

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES

Rick Miera, Vice Chair
Nora Espinoza
Jimmie C. Hall
Dennis J. Roch
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Mimi Stewart

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
Phone: (505) 986-4591 Fax: (505) 986-4338
<http://www.nmlegis.gov/lcs/lesc/lescdefault.aspx>



SENATORS

John M. Sapien, Chair
Craig W. Brandt
Gay G. Kernan
Howie C. Morales

ADVISORY

Alonzo Baldonado
Nathan "Nate" Cote
George Dodge, Jr.
David M. Gallegos
Stephanie Garcia Richard
Timothy D. Lewis
Tomás E. Salazar
James E. Smith
Christine Trujillo
Bob Wooley

ADVISORY

Jacob R. Candelaria
Lee S. Cotter
Daniel A. Ivey-Soto
Linda M. Lopez
John Pinto
William P. Soules
Pat Woods

Frances Ramírez-Maestas, Director

October 28, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: LESC Interim Subcommittee on School Bus Transportation

FR: David T. Craig

**RE: STAFF REPORT: DISTRICT AND STATE-CHARTERED CHARTER SCHOOL
TRANSPORTATION BUDGETS**

INTRODUCTION

During the September 2013 meeting of the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) Subcommittee on School Bus Transportation, members requested LESC staff to:

- research a measure or benchmark of sufficiency for determining transportation funding;
- a table outlining operational funding that is supplementing transportation program funding in school districts and state-chartered charter school statewide.

This staff brief provides an overview of transportation program expenditures, including:

- past studies on sufficiency of transportation funding;
- district expenditures for the transportation program; and
- state comparisons of transportation expenditures.

PAST STUDIES ON SUFFICIENCY OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

For the purposes of discussion, sufficiency in this staff brief is the provision of full funding for attributable transportation costs. This was the definition used in past studies of the student transportation funding formula.¹

Past studies of transportation funding can be separated into two areas related to sufficiency:

1. the amount of funding provided through the transportation formula;² and
2. the amount of funding distributed to districts or state-chartered charter schools.

This distinction is important because, although the appropriation may appear sufficient, some districts or state-chartered charter schools may receive more or less funds than necessary because of how the formula distributes funds.

In 1998, DMG-Maximus, Inc., a contractor working on an evaluation of the state transportation funding formula for the then-State Department of Education, found that the *overall* level of funding appears sufficient, however, some local education agencies (LEAS) may be over-funded and some may be under-funded.³

It appears that national studies on sufficiency of total state funding for transportation is often dated and tends to be based on benchmarking of percent of total expenditures, namely:

- the cost of providing transportation services typically represents 5.0 to 10.0 percent of a school district's budget;⁴
- a pattern of education spending of about 5.0 percent on transportation similar across districts with very different demographics and number of pupils;⁵
- actual expenditures should be reimbursed by a formula;⁶ and
- a common measure for benchmarking sufficiency of transportation expenditures is the percent of total expenditures spent on transportation.

¹ From a April 16, 1998 presentation to the New Mexico Student Transportation Funding Formula Study by David M. Griffith and Associates, Ltd.

² *Comprehensive School Transportation Funding Study*. Prepared for the New Mexico State Department of Education by DMG, Maximus, Inc. November 1998.

³ *Ibid.* p.3

⁴ Zeitlin, Laurie S. "Pupil Transportation and Fiscal Responsibility," *School Business Affairs* 55 (April 1989): 35-39 as reprinted in Alspaugh, John W. "The Effects of Geographic and Management Factors on the Cost of Pupil Transportation," *Journal of Education Finance*. Vol. 22 (Fall 1996), 180-194.

⁵ Odden, Allan. "CPRE's School Finance Research: Fifteen Years of Findings," Consortium of Policy Research in Education (CPRE), UW-Madison. http://datacenter.spps.org/uploads/Odden_15_years_of_findings.pdf.

⁶ *Ibid.*

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES FOR THE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

If transportation expenditures are greater than money available, the operational budget may be tapped and may infringe on the main focus of educating students.⁷ As shown in **Attachment 1, School Year 2012 Transportation Expenditures, by District and State-Chartered Charter School**:

- 42 of 89 school districts, or 47.2 percent, fund some portion of total transportation expenditures from Operational funds;
- of the 50 state-chartered charter schools operating in school year 2011-2012:
 - only eight schools, or 16.0 percent had transportation expenditures; and
 - of those eight schools, five schools fund transportation expenditures with operational funds;
- the percentage of General Fund dollars spent on transportation by school districts and state-chartered charter schools ranges from 2.06 to 16.68 percent;
- 48 of 89 school districts, or 53.9 percent of districts have total transportation spending outside a range of 5.0 to 10.0 percent of their total General Fund expenditures, with
 - 13 of 48 school districts spending greater than 10.0 percent; and
 - 35 of 48 school districts spending less than 5.0 percent; and
- statewide spending for total transportation expenditures was 4.04 percent of total General Fund expenditures.

STATE COMPARISONS OF TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES

Attachment 2, Total Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, by Function and State or Jurisdiction: 2008-09 (in thousands), shows total transportation expenditures as a percent of total current expenditures by state. **Attachment 2** includes funds for which the state does not have control (like federal or local revenues). However, it serves as a baseline for benchmarking New Mexico's transportation expenditures against those of other states.

As shown in **Attachment 2**, New Mexico:

- ranks 40th among states in percent of total expenditures spent on transportation;
- is below the national average of the total expenditures spent on transportation; and
- in comparison to neighboring states (Arizona, Utah, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Texas), ranks only below Arizona in percent of total expenditures spent on transportation.

⁷ Brimley, Jr., Vern and Rulon R. Garfield. Financing Education in a Climate of Change. Eight Edition. Allyn and Bacon: Boston, 2002. P. 357.

**SCHOOL YEAR 2012 TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES,
BY DISTRICT AND STATE-CHARTERED CHARTER SCHOOL**

A	B	C	D (= B + C)	E	F (= C / E)	G (= B / E)	H (= D / E)
DESCRIPTION	OPERATIONAL FUNDING STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	TOTAL PUPIL TRANSPORTATION (FORMULA) EXPENDITURES	TOTAL TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES	TOTAL GENERAL FUNDS	Percent of Transportation Expenditures from Formula	Percent Supplemented from Operational	TOTAL Percent of Spending on Transportation
<i>School Districts (Plus Local Charters)</i>							
1 Alamogordo	\$324,641	\$1,071,812	\$1,396,454	\$43,466,483	2.47%	0.75%	3.21%
2 Albuquerque Plus Charters	\$290,144	\$17,957,045	\$18,247,190	\$656,356,433	2.74%	0.04%	2.78%
3 Animas	\$0	\$436,751	\$436,751	\$2,942,159	14.84%	0.00%	14.84%
4 Artesia	\$0	\$1,401,697	\$1,401,697	\$27,220,102	5.15%	0.00%	5.15%
5 Aztec Plus Charters	\$97,101	\$1,253,262	\$1,350,363	\$22,564,079	5.55%	0.43%	5.98%
6 Belen	\$152,973	\$1,302,634	\$1,455,607	\$32,021,738	4.07%	0.48%	4.55%
7 Bernalillo	\$387,184	\$1,220,735	\$1,607,919	\$26,606,589	4.59%	1.46%	6.04%
8 Bloomfield	\$0	\$1,168,336	\$1,168,336	\$21,423,970	5.45%	0.00%	5.45%
9 Capitan	\$31,831	\$343,957	\$375,788	\$4,416,224	7.79%	0.72%	8.51%
10 Carlsbad Plus Charters	\$0	\$1,254,362	\$1,254,362	\$46,572,950	2.69%	0.00%	2.69%
11 Carrizozo	\$585	\$143,143	\$143,728	\$2,151,383	6.65%	0.03%	6.68%
12 Central	\$170,453	\$2,140,649	\$2,311,102	\$51,539,269	4.15%	0.33%	4.48%
13 Chama Valley	\$21,582	\$316,541	\$338,123	\$5,108,400	6.20%	0.42%	6.62%
14 Cimarron Plus Charters	\$0	\$321,278	\$321,278	\$5,074,934	6.33%	0.00%	6.33%
15 Clayton	\$0	\$667,016	\$667,016	\$5,754,467	11.59%	0.00%	11.59%
16 Cloudcroft	\$0	\$280,394	\$280,394	\$3,939,545	7.12%	0.00%	7.12%
17 Clovis	\$0	\$1,115,467	\$1,115,467	\$54,220,478	2.06%	0.00%	2.06%
18 Cobre	\$36,195	\$606,957	\$643,152	\$13,279,114	4.57%	0.27%	4.84%
19 Corona	\$0	\$298,175	\$298,175	\$1,788,097	16.68%	0.00%	16.68%
20 Cuba	\$6,987	\$769,155	\$776,142	\$6,901,685	11.14%	0.10%	11.25%
21 Deming Plus Charters	\$94,477	\$1,995,496	\$2,089,973	\$38,862,325	5.13%	0.24%	5.38%
22 Des Moines	\$0	\$205,846	\$205,846	\$1,636,133	12.58%	0.00%	12.58%
23 Dexter	\$0	\$559,319	\$559,319	\$7,750,024	7.22%	0.00%	7.22%
24 Dora	\$10,884	\$223,418	\$234,302	\$2,851,483	7.84%	0.38%	8.22%
25 Dulce	\$0	\$159,227	\$159,227	\$6,799,990	2.34%	0.00%	2.34%
26 Elida	\$0	\$206,614	\$206,614	\$1,775,473	11.64%	0.00%	11.64%
27 Espanola Plus Charters	\$16,778	\$1,459,461	\$1,476,239	\$34,521,973	4.23%	0.05%	4.28%
28 Estancia	\$13,596	\$470,309	\$483,905	\$7,938,591	5.92%	0.17%	6.10%
29 Eunice	\$0	\$158,518	\$158,518	\$4,942,607	3.21%	0.00%	3.21%
30 Farmington Plus Charters	\$0	\$2,752,618	\$2,752,618	\$68,414,987	4.02%	0.00%	4.02%
31 Floyd	\$0	\$125,020	\$125,020	\$2,567,468	4.87%	0.00%	4.87%
32 Fort Sumner	\$0	\$418,818	\$418,818	\$3,865,519	10.83%	0.00%	10.83%
33 Gadsden Plus Charters	\$0	\$4,983,296	\$4,983,296	\$95,785,661	5.20%	0.00%	5.20%
34 Gallup Plus Charters	\$0	\$4,912,328	\$4,912,328	\$87,674,957	5.60%	0.00%	5.60%
35 Grady	\$0	\$210,100	\$210,100	\$1,946,316	10.79%	0.00%	10.79%
36 Grants/Cibola	\$0	\$1,449,217	\$1,449,217	\$27,673,792	5.24%	0.00%	5.24%
37 Hagerman	\$0	\$204,045	\$204,045	\$3,917,610	5.21%	0.00%	5.21%
38 Hatch	\$10,000	\$672,296	\$682,296	\$9,972,708	6.74%	0.10%	6.84%
39 Hobbs	\$0	\$1,750,595	\$1,750,595	\$51,086,749	3.43%	0.00%	3.43%
40 Hondo Valley	\$0	\$209,833	\$209,833	\$2,198,366	9.54%	0.00%	9.54%
41 House	\$0	\$171,362	\$171,362	\$1,559,713	10.99%	0.00%	10.99%
42 Jal	\$1,283	\$153,138	\$154,421	\$3,582,302	4.27%	0.04%	4.31%
43 Jemez Mountain Plus Charters	\$61,044	\$501,887	\$562,931	\$3,804,157	13.19%	1.60%	14.80%
44 Jemez Valley Plus Charters	\$96	\$413,179	\$413,275	\$5,686,129	7.27%	0.00%	7.27%
45 Lake Arthur	\$26,378	\$154,492	\$180,869	\$2,484,090	6.22%	1.06%	7.28%

ATTACHMENT 1

**SCHOOL YEAR 2012 TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES,
BY DISTRICT AND STATE-CHARTERED CHARTER SCHOOL**

	A	B	C	D (= B + C)	E	F (= C / E)	G (= B / E)	H (= D / E)	
	DESCRIPTION	OPERATIONAL FUNDING STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	TOTAL PUPIL TRANSPORTATION (FORMULA) EXPENDITURES	TOTAL TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES	TOTAL GENERAL FUNDS	Percent of Transportation Expenditures from Formula	Percent Supplemented from Operational	TOTAL Percent of Spending on Transportation	
	<i>School Districts (Plus Local Charters)</i>								
46	Las Cruces Plus Charters	\$229,998	\$7,625,498	\$7,855,496	\$174,953,570	4.36%	0.13%	4.49%	46
47	Las Vegas City	\$69,165	\$671,292	\$740,457	\$15,776,065	4.26%	0.44%	4.69%	47
48	Logan	\$0	\$241,546	\$241,546	\$3,105,050	7.78%	0.00%	7.78%	48
49	Lordsburg	\$34,107	\$344,460	\$378,568	\$6,325,901	5.45%	0.54%	5.98%	49
50	Los Alamos	\$154,819	\$756,808	\$911,626	\$33,371,981	2.27%	0.46%	2.73%	50
51	Los Lunas	\$257,645	\$2,440,662	\$2,698,307	\$57,035,563	4.28%	0.45%	4.73%	51
52	Loving	\$0	\$131,868	\$131,868	\$5,008,422	2.63%	0.00%	2.63%	52
53	Lovington	\$0	\$965,647	\$965,647	\$25,798,334	3.74%	0.00%	3.74%	53
54	Magdalena	\$0	\$269,943	\$269,943	\$4,957,280	5.45%	0.00%	5.45%	54
55	Maxwell	\$0	\$73,469	\$73,469	\$1,618,480	4.54%	0.00%	4.54%	55
56	Melrose	\$0	\$264,364	\$264,364	\$2,603,703	10.15%	0.00%	10.15%	56
57	Mesa Vista	\$52,562	\$302,096	\$354,658	\$4,228,302	7.14%	1.24%	8.39%	57
58	Mora	\$0	\$385,698	\$385,698	\$5,142,914	7.50%	0.00%	7.50%	58
59	Moriarty	\$133,135	\$1,516,307	\$1,649,442	\$24,342,310	6.23%	0.55%	6.78%	59
60	Mosquero	\$0	\$163,622	\$163,622	\$1,239,350	13.20%	0.00%	13.20%	60
61	Mountainair	\$3,939	\$290,734	\$294,673	\$3,448,858	8.43%	0.11%	8.54%	61
62	Pecos	\$15,804	\$344,695	\$360,499	\$6,078,195	5.67%	0.26%	5.93%	62
63	Penasco	\$16,892	\$235,709	\$252,601	\$5,095,406	4.63%	0.33%	4.96%	63
64	Pojoaque Valley	\$79,190	\$606,560	\$685,750	\$15,848,131	3.83%	0.50%	4.33%	64
65	Portales	\$0	\$1,107,626	\$1,107,626	\$22,625,805	4.90%	0.00%	4.90%	65
66	Quemado	\$34,565	\$313,646	\$348,211	\$2,640,339	11.88%	1.31%	13.19%	66
67	Questa Plus Charters	\$0	\$341,309	\$341,309	\$4,964,685	6.87%	0.00%	6.87%	67
68	Raton	\$0	\$533,461	\$533,461	\$10,015,891	5.33%	0.00%	5.33%	68
69	Reserve	\$3,559	\$221,639	\$225,198	\$2,743,502	8.08%	0.13%	8.21%	69
70	Rio Rancho	\$160,430	\$3,248,856	\$3,409,287	\$110,282,676	2.95%	0.15%	3.09%	70
71	Roswell Plus Charters	\$0	\$2,242,429	\$2,242,429	\$67,886,322	3.30%	0.00%	3.30%	71
72	Roy	\$840	\$89,998	\$90,838	\$1,256,877	7.16%	0.07%	7.23%	72
73	Ruidoso	\$84,172	\$769,531	\$853,703	\$16,769,864	4.59%	0.50%	5.09%	73
74	San Jon	\$0	\$153,469	\$153,469	\$1,632,283	9.40%	0.00%	9.40%	74
75	Santa Fe Plus Charters	\$0	\$3,534,318	\$3,534,318	\$97,553,841	3.62%	0.00%	3.62%	75
76	Santa Rosa	\$8,406	\$360,399	\$368,805	\$5,977,863	6.03%	0.14%	6.17%	76
77	Silver City	\$12,015	\$943,822	\$955,837	\$23,326,596	4.05%	0.05%	4.10%	77
78	Socorro Plus Charters	\$0	\$705,927	\$705,927	\$14,819,118	4.76%	0.00%	4.76%	78
79	Springer	\$0	\$194,036	\$194,036	\$2,596,043	7.47%	0.00%	7.47%	79
80	Taos Plus Charters	\$0	\$924,757	\$924,757	\$22,645,770	4.08%	0.00%	4.08%	80
81	Tatum	\$0	\$209,667	\$209,667	\$3,530,858	5.94%	0.00%	5.94%	81
82	Texico	\$1,377	\$222,703	\$224,080	\$5,162,653	4.31%	0.03%	4.34%	82
83	Truth or Consequences	\$8,460	\$748,765	\$757,225	\$11,048,848	6.78%	0.08%	6.85%	83
84	Tucumcari	\$0	\$398,120	\$398,120	\$8,727,205	4.56%	0.00%	4.56%	84
85	Tularosa	\$47,136	\$460,734	\$507,870	\$7,544,659	6.11%	0.62%	6.73%	85
86	Vaughn	\$0	\$64,275	\$64,275	\$1,844,780	3.48%	0.00%	3.48%	86
87	Wagon Mound	\$0	\$138,883	\$138,883	\$1,726,711	8.04%	0.00%	8.04%	87
88	West Las Vegas Plus Charters	\$68,753	\$624,128	\$692,881	\$14,617,379	4.27%	0.47%	4.74%	88
89	Zuni	\$27,820	\$429,235	\$457,055	\$13,286,841	3.23%	0.21%	3.44%	89
90	District Totals	\$3,259,001	\$95,202,511	\$98,461,512	\$2,383,852,444	3.99%	0.14%	4.13%	90

**SCHOOL YEAR 2012 TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES,
BY DISTRICT AND STATE-CHARTERED CHARTER SCHOOL**

A	B	C	D (= B + C)	E	F (= C / E)	G (= B / E)	H (= D / E)
DESCRIPTION	OPERATIONAL FUNDING STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	TOTAL PUPIL TRANSPORTATION (FORMULA) EXPENDITURES	TOTAL TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES	TOTAL GENERAL FUNDS	Percent of Transportation Expenditures from Formula	Percent Supplemented from Operational	TOTAL Percent of Spending on Transportation
<i>State Chartered Charter Schools</i>							
91 Academy of Trades and Technology	\$5,131	\$0	\$5,131	\$1,523,666	0.00%	0.34%	0.34%
92 ACE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,978,325	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
93 AIMS @ UNM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,199,066	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
94 Albuquerque School of Excellence	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,656,460	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
95 Albuquerque Sign Language Academy	\$0	\$195,719	\$195,719	\$1,068,619	18.32%	0.00%	18.32%
96 Aldo Leopold Charter School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,126,261	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
97 Alma D' Arte Charter High School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,622,818	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
98 Amy Biehl Charter High School	\$3,600	\$0	\$3,600	\$2,423,211	0.00%	0.15%	0.15%
99 ASK Academy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,626,993	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
100 Cesar Chavez Community School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,719,768	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
101 Cien Aguas International School	\$0	\$34,813	\$34,813	\$1,881,133	1.85%	0.00%	1.85%
102 Cottonwood Classical Preparatory School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,910,449	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
103 Creative Education Preparatory Institute #1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,700,939	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
104 East Mountain High School	\$17,700	\$0	\$17,700	\$2,630,056	0.00%	0.67%	0.67%
105 Estancia Valley Classical Academy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
106 Gilbert L. Sena Charter School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,737,162	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
107 Horizon Academy West	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,870,426	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
108 International School @ Mesa Del Sol	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,265,015	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
109 J. Paul Taylor	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$907,905	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
110 La Jicarita Community School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
111 La Promesa Early Learning Center	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,753,026	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
112 La Resolana Leadership Academy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$690,142	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
113 La Tierra Montessori School of the Arts & Sciences	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
114 Learning Community Charter School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,795,247	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
115 MASTERS Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,066,007	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
116 McCurdy Charter School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
117 Media Arts Collaborative Charter School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,527,787	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
118 Mission Achievement and Success	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
119 Montessori Elementary School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,164,560	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
120 New America School	\$3,375	\$0	\$3,375	\$2,628,263	0.00%	0.13%	0.13%
121 New America School - Las Cruces	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
122 New Mexico International School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$769,817	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
123 New Mexico School for the Arts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,676,120	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
124 North Valley Academy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,641,884	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
125 Ralph J. Bunche Academy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$778,910	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
126 Red River Valley Charter School	\$1,752	\$33,288	\$35,040	\$554,512	6.00%	0.32%	6.32%
127 Sage Montessori Charter School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
128 School of Dreams Academy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,593,990	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
129 South Valley Preparatory School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$971,227	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
130 Southwest Intermediate Learning Center	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$911,271	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
131 Southwest Primary Learning Center	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$789,119	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
132 Southwest Secondary Learning Center	\$0	\$86,463	\$86,463	\$2,470,268	3.50%	0.00%	3.50%
133 SW Aeronautics, Mathematics and Science Acader	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
134 Taos Academy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,429,154	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
135 Taos Integrated School of the Arts	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$862,753	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**SCHOOL YEAR 2012 TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES,
BY DISTRICT AND STATE-CHARTERED CHARTER SCHOOL**

A	B	C	D (= B + C)	E	F (= C / E)	G (= B / E)	H = (D / E)
DESCRIPTION	OPERATIONAL FUNDING STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	TOTAL PUPIL TRANSPORTATION (FORMULA) EXPENDITURES	TOTAL TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES	TOTAL GENERAL FUNDS	Percent of Transportation Expenditures from Formula	Percent Supplemented from Operational	TOTAL Percent of Spending on Transportation
<i>State Chartered Charter Schools</i>							
136 The Great Academy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,145,817	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
137 Tierra Adentro	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,630,836	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
138 Uplift Community School	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$326	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
139 Village Academy	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$509,532	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
140 William W. & Josephine Dorn Charter Comm Schoo	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
141 State Chartered Charter Schools Total	\$31,558	\$350,283	\$381,840	\$64,208,893	0.55%	0.05%	0.59%
142 STATEWIDE TOTAL	\$3,290,559	\$95,552,794	\$98,843,352	\$2,448,061,337	3.90%	0.13%	4.04%

**Total Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education,
by Function and State or Jurisdiction: 2008-09
(in thousands)**

	A	B	C	D	
	State or Jurisdiction	Elementary/ Secondary Current Expenditures, Total	Student Transportation	Percent of Total Current Expenditures	
1	West Virginia	\$3,059,420	\$218,795	7.15%	1
2	District of Columbia	\$1,352,905	\$88,538	6.54%	2
3	Delaware	\$1,518,786	\$97,419	6.41%	3
4	Indiana	\$9,680,895	\$563,551	5.82%	4
5	Kentucky	\$5,886,890	\$335,246	5.69%	5
6	Louisiana	\$7,276,651	\$393,372	5.41%	6
7	New Jersey	\$23,589,224	\$1,258,842	5.34%	7
8	New York	\$48,635,363	\$2,568,077	5.28%	8
9	Minnesota	\$9,270,281	\$483,691	5.22%	9
10	Virginia	\$13,505,290	\$691,335	5.12%	10
11	Pennsylvania	\$21,831,816	\$1,109,260	5.08%	11
12	Missouri	\$8,827,224	\$443,929	5.03%	12
13	Connecticut	\$8,708,294	\$437,208	5.02%	13
14	Maryland	\$11,591,965	\$570,850	4.92%	14
15	Illinois	\$23,495,271	\$1,129,961	4.81%	15
16	Alabama	\$6,683,843	\$320,755	4.80%	16
17	Idaho	\$1,957,740	\$92,622	4.73%	17
18	Montana	\$1,436,062	\$67,239	4.68%	18
19	Maine	\$2,350,447	\$109,552	4.66%	19
20	Ohio	\$19,397,511	\$896,796	4.62%	20
21	Wyoming	\$1,268,407	\$58,484	4.61%	21
22	Mississippi	\$3,967,232	\$180,014	4.54%	22
23	Oregon	\$5,529,831	\$240,911	4.36%	23
24	North Dakota	\$928,528	\$40,263	4.34%	24
25	Michigan	\$17,217,584	\$742,718	4.31%	25
26	Nevada	\$3,606,035	\$153,352	4.25%	26
27	New Hampshire	\$2,490,623	\$105,787	4.25%	27
28	<i>United States</i>	<i>\$518,997,430</i>	<i>\$21,685,125</i>	<i>4.18%</i>	28
29	Georgia	\$15,976,945	\$660,665	4.14%	29
30	Florida	\$23,328,028	\$947,681	4.06%	30
31	North Carolina	\$12,470,470	\$503,762	4.04%	31
32	Massachusetts	\$13,942,586	\$551,549	3.96%	32
33	Washington	\$9,940,056	\$391,809	3.94%	33
34	Rhode Island	\$2,139,317	\$84,232	3.94%	34
35	Kansas	\$4,805,310	\$186,685	3.88%	35
36	Arizona	\$8,625,276	\$318,706	3.70%	36
37	Wisconsin	\$9,696,228	\$356,477	3.68%	37

