



**Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary
Master Plan - Project No. 2247839
Architectural Services Interview Results**

The Facilities Planning and Construction division of the School Board of Volusia County, Florida interviewed the top three ranked firms. Interview results from Wednesday, November 10, 2021 are listed below.

FIRM	RESULTS
BRPH Architects Engineers, Inc., Melbourne, FL	4675
Schenkel & Schultz, Inc., Orlando, FL	4325
Zyscovich, Inc., Miami, FL	4320

**Architectural Selection for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan - Project No. 2247839
Presentation Totals**

BRPH Architects Engineers, Inc., Melbourne, FL									
	Assigned Weight		Steve Grube	Chip Johnson	Jim Mather	Danny Seepersaud	Sarah Sowell	Total Ranking	Total Weight Score
Section 1 - Project Team	30	Rating	9	10	10	10	10	49	
		Weighted Score	270	300	300	300	300		1470
Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	40	Rating	9	9	9	10	9	46	
		Weighted Score	360	360	360	400	360		1840
Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	15	Rating	10	9	8	10	9	46	
		Weighted Score	150	135	120	150	135		690
Section 4 - Project Scheduling	15	Rating	10	10	6	10	9	45	
		Weighted Score	150	150	90	150	135		675
Weighted			930	945	870	1000	930		4675
Rating			38	38	33	40	37	186	
Schenkel & Schultz, Inc., Orlando, FL									
Section 1 - Project Team	30	Rating	10	7	8	9	7	41	
		Weighted Score	300	210	240	270	210		1230
Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	40	Rating	10	7	9	10	8	44	
		Weighted Score	400	280	360	400	320		1760
Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	15	Rating	10	8	9	10	8	45	
		Weighted Score	150	120	135	150	120		675
Section 4 - Project Scheduling	15	Rating	9	8	9	10	8	44	
		Weighted Score	135	120	135	150	120		660
Weighted			985	730	870	970	770		4325
Rating			39	30	35	39	31	174	
Zyscovich, Inc., Miami, FL									
Section 1 - Project Team	30	Rating	9	8	7	10	7	41	
		Weighted Score	270	240	210	300	210		1230
Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	40	Rating	10	8	9	10	8	45	
		Weighted Score	400	320	360	400	320		1800
Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	15	Rating	10	8	8	10	8	44	
		Weighted Score	150	120	120	150	120		660
Section 4 - Project Scheduling	15	Rating	8	8	8	10	8	42	
		Weighted Score	120	120	120	150	120		630
Weighted			940	800	810	1000	770		4320
Rating			37	32	32	40	31	172	

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
BRPH Architects Engineers, Inc., Melbourne, FL					
Rating 1-10	9	9	10	10	38
Weighted Score	270	360	150	150	930
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.					

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Schenkel & Schultz, Inc., Orlando, FL					
Rating 1-10	10	10	10	9	39
Weighted Score	300	400	150	135	985
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.					

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Zyscovich, Inc., Miami, FL					
Rating 1-10	9	10	10	8	37
Weighted Score	270	400	150	120	940
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.					

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
BRPH Architects Engineers, Inc., Melbourne, FL					
Rating 1-10	10	9	9	10	38
Weighted Score	300	360	135	150	945
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.					

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Schenkel & Schultz, Inc., Orlando, FL					
Rating 1-10	7	7	8	8	30
Weighted Score	210	280	120	120	730
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.					

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Zyscovich, Inc., Miami, FL					
Rating 1-10	8	8	8	8	32
Weighted Score	240	320	120	120	800
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.					

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
BRPH Architects Engineers, Inc., Melbourne, FL					
Rating 1-10	10	9	8	6	33
Weighted Score	300	360	120	90	870
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.					

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Schenkel & Schultz, Inc., Orlando, FL					
Rating 1-10	8	9	9	9	35
Weighted Score	240	360	135	135	870
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.					

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Zyscovich, Inc., Miami, FL					
Rating 1-10	7	9	8	8	32
Weighted Score	210	360	120	120	810
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.					

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
BRPH Architects Engineers, Inc., Melbourne, FL					
Rating 1-10	10	10	10	10	40
Weighted Score	300	400	150	150	1000
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.	Solid team returning from previous projects. Very knowledgable as to VCS.	Great detailed options presented. Insight as to building orientation with the sun to maximize solar. Energy, <u>high performance</u> and site conscious. Much insight to high performance not just about saving energy costs.	Much detail presented. Well experienced. Knowledgable high level feedback as to processes given. ODP driven.	Timeframe presented. Team available. No issues with proposed timeline for construction. Possible finish earlier than thought.	

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Schenkel & Schultz, Inc., Orlando, FL					
Rating 1-10	9	10	10	10	39
Weighted Score	270	400	150	150	970
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.	Quick introductions not much background given about the team members themselves and specific experience. Mentioned high performance experience. 12 schools. No names.	Spoke of high performance. Much Detail. Net Zero Ready conscious. Much insight as to the site. Some history details about the school.	lock in pricing. Spoke about avenues for cost savings.	no issues with current scheduling. Spoke of acclerating schedule if possible.	

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Zyscovich, Inc., Miami, FL					
Rating 1-10	10	10	10	10	40
Weighted Score	300	400	150	150	1000
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.	Good team outlined with much experience.	presented detailed options. Solar orientation. Much insight to approach and methodology. Knowledgeable to energy savings.	much detail and examples of cost savings and methodology. Quality control program	no issues with schedule. Generous. Will look to shorten it.	

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
BRPH Architects Engineers, Inc., Melbourne, FL					
Rating 1-10	10	9	9	9	37
Weighted Score	300	360	135	135	930
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.	All members participated in the presentation	Gave options for prototypes			

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Schenkel & Schultz, Inc., Orlando, FL					
Rating 1-10	7	8	8	8	31
Weighted Score	210	320	120	120	770
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.		Enjoyed stakeholder engagement and history portion of the design approach	Full size mock up	Showed optional accelerated schedule	

Individual Scores Per Section 9-10= Exceeds Expectations 6-8 = Satisfactory 4-5 = Marginal 2-3 = Below Minimum Standards 0-1 = Does no meet Requirement		Formal Presentation Evaluation Score Sheet RFQ No. 2247839-MB Architectural Services for Tomoka Elementary Master Plan Project No. 2247839			
Selection Committee - Circle one (1) score for each Category (Refer to Scoring Key in upper left corner)					
General Description of Requirements - Please refer to the RFQ's oral presentation guidelines and evaluation criteria for short-listed firms					
Category	Section 1 - Project Team	Section 2 - Overall Design Concept Approach and Methodology	Section 3 - Cost Control and Constructability	Section 4 - Project Scheduling	
Weights	30	40	15	15	100
Zyscovich, Inc., Miami, FL					
Rating 1-10	7	8	8	8	31
Weighted Score	210	320	120	120	770
Record comments, in the space to the right, for each Tab on the above firm for scores of 0-10 supporting your score.	Would like to see more participation from team members	3 great concepts, liked the incorporation of safety and security in presentation	Protoype schools	Showed optional accelerated schedule	