



Seminole County
Resource Management - Purchasing & Contracts
Robert T. Bradley, Purchasing and Contracts Manager
1301 East Second St., Sanford, FL 32771

TABULATION SHEET

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 28, 2025 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Wednesday, October 1, 2025

PROPOSALS RECEIVED

Vendor	Contact Info
ASD SKY	John Curran - jcurran@asdnet.com (813) 341-6810
Cormia Design Group	Annabelle Fowler - design@cormia.com (407) 660-2766
HKS, Inc.	Nathan Butler - nbutler@hksinc.com (321) 251-9481
STORYN Studio for Architecture	Shea Baldino - contact@storynstudio.com
Silling Architects	Michael Moore - mmoore@silling.com (321) 296-8100
Song + Associates, Inc.	Kremer Shell - kshell@songandassociates.com (561) 655-2423
The S/L/A/M Collaborative, Inc.	Mary Martin - mmartin@slamcoll.com
jl2 Architecture	Johnnie Lohrum - jlohrum@jl2architecture.com (407) 340-2879

Tabulated: Wednesday, May 28, 2025 at 4:30 PM EST (Robert T. Bradley, Purchasing Manager)

Evaluation Committee Meeting: Thursday, June 12, 2025 at 3:00PM EST at 1101 E. First Street, Room 3024

Presentations and Interviews: Rescheduled for Tuesday, September 16, 2025, at the County Manager's Conference Room 3024 – 1101 East First Street, Sanford, FL 32771 at 8:30AM EST. These presentations are exempt from public attendance in accordance with F.S. 286.011 (Updated Friday, August 15, 2025 at 10:30AM EST)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

The shortlisted firms are listed alphabetically below:

- HKS, Inc.
- JL2 Architecture
- Silling Architects
- The S/L/A/M Collaborative, Inc.

Final Ranking and Consensus Meeting, Friday, September 19, 2025 11 – 11:30AM EST at County Manager’s Conference Room 3024 - 1101 East First Street, Sanford, FL 32771.

BCC Meeting – October 28, 2025 – Request to approve ranking and authorize staff to negotiate rates with the top-ranked firm in accordance with Florida Statute 287.055 CCNA (Updated and Posted, Friday, September 19, 2025 at 3:30PM EST) by Robert Bradley, Purchasing Manager.

1. Siling Architects
2. JL2 Architecture
3. HKS, Inc.
4. The S/L/A/M Collaborative, Inc.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Request for Professional Services (PS) - Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building



Seminole County
Resource Management - Purchasing & Contracts
Robert T. Bradley, Purchasing and Contracts Manager
1301 East Second St., Sanford, FL 32771

EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 28, 2025 at 2:00 pm - Report Generated: Thursday, June 12, 2025

Vendor	Nick Brow	Anthony Maddox	Kristian Swenson	Chad Wilsky	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
HKS, Inc.	100 (2)	100 (1)	88 (4.5)	100 (1)	97	2.13
JL2 Architecture	100 (2)	95 (2)	79 (6)	96 (3.5)	92.5	3.38
The S/L/A/M Collaborative, Inc.	85 (5)	85 (4)	100 (1)	97 (2)	91.75	3
Silling Architects	100 (2)	80 (6)	88 (4.5)	96 (3.5)	91	4
Song + Associates, Inc.	77 (6.5)	82 (5)	95 (2)	93 (5)	86.75	4.63
ASD SKY	87 (4)	87 (3)	73 (7.5)	90 (6)	84.25	5.13
STORYN Studio for Architecture	77 (6.5)	77 (7)	89 (3)	67 (8)	77.5	6.13
Cormia Design Group	70 (8)	70 (8)	73 (7.5)	70 (7)	70.75	7.63

Shortlisting is based on total average rank of the firms after evaluation and scoring. The Evaluation Committee recommends the top four (4) firms to be shortlisted for Presentations and Interviews: HKS, Inc. – JL2 Architecture – the S/L/A/M Collaborative, Inc. – Silling Architects


Nick Brow

Kristian Swenson


Anthony Maddox


Chad Wilsky Digitally signed by Chad Wilsky
Date: 2025.06.12 14:54:44 -04'00'

Chad Wilsky



Seminole County
Administrative Services - Purchasing & Contracts
Robert T. Bradley, Purchasing and Contracts Manager
1301 East Second St., Sanford, FL 32771

PRESENTATION RANKING

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 28, 2025 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Friday, September 19, 2025


AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Nick Brow	Anthony Maddox	Kristian Swenson	Chad Wilsky	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Silling Architects	95 (1)	96 (1)	100 (1)	100 (1)	97.75	1
jl2 Architecture	90 (2)	80 (2)	90 (2)	75 (3)	83.75	2.25
HKS, Inc.	85 (3)	65 (3)	80 (3)	80 (2)	77.5	2.75
The S/L/A/M Collaborative, Inc.	80 (4)	60 (4)	60 (4)	70 (4)	67.5	4

Recommendation is based on total average ranking of presentations after scoring.

We approve the above stated ranking and will request authorization from the Board to enter into negotiations with top-ranked firm: Silling Architects



Nick Brow

Kristian Swenson

Anthony Maddox

Chad Wilsky



Seminole County
Administrative Services - Purchasing & Contracts
Robert T. Bradley, Purchasing and Contracts Manager
1301 East Second St., Sanford, FL 32771

EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

RESPONSE DEADLINE: May 28, 2025 at 2:00 pm

Report Generated: Wednesday, October 1, 2025

VENDOR QUESTIONNAIRE PASS/FAIL

PHASE 2

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	Agreement Accepted On
Nick Brow	Construction Manager	May 29, 2025 9:36 AM
Anthony Maddox	Division Manager Facilities	Jun 12, 2025 7:41 AM
Kristian Swenson	Assistant County Manager	Jun 12, 2025 8:40 AM
Chad Wilsky	Fleet and Facilities Director	May 30, 2025 7:48 AM

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Qualifications of Proposed Project Team	Points Based	50 (50% of Total)

Description:

- **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.

EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

- **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.

What is the firm's strategy to provide a "local" customer service experience with key personnel located beyond the Central Florida region.

- **Programming Interviews:** Define the firm's process for conducting the building needs assessment with Stakeholders. Outline the timeline and methodology of collecting and then reporting data. Identify key personnel assigned to the programming phase.
- **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.

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

Description:

-
- Highlight projects which align with a new administrative headquarters/office building with an integrated parking structure (if available). Also, highlight projects where this collective team have performed together. List the following criteria for each project:
 - Total Square Footage
 - Occupancy Type
 - Construction Cost
 - Design and Construction Schedule
 - Photographs (*interior and exterior*)
 - Role and Responsibility of each firm.
 - Key Personnel assigned to project.
- Share examples of challenges and measures to overcome, and the resulting lessons learned created from this outcome.

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request for Professional Services (PS) - Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Nick Brow	Anthony Maddox	Kristian Swenson	Chad Wilsky	Total Score (Max Score 100)	Total Average Rank
Silling Architects	95 (1)	96 (1)	100 (1)	100 (1)	97.75	1
jl2 Architecture	90 (2)	80 (2)	90 (2)	75 (3)	83.75	2.25
HKS, Inc.	85 (3)	65 (3)	80 (3)	80 (2)	77.5	2.75
The S/L/A/M Collaborative, Inc.	80 (4)	60 (4)	60 (4)	70 (4)	67.5	4

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Qualifications of Proposed Project Team Points Based 50 Points (50%)	Similar Project Experience Points Based 50 Points (50%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
Silling Architects	49	48.8	97.75
jl2 Architecture	40	43.8	83.75
HKS, Inc.	33.8	43.8	77.5
The S/L/A/M Collaborative, Inc.	31.3	36.3	67.5

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

HKS, Inc.

Qualifications of Proposed Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (50%)

Nick Brow: 40

Utilization of proposed staff is satisfactory. Programming approach is well defined with a good understanding of stakeholder needs. 15-month programming/design schedule shown. Team is actively working on County's CJC Renovation - this effort would run concurrently with this project.

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request for Professional Services (PS) - Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

Anthony Maddox: 30

Good mix of local and non-local, however, very top-heavy with partners and principals leading the team. Could cause potential conflicts with operational priorities.

Kristian Swenson: 30

The schedule needed to be faster. The team was all higher level people. Had concerns over staffing and availability

Chad Wilsky: 35

Programming and design schedule lengthy.

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

Nick Brow: 45

(6) Examples shared for project experience, all of which match this solicitation's criteria.

Anthony Maddox: 35

Good array of municipal work, including Seminole County.

Kristian Swenson: 50

Good experience

Chad Wilsky: 45

Provided specific examples similar in scope to the County's project. Provided information and examples of site utilization.

j|2 Architecture

Qualifications of Proposed Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (50%)

Nick Brow: 45

Good composition of team members. Strong construction management background. Programming approach is well defined. Committed to 12-month schedule during Q&A period.

Anthony Maddox: 40

Seminole County local presence, however, the programming team is in DC.

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request for Professional Services (PS) - Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

Page 4

EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

Kristian Swenson: 40

The schedule needed to be faster

Chad Wilsky: 35

Programming and design schedule lengthy. Strong local project management team.

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

Nick Brow: 45

(3) Examples shared for project experience, all of which match this solicitation's criteria. 250k GSF designed in 12-months.

Anthony Maddox: 40

Good project experience with the public sector within Florida.

Kristian Swenson: 50

Experience was good

Chad Wilsky: 40

Local similar experience shared with Sarasota County Admin and FDACS. Information on site utilization not as detailed/ strong as other presenters. Phasing options eliminated key infrastructure. Not sure why this was presented.

Silling Architects

Qualifications of Proposed Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (50%)

Nick Brow: 48

Utilization of proposed staff is satisfactory. Meeting availability with local representation is satisfactory. Well outlined approach for programming interviews. 12-month programming/design schedule shown.

Anthony Maddox: 48

Teams are local to the Orlando and Tampa area.

Kristian Swenson: 50

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request for Professional Services (PS) - Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

Great schedule. Good team.

Chad Wilsky: 50

Provided detailed and aggressive 12-month design schedule including programming. Willing to commit to LD's if design schedule is not met.

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

Nick Brow: 47

(6) Examples shared for project experience, all of which match this solicitation's criteria. In-depth analysis of site conditions.

Anthony Maddox: 48

Over 6 governmental project examples given with similar credentials.

Kristian Swenson: 50

Great experience

Chad Wilsky: 50

Provided specific examples similar in scope to the County's project. Detailed approach communicated on approach/ cost saving measures/ building functionality and site utilization. Best understanding of significance of the new county administration building and interaction with the community.

The S/L/A/M Collaborative, Inc.

Qualifications of Proposed Project Team | Points Based | 50 Points (50%)

Nick Brow: 40

Utilization of proposed staff is satisfactory. Programming approach is through online surveys and AI supported programming software. 14.5-month programming/design schedule shown. Main "Point of Contact" did not attend presentation.

Anthony Maddox: 30

Local to the Orlando area. Other team members are in CT, but part of the same firm.

Kristian Swenson: 20

EVALUATION TABULATION

Request for Professional Services (PS) - Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

Page 6

EVALUATION TABULATION

PS No. PS-6549-25/RTB

Architectural and Engineering Services for Seminole County Administration Building

Missing the team member who was to be the point of contact from the presentation. The schedule was too slow.

Chad Wilsky: 35

Programming and design schedule lengthy.

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

Nick Brow: 40

(5) Examples shared for project experience, all of which match this solicitation's criteria.

Anthony Maddox: 30

Good municipal experience.

Kristian Swenson: 40

Project experience was okay but not as good as others

Chad Wilsky: 35

Shared some examples of similar project experience but did not seem to have an in-depth understanding or familiarity of the County's project as the other presenters.