



State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

FINAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. EDS 20212-25

AGENCY DKT. NO. 2026-40094

G.T. ON BEHALF OF C.F.,

Petitioner,

v.

PLEASANTVILLE CITY

BOARD OF EDUCATION,

Respondent.

G.T., petitioner, pro se, appearing without her designated advocate, **D.O.**

Raymond Hamlin, Esq., for respondent (Hunt, Hamlin & Ridley, attorneys)

Record closed: February 24, 2026

Decided: March 26, 2026

BEFORE **ELAINE B. FRICK**, ALJ:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner G.T., mother of a preschool child, C.F., seeks door-to-door transportation for C.F. to be picked up in front of their home and returned to the front of their home rather than to be picked up at and returned to the designated bus stop. Respondent Pleasantville Board of Education (the District) opposes the request, asserting that it will provide curb-to-curb bus transportation for the student, as stated in the

Individualized Education Program (IEP) drafted for the child. Curb-to-curb transportation means the student will be picked up at a designated bus stop, which is at the street corner of the street intersecting with petitioner's dead-end street and will be returned home by being dropped off at the designated bus stop. At issue is whether the District has failed to provide a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) in the child's proposed IEP, with curb-to-curb bus transportation rather than the door-to-door transportation the mother wants for her child. The evidence preponderates that the District's implementation of curb-to-curb transportation for the student is appropriate and designed to provide FAPE. The District's designation of the location of the bus stop for C.F. is not arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable, and it comports with the requirements of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner parent, G.T., submitted a due process petition to the Department of Education (DOE) Office of Special Education (OSE) on December 2, 2025. At the expiration of the thirty-day resolution period, the OSE transmitted the petition to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), where it was filed on December 31, 2025, to be heard as a contested case. N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to -15; N.J.S.A. 52:14F-1 to -13.

An initial telephonic conference was scheduled for January 7, 2026. The District's attorney appeared. Petitioner and her designated advocate, D.O., failed to appear. The proceeding was rescheduled for January 13, 2026. G.T. and D.O. appeared, but the District failed to appear. The proceeding was rescheduled for January 21, 2026, at which time the parties appeared and the telephonic conference was conducted with the assistance of a Spanish language interpreter. The parties agreed upon the extended future hearing date. A Prehearing Order was issued, confirming that the hearing date was scheduled for February 24, 2026, at 9:30 a.m., in person at the OAL office in Atlantic City.

On February 23, 2026, state offices were closed due to inclement weather. The District's attorney inquired that afternoon whether the hearing would proceed as scheduled the next day. The parties were advised that at the time of the inquiry, there

was no issued state office closure or delayed opening notification and the parties were required to appear as scheduled unless they submitted confirmation in writing by 4:30 p.m. that they agreed to adjourn the hearing date. G.T. provided an email response that she would appear on the next day, February 24, 2026, as scheduled at 9:30 a.m.

On February 24, 2026, there was a two-hour delayed opening for state offices. However, I was present at the scheduled start time of 9:30 a.m. for the proceeding. The District's attorney and representative were present as scheduled for 9:30 a.m. Neither G.T. nor her advocate were present.

While present in the court room, with the District's counsel and representative, I initiated a call to G.T., with the assistance of a Spanish language interpreter. G.T. answered and indicated she had gone to the Superior Court building, located at another address in Atlantic City, and could not access the building, thus assuming this proceeding was cancelled. G.T. agreed she would come back to Atlantic City to the OAL location for the hearing.

G.T. appeared without her advocate, D.O. A Spanish interpreter was utilized to confirm that G.T. wanted to proceed without D.O., who is the child's Care Management Organization (CMO) worker, referred to as an advocate. G.T. stated she was prepared to go forward with her case and wanted to proceed. The hearing was conducted in person, with the use of a Spanish language interpreter, on February 24, 2026.

FACTUAL DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

The following information was derived from the testimony of the witnesses and the one document entered into evidence. I **FIND** as **FACTS** the following:

C.F. is currently a four-year-old preschool student and a resident of the Pleasantville School District. He received Early Intervention (EI) Services starting at the age of nine months. (R-1 at 5.) Karin Farkas, Director of Special Services for the District, testified that C.F. came into the District at the age of three years old. It was his first school

experience. He was referred to the Child Study Team (CST) by EI sometime in the spring of 2024. (R-1 at 3.)

C.F. was classified as a preschool child with a disability, and an initial IEP was developed at a meeting on June 20, 2024, for his 2024–2025 academic school year. (R-1 at 1.) He attended school at the North Main Street building for the 2024-2025 school year in a self-contained special education preschool class.

Transportation was provided to C.F. during the 2024–2025 school year. As per G.T.'s testimony, the transportation was door-to-door by a minivan that would stop in front of their home to transport C.F. to school. This was due to his anxiety and behavioral challenges. (R-1 at 6.) G.T. and the child's CMO worker, D.O., described during an IEP meeting that at times it took three individuals to get C.F. in the van during that school year. They acknowledged during the meeting that his behavior did improve over time. (R-1 at 6.)

The annual review IEP meeting was conducted on May 9, 2025. The IEP provided for curb-to-curb transportation for C.F. (R-1 at 1, 14.) C.F. was to attend Leeds Avenue school for the 2025–2026 academic school year. G.T. testified that C.F. has not attended school for the 2025–2026 school year because of the transportation problem. The last time he attended school was in June at the end of the 2024–2025 school year.

G.T. testified that "they" lied and said C.F. would have door-to-door transportation. G.T. requested an IEP meeting regarding her concerns about the curb-to-curb transportation in the IEP. That meeting was held on September 18, 2025, with the proposed draft IEP confirming that curb-to-curb transportation would remain as listed in the IEP from May 2025. (R-1.) The determination to keep the same transportation in the IEP was agreed upon by all members of the CST except for G.T. and D.O. (R-1 at 6, 15.)

The mother testified that she went a couple of times to the bus stop, but the bus never "drove through," and that her child "runs." One time that this happened was the first day of school in September 2025. It is not clear if her two efforts to walk C.F. to the

bus stop occurred at the start of the 2025–2026 academic school year or if one time had occurred for the Extended School Year (ESY) in July 2025.

The mother stated that on one occasion when she walked C.F. to the bus stop, he ran from her. She explained that she waved down a bus that was going by and the driver told her it was not for her child. C.F. was “freaked out” and said, “no school.” She first testified she was holding his hand, and he tried to run away because he was traumatized when that bus left. She conceded on cross-examination that he wanted to run but she grabbed his hand and walked home with him. She provided no cohesive testimony that C.F. ran from her, broke away from her grasp, ran into the roadway, or otherwise “ran” in an unsafe or hazardous manner. G.T. asserted that she spoke to C.F.’s case manager, who had previously told her that C.F.’s transportation would stay the same, yet then they said they would not do door-to-door transportation.

G.T. testified that both times she took C.F. to the bus stop he reacted “real bad.” The third time he threw himself on the floor, apparently in their home, yelling “no school, no school!” G.T. admittedly did not take C.F. to the bus stop again, nor did she take him to school. She forcefully denied that she had “given up” on getting C.F. to school after only two attempts. She stated she was not playing with the safety of her child in the street. She confirmed C.F. has not attended school for the 2025–2026 school year.

G.T. testified that she has a ten-year-old son who “got lost” so he now gets door-to-door transportation. Since the school is giving her other son door-to-door transportation, she does not know why C.F. cannot get door-to-door transportation as well. She does not have a car. She cannot count on her driving-age son who stays at her home on occasion to provide daily transportation for C.F. to school.

The designated bus stop is located at the corner intersection of a cross street and the dead-end street where G.T. resides. G.T. testified there is no sidewalk at the bus stop.

When Director Farkas became aware of the issue raised by G.T., she went to the area to determine if it was on a main road with heavy traffic or close to the Black Horse

Pike, a major roadway in Pleasantville. She did not state what day or time she visited the area. She stated that the bus stop for C.F. is not at a major roadway intersection. G.T.'s home is one of nine homes on a dead-end street. Director Farkas stated there was no traffic when she was there. Director Farkas paced out the number of steps between the bus stop and the front of G.T.'s home. She testified that she took into account the smaller sized steps of a four-year-old and estimated it was approximately 120 to 125 steps from petitioner's residence to the bus stop at the street corner. She timed this pace, which took one minute and forty-five seconds to walk from their home to the bus stop.

Jacqueline DiJoseph was C.F.'s special education preschool teacher for the 2024–2025 school year. C.F. was in her self-contained class, which utilizes the general education curriculum taught at a pace individualized for each student. She stated C.F. came to school every day with a smile and participated in all activities. She never noticed that he came to school tired. She never heard him comment that he did not want to be in school. She testified that C.F. was an enthusiastic learner and enjoyed learning new activities. He was able to follow multi-step directions for tasks, with some repetition at times. He made significant progress academically from where he started at the beginning of the school year to the end. He participated more as the year progressed, made friendships with other students, and had a good rapport with the staff. C.F. was recommended to attend preschool for the 2025–2026 school year in the inclusion class, which is progress from the self-contained class.

Ms. DiJoseph confirmed that C.F.'s therapist came to observe him in her classroom during the 2024–2025 school year. The therapist apparently remarked how she was pleasantly surprised at how different C.F.'s behavior was in school compared to at home. Ms. DiJoseph acknowledged that at the start of the 2024–2025 school year, C.F. did arrive at school crying sometimes. She described this as an adjustment period for him starting school, and after a few weeks, he no longer cried.

Laurie Poplawski, School Social Worker, has served as C.F.'s case manager since September 2024. She is a member of his CST, and she participated in drafting C.F.'s IEP. She confirmed the September 18, 2025, IEP meeting was held at the request of the mother to discuss the transportation issue for his 2025–2026 school year. (R-1 at 6.)

She stated that the District CST members did not approve of G.T.'s request for door-to-door transportation. C.F.'s behavior in the school environment did not match what the mother described. At school, C.F. was very well behaved. He responded when called by name. He followed directions. He transitioned easily between classes and walked in line. He did not elope. C.F. attended a field trip and rode on a bus, boarding it and getting off without issue. Case Manager Poplawski recognized this was in contrast with how G.T. described C.F.'s behavior at home.

Ms. Poplawski testified that G.T. was offered a walking harness to assist with walking C.F. to the bus stop since G.T. expressed concern that C.F. would run and she could not control him. G.T. was afraid she would have to struggle with him. G.T. told the CST that she has asthma and could provide a doctor's note. (R-1 at 6.) G.T. acknowledged she was told to use a safety harness but stated if her "kid runs I am not going to hit him." G.T. testified that C.F.'s home therapist has put him in a harness and it "doesn't work" and that the therapist took him to the grocery store and it did not work there. G.T. denied that the school offered to buy a harness for her to use with C.F. She further stated that if she did use a harness and C.F. ran, she would probably hurt him when she pulled on the harness. She stated she could hold him, but he is a "really stubborn kid." He is too heavy for her to carry him to the bus stop.

G.T. testified that the school CST members do not understand C.F.'s behavior. She stated that he missed four months of school the year prior because he would cry all night. She took him to a neurologist, who prescribed melatonin for him. He would panic when he had to go to school, and it was difficult to get him in the minivan. He would cry, scream, and say he did not want to go to school. G.T. asserted that C.F. does not want to deal with being taught how to ride to school. She stated it is not dangerous for C.F. to get on the bus in front of her house. She will grab his hand and walk him to the bus. It is more convenient because when she takes him out the door to the van, C.F. has no chance to run.

Case Manager Poplawski acknowledged that G.T. was concerned about C.F.'s home behavior and about being able to get him to the bus stop. Ms. Poplawski reiterated that the behaviors G.T. described as occurring in the home were not observed in school.

She confirmed that the 2025–2026 school year IEP for C.F. was developed with the goal of working towards the least restrictive environment for him. He was in a self-contained disability preschool class for 2024–2025 and was recommended for the inclusion classroom for 2025–2026 preschool. This change in placement was discussed and agreed upon at the May 2025 IEP meeting. The change of preschool classroom assignment would change C.F. from North Main Street School to Leeds Avenue school. Curb-to-curb transportation was specified as a related service in the May 2025 IEP. Case Manager Poplawski confirmed that C.F. was becoming independent. He would grow and learn by having curb-to-curb transportation rather than the door-to-door transportation G.T. and the CMO therapist, D.O. wanted for C.F.

Director Farkas testified that Pleasantville is a walking school district. The majority of students walk to their school building, or their parent or guardian transport them to school. Students who are classified with a disability receive transportation as articulated in their IEP. Director Farkas testified that door-to-door transportation is reserved for students with significant disabilities. The student is usually escorted by an aide from their door to the bus. Curb-to-curb transportation means that the student is picked up at a designated bus stop. This depends upon the student's adaptive skills and their ability to communicate. C.F.'s skills increased during his 2024–2025 school year. Such progress is why he was shifted to a less restrictive environment for his academics and for his related services, such as transportation being curb-to-curb, rather than door-to-door. He did well in school for the 2024–2025 school year without elopement issues, and he participated in activities, which was a "good thing" for him. She recognized that it is less convenient for the mother to walk to the corner bus stop, rather than having C.F. picked up in front of their home. This is due to his progress. C.F. does not have a significant disability preventing him from safely accessing school.

Director Farkas was not certain if other students would be waiting at the bus stop with C.F. She was not aware if other preschool students were on the same bus.

G.T. wants help to get door-to-door transportation restored for C.F. She asserts it is due to safety concerns because he runs.

The District contends that the mother's request for door-to-door transportation is based upon her convenience and assertion that C.F. is too difficult to handle. The District acknowledges the parent's concerns and recognizes the difficulty that comes with being a parent and having to convince a child that being away from home is required for the child's future success. The District asserts that the decision for curb-to-curb transportation is based upon C.F.'s functioning in the school environment. (R-1 at 6.) The decision is "not solely on home-based concerns." (R-1 at 6.)

The District emphasized that the change from door-to-door to curb-to-curb is due to progress by C.F. during his 2024–2025 preschool year. The notes in the draft IEP indicate that the student "demonstrates the ability to access the school setting and transportation safely." (R-1 at 6.) The behaviors the parent expressed were occurring at home were "not observed to affect his functioning in school or during transport." (R-1 at 6.)

There were no concerns expressed by the parent, nor in the IEP, that C.F. has physical challenges or emotional or social reasons to warrant door-to-door transportation. The District contends that during preschool years a child's social and educational success is the focus to get them past any fears of school attendance and get them prepared for kindergarten.

The District suggests that it is "not a lot to ask of a parent" to walk approximately one and a half minutes, traversing 120 to 125 steps to get their student to the designated bus stop. If the parent does not practice this, it is assumed the student will regress without attending school as they remain at home.

There is no indication that the mother sought a resolution within fifteen days of the proposed September 18, 2025, IEP. It is unclear why a due process petition was not initiated until December 2, 2025, contesting the curb-to-curb transportation of the child as set forth in the IEP. The parent and the District's witnesses confirmed the child has not been to school at all for the 2025–2026 school year.

LEGAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C. §1400, et seq., was enacted to improve education for disabled students. One of the purposes of IDEA is “to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education [FAPE] that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living[.]” 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1)(A). The local public school district is required to deliver appropriate educational and related services. N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.1(d). A school district is tasked with ensuring a disabled child is educated in the least restrictive environment. 20 U.S.C. §1412(a)(5)(A).

When a due process hearing is conducted to determine if a FAPE has been provided pursuant to the IDEA, “the school district shall have the burden of proof and the burden of production.” N.J.S.A. 18A:46-1.1. If a change in the student’s IEP is sought, whether by the parents or the school district, the burden to prove whether the IEP is appropriate is upon the school district. Lascari v. Bd. of Educ. of the Ramapo Indian Hills Reg’l High Sch. Dist., 116 N.J. 30, 44 (1989). The burden of proof is by a preponderance of the credible evidence. N.J.A.C. 1:6A-14.1(d). There is no presumption of correctness on the part of the Board of Education for its proposed action. Ibid.

The primary method of ensuring the delivery of a FAPE is through an IEP. 20 U.S.C. §1414(d)(1)(A). An IEP outlines the student’s present levels of academic achievement and functioning, outlines measurable goals and the services to be provided, and establishes objective criteria for evaluating the child’s progress. 20 U.S.C. §1414(d)(1)(A)(i); C.H. v. Cape Henlopen Sch. Dist., 606 F.3d 59, 65 (3d Cir. 2010). The IEP is meant to be developed, reviewed, and revised for the individual needs of the child. 20 U.S.C. §1414(d)(1)(A). To meet its obligation to deliver FAPE, a school district must offer an IEP that is “reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child’s circumstances.” Andrew F. v. Douglas Cnty. Sch. Dist. RE-1, 580 U.S. 386, 399 (2017).

“Related services” are services outlined in a student’s IEP consisting of

“transportation, and such developmental, corrective, and other supportive services” that are required to aid a disabled student to access and benefit from special education. 20 U.S.C. § 1401(26)(A). Transportation may be set forth in a student’s IEP as a related service and shall be provided in accordance with New Jersey regulations consistent with the IDEA. N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.9(a)(7).

The beginning and end location of where a school district is responsible to transport a student with disabilities is not specified in the IDEA. The IDEA does not mandate that a child must be picked up at their home. It does not prohibit a school from determining a bus stop location for a student with disabilities. There are no descriptors of “door-to-door” or “curb-to-curb” transportation in the IDEA. Presumably, the federal regulations are intentionally broad to allow for transportation concerns to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. This is the status in New Jersey, where students with disabilities who are deemed eligible for special education and related services shall be provided transportation “in accordance with N.J.S.A. 18A:39-1 et seq., [the statute which requires a school district to provide transportation to students living more than two miles from the school building] and with their individualized education program (IEP).” N.J.A.C. 6A:27-5.1(a). “The district board of education shall provide transportation as required in the IEP. Such services may include, but are not limited to, special transportation equipment, transportation aides, and special arrangements for other assistance to and from school.” N.J.A.C. 6A:27-5.1(a)(1).

The applicable statute mandating school districts to provide transportation in certain circumstances also specifies that it is the school’s prerogative to “make rules and contracts for the pupil transportation[.]” N.J.S.A. 18A:39-1. The Board of Education thus establishes the bus routes and bus locations. “The Commissioner of Education will not overturn a district’s decision pertaining to the location of school bus stops and will not second guess such exercise of discretion unless it is arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable.” Vineland City Bd. of Educ. v. C.M., EDS 04589-08, Final Decision (June 26, 2008) <https://njlaw.rutgers.edu/OAL/index.php> (citing Lemma v. Branchburg Bd. of Educ., EDU 08953-97 Initial Decision (July 22, 1998), adopted Commissioner (August 28, 1998) (upholding the school’s refusal to change a bus stop to a private road where the student’s residence was located, even though the walk was long and potentially

hazardous without sidewalks); Mandaglio v. Mendham Twp. Bd. of Educ., 1998 S.L.D. 1380, 1384 (Comm'r 1990) (upholding uniformly applying school policy prohibiting school buses from turning around on dead end streets); and J. O'D. v. Peapack Gladstone Bd. of Educ., 1989 S.L.D. 1303, 1313 (Comm'r March 15, 1989) (upholding appropriateness of the local district's bus stop and rejecting a proposed alternate route as patently dangerous).

Here, petitioner contends that for safety reasons, her four-year-old son should receive door-to-door transportation, as he previously received in his first preschool year, rather than curb-to-curb, which requires her to walk with him to a bus stop located at the corner intersecting street. She asserts it is a safety hazard because there is no sidewalk and the child runs. She further argues that the child was traumatized on one of the two occasions when she took him to the bus stop because a bus she waved down was not C.F.'s bus, and it traumatized him when it drove away. Her testimony was not definitive as to whether the child actually ran away or not. She stated he tried to run, but she was holding his hand, and when he got upset, she walked home with him. She never provided specific testimony that the child left her grasp, that he ever darted into the roadway, or that he actually ran away from her on the two occasions she claimed to have walked him to the bus stop.

The District contends it is providing an appropriate FAPE by designating curb-to-curb transportation in the child's IEP. It recognizes an obligation to transport the child. The District asserts requiring the student to walk a short distance of 120 to 125 paces, taking approximately one minute and forty-five seconds, is in line with providing the least restrictive environment for him, encouraging the child to develop independence. The District acknowledged that the child had a period of adjustment at the start of his first preschool year in 2024–2025. He progressed well during that year academically, socially, and behaviorally to warrant recommendation for the inclusion preschool class for 2025–2026.

The District took into consideration the mother's concern for safety due to behavioral issues she expressed were occurring at home. The District recommended use of a safety harness for the mother's fear of the child running from her. The mother

admittedly did not try using a harness, claiming it does not work and that she feared she would hurt the child if she had to pull on the harness if he ran from her. The District's witnesses confirmed that the child had no elopement issues in school, was compliant with directions, and had attended a field trip, via bus, with no issues boarding or exiting the bus.

The District's explanation of the location of the bus stop being a corner with "no traffic" and of petitioner's home being one of nine located on a dead-end street was unchallenged by the mother. The mother did not provide any supporting description, documentation, or evidence to counter the District's description of the bus stop. She did not provide any supporting description, documentation, or evidence to counter the District's description of the child's behavior, but for her insistence that he runs. Her description of the two times she went to the bus stop only had an allegation that the child tried to run from her one time, but she was holding his hand. There was no evidence as to why the bus must pick up the student at the front door except for the mother's testimony that it is more convenient and safer for the child because he does not have the chance to run when exiting the front door and walking to the bus waiting in the street.

The student's progress in school warranted the decision by the CST to modify transportation from door-to-door to curb-to-curb transportation for this student. Simply because door-to-door transportation was in his prior IEP does not demonstrate that it must remain that way. The purpose of an annual IEP meeting is to assess the student's status and determine whether progress has occurred pursuant to the goals and objectives in the IEP. The IEP is a fluid roadmap for the student, meant to be updated and adjusted for the unique needs of a student with a disability. 20 U.S.C. §1414(d)(1)(A). The District demonstrated, by a preponderance of the evidence through the witnesses' testimony and the proposed IEP, that the student was not seen to be a flight or elopement risk. The mother's fear for the child's safety is understandable, but she failed to counter any of the District's straightforward information regarding the child's progress in school and behavior. Nothing was presented that the student's disability was unique or presented challenges for him physically or cognitively to walk to and from the designated bus stop at the corner intersection, while accompanied by his mother.

I **CONCLUDE** that the related service of curb-to-curb transportation in the IEP was appropriate and that FAPE would be provided. The mother self-reported only two attempts to walk the student to the bus stop to get him to board the bus for school. The District thus has not even had the opportunity to provide academic instruction to him for the entire 2025–2026 academic school year for his second preschool year. Unfortunately, the mother has chosen to keep him at home and has made no effort to get him to school.

The District is a “walking” district but has established a bus route as per C.F.’s IEP and designated his bus stop to be at the corner where his residential dead-end street intersects with a cross street with “no traffic.” The District’s testimony and information about the location of the stop, the short distance from petitioner’s home, and the time to walk to the bus stop were unchallenged by petitioner. Her only statement was that there is no sidewalk at the bus stop. There has been nothing demonstrated that the District’s decision to designate that corner for C.F.’s bus stop was arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable. I **CONCLUDE** that the District’s designated bus stop for C.F. is appropriate and comports with the goal of the least restrictive environment for him to gain independence and progress under the proposed IEP in compliance with IDEA by providing a FAPE. I **CONCLUDE** that petitioner’s request for door-to-door transportation shall be denied.

ORDER

It is **ORDERED** that petitioner's due process petition seeking door-to-door transportation is denied.

This decision is final pursuant to 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(1)(A) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.514 (2025) and is appealable by filing a complaint and bringing a civil action either in the Law Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey or in a district court of the United States. 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2); 34 C.F.R. § 300.516 (2025). If the parent or adult student feels that this decision is not being fully implemented with respect to program or services, this concern should be communicated in writing to the Director, Office of Special Education.

March 26, 2026

DATE



ELAINE B. FRICK, ALJ

Date Received at Agency _____

Date Mailed to Parties: _____

EBF/dc/gd

APPENDIX

Witnesses

For petitioner:

G.T.

For respondent:

Jacqueline DiJoseph

Laurie Poplawski

Karin Farkas

Exhibits

For petitioner:

None

For respondent:

R-1 Draft IEP, dated September 18, 2025