# A 'survival budget' helps win bids 

Part three of a multi-part series.

n my April column ("Get high profits with design/build," page 60), I went to a bid opening where 38 landscape companies bid a school construction job. My client finished 10th despite tightening his pricing factors and production standards.

Sure there's a part of you that says, "Let 'em have it at that price." But there's also a thought that gnaws at you: "I will get nothing at my current price if this keeps up." Welcome to the new world. It's hard to define what distinguishes high-profit from low-profit companies in this environment when survival becomes the driving force.

There's only so much past relationships do for you in this environment, so fashion a "survival budget" that reduces costs and prices - and gives you a better chance of generating revenues. A survival budget must provide enough profit to recapitalize the company for next year. Using the chart below, let's review the budget's basic elements.

The starting point is expected revenues. In

|  | Good times | Survival mode |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Revenues | $\$ 5,000,000$ | $\$ 2,500,000$ |  |  |
| Gross margin | $\$ 1,700,000$ | $34 \%$ | $\$ 625,000$ | $25 \%$ |
| Overhead | $\$ 1,100,000$ | $22 \%$ | $\$ 550,000$ | $22 \%$ |
| Net profit | $\$ 600,000$ | $12 \%$ | $\$ 75,000$ | $3 \%$ |
| Assume (no subs) |  |  |  |  |
| Average hourly wage | $\$ 15$ | $\$ 13$ |  |  |
| Job materials | $35 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |  |
| Materials | $\$ 1,750,000$ | $\$ 1,250,000$ |  |  |
| Materials markup | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ |  |  |
| Labor | $\$ 1,550,000$ | $\$ 625,000$ |  |  |
| Hours | $\$ 103,333$ | $\$ 48,077$ |  |  |
| Effective rate | $\$ 29.76$ | $\$ 23,40$ |  |  |
| Labor cost reduction/hour |  | $15 \%$ |  |  |
| Pricing reduction |  | $27 \%$ |  |  |
| Overhead reduction |  | $100 \%$ |  |  |

this example, we anticipate a $50 \%$ year-to-year reduction in revenues. We then establish a survival net profit margin. I use $3 \%$ as the low-end recap target, which reflects the working capital needed to fund longer Accounts Receivable collection periods and some level of hard asset replacement.

## Overhead reduction

We keep overhead in line with revenues at $22 \%$ and conclude that overhead costs need to be halved. This is a painful, but necessary step. We add the 3\% net margin to the $22 \%$ overhead expense to equal a gross margin of $25 \%$.

## Labor cost reduction/hour

Given the reduced gross margin expectation, materials costs are now likely $50 \%$ of revenues - up from $35 \%$. We can calculate labor expenditures and hours from this assumption.

Revenues of $\$ 2.5$ million, less $\$ 1.25$ million in materials, leaves $\$ 625,000$ for labor. Dividing this by a $\$ 13$ hourly wage rate yields 48,077 labor hours.

To lower labor cost, we must lower the average wage $15 \%$, from $\$ 15$ to $\$ 13$ per hour. Some of this comes from less overtime and some from tighter management of non-billable hours.

## Pricing reduction

Lastly, we can calculate the hourly labor billing rate. Revenues minus the materials cost at its $10 \%$ markup, divided by the labor hours, provides the rate of $\$ 23.40$ per hour, $27 \%$ less than the prior year. In effect, prices are lowered $27 \%$ to achieve the desired margin.

With this survival budget, we can manage through a downturn and still have reinvestment income for the future. Those companies with solid balance sheets (debt-to-equity ratios lower than $40 \%$ and current ratios of 2.5 or better) will survive.

It is truly a stomach-churning case of survival of the fittest out there in the bid build world. Be prepared, and next year might look a little better.

