City of Port St. Lucie

Procurement Management Division

121 SW Port St. Lucie Blvd,, Port St. Lucie, FL 34984

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFQu No. 20250144

Independent Peer Review of Design Plans

RESPONSE DEADLINE: July 23, 2025 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Tuesday, December 30, 2025

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

Question Title	Giangrande Engineering & Planning	Propel Engineering, LLC	Willdan Engineering
Mandatory Forms			
Proposal Upload	Pass	Pass	Pass
Proof that Consultant qualifies as a design criteria professional under section 287.055, Florida Statutes	Pass	Pass	Pass
Consultant's General Information Worksheet	Pass	Pass	Pass
E-Verify Form	Pass	Pass	Pass
Non-Collusion Affidavit	Pass	Pass	Pass
Debarment Form	Pass	Pass	Pass
Lobbying Form	Pass	Pass	Pass
Copy of W-9	Pass	Pass	Pass
Copy of Certificate of Insurance	Pass	Pass	Pass
Electronic Confirmation			
Cone of Silence and Communication Document	Pass	Pass	Pass
Consultant's Code of Ethics	Pass	Pass	Pass

Question Title	Giangrande Engineering & Planning	Propel Engineering, LLC	Willdan Engineering
Drug Free Workplace	Pass	Pass	Pass
Affidavit of Nongovernment Entity Anti-Human Trafficking Laws	Pass	Pass	Pass
Vendor Scrutinized Companies List Certification	Pass	Pass	Pass
I certify that I have read, understood, and agreed to the terms outlined in this solicitation, including all Addenda, Notices, and the Question & Answer section. Furthermore, I confirm that I am authorized to submit this response on behalf of my company.	Pass	Pass	Pass

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
John Lamb	Project Manager	Aug 12, 2025 3:12 PM
Mike Martin	Regulatory Inspector	Aug 13, 2025 1:30 PM
Zak Sherman	Executive Project Manager	Aug 12, 2025 3:07 PM
Cesare Simonelli	Traffic project manager	Aug 12, 2025 2:43 PM
Everett Tourjee	Project Manager – CIP & Sales Tax Project Group	Aug 15, 2025 11:21 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Firm's Qualifications, Personnel & Experience	Points Based	20 *(20% of Total)*

Description:
See Tabs 1 & 2 in Section 3.3. Proposal Format

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Project Understanding	Points Based	25 *(25% of Total)*

Description:
See Tabs 1 & 3 in Section 3.3. Proposal Format

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Methodology/Approach/ Project Understanding/ Peer Review Experience	Points Based	35 *(35% of Total)*

Description:
See Tabs 1 & 3 in Section 3.3. Proposal Format

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Relevant Project References	Points Based	20 *(20% of Total)*

Description:
See Tab 1 in Section 3.3. Proposal Format

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	John Lamb	Mike Martin	Zak Sherman	Cesare Simonelli	Everett Tourjee	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Propel Engineering, LLC	90	94	93	100	98	**95**
Willdan Engineering	100	95	84	90	99	**93.6**
Giangrande Engineering & Planning	100	93	89	85	94	**92.2**

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Firm's Qualifications, Personnel & Experience Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Project Understanding Points Based 25 Points (25%)	Methodology/Approach/ Project Understanding/ Peer Review Experience Points Based 35 Points (35%)	Relevant Project References Points Based 20 Points (20%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Propel Engineering, LLC	18.8	24.4	32.2	19.6	**95**
Willdan Engineering	19.4	24.2	32	18	**93.6**
Giangrande Engineering & Planning	18.2	23.2	33	17.8	**92.2**

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Giangrande Engineering & Planning

Firm's Qualifications, Personnel & Experience | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

John Lamb: 20

Qualified, small, experienced. Limited inclusion of subs. **Perfectly articulated to account for an increase.

Mike Martin: 18

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 19

Mid-sized local firm, licensed staff, history of work with municipalities. Strong but narrower staff depth, Office in Stuart. Presentation: Has done reviews for city before, like 10.

Cesare Simonelli: 15

Did not see qualifications for signalization

Everett Tourjee: 19

Wealth of experience and several discipline-specific subconsultants. *Showed significant roundabout experience.

Project Understanding | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

John Lamb: 25

No issues with understanding the scope of projects.

Mike Martin: 25

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 21

Solid grasp of scope, shows awareness of city needs. Framed more generally and with less direct PSL tie-ins.

Cesare Simonelli: 20

See projects for drainage, traffic calming, etc but do not show any projects related to signalization

Everett Tourjee: 25

Adequate understanding of the project.

Methodology/Approach/ Project Understanding/ Peer Review Experience | Points Based | 35 Points (35%)

John Lamb: 35

Presentation is streamlined/no frills. A few formatting issues. **Perfectly articulated to cancel out formatting issues.

Mike Martin: 32

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 31

Provides framework for reviews, QA/QC, and compliance. Lacks some of the step-by-step detail offered; more narrative than procedural. Presentation: Review 30,60, 90 and give time estimates. follows up meeting with email summaries.

Cesare Simonelli: 35

Appears to understand the citys needs

Everett Tourjee: 32

Approach is adequate. May not be sufficiently fleshed-out. *Fleshed out approach more for specific project types.

Relevant Project References | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

John Lamb: 20

Have plenty of relevant previous work listed.

Mike Martin: 18

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 18

Relevant municipal projects, but less variety and scale than we'd like to see

Cesare Simonelli: 15

Could have posted a signalized intersection improvement. Does not show versatility

Everett Tourjee: 18

Small but local and applicable: Community/Discovery Intersection with TIM. Rosser/Sandia Traffic Calming. Tradition Trail Ph 3. Tulip Raised Crosswalk. East Fork STA. Derecktor Boat Yard.

Propel Engineering, LLC

Firm's Qualifications, Personnel & Experience | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

John Lamb: 17

Focus seems to be on subs, not on main staff. **Personable

Mike Martin: 19

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 19

Holds required licenses/certs, extensive staff and firm experience, relevant detailed projects including St. Lucie, strong municipal background. Office in WPB. Presentation: also have office stuart.

Cesare Simonelli: 20

Staff is well rounded in various engineering projects

Everett Tourjee: 19

Wealth of experience and several discipline-specific subconsultants. *Personnel demonstrated significant experience during presentation.

Project Understanding | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

John Lamb: 25

No issues with understanding the scope of projects.

Mike Martin: 24

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 23

Understands City scope and why it's important. Notes prior work in PSL. Shows they grasp both the "what" and the "why."

Cesare Simonelli: 25

They understand the city's need for a consultant to work hand in hand with

Everett Tourjee: 25

Adequate understanding of the project.

Methodology/Approach/ Project Understanding/ Peer Review Experience | Points Based | 35 Points (35%)

John Lamb: 28

Presentation feels clunky, attention to detail missed on page 98 and duplicate pages. **Organized, thorough responses, though perhaps overcomplicated**

Mike Martin: 32

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 32

Clear, detailed methodology. Defined review process with engineering comments, follow-ups, marked plans, and certification letters. Plan to verify scope, payment items, cost estimates, and constructability. Strong QA approach with reports and trend analysis. Shows they've thought through implementation, not just understanding. Presentation: 3 tier approach to addressing reviews. Within 10 day turnaround time.

Cesare Simonelli: 35

The approach and Methodology to the projects will help to alleviate costly mistakes

Everett Tourjee: 34

Extremely thorough, above adequate. Site Visits a possibility. *Firm got more granular with approach including FDOT items.

Relevant Project References | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

John Lamb: 20

Have plenty of relevant previous work listed.

Mike Martin: 19

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 19

Extensive Florida and municipal experience, with history of delivering cost savings. Prior PSL projects reinforce credibility.

Cesare Simonelli: 20

Propel submitted appropriate project references.

Everett Tourjee: 20

In-State and very applicable: Boynton Beach Complete Streets. SR 535 RRR. SR 44 RRR. Morris Bridge Rd Mobility Improvements. Lyons Rd Improvements. Old Germantown Rd Multimodal Improvements. Miner Rd and High Ridge Rd Improvements. SR 809 RRR.

Willdan Engineering

Firm's Qualifications, Personnel & Experience | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

John Lamb: 20

Qualified, experienced, no subcontracting listed. **Appears that no subcontracting was listed because of a very large corporate presence**

Mike Martin: 19

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 18

Large, established firm with extensive resources. Strong team credentials and broad service capabilities. Experience across multiple disciplines and municipalities. Not as locally rooted but shows depth of experience.

Cesare Simonelli: 20

Appears to have qualified personal with the experience on the team.

Everett Tourjee: 20

Massive experience; few subconsultants needed, however none listed. *Specific FDOT experience

Project Understanding | Points Based | 25 Points (25%)

John Lamb: 25

No issues with understanding the scope of projects.

Mike Martin: 25

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 21

Shows clear awareness of the City's scope and needs. Highlights importance of aligning with municipal processes and the value of plan review and inspection services. Demonstrates understanding of why peer review matters, though less tailored to PSL specifically.

Cesare Simonelli: 25

Appears to understand the needs of the City

Everett Tourjee: 25

Adequate understanding of the project.

Methodology/Approach/ Project Understanding/ Peer Review Experience | Points Based | 35 Points (35%)

John Lamb: 35

Presentation is polished and detailed. **Specifically mentioned the field staff as being present in the review process - hands on experience building things is key to finding challenges** **Plan Review Software Seems Helpful**

Mike Martin: 33

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 27

Outlines review process and quality assurance structure, but presented in a broad way. Focuses on consistency and resources available across Florida, but lacks detailed step-by-step processes or PSL-specific integration. Strong on capacity, less strong on implementation detail. Presentation: have 15 day turnaround.

Cesare Simonelli: 30

Due to their location onsite project visit's may be delayed

Everett Tourjee: 35

Extremely thorough and well-thought out. Almost all potentialities accommodated

Relevant Project References | Points Based | 20 Points (20%)

John Lamb: 20

Have plenty of relevant previous work listed.

Mike Martin: 18

No Comment

Zak Sherman: 18

Extensive Florida client list across counties and cities, covering plan review, inspection, permitting, and disaster-related services. Demonstrates broad municipal work but lighter on direct Port St. Lucie or hyper-local context.

Cesare Simonelli: 15

Project references do not show versatility in all phases of the City's needs. (Ex: Signals)

Everett Tourjee: 19

Applicable but many out of state: Pinellas On-Call Post-Hurricane Development Review. St. Pete Beach On-Call Post-Hurricane Plan Review. La Habra On-Call General Engineering. Inglewood As-Needed Engineering. San Fernando As-Needed Engineering. *Included extra examples in presentation