



MEMORANDUM

TO: School Board Members

FROM: Dr. John B. Gordon III, *Superintendent JB/GJ/AG*

DATE: July 1, 2024

RE: HES Contract Cost Analysis

To improve the efficiency and frequency of the maintenance of all Suffolk Public School's grounds, a Grounds Resourcing model is being recommended to the School Board.

Currently, SPS has 8 employees who work 12 months to take care of all Elementary and Middle School outlying grass cutting. The equipment they use is maintained and purchased by SPS, this includes mowers, trimmers, blowers, trailers, truck to pull the trailers, and gasoline. Four new large mowers are needed for this year to be purchased with an estimated cost of \$60,000.

Total Budget for Grounds in the Adopted Budget Book:	\$616,759
Add: Repairs for mowers FY24 -in Building Services budget	15,000
Gasoline estimate for mowers FY24	3,000
Purchase orders for new mowers	<u>60,000</u>
Total	\$694,759
LESS:	
Personnel and benefits for 8 FTE filled who remain on SPS Payroll	(398,231)
Difference available to pay contract	\$296,528
Cost of Contract	(365,196)
Difference (Budget needed)	\$(68,668)

PROS of this contract include the following:

1. All SPS employees keep their positions until vacated by current employee
2. Each time HES hires a new grounds employee for us there is a savings to SPS of \$9,857.88
3. HES provides ALL equipment, trailers, supervision, training, and vehicles
4. HES does all recruitment of new employees and makes sure all areas are cut 21 times annually
5. This removes grass cutting from our current Custodians (we are having issues retaining custodians who do not want this responsibility)
6. SPS will not have to purchase/maintain mowers, trimmers, blowers and other outdoor equipment at each school location at a significant savings to the Building Services Budget
7. HES will cut ALL schools and locations grounds whereas our current grass cutters do not cut grass at the High Schools, edge and trim around any buildings, flowerbeds, and parking lots. Those items are maintained by custodians at each individual building.

CONS of this contract include:

1. The committee did not see any negatives to this more efficient and effective way of maintaining all the grounds, recruitment and training of new grass keepers, supervision as a whole of all of SPS grounds, less maintaining and purchasing of grounds equipment. There are many soft costs that are difficult to estimate like: MORE chances to recruit and retain custodians who will not have these duties and can concentrate on keeping facilities clean, training costs, recruitment costs, onboarding costs, etc.

tlg

M# - 001