



Alternative School Transportation of Students by County Boards

Education Article §7-801 – Effective June 30, 2026

Pupil Transportation and Emergency Management Branch
December 2025



MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Carey M. Wright, Ed.D.

State Superintendent of Schools

Krishnanda Tallur

Chief Operating Officer

Office of Finance and Operations

Wes Moore

Governor

December 1, 2025

Chair Brian Feldman
Education, Energy, and the
Environment Committee
11 Bladen Street, Suite 2 West
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Chair Vanessa Atterbeary
Ways and Means Committee
Taylor House Office Building, Room 131
6 Bladen St.
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Re: Report required by Education Article – Effective June 30, 2026, Chapters 197 and 198 of the Acts of 2021

Dear Senator Feldman and Delegate Atterbeary,

In accordance with the reporting requirements set forth in Chapters 197 and 198 of the Acts of 2021, effective through June 30, 2026, and codified under §7-801(c) of the Education Article, I am pleased to submit the enclosed report on student transportation practices for the period covering the 2018–2019 through 2024–2025 school years.

This report reflects our commitment to ensuring safe, equitable, and efficient transportation for all students, particularly those with unique needs or limited access to traditional school bus services.

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact Laurel Cratsley, Education Policy Program Analyst, Government Affairs, Education Policy, and External Relations by phone at (410) 767-0906 or by email at laurel.cratsley@maryland.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Carey M. Wright". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Carey M. Wright, Ed.D.
State Superintendent of Schools

Table of Contents

Background	6
Reporting Requirement	7
County Board Submissions	7
Data Analysis	32
Summary	33

Legislative Report: Transportation of Students by County Boards

Pursuant to §7-801, Education Article – Effective June 30, 2026

Chapters 197 and 198 of the Acts of 2021

Prepared for:

Maryland General Assembly
Senate Education, Energy, and the Environment Committee
House Ways and Means Committee

Prepared by:

The Pupil Transportation and Emergency Management Branch
Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

Date:

December 1, 2025

Background

The Maryland General Assembly enacted Chapters 197 and 198 during the 2021 Regular Session in response to growing concerns about the inflexibility and limitations of traditional school transportation systems, particularly in serving students with specialized or nontraditional needs. The legislation was introduced as House Bill 72 and Senate Bill 448, sponsored by Delegate Solomon and Senator Edwards.

The law was designed to expand transportation options for county boards of education by allowing the use of vehicles other than Type I and Type II school buses under specific, regulated conditions. This flexibility was seen as essential for:

- Preschool-age students
- Students with disabilities
- Homeless youth
- Children in foster care
- Students without access to school buses
- Students in nonpublic school placements
- Students in dual enrollment, work-based learning, or off-campus educational programs

KEY PROVISIONS

1. Authorization of Alternative Vehicles

County boards may use non-traditional vehicles (e.g., vans, SUVs) when a school bus cannot reasonably be provided. This includes situations where:

- The student population is small or dispersed
- The transportation need is temporary or specialized
- A school bus would be cost-inefficient or unavailable

2. Regulatory Oversight

The law requires the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), in consultation with the Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) and local boards, to adopt minimum safety standards for:

- Vehicle specifications
- Driver qualifications
- Insurance and inspection requirements

This was accomplished with the passing of revised COMAR 13A.06.07 regulations in 2022.

3. Sunset Clause

The MSDE must compile and submit a comprehensive report to the Senate Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means, by December 1, 2025.

The law includes a termination provision, meaning its continuation is dependent on the findings and recommendations of the 2025 report to the General Assembly.

Reporting Requirement

Under the Acts, each county board of education is required to submit a report to MSDE on or before September 1, 2025, detailing:

- The use of non-Type I/II vehicles for student transportation from 2018–2019 through 2023–2024 school years
- The number and types of vehicles used
- The categories of students transported
- Safety incidents or concerns
- Compliance with adopted safety standards
- Cost comparisons with traditional school bus transportation

MSDE was required to compile these reports and submit a consolidated report to the General Assembly.

County Board Submissions

The MSDE Pupil Transportation/Emergency Management Branch started the collection of Alternative School Vehicle data following the conclusion of the 2021-2022 School year. At the conclusion of each following school year, LEAs were requested to complete a survey that was sent to each LEAs Transportation Director/Supervisor via email. The emails included a link that directed them to a Google Form (2021-2023) and then a Microsoft Form (2024-2025). The data collected from these annual surveys is provided below in alphabetical order by LEA.

Additionally, each LEA was required to submit a spreadsheet with all the types of vehicles used and the owner of the vehicles for each school year. This data is available upon request

The MSDE Pupil Transportation/Emergency Management Branch implemented a comprehensive outreach strategy to ensure LEAs were aware of and completed the required surveys. Initial notifications were sent via email to LEA Transportation Directors at the conclusion of each school year, clearly outlining the purpose and importance of the data collection. To reinforce participation, multiple follow-up communications were conducted, including reminder emails and direct phone calls to address questions and provide assistance. Furthermore, the survey and its significance were highlighted during semi-annual meetings with Transportation Directors, offering an additional opportunity for discussion and clarification. Despite these sustained efforts, a number of LEAs were unable to submit all required surveys, which has resulted in gaps in the data available for this final report.

Allegany County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	5	7	5	5	6	29	11
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	86	0	85	129	150	119	118
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	No Change	Increase d*	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	SWATSB	N/A	N/A	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP	N/A	N/A

* The MSDE Pupil Transportation Branch believes that this response was made in error but was unable to verify due to staff turnover.

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,

CIFC=Children in foster care,

SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,
 SIDEPE=Students in dual enrolled programs,

WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based
 off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Anne Arundel County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	145	152	155	155	153	176	161
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	578	580	545	587	565	559	561
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	10	12	N/A	26	54	45
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	No Change	Increased	Increased	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	HY	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP	HY	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Baltimore City Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	220	216
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP,	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP,

Type II school vehicles?						SIDEP, WP, FT, AC	SIDEP, WP, FT, AC
--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------	-------------------

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Baltimore County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	1000 estimated due to ransom ware attack	1000	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	150 estimate d due to ransom ware attack	150	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE

What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDE, WP, FT, AC	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDE, WP, FT, AC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDE=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Calvert County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	36.5	40.5	40.5	40.5	NO RESPONSE	7	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	150	154	152	138	NO RESPONSE	162	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted	N/A	No Change	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE	No Change	NO RESPONSE

alternative school vehicles?							
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	SWD, HY, SINPSP	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDEP, WP, FT, AC	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Caroline County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	52	57	58	62	61	NO RESPONSE	65
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	13	13	13	13	13	NO RESPONSE	13
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE	Increased
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDE, WP, FT, AC

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Carroll County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	14	14	14	NO RESPONSE	14	14	15
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	259	258	257	NO RESPONSE	354	NA*	360
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	2	7	9
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	SWD, SINPSP	SWD, SINPSP	SWD, SINPSP

* The MSDE Pupil Transportation Branch believes that this response was made in error but was unable to verify due to staff turnover.

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Cecil County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	25	24	24	24	NO RESPONSE	33	23
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	143	200	191	189	NO RESPONSE	186	180
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	NO RESPONSE	71	11
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE	Increased	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	N/A	SWD, HY, CIFC, SINPSP	N/A	NO RESPONSE	SWD, HY, CIFC, SINPSP	SWD, HY, CIFC, SINPSP

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Charles County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	25	20	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	72	72
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	298	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	0*	0*
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	Increased	Increased
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	SWD, HY	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDE, WP, FT, AC

* The MSDE Pupil Transportation Branch believes that this response was made in error. Charles County has approximately 327 contracted buses

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,

CIFC=Children in foster care,

SWD= Students with a Disability

SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,

SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,

WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus,

FT=School related field trips,

AC=School related athletic competition

Dorchester County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	15	16	15	NO RESPONSE	16	16	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	85	89	78	NO RESPONSE	78	77	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	SWD	NO RESPONSE

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Frederick County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	497	NO RESPONSE	509	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	524	538
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	N/A	349*
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	No Change	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A

* The MSDE Pupil Transportation Branch believes that this response was made in error. Frederick County has no contracted buses.

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Garrett County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	3	NO RESPONSE	3	NO RESPONSE	3	3	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	62	NO RESPONSE	0*	NO RESPONSE	112*	58	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	2	NO RESPONSE
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	No Change	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	FT, AC	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	FT, AC	SINPSP	NO RESPONSE

* The MSDE Pupil Transportation Branch believes that this response was made in error but was unable to verify due to staff turnover. Garret had 58 buses in 2025 and that is believed to be similar to past years.

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,

CIFC=Children in foster care,

SWD= Students with a Disability

SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,

SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,

WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,

FT=School related field trips,

AC=School related athletic competition

Harford County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	14	203	187	204	199	NO RESPONSE	218
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	111	96	367	341	525	NO RESPONSE	463
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	99*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	Increase d	No Change	NO RESPONSE	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Preschool-age students; CIFIC	NO RESPONSE	Preschool-age students; SWD; CIFIC

* The MSDE Pupil Transportation Branch believes that this response was made in error but was unable to verify due to staff turnover.

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFIC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Howard County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	16	NO RESPONSE	16	16	17	22	23
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	453	NO RESPONSE	489	419	402	507	672
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	5	NO RESPONSE	11	9	N/A	58	90
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	Homeless	NO RESPONSE	HY,SINPSP	SWD, SINPSP	SWD, HY	SWD, HY, CIFC	SWD; HY; SINPSP; CIFC; Pre-school-age students;

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Kent County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	20	17	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	18	18
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	6	7	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	4	N/A
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	HY, SINPSP	SWD, SINPSP	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	SWD, SINPSP	SWD, SINPSP

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Montgomery County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	1898	NO RESPONSE	2092	NO RESPONSE	2073	2057	2037
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A	N/A
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	28	2	2
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	No Change	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	Medically fragile students	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	HY, CIFC, SWOATSB, SINPSP	HY, CIFC, SWOATSB, SINPSP	HY, CIFC, SWOATSB, SINPSP

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Prince George's County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	2130	1323	NO RESPONSE	1324	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	1401
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	N/A
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	16
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	NO RESPONSE	No Change	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	Increased
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	Homeless Youth

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Queen Anne's County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	34	34	NO RESPONSE	35	NO RESPONSE	33	34
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	76	73	NO RESPONSE	73	NO RESPONSE	49	48
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	NO RESPONSE	No Change	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

St. Mary's County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	26	20	26	23	22	23	24
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	319	315	307	320	333	320	329
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	Increased	Decreased	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	SIDEP, WP, FT	SIDEP WP, FT	SWD, SIDEP, WP, FT	SWD, SIDEP, WP, FT	SWD, SIDEP, WP, FT	SWD, SIDEP, WP, FT	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDEP, WP, FT, AC

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Somerset County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	2	2.5	3	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	3	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	58	65	57	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	58	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	2	4	1	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	10	NO RESPONSE
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	No Change	NO RESPONSE
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	SWD, HY, CIFIC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDE, WP, FT, AC	SWD, HY, CIFIC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDE, WP, FT, AC	SWD, HY, CIFIC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDE, WP, FT, AC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	SWD, HY, CIFIC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDE, WP, FT, AC	NO RESPONSE

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFIC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Talbot County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	49	60	53	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	N/A	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	SWD, SINPSP	SWD, SINPSP	SWD, SINPSP	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Washington County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	169	NO RESPONSE	165	171	187	187	189
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	47	NO RESPONSE	46	45	38	37	53
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Wicomico County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	9	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	9	14	16	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	190	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	185	183	203	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	6	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	7	8	10	NO RESPONSE
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	No Change	No Change	No Change	NO RESPONSE
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	SWD, HY, CIFIC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDEF, WP, FT, AC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	SWD, HY, CIFIC, FT, AC	SWD, HY, CIFIC, FT, AC	SWD, HY, CIFIC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDEF, WP, FT, AC	NO RESPONSE

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFIC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEF=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

Worcester County Public Schools

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	69	69	69	69	69	69	67
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	4	3	N/A	4	5	5	7
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	N/A	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	HY, CIFC, SWATSB, FT, AC	HY, CIFC, SWATSB, FT, AC	HY, CIFC, SWATSB, FT, AC	HY, CIFC, SWATSB, FT, AC	HY, CIFC, SWATSB, FT, AC	HY, CIFC, SWATSB, FT, AC	SWD, HY, CIFC, SWATSB, SINPSP, SIDE, WP, FT, AC

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,
 CIFC=Children in foster care,
 SWD= Students with a Disability
 SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,
 SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDE=Students in dual enrolled programs,
 WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus,
 FT=School related field trips,
 AC=School related athletic competition

The SEED School of Maryland

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
How MANY transportation employees (with benefits) are employed by your school system?	NO RESPONSE	3	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in a Type I or Type II school vehicle during the school year?	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
How MANY contracted drivers transported students in other vehicles authorized under 7-801(c) of the Education Article during the school year?	NO RESPONSE	N/A	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
Have the number of transportation employees with benefits increased or decreased during the school year due to the use of contracted alternative school vehicles?	NO RESPONSE	No Change	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE
What types of students were transported in vehicles other than Type I and Type II school vehicles?	NO RESPONSE	HY, CIFC, SWATSB, FT, AC	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE	NO RESPONSE

Terms

HY=Homeless youth,

CIFC=Children in foster care,

SWD= Students with a Disability

SWATSB=Students without access to school buses,

SINPSP=Students in a non-public school placement,

SIDEP=Students in dual enrolled programs,

WP=Work programs, or other educational programs based off the school campus.,

FT=School related field trips,

AC=School related athletic competition

Data Analysis

The implementation of SB448 and HB72 in Maryland has introduced greater flexibility in student transportation by allowing county boards of education to use alternative vehicles when traditional school buses are not reasonably available. Importantly, this shift has not resulted in adverse effects on contracted school bus drivers or small transportation businesses.

1. Complementary, Not Competitive Use

Alternative vehicles are authorized only when a Type I or Type II school bus cannot reasonably be provided. This ensures that traditional school buses—and the drivers and companies that operate them—remain the primary mode of transportation for the majority of students.

2. Targeted for Special Populations

The legislation specifically supports transportation for:

- Preschool-age children
- Students with disabilities
- Homeless youth
- Children in foster care
- Students in nonpublic placements or off-campus programs

These groups often require specialized or flexible transportation solutions that traditional buses may not be able to accommodate efficiently. This creates new opportunities for small transportation providers to serve niche needs without displacing existing bus contracts.

3. Continued Contracting Opportunities

The Maryland Association of Boards of Education (MABE) has emphasized that the regulations implementing SB448/HB72 must apply insurance and safety standards equally to both school system-owned and contractor-owned vehicles. This ensures that contracted providers remain integral to the transportation ecosystem and are not excluded from participating in alternative vehicle operations.

4. Regulatory Safeguards and Equity

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), in consultation with the Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA), has adopted regulations that maintain high safety standards for all vehicles and drivers, including those operated by contractors. This protects the integrity of the profession and ensures that qualified drivers and businesses continue to play a vital role.

Conclusion

Rather than undermining contracted school bus drivers or small transportation businesses, the continued use of alternative school vehicles under SB448 and HB72 enhances Maryland's transportation framework by:

- Filling service gaps
- Supporting vulnerable student populations
- Creating new contracting opportunities
- Maintaining rigorous safety and operational standards

This balanced approach ensures that traditional providers remain essential, while new competitors can contribute meaningfully to student transportation in Maryland.

Summary

The MSDE Pupil Transportation/Emergency Management Branch has found that the continued use of alternative school vehicles under SB448 and HB72 is not only a practical solution—it is a necessary evolution in Maryland’s approach to equitable student transportation. These legislative measures have empowered county boards to address longstanding logistical challenges, especially in rural, geographically dispersed, or underserved communities where traditional school buses are not always feasible.

By allowing flexibility in vehicle types, the law enables school systems to:

- Ensure consistent access to education for students who might otherwise face transportation barriers.
- Optimize operational costs, particularly in areas with low student density or limited infrastructure.
- Respond swiftly to emergent needs, such as driver shortages or vehicle unavailability, without compromising safety.

Moreover, the regulatory framework established by MSDE and MVA ensures that safety remains paramount. The requirement for minimum standards and compliance with regulations provides a robust safeguard for student well-being. Additionally, if the continued use of alternative school vehicles is allowed under Maryland law, the MSDE is prepared to revise regulations related to driver and vehicle standards for alternative school vehicles in 2026. This will be accomplished by reviewing best practices and involving a diverse group of subject matter experts and transportation staff that oversee the use of these vehicles.

As the General Assembly prepares to review the county-level reports due in September 2025, early indicators suggest that alternative vehicle use has already improved transportation reliability and efficiency. Discontinuing this flexibility would risk reversing these gains and reintroducing inequities in access to education.



Enactment

Maryland General Assembly passes Chapters 197 and 198, authorizing the use of alternative vehicles for student transportation

Regulation Development

MSDE and MVA begin drafting safety and operational standards for alternative vehicles.



Initial Implementation

County boards begin limited use of alternative vehicles under draft guidelines.

Expanded Use

More counties adopt alternative transportation methods; MSDE provides technical assistance



County Reporting Deadline

County boards must submit data on alternative vehicle use by September 1, 2025

Statewide Report Due

MSDE submits a comprehensive report to the Maryland General Assembly by December 1, 2025.



Appendix A: Examples of Alternative School Vehicles



A Baltimore City Public School Alternative School Vehicle.





A Baltimore City Public School Alternative School Vehicle.



A Worcester County Public School Alternative School Vehicle.



A Harford County Public School Alternative School Vehicle.

Appendix B: Adopted Alternative School Driver Vehicle Regulations

13A.06.07.09

Alternative School Vehicle Driver Qualifications and Disqualifications

A. An Alternative School Vehicle Driver Shall:

- (1) Meet all licensing requirements of the Motor Vehicle Administration for a Class A or Class M vehicle respectively;
- (2) Have not more than two current points on the individual's driving record and a satisfactory past driving record as determined by the local supervisor of transportation;
- (3) Be 21 years old or older;
- (4) Be in good health, mature, able to discharge the duties of the position, and able to command the respect of others;
- (5) Receive a negative controlled substance test result; and
- (6) As permitted, is included in the MVA Licensing Monitoring System.

B. Alternative School Vehicle Driver Training

- (1) Alternative school vehicle drivers shall have 4 hours of preservice classroom instruction and 1 hour of behind the wheel instruction.
- (2) Alternative school vehicle drivers shall complete 2 hours of in-service training annually that shall include topics contained in the National Safety Council's Defensive Driving Course.

C. Disqualifications for Criminal Conduct

- (1) An individual may not serve as an alternative school vehicle driver if the individual has been convicted of a criminal charge or if a criminal charge is pending for a crime involving:
 - (a) Child abuse or neglect;
 - (b) Contributing to the delinquency of a minor;
 - (c) Moral turpitude, if the offense bears directly on the individual's fitness to assist minors;
 - (d) A crime of violence as set forth in Criminal Law Article, §14-101, Annotated Code of Maryland; or
 - (e) Any conduct that may endanger the safety of students being transported.

(2) An individual who pled guilty or nolo contendere with respect to, is placed on probation before judgment with respect to, or is convicted of a crime under §B(1) of this regulation, is permanently disqualified from serving as an alternative school vehicle driver.

(3) An individual who pled guilty or nolo contendere with respect to, is placed on probation before judgment with respect to, or is convicted of a controlled substance offense as defined in federal or State law is disqualified from serving as an alternative school vehicle driver for a period of 10 years from the date of the action.

(4) An individual may not serve as an alternative school vehicle driver if the supervisor of transportation has evidence of criminal history, including second degree assault, which in the opinion of the supervisor makes the individual unfit for employment. Evidence of second-degree assault is not deemed to be an automatic reason for disqualification.

D. Disqualification for Unsafe Actions Misfeasance, incompetence, insubordination, or any act or omission that adversely affects transportation or safety may be grounds for disqualification and termination of the alternative school vehicle driver by the supervisor of transportation.

E. Disqualification for Driving Record If an alternative school vehicle driver has three or more current points, they shall be disqualified, and the driver may not operate an alternative school vehicle.

F. Disqualified Alternative School Vehicle Driver Database

(1) The Department's Office of Pupil Transportation shall maintain a confidential computer database of alternative school vehicle drivers who have been disqualified by a local school system under §§ C, D, and E of this regulation or for any other reason.

(2) The supervisor of transportation shall notify the Department's Office of Pupil Transportation of an alternative school vehicle driver disqualification within 30 days of the alternative school vehicle driver receipt of notification of the disqualification.

(3) The notification shall be in the format prescribed by the Department.

(4) Within the first 4 business days after receipt of the current list of active alternative school vehicle drivers, the Department's Office of Pupil Transportation shall match those lists with the Department's confidential computer database established under this regulation and immediately notify the supervisor of transportation if an active alternative school vehicle driver is listed on the Department's computer database. The supervisor of transportation shall respond in writing to the Department verifying receipt of notification and advise of their next appropriate action.

Appendix C: Adopted Alternative School Vehicle Regulations

13A.06.07.12

General Standards

A. A school vehicle or school charter vehicle may not be used to transport students unless a vehicle acceptance sheet as required by the Department has been completed by the supervisor of transportation and is on file in the local transportation office.

B. Type I or Type II school vehicles shall be used to transport students to and from school and school related activities when local school system sponsored transportation services are provided.

C. Vehicles other than Type I or Type II school vehicles and MFSAB vehicles may be used to transport students to and from school if:

(1) The vehicle is a taxicab;

(2) Only one student is transported;

(3) The vehicle used is a commercial motor coach; or

(4) A local board of education determines that it is necessary to own, operate, or contract the use of an alternative school vehicle for student transportation.

D. Alternative School Vehicles

(1) Local boards of education that use alternative school vehicles shall:

(a) Develop written policies and procedures to utilize their alternative school vehicles;

(b) Require that the use of alternative school vehicles not expressly permitted by Education Article, §7-801(c), Annotated Code of Maryland and this chapter must be approved in writing by the local school board of education and must specify the length of time that the approved use of the vehicles will remain in effect;

(c) Carryout the requirements of Transportation Article, §11-154(b)(2), Annotated Code of Maryland;

(d) Require that three-point safety belts and other age-appropriate safety belts and equipment be worn by all passengers and students while in motion;

(e) Require that the designated areas for loading and unloading follow COMAR 11.19.06.05B; and

(f) Have insurance coverage be the same as for other school system-owned Class A, Class M, and contractor-owned vehicles.

E. Alternative School Vehicle Standards

(1) Unless the vehicle is a MFSAB, the vehicle shall:

- (a) Have a Gross Vehicle Weight rating of less than 10,000 lbs. and
- (b) Have a seating capacity of no more than ten passengers not including the driver.

(2) Alternative school vehicles and MFSABs shall have the name of the school district, contractor's name, or other contact information lettered on each side of the body of the vehicle in letters of not less than 2 inches in height and not more than 4 inches in height. Decals are permitted.

(3) Alternative school vehicles and MFSABs may have the words "School Students" in black lettering at least 6 inches in height on a background of National School Bus Yellow located on both sides of the vehicle. Decals or magnetic signs are permitted. Lettering shall conform to Series B of Standard Alphabets for Highway Signs.

(4) Alternative school vehicles and MFSABs shall have an audible back up warning alarm, installed behind the rear axle, that meets the standard under COMAR 11.19.02.24

(5) Alternative school vehicles and MFSABs shall have a first aid kit, fluid clean up kit, and a fire extinguisher located in the storage area, all of which meets the standards under COMAR 11.19.02.25. The vehicle shall have a seat belt cutter that is accessible to the driver.

(6) Video cameras may be installed in alternative school vehicles and MFSABs in line with COMAR 11.19.02.39.

F. Alternative School Vehicle Inspections

(1) Alternative school vehicles and MFSABs shall undergo two inspections each school year in line with COMAR 11.14.02.01-.26. The two inspections shall be conducted more than 120 calendar days apart.

(2) Inspections shall be conducted by the local school system and records of each inspection shall be maintained in the transportation office of the local school system.

(3) Pre/post-trip inspections may be conducted and retained at the local level.

G. A Type I or Type II charter vehicle shall meet the Motor Vehicle Administration requirements for such vehicles.

H. This regulation does not prohibit the transportation of students by commercial motor vehicles that are not exclusively engaged in the transportation of school students or by entities subject to this chapter which own or operate these vehicles.