500.00 8,830.00 1,000.00 4,500.00 6,000.00 5,650.00	No No No O No No No	Board Bids Board Bids 0 Bids Board Board	Yes Owners Owners Yes 0 No No No
Union Warren Washington Wayne Webster Whitley Wolfe Woodford	13,900.00 27,900.00 9,340.00 4,500.00 12,000.00 6,400.00	No No No No No O Yes	Bids and Board Bids and Board Board Bids Salary Schedule Board 0 Board	No No No Yes Yes 0 No
oJulotu	15,000.00	Tes		
Totals	\$1,116,517.00	No 92 Yes 21	Bid and Board 10   Salary Schedule 6   Mileage 2	No   70   Yes   28   Owner   6   Operator   Driver   5   Contractor   2

Traffic Law Obeyed	Safety Regulations	Drivers under 21 Years of Age	Any High School Boys as Drivers
	(17)	(18)	(19)
Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes No Partly Yes Yes	No Yes No State Regulations No Special Patrol No Yes No	No No No No Yes No No No	No No No No Yes Yes No
Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ares Yes No	Yes No State Regulations State and Local Yes Yes Yes State Regulations No	No No No No Yes No No No	No No No Yes No No No
No No Yes O Partly No Partly Yes Partly	State Regulations No Yes 0 0 State Regulations No No Safety Zones No	No No No O No No No No No	No No No No No No No
Yes Partly Yes No No Partly No Yes	No No No No Safety Patrols School Bus Patrols No School Patrols	No No No No No No No	No No No No No No Yes
No No Yes Partly Yes No Partly Yes	No Yes No Yes No No Yes No	No No No No No No No	No No No No No No No
Yes No No Partly 0 Partly No Partly	School Boy Patrol No Junior Patrol No Instruction Special Patrols	No No Yes No O No No No	No No No No O No No No
Yes Partly Partly No Partly Partly Partly O Partly	Special Patrols Safety Patrols No No State Regulations State Regulations O Instruction	No No No No No O	NO NO NO NO NO 0 NO
Yes 51 No 34 Partly 28	Yes 66 No 47	Yes 11 No 102	Yes 7 No 106

