



TABULATION SHEET

PS No. PS-6548-25/RTB

Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Services for the Seminole County Administration Building

RESPONSE DEADLINE: June 4, 2025 at 2:00 pm

Monday, October 6, 2025

Vendor	Contact Info
Ajax Building Company, LLC	Kasey Diehl - kasey.diehl@ajaxbuilding.com
Charles Perry Partners, Inc.	CPI Team - marcom@cpi.com (352) 333-9292
Persons Services Corp.	Olga Cala - olga@personsservices.com (954) 616-5106
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	Becky Titus btitus@whartonsmith.com

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Tabulated and Posted: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 at 4:30PM EST by Robert Bradley, Purchasing Manager

Evaluation Committee Meeting: Monday, June 30, 2025 at 10AM at 1101 E. First Street, Sanford, FL 32771 room 3024. The shortlist will be determined by the total average ranking of the firms after evaluations. Updated and posted Thursday, June 26, 2025 at 8:00AM EST.

Presentations and Interviews: Monday, October 6, 2025 at 8:30 AM EST) in County Manager's Conference Room 3024 at 1101 East First Street, Sanford, FL 32771, listed alphabetically:

1. Ajax Building Company
2. Charles Perry Partners
3. Wharton Smith

Final Ranking and Consensus Meeting: Monday, October 6, 2025 at 4pm in County Manager's Conference Room 3024 at 1101 East First Street, Sanford, FL 32771

TABULATION SHEET

Request for Professional Services (PS) - Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Services for the Seminole County Administration Building

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
PS No. PS-6548-25/RTB

Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Services for the Seminole County Administration Building

BCC Meeting: October 28, 2025 – Request to approve ranking and authorize staff to negotiate rates with the top-ranked firm in accordance with Florida Statutes, 287.055 CCNA (Updated and Posted, Monday, October 6, 2025 at 4:30PM EST):

1. Charles Perry Partners, Inc.
2. Ajax Building Partners
3. Wharton Smith, Inc.



EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6548-25/RTB
Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Services for the Seminole County Administration Building
RESPONSE DEADLINE: June 4, 2025 at 2:00 pm
Report Generated: Monday, June 30, 2025

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Nick Brow	Anthony Maddox	Kristian Swenson	Chad Wilsky	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Charles Perry Partners, Inc.	95 (1)	90 (1)	100 (1)	99 (1.5)	96	1.13
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	88 (3)	85 (2.5)	98 (2)	99 (1.5)	92.5	2.25
Ajax Building Company, LLC	90 (2)	85 (2.5)	94 (3)	95 (3)	91	2.63
Persons Services Corp.	57 (4)	67 (4)	84 (4)	57 (4)	66.25	4

Shortlist for presentations and interviews is based on total average ranking of each firm after evaluation scoring. We approve the above stated ranking and recommend the top three (3) firms for presentations and interviews.

Nick Brow
Kristian Swenson

Anthony Maddox
Chad Wilsky



PRESENTATION TABULATION/RANKING

PS No. PS-6548-25/RTB
Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Services for the Seminole County Administration Building
RESPONSE DEADLINE: June 4, 2025 at 2:00 pm
Report Generated: Monday, October 6, 2025

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Nick Brow	Anthony Maddox	Kristian Swenson	Chad Wilsky	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Charles Perry Partners, Inc.	98 (1)	90 (1)	100	100 (1)	97	1
Ajax Building Company, LLC	90 (2)	80 (2)	80	90 (2)	85	2
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	80 (3)	70 (3)	60	75 (3)	71.25	3

Final Ranking is based on total average ranking of each firm after presentations. The Evaluation Committee approves the above stated ranking and recommend award to the top-ranked firm: 1. Charles Perry Partners, Inc. 2. Ajax Building Company, LLC, 3. Wharton-Smith, Inc.

Nick Brow

Kristian Swenson

Anthony Maddox

Chad Wilsky



EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6548-25/RTB

Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) Services for the Seminole County Administration Building

RESPONSE DEADLINE: June 4, 2025 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Monday, October 6, 2025

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

PHASE 2

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Nick Brow	Construction Manager	Jun 13, 2025 7:26 AM
Anthony Maddox	Division Manager Facilities	Jun 5, 2025 7:07 AM
Kristian Swenson	Assistant County Manager	Jun 30, 2025 9:22 AM
Chad Wilsky	Fleet and Facilities Director	Jun 9, 2025 10:20 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Qualification and Experience	Points Based	50 (50% of Total)

Description:
A. Utilization Ratio: Provide an organizational chart with all supporting staff, provide current utilization; plus, anticipated utilization upon award of this project.
Represent utilization in hours with percentages based on a 40-hour work week.

- B. Meeting Availability: Share anticipated availability for in-person impromptu meetings, identify personnel to be in attendance and communication structure. Provide examples of how Stakeholder meetings have been performed with great success on past projects, share the strategy to manage including the tools used to memorialize information.
- C. Schedule: Provide a detailed schedule for both programming and design phase of the project. The measure of time shall be in weeks, hold four (4) weeks between each milestone deliverable for Stakeholder review; additional time for pricing will need to be evaluated.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Similar Project Experience	Points Based	50 (50% of Total)

Description:

- A. Highlight projects which align with a new administrative headquarters/office building with an integrated parking structure (if available). List the following criteria for each project:
- Total square footage
 - Construction cost
 - Design and Construction Schedule
 - Required: Original Final Completion vs. Actual Final Completion Date
 - Photographs (interior and exterior)
 - Key Personnel assigned to project
- Share examples of challenges and measures to overcome, and the resulting lessons learned created from this outcome
- B. Share a list of projects with unique challenges, respond to the following categories:
- Liquidated Damages: Include both assessed and/or resolved
 - Contract Claims
 - Litigation
 - Surety Involvement
 - Jobsite Injury Claims
 - If asked, projects which would receive a poor satisfaction rating from the owner.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Nick Brow	Anthony Maddox	Kristian Swenson	Chad Wilsky	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Charles Perry Partners, Inc.	98 (1)	90 (1)	100	100 (1)	97	1
Ajax Building Company, LLC	90 (2)	80 (2)	80	90 (2)	85	2
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	80 (3)	70 (3)	60	75 (3)	71.25	3
Persons Services Corp.	0 (4)	0 (4)	0 (1)	0 (4)	0	3.25
Excluded						

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Qualification and Experience Points Based 50 Points (50%)	Similar Project Experience Points Based 50 Points (50%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Charles Perry Partners, Inc.	48.3	48.8	97
Ajax Building Company, LLC	42.5	42.5	85
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	36.3	35	71.25
Persons Services Corp.	0	0	0
Excluded			

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Ajax Building Company, LLC		
Qualification and Experience Points Based 50 Points (50%)		
Nick Brow: 45		

Team is actively performing on another project together. Good use of "Join" software during preconstruction. 24-month schedule shown.

Anthony Maddox: 40

Experienced construction team with great experience in public sector commercial construction.

Kristian Swenson: 40

Overall good presentation. Good explanation of how the team would be available for the project. Concerns exist that the timeline could be impacted due to contract review and potential modifications.

Chad Wilisky: 45

Provided utilization ratio of proposed team. Sr Project Manager not listed as part of preconstruction services or GMP. Needed to provide more time for questions during presentation.

Similar Project Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (50%)

Nick Brow: 45

Excellent project experience closely matching this project.

Anthony Maddox: 40

Similar projects identified, clarity on litigation needed.

Kristian Swenson: 40

Good experience displayed

Chad Wilisky: 45

Proposed construction team worked on Sarasota County Admin building. Experienced with similar project scope. Thorough presentation.

Charles Perry Partners, Inc.

Qualification and Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (50%)

Nick Brow: 48

Team is available with dedicated staff on-site. 16-22 month schedule shown.

Anthony Maddox: 45

Good team with public sector commercial construction experience, local to Seminole County.

Kristian Swenson: 50

Excellent team and guarantee of the assignment.

Chad Wilsky: 50

Staff utilization ratio provided and explained in detail.

Similar Project Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (50%)

Nick Brow: 50

Team provided closely related experience with great lessons learned to be applied to our project. Heavy investigation of this project's background and site logistics.

Anthony Maddox: 45

Similar projects demonstrated with open transparency to litigation and contract claims.

Kristian Swenson: 50

Excellent experience. Forthright about other project issues and the correction of them. Excellent examples of how to build our project.

Chad Wilsky: 50

Very seasoned and experienced project management and superintendent construction team. Provided relevant and similar project experience as a firm and team. Provided 16-22 month construction schedule based on four different construction options. Detailed and thorough presentation.

Wharton-Smith, Inc.

Qualification and Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (50%)

Nick Brow: 40

Team is qualified with availability for specific dates of the project. Good preconstruction methodology. 24-month schedule shown.

Anthony Maddox: 35	Clarity is needed on the project team's experience in public sector commercial construction and the project team's availability.
Kristian Swenson: 30	Team is very casual about the availability and guarantee.
Chad Wilsky: 40	Questions regarding true availability of proposed team for project.

Similar Project Experience Points Based 50 Points (50%)	
Nick Brow: 40	Experience is satisfactory.

Anthony Maddox: 35	Similar projects demonstrated, however, clarity is needed regarding settled litigations and lessons learned.
Kristian Swenson: 30	The presentation lacked the depth of others in details and experience.
Chad Wilsky: 35	Not as detailed as the other proposers. Based on what was presented, proposed team was not as strong as other proposers.

Persons Services Corp. (Excluded)	
--------------------------------------	--

Qualification and Experience Points Based 50 Points (50%)	
Nick Brow: 0	
Anthony Maddox: 0	
Kristian Swenson: 0	

Chad Wilisky: 0

Similar Project Experience | Points Based | 50 Points (50%)

Nick Brow: 0

Anthony Maddox: 0

Kristian Swenson: 0

Chad Wilisky: 0

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Nick Brow	Construction Manager	Jun 13, 2025 7:26 AM
Anthony Maddox	Division Manager Facilities	Jun 5, 2025 7:07 AM
Kristian Swenson	Assistant County Manager	Jun 30, 2025 9:22 AM
Chad Wilisky	Fleet and Facilities Director	Jun 9, 2025 10:20 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Qualifications of Proposed Team	Points Based	30 (30% of Total)

Description:

- Provide qualifications and experience for staff proposed for this project, such as licenses and/or certifications. Resumes of key individuals may be included to demonstrate the skills necessary to complete this project.

- Identify and provide qualifications and experience of sub-consultants, relevant to this project. It is preferred for the sub-consultant to have worked with the prime consultant on previous projects and demonstrated their ability to be part of the design team.
- Provide an Organizational Chart depicting the team for this project to include roles and responsibilities in relation to the scope of this project. The organizational chart should include the location of each staff member that is proposed.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Similar Work Experience	Points Based	30 (30% of Total)

Description:

- Provide a list of similar projects, for which services have been successfully completed within the past five [5] years which most closely match the scope of work within this project. List must include a brief description of the project, contact person, address, telephone number, e-mail addresses. The County intends to conduct reference checks of those clients. These checks will be designed to validate the company's performance, ascertain the difference (if any) between expectations and delivery, and determine overall satisfaction with the company's services.

- Provide a maximum of four [4] verifiable references for similar services provided within the last five [5] years on the form provided in Part 3 of the solicitation package. The contact person(s) listed as a reference shall be someone who has personal knowledge of the Proposer's performance during the referenced project. Contact person(s) must have been informed that they are being used as a reference and that the County may be calling them on a valid phone number as provided. More than one [1] person can be listed, but all must have knowledge of the project. DO NOT list principals or officers who will not be able to answer specific questions regarding the project. The reference shall be the owner or a representative of the owner. An owner's representative is defined as a firm or individual hired by the owner to oversee design or construction oversight services performed by the prime Consultant. Consultants or Contractors who provided services under project (contract) shall not be accepted as references unless they were hired as the owner's representative for the referenced project (contract).

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Cost Analysis and Value Analysis	Points Based	35 (35% of Total)

Description:

- Cost Analysis: Identify strategies for estimating, monitoring, and controlling costs during both the preconstruction phase and construction phase of the project.
- Value Analysis: Outline framework and identify how your team measures projected costs against expected benefits. Provide successful examples of this process used on past projects.

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Location of the Firm	Points Based	5 (5% of Total)

Description:

Provide the location of the firm's office that will support the activities under this Agreement. Regional firms whose physical address is located within the Counties of Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Seminole, and Volusia will receive five (5) points. Firms located within the state of Florida will receive 2 points.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Nick Brow	Anthony Maddox	Kristian Swenson	Chad Wilsky	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Charles Perry Partners, Inc.	95 (1)	90 (1)	100 (1)	99 (1.5)	96	1.13
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	88 (3)	85 (2.5)	98 (2)	99 (1.5)	92.5	2.25
Ajax Building Company, LLC	90 (2)	85 (2.5)	94 (3)	95 (3)	91	2.63

Vendor	Nick Brow	Anthony Maddox	Kristian Swenson	Chad Wilsky	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Persons Services Corp.	57 (4)	67 (4)	84 (4)	57 (4)	66.25	4

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Qualifications of Proposed Team Points Based 30 Points (30%)	Similar Work Experience Points Based 30 Points (30%)	Cost Analysis and Value Analysis Points Based 35 Points (35%)	Location of the Firm Points Based 5 Points (5%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Charles Perry Partners, Inc.	28.8	28.8	33.5	5	96
Wharton-Smith, Inc.	29.5	26.3	31.8	5	92.5
Ajax Building Company, LLC	26.3	27	32.8	5	91
Persons Services Corp.	20.8	19	24.5	2	66.25

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

Ajax Building Company, LLC

Qualifications of Proposed Team | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Nick Brow: 25

Team is well qualified. Organizational Chart is satisfactory. Team is working out of several offices.

Anthony Maddox: 20

Personnel have diverse experience in commercial construction. Years of experience not provided.

Kristian Swenson: 30

Team seems qualified

Chad Wilisky: 30

Qualified team. Construction of Sarasota County admin building

Similar Work Experience | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Nick Brow: 30

Excellent experience closely aligned to project. Includes both government offices and parking garages. 90% of work is focused on public entities.

Anthony Maddox: 25

Ajax has diverse experience in the public sector and office settings.

Kristian Swenson: 25

Most applicable experience was still "coming soon"

Chad Wilisky: 28

Provided similar project experience. One of four references was for a project to be completed

Cost Analysis and Value Analysis | Points Based | 35 Points (35%)

Nick Brow: 30

Good value reflected in approach to cost analysis.

Anthony Maddox: 35

Preconstruction, Life Cycle Analysis, System Cost Analysis, construction cost control, and total cost control.

Kristian Swenson: 34

Process seemed fine but examples were small value

Chad Wilisky: 32

Provided outline for cost analysis and examples of value analysis

Location of the Firm | Points Based | 5 Points (5%)

Nick Brow: 5

Lake Mary, FL

Anthony Maddox: 5

Lake Mary, FL

Kristian Swenson: 5

Lake Mary, FL

Chad Wilisky: 5

Lake Mary, FL

Charles Perry Partners, Inc.

Qualifications of Proposed Team | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Nick Brow: 30

Team is well qualified. Organizational Chart is satisfactory. All project team members working out of local office.

Anthony Maddox: 25

Personnel have diverse experience in commercial construction. Staff have a minimum of 20 years of experience.

Kristian Swenson: 30

Great Team

Chad Wilisky: 30

Qualified team

Similar Work Experience | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Nick Brow: 25

Experience closely aligned to project. Includes both healthcare and headquarter offices with parking garages.

Anthony Maddox: 30

Ajax has diverse experience in the public sector and office settings, with over 20 municipal office/parking facilities erected.

Kristian Swenson: 30	Good similar projects
Chad Wilisky: 30	Several examples of similar work experience provided
Cost Analysis and Value Analysis Points Based 35 Points (35%)	
Nick Brow: 35	Great value reflected in approach to cost analysis.
Anthony Maddox: 30	Preconstruction and construction cost control
Kristian Swenson: 35	Good examples and not just small ones
Chad Wilisky: 34	Provided detailed approach for cost analysis and examples of value analysis
Location of the Firm Points Based 5 Points (5%)	
Nick Brow: 5	Oviedo, FL
Anthony Maddox: 5	Oviedo, FL
Kristian Swenson: 5	Oviedo, FL
Chad Wilisky: 5	Oviedo, FL

Persons Services Corp.	
Qualifications of Proposed Team Points Based 30 Points (30%)	
Nick Brow: 20	Team is qualified. Organizational Chart is satisfactory. Team is working out of Ft Lauderdale office. Exceeds page count.
Anthony Maddox: 20	Personnel have diverse experience in commercial construction. Staff have a minimum of 15 years of experience.
Kristian Swenson: 23	Team seems qualified but all far away
Chad Wilsky: 20	Project manager and superintendent not in central Florida area. Limited proposed team. Proposed team's qualification do not align with project
Similar Work Experience Points Based 30 Points (30%)	
Nick Brow: 15	Experience does not align to project.
Anthony Maddox: 20	Diverse university office space; however, no municipal administration building experience shown.
Kristian Swenson: 26	Experience seems fine but far all away.
Chad Wilsky: 15	Limited similar project experience provided and overall does not align with project
Cost Analysis and Value Analysis Points Based 35 Points (35%)	
Nick Brow: 20	Approach to cost analysis provided.

Best value delivery approach	Anthony Maddox: 25
Description seems brief	Kristian Swenson: 33
Limited detailed information provided	Chad Wilsky: 20

Location of the Firm Points Based 5 Points (5%)	
Ft. Lauderdale, FL	Nick Brow: 2
Ft. Lauderdale, FL	Anthony Maddox: 2
Ft. Lauderdale, FL	Kristian Swenson: 2
Ft. Lauderdale, FL	Chad Wilsky: 2

Wharton-Smith, Inc.	
Qualifications of Proposed Team Points Based 30 Points (30%)	
Team is well qualified. Organizational Chart is satisfactory. All project team members working out of local office. Staff utilization overlaps with current Seminole County CJC Renovation.	
Anthony Maddox: 30	
Personnel have diverse experience in commercial construction. Staff have a minimum of 20 years of experience, with familiarity with the Seminole County process.	

Great Team	Kristian Swenson: 30
	Chad Wilisky: 30
Qualified team	
Similar Work Experience Points Based 30 Points (30%)	
Nick Brow: 20	Experience is satisfactory. Includes government office and parking garage.
Anthony Maddox: 25	Wharton has diverse experience in the public sector and office settings with specific experience in admin buildings.
Kristian Swenson: 30	Good experience
Chad Wilisky: 30	Several examples of similar work experience provided
Cost Analysis and Value Analysis Points Based 35 Points (35%)	
Nick Brow: 35	Great value reflected in approach to cost analysis.
Anthony Maddox: 25	Preconstruction, value engineering, total cost of ownership, and construction cost control.
Kristian Swenson: 33	Described process, did not give many detailed examples
Chad Wilisky: 34	Provided detailed approach for cost analysis and examples of value analysis

Location of the Firm Points Based 5 Points (5%)	
Nick Brow: 5	Sanford, FL
Anthony Maddox: 5	Sanford, FL
Kristian Swenson: 5	Sanford, FL
Chad Wilisky: 5	Sanford, FL