



Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Student Transportation

**Transportation Efficiency Review of  
2015-16 School Year Transportation Operations  
For Everett School District**

5/19/2017

## Table of Contents

|                                                                           |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Executive Summary .....                                                   | 3  |
| Report Process and Review Methodology .....                               | 4  |
| Section One: STARS Relative Efficiency Rating .....                       | 4  |
| Section Two: Key Performance Indicators .....                             | 5  |
| A. Basic KPI Riders .....                                                 | 5  |
| B. Special Education Rider KPI .....                                      | 6  |
| C. Cost per Rider KPI .....                                               | 6  |
| Section Three: Review of District Transportation Operations .....         | 7  |
| A. Policies and Procedures .....                                          | 7  |
| B. Transportation Operations .....                                        | 8  |
| C. Geographic and Other Constraints .....                                 | 9  |
| Section Four: Comments .....                                              | 9  |
| A. Comments Regarding the STARS Efficiency Rating .....                   | 9  |
| B. Comments Regarding the KPI .....                                       | 10 |
| C. Comments Regarding the District Transportation Operations Review ..... | 11 |
| D. District Comments Regarding the RTC Efficiency Review Process .....    | 11 |

## Appendices

Appendix I Efficiency Detail Report

Appendix II Key Performance Indicators

## Executive Summary

Everett School District had a full time equivalent enrollment for the 2015–16 school year of 19,560.62 students. Of those enrolled, Everett provided home-to-school transportation service for an average of 12,450 basic program riders and 1,576 special program riders per day (combined AM and PM student counts). The district operated 127 school buses to provide this service, at a cost of \$9,198,558.33. The March 2017 relative efficiency rating for Everett School District (based on data from the 2015-16 school year) was 100%.

Everett School District's March 2015 relative efficiency rating (based on data from the 2013–14 school year) was 100.0% and the March 2016 relative efficiency rating (based on data from the 2014–15 school year) was 84.03%.

A review by the Regional Transportation Coordinator (RTC) is required for school districts with a relative efficiency rating less than 90%. RTCs also conduct follow-up reviews for districts moving above 90%. The RTC review was conducted by Anna Esquibel from Northwest Educational Service District 189.

The purpose of this report is to identify changes implemented in the district's transportation operations since the 2014-15 school year.

The regional transportation coordinator found that the most significant factors affecting the district's improved relative efficiency rating were:

- A high number of McKinney Vento students which are transported to and from 27 neighboring school districts require continuous adaptation of routes and resources.
- The geographic constraints of the I-5 corridor and peak hour Boeing traffic pose challenges to the district.

### Overall Summary:

The Everett School District continues to take measures to strive for as much efficiency as possible. The district has an excellent efficiency rating of 100% and adjusted prior year expenses are fully funded.

## Report Process and Review Methodology

A detailed description of the STARS efficiency rating process is available upon request. The detailed rating process description provides detailed guidance of the rating calculation.

Key Performance Indicators (KPI) material is included in this document, but for an explanation of each indicator and the methodology, please see the Key Performance Indicators Technical Assistance Paper, which is available upon request.

The approach used for the 2017 review of a school district's transportation program involves four sections:

1. Review of the district's STARS relative efficiency rating;
2. Review of the district's Key Performance Indicators (KPI);
3. Review of the school district's school transportation operations, including identifying constraints and changes from prior years (if any); and
4. Comments on the material provided by the regional transportation coordinator and school district staff.

Using this process, the district's transportation program is evaluated for the efficient use of state fiscal resources. The goal of this process is to attempt to identify best practices that districts can apply to minimize the costs of operating their transportation service.

## Section One: STARS Relative Efficiency Rating

The STARS efficiency rating system uses Data Envelopment Analysis to calculate a relative efficiency rating for each school district's transportation operations. The results are displayed in the STARS Efficiency Detail Report.

The relative efficiency rating for the Everett School District, which was released in March of 2017, was 100%. As a result, there is no longer a requirement for an efficiency review of the district's transportation operations.

### **Regional Transportation Coordinator Analysis:**

Transportation operations and a school district's efficiency score is often influenced by operational changes made by other efficiency cohort school districts.

In the case of Everett School District, the greatest impact on its efficiency score appears to have been an addition of eighteen reported route buses because the district moved from use of car/vans to school buses. The addition of buses allowed the district to submit routes which significantly increased their claimed destinations from 38 to 85. The combined change of additional buses, destinations, and a modest rise in student ridership resulted in the absence of cohort districts in the efficiency detail report. Because there are no identified cohorts, the district is now compared to itself and therefore has a 100% efficiency score.

## Section Two: Key Performance Indicators

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are useful in comparing and evaluating specific operational outcomes. This section of the efficiency review process uses three Key Performance Indicators (KPI): the average number of basic program riders per basic program bus; the average number of special education riders per special education bus; and the average cost per rider. These three comparative measurements embody a quantitative process where the outcome is readily visible and easily understood. The comparative results provide a quick analytical assessment based on a ranking order. These three KPI are helpful in translating efficiency into “ground level” concepts.

In addition to each district’s KPI, a KPI cohort is developed. The KPI cohort is comprised of the 20 most similar districts (ten above and ten below) to Everett School District based on total ridership.

### A. Basic KPI Riders

| Basic Program Riders per Basic Program Bus KPI by School Year |         |         |                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------------------------|
| 2013-14                                                       | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | Change<br>2014-15 to 2015-16 |
| 55.38                                                         | 85.08   | 86.16   | 1.27%                        |

This KPI attempts to measure the efficiency of the district’s basic program transportation by calculating the average number of students carried on basic program school buses.

General comment: independent of other factors, an **increase** in the number of basic riders per basic school bus from year to year reflects an **increase** in efficiency.

### Regional Transportation Coordinator Analysis:

In the 2014–15 school year, Everett transported an average of 85.08 basic program students per basic program bus. In the 2015–16 school year, this changed to an average of 86.16 basic program students per bus. This was a increase of 1.27%.

The district ranks 14<sup>th</sup> in the Basic Riders KPI within their 21 district KPI cohort. The average basic students per basic bus among all 4<sup>th</sup> quartile districts statewide is 82.79.

## B. Special Education Rider KPI

Special Education Riders per Special Education Bus KPI by School Year

| 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | Change<br>2014-15 to 2015-16 |
|---------|---------|---------|------------------------------|
| 7.69    | 9.30    | 8.53    | -8.3%                        |

### Regional Transportation Coordinator Analysis:

This KPI attempts to measure the efficiency of the district's special education transportation by calculating the average number of students carried on special education school buses. It is important to note that special education students may require specialized transportation that limits a district's ability to maximize bus utilization. In special education transportation, student needs preempt efficiency concerns.

General comment: independent of other factors, an **increase** in the number of special education riders per special program school bus from year to year reflects an **increase** in efficiency.

In the 2014–15 school year, Everett transported an average of 9.30 special education students per special education bus. In the 2015–16 school year, the district transported an average of 8.53 special education students per bus. This was a decrease of 8.3%.

The district ranks 9<sup>th</sup> in the Special Education Riders KPI within their 21 district cohort. The average Special Riders per Special Bus among all 4<sup>th</sup> quartile districts statewide is 8.29.

## C. Cost per Rider KPI

Cost per Student KPI by School Year

| 2013-14     | 2014-15     | 2015-16     | Change<br>2014-15 to 2015-16 |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|
| \$ 1,068.47 | \$ 1,266.60 | \$ 1,311.55 | 3.55%                        |

### Regional Transportation Coordinator Analysis:

This KPI attempts to measure the overall efficiency of the district's transportation operation by calculating the average cost of transporting a student.

General comment: independent of other factors, a **decrease** in the average cost of transporting a student from year to year reflects an **increase** in efficiency.

In the 2014–15 school year, Everett's average cost per rider was \$1,266.60. In the 2015–16 school year, the district's average cost per rider was \$1,311.55. This was an increase of 3.55%.

The district ranks 17<sup>th</sup> in the Cost per Rider within their 21 district KPI cohort. The average cost per rider among all 4<sup>th</sup> quartile districts statewide is \$1,106.70.

For districts able to break out the average cost per student between the basic program and the special education program, the year to year change in these values can assist the district in evaluating their transportation operations. However, the workload to break out these costs by program can be substantial.

## Section Three: Review of District Transportation Operations

The review of district transportation operations is grouped in three areas:

- Policies and Procedures
- Transportation Operations
- Geographic and Other Constraints

The goal of the district review process is to identify changes that the district has made that impact the cost of providing transportation service. The identification of constraints the district faces can help in identifying solutions so that these solutions can be shared with other districts.

### A. Policies and Procedures

Policies are the desired high level outcomes as articulated by the school district board of directors. The school district administration and transportation staff develop procedures to accomplish the policy objectives. Examples may include providing transportation for out-of-district 'choice' students or establishing a 2-mile walk area for high school students.

#### **Regional Transportation Coordinator Observations:**

The Everett School District policies and procedures are supportive of transportation efficiency. Primarily, transportation is provided by Durham School Services and a significant portion of additional special program transportation is provided by the district. The district administration is satisfied that both sources of transportation service reflect the district's mandate for efficiency.

Students are required to walk to school inside one radius mile unless hazardous conditions meet established criteria as established by the RCW 28A.160.160 process.

Paid call out time for drivers is relatively low at 45 minutes per instance. The daily hourly guarantee is 3.0 hours per day with no drivers working less than the minimum guarantee. Although drivers are allowed to take extra trips which start them in overtime, the contractor utilizes the option to select drivers that will not go into overtime. These measures indicate that the contractor makes efficient use of paid driver time.

## B. Transportation Operations

Transportation operations include all the organizational processes used to manage and run the transportation program on a daily basis from routing to payroll. The age of the fleet impacts maintenance costs, as does a good preventative maintenance program. Any district changes in operations that could significantly impact the efficiency or cost of operations should be noted. Examples include combining routes to reduce the number of buses or increasing buses to reduce student ride times.

### Regional Transportation Coordinator Observations:

| Transportation Expenditures (STARS Prior Year Expenditures) by School Year |                 |                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 2013-14                                                                    | 2014-15         | 2015-16         |
| \$ 6,885,902.34                                                            | \$ 8,427,813.54 | \$ 9,198,588.33 |

District's transportation increased 6.88% between 2013-14 and 2014-15, and increased 8.4% between 2014-15 and 2015-16.

The transportation budget for each year is based on the contractor's actual operation cost and is adjusted annually. If a threshold of 10% increase or decrease in agreed upon expenditures is reached, the contract between the district and contractor requires an adjustment to the agreement.

To/from school transportation is provided by the contractor including specialized transportation that either fits into existing routes or can otherwise be provided for. Additionally, Everett school district operates a separate fleet of buses and vans to accommodate a significant number of McKinney Vento and other special program students. The district works closely with the contractor and conveys foreseen increases or decreases in student transportation trends and needs. The partnership allows the contractor to keep costs down.

The district experienced a funding short fall of \$1,287,821 in 2014-15. The district met with OSPI on August 3, 2015 to determine the cause of the shortfall. It was identified that the use of vans (8 passenger capacity) for out of district McKinney-Vento students was lowering the number of destinations within STARS. In the 2015-16 school year, the district shifted their use of vans to buses in order to report the routes, and specifically their destinations, in order to mitigate another funding shortfall that year.

## C. Geographic and Other Constraints

Geographic constraints can impact the ability of a school district to maximize efficiency. Identifying methods to minimize the impacts of constraints can assist other districts facing similar challenges. Examples of constraints include geographic constraints such as large bodies of water, minimal student density or urban traffic congestion.

### **Regional Transportation Coordinator Observations:**

Everett School District is one of the largest transporters of homeless students in Washington State. The district shares the cost and resources required to transport student population to and from 27 other school districts in the Puget Sound area as far away as Highline, Snoqualmie Valley, Sultan and Sedro-Woolley. This legal constraint requires continuous adaptation of routes and resources and the situation does not lend itself to the kind of strategic planning that more established routes afford.

Everett's geographic constraints are also significant. The district has a 2 ½ mile by 15-mile-long district profile which is bisected by the I-5 corridor. North and Southbound Boeing traffic on I-5 results in severe rush hour conditions that impact transportation in the afternoon. Considering the number of out-of-district students transported by the district, traffic congestion on the interstate adds further weight to this constraint. Roadway connectivity within the district is hindered by East and Westbound travel across I-5, as well as areas of limited road access to pockets of students on the east side of the district.

## Section Four: Comments

### A. Comments Regarding the STARS Efficiency Rating

#### **Regional Transportation Coordinator Comments:**

Providing school districts an easy to understand validation of the STARS efficiency rating system is problematic because of the complexity of the mathematical process and the multitude of unique district student transportation operational factors not included in the STARS calculation. Consequently, this can skew the district's relative efficiency score.

Student transportation dynamics unique to school districts that STARS cannot or does not equitably consider minimizes the accuracy of this complicated efficiency rating system. A school district may be extremely limited in its ability to control unique site characteristics that may be contributing to an unfair cohort selection and peer comparison. Unique geography, negotiated salaries and benefits, a one-time expense targeting improved

student safety, maintaining an operational standard, geo-economic differences, or something as simple as a lower than average fleet age are examples of differing variables between school districts that the efficiency rating system cannot equitably compare.

Using both the STARS Efficiency Review process and the KPI process can present the district with an opportunity to evaluate two measuring methodologies in concert, which can provide a more accurate approach for appraising overall efficiency and operational performance.

There is a significant offset between the time of an efficiency review and the time when changes to transportation operations can be implemented. Many changes in transportation operations can only be made at the beginning of a school year. Because changing bell times or other operational changes have a significant impact on parents, students and district staff, changes must be undertaken in a manner that provides an opportunity for involvement of all stakeholders. In some cases, changes are also subject to bargaining agreement constraints.

**School District Comments:**

The district has no additional comments.

**B. Comments Regarding the KPI**

**Regional Transportation Coordinator Comments:**

Using both the STARS Efficiency Review process and the KPI process can present the district with an opportunity to evaluate two measuring methodologies in concert, which can be a more accurate approach for appraising overall efficiency and operational performance.

- Basic Program Riders per Basic Program Bus increased in efficiency by 1.27%
- Special Education Riders per Special Education Bus decreased in efficiency by 8.3%
- Cost per Student Rider KPI by School Year decreased in efficiency by 3.56%

The efficiency challenge primarily lies in the transportation of special program students.

**School District Comments:**

The district has no additional comments.

## **C. Comments Regarding the District Transportation Operations Review**

### **Regional Transportation Coordinator Comments:**

The district is doing a good job of transporting students efficiently. Choices to shift transportation onto school buses from vans has allowed the district to report destinations for special transportation. The district is encouraged to continue to use the funding simulator to align the number of destinations which impacts both funding and expenditures.

### **School District Comments:**

The district has no additional comments.

## **D. District Comments Regarding the RTC Efficiency Review Process**

The district has no additional comments.

**Superintendent of Public Instruction**  
School Year 2016-2017 - Everett School District  
Efficiency Detail Report

**EVERETT**

| EVERETT |                |        |                         |       | Workload     |                | Site Characteristics (>) |                 |           |       | Site Characteristics (<) |                        |
|---------|----------------|--------|-------------------------|-------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Cohort  | District       | Weight | Prior Year Expenditures | Buses | Basic Riders | Special Riders | Avg Distance             | Number of Dest. | Land Area | K Rte | Road Miles per Sq Mile   | Students Per Road Mile |
|         | Everett        |        | \$9,198,558.33          | 127   | 12,450       | 1,576          | 2.80                     | 85              | 38.1      | 0     | 13.68                    | 26.87                  |
| Cohort  | Everett        | 100.0% | \$9,198,558.33          | 127   | 12,450       | 1,576          | 2.80                     | 85              | 38.1      | 0     | 13.68                    | 26.87                  |
| Target  | Everett Target | 100%   | \$9,198,558.33          | 127   |              |                |                          |                 |           |       |                          |                        |

**Relative Efficiency Rating**

100.00%

Site Characteristics (>) are those characteristics where a larger number is more challenging

Site Characteristics (<) are those characteristics where a smaller number is more challenging



Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Student Transportation

**Key Performance Indicators**  
**Technical Assistance Paper**  
Customized for Everett School District

April 2017

## Overview

The use of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) provides a straightforward method of analyzing school district transportation operational efficiency.

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the Regional Transportation Coordinators (RTCs) have standardized the use of three widely recognized KPI:

1. Basic program riders per basic program bus;
2. Special education riders per special education bus; and
3. Average cost per rider.

The value of KPI cannot be analyzed independent of a school district's characteristics. For instance, a rural district may be unable to fill a school bus given the student density. In a similar way, a school district's special education rider KPI is constrained by the number of special education students, where they live and their transportation requirements.

The three KPI are evaluated using the information gathered through the STARS system. The analysis is done across multiple school years to determine trends in student ridership and the cost of transportation service.

The KPI can also be used in comparison to other districts. Since larger districts have more ability to take advantage of economies of scale, the comparison to other districts is done using 20 districts that are close in total student ridership.

Districts wishing additional information or analysis on this report should contact their regional transportation coordinator. Contact information is available at:  
<http://www.k12.wa.us/Transportation/coordinators.aspx>

## Discussion of the Key Performance Indicators

Key Performance Indicators are sometimes referred to as "benchmarks". The current view within the industry is that the term benchmark has connotations of being a one-size-fits-all standard that provides a hard quantitative line between efficient and inefficient transportation operations. However, actual student transportation operational efficiency is subject to many conditions totally outside school district control. For instance, the geographic distribution of students may place severe constraints on the district's operational efficiency. As an example, in a rural district there may be one student living a great distance up a canyon or isolated highway. Similarly, a special

education student may require expensive individualized transportation service. Two districts with otherwise similar conditions may vary in their relative efficiency rating or KPI numbers due to situations such as these. KPI by themselves do not reveal the existence of these extenuating factors (nor does the STARS Efficiency Rating).

The primary strength of KPI is when they are used over time to provide an ongoing method of evaluating one district's transportation operations. Year to year review of the basic statistics revealed by the KPI should be an essential part of each district's self-evaluation of their transportation department's performance.

Some additional description of these individual KPI and how the data collected through STARS is used to calculate each KPI may help to clarify their relevance and their impact on a district's STARS efficiency rating.

### **Basic Program Riders per Basic Program Bus**

The number of basic program riders per basic program bus is a critical measure of efficiency. For calculating the riders per bus, the total student ridership count (the combined AM plus PM count collected through the STARS reporting process) is divided by two in order to reflect students per bus. The number of buses used is collected from STARS routing data.

### **Special Education Riders per Special Education Bus**

As in the basic riders KPI, the total special education student ridership count (combined AM plus PM) is divided by two and the bus count is collected from STARS route data.

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 392-172A-02095 says that school districts should, when possible, limit the one-way transportation times for special education students to no more than 60 minutes. A district may also have one or more students with an IEP that requires individual transportation (without other students). These two factors can restrain efficiency.

Greater inclusion of special needs students onto basic education buses is to be encouraged where possible. Greater inclusion may result in fewer overall special education routes (reducing expenditures), but may result in lower special riders per special bus ratios ... since the remaining special needs students may demand a higher level of individualized service.

Overall, this KPI category is one that should be carefully evaluated to ensure that student needs are prioritized.

### **Average Cost per Rider**

This KPI provides the district's average cost of transporting students to school. Again, the total student ridership count (combined AM plus PM) is divided by two in order to reflect an average cost per student. This KPI reflects all students provided with transportation in the special program categories and not just special education students.

Special education students typically will generate a significantly higher cost per student due to fewer students per bus, greater distances between stops and

longer routes. Districts that are able to break out costs between basic program and special program are encouraged to do so for the additional benefit it will provide.

## District KPI

The Everett School District's KPI are as follows:

### 1. Basic program riders per basic program bus KPI

| Basic Rider KPI<br>2013-14 | Basic Rider KPI<br>2014-15 | Basic Rider KPI<br>2015-16 | Change in<br>Basic Rider<br>KPI |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 55.38                      | 85.08                      | 86.16                      | 1.27%                           |

General comment: independent of other factors, an increase in the number of basic riders per basic school bus from year to year reflects an increase in efficiency.

### 2. Special education riders per special education bus KPI

| Special Ed<br>Rider KPI<br>2013-14 | Special Ed<br>Rider KPI<br>2014-15 | Special Ed<br>Rider KPI<br>2015-16 | Change in<br>Special Ed<br>Rider KPI |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 7.69                               | 9.3                                | 8.53                               | - 8.3 %                              |

General comment: independent of other factors, an increase in the number of special education riders per school bus from year to year reflects an increase in efficiency.

If a school district does not have special education students requiring transportation, this KPI has limited meaning, except to be noted when comparing the overall cost per rider KPI with another district of similar size that does have special needs students requiring transportation.

### 3. Average cost per rider KPI

| Average Cost per Rider KPI 2013-14 | Average Cost per Rider KPI 2014-15 | Average Cost per Rider KPI 2015-16 | Change in Average Cost per Rider KPI |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| \$ 1,068.47                        | \$ 1,266.6                         | \$ 1,311.55                        | 3.55%                                |

General comment: independent of other factors, a decrease in the average cost per rider from year to year reflects an increase in efficiency.

## Cohort District KPI

To further provide comparison with similar districts, a KPI cohort is developed. This cohort is based on sorting all school districts by total students transported and selecting ten districts above and below the district in question, when possible. For districts at either end of the student load spectrum, the closest twenty are selected. The resulting group is referred to as the KPI cohort. Each district is compared within this group for each KPI. The next four pages show the four tables developed to display the KPI Cohort information. Each table has the district highlighted in yellow. The sort order of each table is determined based on having the number representing the greatest efficiency at the top of the table.

Generally, if all districts had exactly identical student ridership requirements, identical geographic constraints and were similar in the other factors impacting the efficiency of transportation of operations, the districts should remain in the same order. A rise in the

district placement in a KPI table indicates more efficient operations compared to the districts lower in the table. A drop in placement reflects less efficient operations relative to the other districts.

KPI Technical Assistance Paper  
April, 2017

Table 1

Table 1 shows the KPI cohort group. This table shows the districts that will be used for comparison in the following tables. It may be worthwhile noting the range in student ridership within the cohort, as larger student ridership provides more opportunities for routing efficiently. These are referred to as 'efficiencies of scale' and are common in all efficiency evaluations.

| District        | Total Riders<br>2015-16 |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| BETHEL          | 9,908.4                 |
| KENT            | 9,527.7                 |
| VANCOUVER       | 8,874.1                 |
| NORTSHORE       | 8,779.2                 |
| LAKE WASHINGTON | 8,206.2                 |
| ISSAQUAH        | 8,192.8                 |
| FEDERAL WAY     | 7,687.3                 |
| PUYALLUP        | 7,617.4                 |
| TACOMA          | 7,476.6                 |
| EDMONDS         | 7,346.8                 |
| EVERETT         | 7,013.5                 |
| BELLEVUE        | 6,757.7                 |
| NORTH THURSTON  | 6,415.9                 |
| AUBURN          | 6,369.1                 |
| SPOKANE         | 5,935.1                 |
| RENTON          | 5,686.1                 |
| BATTLE GROUND   | 5,672.4                 |
| HIGHLINE        | 5,531.8                 |
| MUKILTEO        | 5,499.6                 |
| CLOVER PARK     | 5,406.4                 |
| PASCO           | 5,242.6                 |

Table 2

This table shows the districts sorted in descending order by the value of their Basic Rider per bus KPI.

| Change in rank |                 |                      |                                    |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
|                | District        | Total Riders 2015-16 | Basic Riders Per Basic Bus 2015-16 |
| +10            | FEDERAL WAY     | 7,687.3              | 132.8                              |
| +9             | EDMONDS         | 7,346.8              | 125.4                              |
| +8             | NORTH THURSTON  | 6,415.9              | 121.5                              |
| +7             | NORTHSHORE      | 8,779.2              | 121.1                              |
| +6             | VANCOUVER       | 8,874.1              | 113.1                              |
| +5             | LAKE WASHINGTON | 8,206.2              | 111.7                              |
| +4             | RENTON          | 5,686.1              | 110.6                              |
| +3             | HIGHLINE        | 5,531.8              | 110.1                              |
| +2             | MUKILTEO        | 5,499.6              | 108.2                              |
| +1             | KENT            | 9,527.7              | 105.2                              |
|                | AUBURN          | 6,369.1              | 100.0                              |
| -1             | BETHEL          | 9,908.4              | 97.2                               |
| -2             | ISSAQUAH        | 8,192.8              | 91.0                               |
| -3             | EVERETT         | 7,013.5              | 86.2                               |
| -4             | PUYALLUP        | 7,617.4              | 85.0                               |
| -5             | CLOVER PARK     | 5,406.4              | 80.1                               |
| -6             | BELLEVUE        | 6,757.7              | 77.0                               |
| -7             | TACOMA          | 7,476.6              | 70.5                               |
| -8             | BATTLE GROUND   | 5,672.4              | 60.2                               |
| -9             | SPOKANE         | 5,935.1              | 56.5                               |
| -10            | PASCO           | 5,242.6              | 54.0                               |

Table 3

This table shows the districts sorted in descending order by the value of their Special Education riders per Special Education bus KPI.

| Change in rank | District        | Total Riders 2015-16 | SpEd Riders Per SpEd Bus 2015-16 |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| +10            | KENT            | 9,527.7              | 11.8                             |
| +9             | NORTH THURSTON  | 6,415.9              | 9.3                              |
| +8             | FEDERAL WAY     | 7,687.3              | 9.0                              |
| +7             | PASCO           | 5,242.6              | 8.9                              |
| +6             | VANCOUVER       | 8,874.1              | 8.8                              |
| +5             | PUYALLUP        | 7,617.4              | 8.7                              |
| +4             | HIGHLINE        | 5,531.8              | 8.7                              |
| +3             | LAKE WASHINGTON | 8,206.2              | 8.6                              |
| +2             | EVERETT         | 7,013.5              | 8.5                              |
| +1             | CLOVER PARK     | 5,406.4              | 8.5                              |
|                | MUKILTEO        | 5,499.6              | 8.5                              |
| -1             | TACOMA          | 7,476.6              | 8.4                              |
| -2             | SPOKANE         | 5,935.1              | 8.3                              |
| -3             | RENTON          | 5,686.1              | 8.2                              |
| -4             | EDMONDS         | 7,346.8              | 8.1                              |
| -5             | NORTHSHORE      | 8,779.2              | 7.9                              |
| -6             | AUBURN          | 6,369.1              | 7.5                              |
| -7             | BETHEL          | 9,908.4              | 7.0                              |
| -8             | BELLEVUE        | 6,757.7              | 6.9                              |
| -9             | BATTLE GROUND   | 5,672.4              | 5.5                              |
| -10            | ISSAQUAH        | 8,192.8              | 5.3                              |

For districts without Special Education students requiring specialized transportation, the table is only useful while reviewing potential reasons for differences in the next table, Average Cost per Rider.

Table 4

This table shows the districts sorted in ascending order by the value of their Cost per Rider KPI. This sorts reflects that efficiency in this KPI is reflected by a lower cost per student, rather than higher numbers of riders per bus.

| Change in rank | District        | Total Riders 2015-16 | Cost Per Rider 2015-16 |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| +10            | NORTH THURSTON  | 6,415.9              | \$ 834.63              |
| +9             | ISSAQUAH        | 8,192.8              | \$ 855.18              |
| +8             | KENT            | 9,527.7              | \$ 874.21              |
| +7             | NORTHSHORE      | 8,779.2              | \$ 905.20              |
| +6             | VANCOUVER       | 8,874.1              | \$ 930.22              |
| +5             | BELLEVUE        | 6,757.7              | \$ 985.56              |
| +4             | AUBURN          | 6,369.1              | \$ 1,076.97            |
| +3             | LAKE WASHINGTON | 8,206.2              | \$ 1,084.86            |
| +2             | FEDERAL WAY     | 7,687.3              | \$ 1,085.58            |
| +1             | CLOVER PARK     | 5,406.4              | \$ 1,087.45            |
|                | BETHEL          | 9,908.4              | \$ 1,093.63            |
| -1             | HIGHLINE        | 5,531.8              | \$ 1,167.89            |
| -2             | MUKILTEO        | 5,499.6              | \$ 1,175.66            |
| -3             | PUYALLUP        | 7,617.4              | \$ 1,180.54            |
| -4             | BATTLE GROUND   | 5,672.4              | \$ 1,197.69            |
| -5             | RENTON          | 5,686.1              | \$ 1,250.08            |
| -6             | EVERETT         | 7,013.5              | \$ 1,311.55            |
| -7             | PASCO           | 5,242.6              | \$ 1,342.39            |
| -8             | TACOMA          | 7,476.6              | \$ 1,351.73            |
| -9             | EDMONDS         | 7,346.8              | \$ 1,376.40            |
| -10            | SPOKANE         | 5,935.1              | \$ 1,488.08            |