

# Custodial Services Proposal 2025- 2027



# Current Service Provider: GRBS

- Service provider last three years
- Responsible for evening cleaning inside all buildings
- Contract has provision to extend for 2 years

Summary: Challenges due to staffing turnover, establishment of reasonable expectations, relationships between GRBS/Okemos Staff, willingness to improve

# Contracting or Okemos Staff

## Contracting (3rd Party)

- Cost savings
- Expanded resources
- Transfer management intensive duties

## Okemos

- Relationships
- Staff more vested
- Consistent staff
- Knowledge of facilities
- Direct supervision and control

# Contract Extension vs. an RFP

- Allows OPS time to coordinate new builds with contract renewal
- Extension of contract more economical than reopening bids
- Current provider responsive to feedback, willing to work with us
- Higher quality service with existing team vs. a new team
  - Relationships
  - Training, Knowledge of buildings
  - Improvements

# Cost Analysis: GRBS vs. Okemos Staff

<b>GRBS</b> <b>(cost per year/ previous 3 years)</b>	<b>\$1,177,000</b>
<b>GRBS</b> <b>(cost per year/next 2 years)</b>	<b>\$1,247,094</b>
<b><i>Difference (GRBS Extension):</i></b>	<b><i>\$70,094 (6% increase)</i></b>
<b>Okemos Staff (cost per year):</b> <b>(Maintains Current Staffing Model)</b>	<b>\$1,950,000</b>

# Why extend with GRBS?

- Relationship developing, working with us to address concerns
- Promoting ownership from students,
- Developing routines to assist in success
- Management has been responsive
- Positive references from other districts
- Struggles not unique to GRBS
- Most economical solution
  - Makes unknown, known for budget planning
- Timelines for bond/new buildings

# Recommendation

- Continue to contract for night custodial
- 2 year contract extension with GRBS, reassess

Other Considered but rejected:

- Going out to third party bid
- Bringing all custodial in house