

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 260000000173

Notice of Intent to Award Date: 3/18/2026

The Department of Technology, Management, and Budget’s Central Procurement Office has completed the evaluation of Request for Proposal (RFP) 260000000513 for Accessible Passenger Vehicle – Modified Minivans and has recommended an award to Hoekstra Transportation, Inc. in the amount of \$100,000, and Bus Service Incorporated in the amount of \$100,000, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Patrick Turcotte, Solicitation Manager.
 TurcotteP@michigan.gov

Public copies of all bidder proposals can be found here: [DTMB - Bid Proposals \(michigan.gov\)](#)

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Accessible Passenger Vehicle – Modified Minivan. The term of this contract is two years, with up to two one-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on 12/5/2025 for four weeks. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 1/9/2026.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Hoekstra Transportation Inc.	3741 Roger B Chaffee Blvd. Grand Rapids, MI 49548	N/A	N/A
Bus Service Incorporated	8120 Howe Industrial Parkway Canal Winchester, OH, 43110	N/A	N/A

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

**GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation. The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Specifications – Schedule D – Small Class of Non-lift and Lift Transit Bus Specifications, and Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.1	50
2.	Schedule A , Section 1.2	10
3.	Schedule A , Section 2	5
4.	Schedule A , Sections 2.1, 6.1, and 6.2	5
5.	Vendor Questions Worksheet, Schedule A , Section 3	20
6.	Schedule A , Section 7	10
	Total	100

Proposals receiving **80** or more evaluation points will have pricing evaluated.

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Patrick Turcotte, Commodities Category Analyst DTMB, Central Procurement Services	Rob Pearson, Bus Regulatory, Intercity Bus, Procurement Unit Supervisor MDOT, Office of Passenger Transportation
Blayne Mitchell, Vehicle Procurement Analyst MDOT, Office of Passenger Transportation	Terry Harris, Buyer Specialist MDOT, Contract Services Division

Voting	Advisory
	Valerie Shultz, Transportation Services Section Manager MDOT, Office of Passenger Transportation
	Alannah Doak, Category Specialist DTMB, Central Procurement Services
	Katie McFarland, Category Manager DTMB, Central Procurement Services

III. Evaluation Results

A. Hoekstra Transportation, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Hoekstra Transportation, Inc. based on a score of 99, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule D – Small Class of Non-lift and Lift Transit Bus Specifications, and Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.1 – Required Documentation (50/50 points)
The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies.
2. Schedule A, Section 1.2 – Product Specifications (10/10 points)
The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:
The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies.
3. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 2 – Service Timeframes (5/5 points)
The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies.
4. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Sections 1.2, 6.1, and 6.2 – Timeframes, Delivery Program, General Delivery (5/5 points)
The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies.
5. Vendor Questions Worksheet, Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 7 – Acceptance (20/20 points)
The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies.
6. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 7 – Acceptance (10/10 points)
The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies.

Total Score: 100/100

B. Bus Service Incorporated

The Evaluation Team determined that Bus Service Incorporated, based on a score of 94, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies

1. Schedule D – Small Class of Non-lift and Lift Transit Bus Specifications, and Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.1 – Required Documentation (50/50 points)
2. Schedule A – Section 1.2 – Product Specifications (10/10 points)

The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies.

3. Schedule A, Section 2 – Service Timeframes (4/5 points)

The evaluation team found the following deficiencies:

- a. The bidder provided pricing for additional training in requirement 2.3 for mechanical and technician review which violated the proposal instructions.
4. Schedule A, Sections 2.1, 6.1, and 6.2 – Timeframes, Delivery, Delivery Program, General Delivery (5/5 points)

The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet, Schedule A, Section 3 – Staffing (17/20 points)

The evaluation team found the following deficiencies:

- a. For requirement 3.4 the bidder did not provide an org chart.
6. Schedule A, Section 7 – Acceptance (10/10 points)

The evaluation Team did not find any deficiencies

Total Score: 96/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Selection Criteria		Hoekstra Transportation, Inc.	Bus Service Incorporated
1	Schedule D, Small Class of Non-lift and Lift Transit Bus Specifications, and Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.1	50	50
2	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2	10	10
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 2	5	4
4	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 2.1, 6.1, and 6.2	5	5
5	Vendor Questions Worksheet, and Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 3	20	17
6	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 7	10	10
	Total	100	96

V. Pricing Summary

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

Deliverable		Hoekstra Transportation, Inc. BraunAbility	Hoekstra Transportation, Inc. FR Conversions	Bus Service Incorporated FR Conversions
1	Vinyl Seat Covers	\$3,516,567.50	\$3,586,611.00	\$3,457,331.00
2	Cloth Seat Covers	\$3,516,567.50	\$3,586,611.00	\$3,482,581.00
3	Equipment Options	\$374,836.25	\$377,866.25	\$808,409.05
	Total Price With Options			
	Vinyl Seat Covers	\$3,891,403.75	\$3,964,477.25	\$4,265,740.05
	Cloth Seat Covers	\$3,891,403.75	\$3,964,477.25	\$4,290,990.05

VI. Clarifications

The State requested clarifications to all bidders regarding whether the swing-away side entry ramp, foldaway rear seat footrest, and the video surveillance prep were standard equipment at no additional cost, unavailable, or available at additional cost. Bus Service Incorporated was also asked whether they would provide purchased vehicles in Michigan since they are based in Ohio.

Hoekstra Transportation, Inc. confirmed the swing-away side entry ramp was standard equipment at no additional cost. They also confirmed the foldaway rear seat footrest was standard at no additional cost. The bid for the video surveillance prep is confirmed as an additional equipment option but bid \$0.

Bus Service Incorporated confirmed the swing-away side entry ramp was standard equipment at no additional cost. The foldaway rear seat footrest and video surveillance prep were confirmed as additional equipment options at additional cost. They also confirmed that vehicles purchased by Michigan Transit Authorities would be registered in Michigan prior to delivery.

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidders who offer the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section.

Hoekstra Transportation, Inc. and Bus Service Incorporated provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include: passing the technical evaluation.

Award Recommendation is made to Hoekstra Transportation, Inc. in the amount of \$100,000. Award Recommendation is made to Bus Service Incorporated in the amount of \$100,000.