

Contracting with Private Providers by the Public Transportation Industry

Outline

- **Organizational Schemes (Also see 1.201, Lecture 19)**
- **Services Typically Contracted**
- **Contract Economics**
- **Contracting Issues and Practices**
- **Types of Transit Contracts**
- **Contract Management**
- **Case Studies**
- **Final Thoughts on Performance Regimes**

Primary Organizational Schemes in the U.S.

1. Standard Public Ownership & Operations

- * **Simplest structure**
- * **Theoretically has maximum accountability and control**
- * **Political and labor issues may introduce inefficiencies**
- * **Innovation often tied to individual GM skills and future ambitions**

Primary Organizational Schemes in the U.S.

2. Management Contract

- * **Mostly in smaller areas/not growing in number**
- * **Provides expertise and/or experience via a manager or team who are not available locally**
- * **3-5 year contract duration typical—usually fixed fee**
- * **Large incentive difficult to justify**
- * **Employees either public employees or hired by a locally-incorporated private entity**
- * **Implementation can be flawed; few incentives for private managers; very similar to first model**

Primary Organizational Schemes in the U.S.

3. Service Contracting

- * Various components of service can be contracted out
- * Provision of actual bus or paratransit service most common
- * Vehicles, facilities, and equipment may or may not be included in contractor-provided services
- * Objectives of public agencies key to determining type of procurement and contract

U.S. Transit Industry Structure

- **Remarkably little change since the early 1970s:**
 - **regional transit authorities regulating, planning and directly operating most services in larger urban areas (> 100 buses + rail)**
 - **municipalities operate transit in many small cities (< 100 buses)**
 - **principal use of private sector is in providing limited types of purchased services to transit authorities**

Ancillary Services Typically Contracted

- **Ancillary or support services: cleaning, advertising, real estate, etc.**
 - * relatively straightforward and easy to define & administer
- **Maintenance of way and vehicles**
 - * limited examples in U.S. (London PPPs)
 - * labor issues can be tricky
 - * more examples in the private sector

Purchased Transit Service in US Transit Industry: Operating Expense (2007, \$ millions)

Mode	Directly Operated	Purchased	Total	% Purchased
Bus	15,662	1,646	17,308	9.5%
Heavy Rail	5,835	53	5,888	0.9%
Commuter Rail	3,772	242	4,015	6.0%
Light Rail	1,098	72	1,170	6.1%
Paratransit	2,166	2,255	4,421	51.0%
Total	28,533	4,268	32,801	13.0%

Source: American Public Transit Administration Fact Book 2009 (for 2007)

Transportation Services Typically Contracted

- **Fixed route bus and rail services**
 - * **limited examples but increasing—Denver, Dallas, Southern California, San Juan, D.C. suburban services**
 - * **generally has been proposed to reduce costs and/or to provide new services**
 - * **since market is relatively small, # of bidders usually low**
 - * **rail market just starting—quality of service seems to be the emphasis here**

Services Typically Contracted

- **Paratransit (i.e., demand-responsive) services**
 - * **contracting much more prevalent here with a range of outcomes**
 - * **small but growing portion of public agency budget often consumes a disproportionate amount of management attention and public scrutiny**
 - * **transition difficulties are frequent, especially in areas with only one provider**
 - * **technology and customer relations play an important role**

Contract Economics: Basic Principles

- **Deals with situation of asymmetric information:**
 - important information available to only one of parties
 - important information cannot be independently verified
- **Basic question: how can the party (the principal) with limited information:**
 - (a) create a mechanism (contract) and
 - (b) behave, such that a party (the agent) with desired traits:
 - i) wants to enter into the contract and
 - ii) then wants to behave as desired by the principal

Difficulties in Applying Contract Economics

- **Complexity of agent's task is great, simple incentives are risky**
- **The principal may have difficulty determining the utility function**
- **A great deal of information is required of both parties**
- **Outcomes are often not under the agent's control**
- **Resulting contracts may be unfeasibly complex**
- **The more possible actions, possible outcomes, and uncertainty between the action and the outcome, the more difficult the problem.**
- **There are limits to contract complexity in practice -- they are difficult and costly to design and enforce.**

Applications to Transit Service Contracting

Traditional approaches to contract design:

- identify desirable performance by contractor
- define measures for performance
- devise incentives/penalties based on measures

Obstacles to applying contract economics:

- agency has multiple objectives for contracting
- contractors have a great range of actions to choose from
- contractors also have multiple objectives

Fundamental Contracting Issues

- **Maximize competition**
- **Understand the potential contractors**
- **Consider risk premiums**
- **Consider implications of fixed and variable costs**
- **Provision of equipment and facilities**
- **Performance standards, incentives, and penalties**
- **Compensation provisions (startup costs and cash flow)**
- **Contract length (normally 3-5 years)**

US Transit Agency Contracting Practices

- **Contracting is relatively stable, and still a small share of all service (13% overall, 51% of paratransit)**
- **Increasing use of competitive selection processes**
- **Structuring bids to minimize contractor's risk can increase competition**
- **Incentives and penalties are often included in contracts, but enforced much less frequently**
- **Contract extension/renewal a common implicit incentive**
- **Impact on reputation is a major factor**

Types of Service Contracts

1. “Cost Plus” (~ 20%)

- * provider is reimbursed for all costs (usually up to a “ceiling”) plus a negotiated profit
- * contractor generally cannot suffer a loss
- * thought to provide little inducement to keep costs low
- * often associated with quality of service objective

Types of Service Contracts

2. “Fixed Price” (~ 80%)

- * ~ 60% based on service provided (vehicle hours or miles)
 - revenue versus non-revenue
 - can result in less emphasis on quality
- * ~ 20% based on service consumed (passenger trips or miles)
 - short trips versus long trips
 - measurement becomes a critical item
- * shifts much more risk to contractor and various mechanisms have been used to reduce this risk
 - “floors” on service or passenger units
 - combination of fixed and variable payments
 - full cost template specification and "shadow" bids at TfL

Contract Management/ Contractual Relationships

- **Key to success is competent management on both sides**
- **Mutual respect and fair dealings most important aspects of relationship**
- **Regular reporting by contractor, thorough review by agency necessary**
- **Hands-on, frequent interaction reduces “games”**

Contract Management/ Contractual Relationships

- **Achievable, significant incentives more important than penalties except in extreme cases**
- **Reputation/recommendation more important than minor financial incentives**
- **“Cost-plus” form of contract with revenue/cost savings sharing may be cheapest in the long run**

Case Study 1: New Suburban Fixed-Route Bus Services

- **5-year fixed-price for new services (compensation based on revenue-hours)**
- **Low-bid selected (a penny an hour difference!)**
- **Vehicles purchased by public agency and maintenance-facility provided midway through contract**
- **Contract economics change drastically as service expands and vehicles age**

Case Study 1: New Suburban Fixed-Route Bus Services

- **Drivers hired by public agency**
- **No interest within agency in renegotiating terms**
- **Penalties and incentives were insignificant**
- **Major loss could cripple small company**
- **Resulted in: new operator with substantially increased costs**

Case Study 2: State-Sponsored Paratransit/Medicaid Transportation

- **Competition for each county or groups of counties every 3-5 years**
- **Public, private-not-for-profit and private-for-profit companies compete**
- **Compensation on basis of price per passenger-mile with COL adjustments**
- **Quality of service initially an explicit factor; later reduced to a “qualification”**
- **Private providers pushed out due to public cross-subsidies**

Case Study 3: Paratransit Brokerage

- **One of longest-running private contracts in U.S. for one of the largest ADA/elderly paratransit programs**
- **Private broker has a “cost-plus” contract with public agency and in-turn contracts on a vehicle-hour basis with 6-12 private providers (by region)**
- **Significant incentive for productivity; small penalties for poor service**
- **Year-to-year semi-formal cost-based renegotiations of rates and adjustments of service areas**
- **Proven result-lower costs per passenger and per-hour and excellent service quality**

Case Study 4: TfL Overground Service

- **Transfer of 4 commuter rail services from UK National Rail to TfL, to be combined with a newly-built service (ELL)**
- **Complete cost specification including explicit overheads and profits through TfL-supplied templates**
- **Evaluators and consultants complete a "shadow bid"**
- **Performance regime is difficult because of enormous uncertainty**
- **BAFO included "Dynamic Benchmarking Revenue Share Incentive," but TfL never "bought in"**

Final Thoughts on Performance Regimes

- **Carefully consider aspects of performance you want to reward or discourage**
- **Can you justify significant monetary incentives?**
- **Rule of Thumb from Contractor's Perspective:**
 - **Put no more than 2/3 of profit at risk**
 - **Will work harder if profit can be doubled**
- **The more uncertainty in future performance, the more dynamic benchmarks make sense**

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

1.258J / 11.541J / ESD.226J Public Transportation Systems
Spring 2010

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.