

**Board Brief**  
**Transportation System: Service Deliver Model Selection**

The Board is faced with many difficult issues and decisions. Quality decision-making requires the consideration of several pieces of information. Listed below are five questions, when applied to the issues related to student transportation in Parkrose School District, may prove valuable.

Note: Timeliness of decision-making is critical, if a change in delivery model is selected.

1. What is or are the specific issue(s) or concern(s) related to the current model?
2. What are the potential answers or solutions to be considered?
3. Will the potential solutions meet the immediate needs and respond to the stated concerns?
4. Are the potential solutions sustainable (Infrastructure, costs, etc.)
5. Of the potential solutions, which one BEST meets the needs of the District and its students within the dynamics identified above.

**Listed below are three scenarios related to transportation service delivery models. As noted before, no magic or ultimate advantage is attributable to any single model given that each will have both strengths and weaknesses.**

Scenario #1	Scenario #2	Scenario #3
<b>Continue to operate system in its current configuration</b>	<b>Continue to operate system in its current format including a long-term commitment to bus replacement</b>	<b>Outsource entire Transportation operation based on RFP requirements</b>
<b>Approved Budget : ???</b>	<b>Estimated Costs:</b> See Cost Analysis	<b>Estimated Costs:</b> See Cost Analysis
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Strengths</b>
Familiarity  Requires no additional action beyond current budget adoption  Retains staff and provides least amount of employee disruption  Maintains total control of operations  District retains the option to change service delivery model in the future	Fleet is updated significantly with buses matching current capacities and configuration  Links state support more closely to expenditure  District retains employees and total control of operations.  Minimizes budget spikes due to unplanned vehicle purchases  Better, safer buses with a smaller carbon footprint and fewer emissions  Reduced vehicle maintenance costs	-Fleet updated next year and remains updated without additional Board action  -May provide efficiency and safety features not implemented in current operations at no additional cost, e.g. routing technology, cameras, additional training and efficiencies of scale  Provides ongoing built-in service assessments and comparative analysis of operational efficiency  Potential one-time cash inflow with unlimited uses from fleet sale  Avoids budget spikes due to

<p>OTHERS?</p>	<p>District retains the option to change service delivery model in the future.</p> <p>Maintains total control of operations</p> <p>OTHERS?</p>	<p>unplanned vehicle purchases</p> <p>If selected, can provides cash flow from facility lease (limited use)</p> <p>Results in reduced liability and PD insurance expenses</p> <p>District retains the option to change service delivery model in the future.</p> <p>Removes employee issues, e.g., recruitment, hiring, testing, retention, PERS, etc.</p> <p>OTHERS?</p>
<p><b>Weakness</b></p> <p>Susceptibility to budget spikes for unplanned vehicle purchases and/or major repair</p> <p>Sustainability of current model</p> <p>Ever increasing vehicle maintenance costs for aging buses and availability of parts resulting in an estimated ?? additional annual expense</p> <p>Buses with higher emissions requiring significant retrofit or replacement</p> <p>Older buses do not include additional safety components now required</p> <p>If future sale is considered, the value of the fleet decreases each year. In five years the fleet is estimated to be worth ??? of it's current value</p> <p>Implications of future changes in PERS requirements</p> <p>Unknown impact of future changes in state support</p> <p>OTHERS?</p>	<p><b>Weakness</b></p> <p>Requires additional District funds ??? <b>after</b> state support</p> <p>Requires long-term commitments</p> <p>Potential costs associated with bid/RFP development</p> <p>Possible employee conflicts over new buses</p> <p>Potential negative perceptions related to making bus purchases while furloughing/laying off staff</p> <p>Possible staff time reductions resulting from increased vehicle reliability</p> <p>Implications of future changes in PERS requirements</p> <p>Unknown impact of future changes in state support</p> <p>OTHERS?</p>	<p><b>Weakness</b></p> <p>Preparation costs of Bids/RFPs</p> <p>Provides bus replacement with similar "new" units only if specified by contract</p> <p>Employee anxiety and disruption over outsourcing operations</p> <p>Requires long-term commitments</p> <p>Possible challenges and legal costs</p> <p>Establishes some limits on local control based on contract</p> <p>Limits District's ability to return to self-op, possibly irrevocable commitment</p> <p>Limited use of existing funds derived from bus depreciation</p> <p>Requires ongoing service review schedules and procedures</p> <p>Unknown impact of future changes in state support</p> <p>OTHERS?</p>