

BRENT SPENCE

BRIDGE CORRIDOR



BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE CORRIDOR PROJECT

SPECIAL EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT NUMBER 14 (SEP-14) INITIAL REPORT

ODOT BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE CORRIDOR PID 116649 | KYTC PROJECT ITEM
NO. 6-17 (BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE CORRIDOR PHASE III)

NOVEMBER 30, 2023

PREPARED BY:



PREPARED FOR ODOT AND KYTC



Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. PROJECT SCOPE AND BACKGROUND	1
3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS.....	2
4. PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACT NEGOTIATION PROCESS PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2.....	6
4.1 Sub-Phase 1A: Proof of Concept.....	7
4.2 Sub-Phase 1B: Proposal.....	7
4.3 Early Work Proposal	8
4.4 Phase 2 Proposal and Change Order	8
4.4.1 Failure to Agree to a Phase 2 Change Order	9
4.4.2 Actions Following Notice of Failure to Agree Phase 2 Change Order.....	9
4.5 Requirements for FAR Participants.....	10
4.6 Open Book Basis of Negotiations.....	11
5. DESIGN PRECONSTRUCTION COSTS RECEIVED	11
6. INDUSTRY AND 3 RD PARTY REACTION	11
7. SUMMARY.....	14

List of Tables

Table 3-1: Technical Proposal and Interview Evaluation	5
Table 3-2: Procurement Schedule.....	6
Table 5-1: Sub-Phase 1A Design Proposal Costs.....	11
Table 6-1: Industry Outreach Events and Communication	11

List of Appendices

- APPENDIX A: LOI RESPONDENTS AND INDUSTRY FORUM ATTENDEES
- APPENDIX B: ONE-ON-ONE MEETING MINUTES
- APPENDIX C: INDUSTRY SURVEY RESULTS

1. INTRODUCTION

The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) submits this initial report under the provisions of Special Experimental Project No. 14 (SEP 14) for the use of innovative contracting practice of Progressive Design-Build (PDB) delivery method.

Ohio and Kentucky have entered into an Interstate Cooperative Agreement (ICA) regarding the Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Project. Ohio and Kentucky will evaluate, implement, administer, and monitor the Project, by the parties established as a Bi-State Management Team (BSMT) comprised of representatives from ODOT and KYTC. A PDB contract has been executed for the Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Phase III (PID 116649 | KYTC PROJECT ITEM NO. 6-17) located in Hamilton County, Ohio and Kenton County, Kentucky. This initial report includes a brief scope of the PDB project, a brief history of the procurement and contracting process, a breakdown of the design-builder's costs, and industry reaction to the process.

2. PROJECT SCOPE AND BACKGROUND

The scope of work for this project includes constructing approximately five miles of I-71/I-75 in Kentucky and one mile of I-75 in Ohio, a new Companion Bridge over the Ohio River just to the west of the existing Brent Spence Bridge and rehabilitating the existing Brent Spence Bridge.

The Sub-Phase 1A project scope includes the following activities and deliverables:

- A. Development of the Design-Builder's Project Management Plan (DBT PMP)
- B. The Design Quality Management System Plan
- C. Setting up the Project Management Office (PMO)
- D. DBE Performance Plan, DBE Outreach Plan and associated plans
- E. Public information and communications support
- F. Environmental documents and Submittals
- G. Survey verification and subsurface utility memorandum
- H. Utilities coordination
- I. Railroad coordination
- J. Right of Way Plans
- K. Subsurface Geotechnical Exploration Reports
- L. Building Demolition and Removal Plan
- M. Development of engineering reports and development of the Base Design for roadway, drainage, structures, sanitary and combined sewers, structures, aesthetics, enhancements, and traffic control
- N. Conceptual MOT Plan and Summary Report together with requirements for the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) and Incident Management Plan (IMP)
- O. Development of Governmental Approvals strategy and schedule to submit and obtain all Governmental Approvals in accordance with the Baseline Schedule;
- P. Preliminary engineering development including iterative exploration of value-adding options and constructability analysis to investigate alternatives;

- Q. Development of the Sub-Phase 1B Project Scope;
- R. Development of the cost & resource loaded Project Schedule for all Phases to the stage and buildable unit using the critical path method.
- S. Cost estimate.

The design will meet the requirements of the ODOT Manuals, KYTC Manuals, AASHTO Standard Specifications, and other agency manuals as defined in the Progressive Design-Build Contract (PDBC) Exhibit E.

3. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

Upon determination of an anticipated announcement of a single Project, the BSMT compiled a contact list of the top national 25 roadway and bridge contractors and top 25 national civil engineering design firms as determined by Engineering News Record. A notification and a LOI was sent directly to the identified contacts. This information was also sent to Dodge Construction networks for national exposure.

A procurement website was created to share the Draft Request For Proposal (RFP), RIDs, and other project updates/announcements. Beginning on Sept 16 2022, the BSMT created and maintained a Progressive Design-Build Key Elements/Project Considerations document for industry review. The document summarized BSMT key Progressive Design-Build elements, anticipated procurement considerations, and overall proposed contract. This document was posted on the procurement website and updated through final issuance of the final RFP and encouraged industry feedback to the proposed PDB approach.

The announcement of the final RFP was made on February 17, 2023 on the Procurement Website and ODOT Contracting website. ODOT advertised the RFP to all interested parties at no cost through ODOT contracting website, with reference project number 233000. ODOT provided each Offeror the opportunity for four Pre-Proposal one-on-one meetings with the BSMT prior to the Proposal due date to discuss issues and clarifications regarding the RFP and/or insurance and bonding.

The BSMT's goal was to create a fair and uniform basis for the evaluation of the Proposals in compliance with all applicable legal requirements governing this Procurement Process. A project specific Proposal Evaluation Manual was established to ensure the impartial, equitable, and comprehensive evaluation of each Offeror's Proposal and Interview in accordance with the Instruction to Offerors (ITO). Technical Proposals were evaluated by the Proposal Advisory Group. The Proposal Advisory Group consisted of a Proposal Evaluation Team and an Executive Management Team composed of representatives from ODOT and KYTC. The Proposal Advisory Group was assisted by a number of subgroups and/or subject matter experts within the BSMT, other involved agencies, and/or entities contracted by the BSMT. In addition, Observers from federal and local agencies, as well as Department consultants, were given the opportunity to access and perform individual reviews of the Proposals and provide written comments on strengths, weaknesses, or other general comments to the Proposal Evaluation Team for consideration.

Proposals were first reviewed by a Proposal Evaluation Team for conformance to the Instruction to Offerors (ITO) regarding organization and format, the responsiveness of the Offeror to the requirements set forth in the ITO, and completeness of the Proposal. If responsive, Proposals were then reviewed for compliance with the pass/fail criteria. Responsive, “passing” Proposals were further evaluated based on the Offeror’s ability to meet and exceed the requirements and objectives established in the RFP in a beneficial way that provides a consistently outstanding level of quality. The extent to which the Offeror meets or exceeds the evaluation criteria of the Technical Proposals and Evaluation of Financial Proposal was determined by the Proposal Evaluation Team in its sole discretion and was reflected in the rating of each Proposal. The Proposal Evaluation Team presented their findings and recommended scoring information to the Executive Management Team for consideration. The Executive Management Team examined the Proposal Evaluation Team’s findings and ratings. The Proposal Evaluation Team then established Proposal scores with concurrence from the Executive Management Team based on the scoring guidelines below in Table 1. Thereafter, qualitative evaluation of Offerors’ respective interview performance resulted in an interview score for each Offeror. An overall Proposal score inclusive of the interview score resulted in the overall proposal score.

Proposal scores were based on a score of 0 to 100. The relative weight of each criteria was set based upon the individual project requirements. The following criteria was considered in determining the Proposal Score.

Scoring Summary:

- 1) Evaluations of Technical Proposals (80 points)
 - a) DBT Organization and Key Personnel (30 points)
 - i) Demonstrates an effective organization to deliver a progressive design-build delivery;
 - ii) Demonstrates an efficient structure that is capable of effective internal coordination and collaboration with the BSMT, its consultants, and Stakeholders;
 - iii) Identifies appropriate personnel to perform the Work; and
 - iv) Is likely to facilitate successful delivery of the Project
 - v) The required Key Personnel meet or exceed minimum requirements for qualifications and experience and provide experience that is likely to facilitate and improve successful delivery of the Project; and
 - vi) The Offeror-identified additional Key Personnel provide value and have experience that is likely to facilitate and improve successful delivery of the Project.
 - b) DBT Capabilities and Experience (22 points)
 - i) Demonstrates experience designing and constructing projects of similar scope;
 - ii) Demonstrates experience collaborating with owners to determine cost effective solutions and resulting projects;
 - iii) Demonstrates experience and capability with open book pricing processes used in progressive design-build and CMGC delivery methods; and
 - iv) Demonstrates relevant experience that improved the likelihood of a successful project.

- c) Project Understanding and Approach (23 points maximum)
 - i) Project Approach – Overall Approach;
 - ii) Project Approach – Preconstruction Phase – Sub-Phase 1A (Proof-of-Concept);
 - iii) Project Approach – Preconstruction Phase – Sub-Phase 1B (Project Development);
and
 - iv) Project Approach – Construction Phase – Phase 2 (Final Engineering and Construction).
 - v) An understanding of the Project, project objectives, and Project Goals;
 - vi) An effective approach to creating and implementing a project-specific Diversity, Inclusion, and Outreach Plan (DIOP), as defined in the PDBC Exhibit E (Technical Requirements); and
 - vii) An effective approach to developing reliable and consistent Opinion of Probable Costs.
 - viii) An alignment with Project Goals and the concepts of progressive design-build delivery;
 - ix) An approach that effectively engages Key Personnel and other project personnel;
 - x) An efficient and effective approach for internal coordination and collaboration and external coordination with, the BSMT, third parties, and stakeholders in connection with the Project;
 - xi) An understanding of the scope of work, schedule for the work, and effective processes to advance and manage the Project in a manner that is cost-effective and ensures quality while maintaining the schedule;
 - xii) An effective approach to identify innovation; and
 - xiii) An approach to developing Work Packages, pricing, subcontracting, and risk pricing that drives innovation and cost savings.
 - d) Offeror Identified Pre-Award Clauses (5 points maximum)
 - i) The evaluation criteria for the Offeror Identified Pre-Award Clauses will be evaluated based on the extent to which the additional PDBC Information is in furtherance of the Project Goals as stated in the PDBC.
- 2) Interviews (10 points)
- a) Offerors were evaluated on their interview performance and based on the extent the Offeror demonstrates:
 - i) Experienced team and personnel that can successfully deliver the Project;
 - ii) Project understanding and approach; an understanding of Progressive Design-Build delivery method, including understanding of Contractor's role at each Phase of the Project;
 - iii) Recognition of key points and ideas, including the Progressive Contractor's role in Project advancement at each Project Phase, risks at each Project Phase, understanding of the GMP process and pricing transparency, and ideas and ability necessary to effectively collaborate with the BSMT and other stakeholders to achieve Project Goals; and

- iv) Innovative and feasible concepts which have the potential to drive costs savings and/or improve the value-for-money and meet the Project Goals.

3) Evaluation of Financial Proposal (10 points)

- a) The Offeror who submitted the lowest Phase 1 Mark-Up received 10 points. The formula for determining number of points for the competitive bidding element is as follows:

$$10 \text{ points} \times \frac{\text{Lowest Offeror Phase 1 Mark-Up}}{\text{Offeror's Phase 1 Mark-Up}}$$

Table 3-1: Technical Proposal and Interview Evaluation

Adjectival Rating	Description	Percent of Possible Points
Excellent (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses ITO requirements in a significantly beneficial way (providing advantages, benefits, or added value to the Project). Indicates significant strengths with few or no minor weaknesses. Offers an approach with the high potential of exceeding Project Goals. 	80-100%
Very Good (VG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses ITO requirements in a beneficial way (providing advantages, benefits, or added value to the Project). Indicates few or minor weakness that are outweighed by strengths. Offers an approach which will likely meet or potentially exceed Project Goals. 	60-79%
Good (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficiently addresses ITO requirements. Indicates weaknesses that are generally balanced with the strengths. Offers an approach which likely meet the Project Goals. <p>Approach with no identified strength and no identified weaknesses will be within this range.</p>	40-59%
Fair (F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marginally addresses the ITO requirements. Indicates weaknesses that are not offset by strengths or weaknesses that could adversely affect successful project performance. Offers an approach which will require improvement to meet the Project Goals. 	20-39%
Poor (P)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not demonstrate the potential to meet the ITO requirements. Lacks essential information or information provided is conflicting or unproductive. Indicates significant weaknesses or deficiencies. Offers an undesired approach to the Project Goals. 	0-19%

To meet the bidding requirements of the Ohio Revised Code Section 5525.01, each Offeror was required to file with its bid a certified check or cashier's check payable to the Director of Transportation. The office of contracts was to receive the check up to 72 hours in advance of the letting.

Following the Proposal submission, Offerors were required to attend an interview with the BSMT. Following interviews and evaluations, the BSMT selected an Offeror for conditional

award based on the BSMT's determination of apparent best value and began finalizing a PDBC for award and execution.

The Executive Management Team approved the start of negotiations and ODOT offered to start contract negotiations to the Offeror. However, if the parties were unable to execute a PDBC, the BSMT could have pursued alternative project delivery methods to meet the project goals. This was not necessary since successful negotiation produced an executed PDBC with the Offeror. The PDBC does allow for future contract off-ramps at Sub-Phase 1B proposal and Phase 2 proposal.

A brief outline of the project procurement milestones is shown in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2: Procurement Schedule

Milestone	Date
Draft RFP Release	Friday, January 13, 2023
Final RFP Release	Friday, February 17, 2023
Last date for Offeror team registration	Monday, February 20, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time
Pre-Proposal One-on-One Meeting No. 1 (Regarding the RFP)	Thursday, February 23, 2023
Pre-Proposal One-on-One Meeting No. 2 (Regarding the RFP)	Thursday, March 9, 2023
Pre-Proposal One-on-One Meeting No. 3 (Regarding Bonding and Insurance)	Tuesday, March 14, 2023
Pre-Proposal One-on-One Meeting No. 4 (Regarding the RFP)	Monday, April 3, 2023 or Tuesday, April 4, 2023
Anticipated final Addenda	Tuesday, April 11, 2023
Proposal Due Date	Friday, April 14, 2023, at 10:00 a.m. Eastern Time
Interview	Tuesday, April 25, 2023
DBT Selection Public Notification	Tuesday, August 1, 2023
Award Date / NTP (Sub-Phase 1A)	Monday, October 2, 2023

4. PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACT NEGOTIATION PROCESS PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2

Following the announcement by the BSMT of the apparent best value Offeror, but prior to (1) the execution of this Contract and/or (2) the issuance of the Sub-Phase 1A NTP, the BSMT and the apparent best value Offeror conducted regular meetings to finalize the Sub-Phase 1A Proposal. The apparent best value Offeror submitted the Sub-Phase 1A Proposal to the BSMT, which included (a) a draft of the Sub-Phase 1A Project Scope, including all plans, reports, and other documents required to be developed by the Contractor, (b) a projected schedule for the performance of such Sub-Phase 1A Work, and (c) the Sub-Phase 1A Maximum Prime

Compensation developed in accordance with PDBC Exhibit G (Opinion of Probable Cost (OPC) and Pricing Process).

PDBC Exhibit G requires a certification from the Contractor that all costs included in the OPC are allowable in accordance with the cost principles in 2 CFR part 200 subpart E, and the OPC does not include any costs which are expressly unallowable under applicable cost principles of 2 CFR part 200 subpart E; and such other information as is necessary, in the BSMT's sole discretion, to satisfy the BSMT as to the reasonableness of the OPC and that the Contractor's pricing and other financial terms for the Work are fair and reasonable.

Costs for Professional Services undertaken in the performance of the Phase 1 Work are the actual direct labor rates multiplied by the number of hours estimated to be worked multiplied by the Phase 1 Multiplier Rate.

Labor Costs will include costs for Professional Services undertaken in the performance of Early Work Packages, and Phase 2 Work by personnel and entities that meet the definition of FAR Participants. Labor costs are the actual direct labor rates multiplied by the number of hours estimated to be worked multiplied by the Phase 2 Multiplier Rate for FAR Participants.

Costs for Professional Services undertaken in the performance of Early Work Packages and the Phase 2 Work by personnel and entities that do not meet the definition of FAR Participants are the actual direct labor rates multiplied by the number of hours estimated to be worked multiplied by the Phase 2 Multiplier Rate for Non-FAR Participants.

4.1 Sub-Phase 1A: Proof of Concept

Phase 1 and Sub-Phase 1A commenced with the BSMT's issuance of the Sub-Phase 1A NTP October 2, 2023 and is to continue until the earlier of (i) the BSMT exercising its right to terminate the PDBC Termination for Convenience, or (ii) the final completion date for the Sub-Phase 1A Work as shown in the Phase 1 Baseline Schedule. From time to time during the Contractor's performance of the Sub-Phase 1A Work, the Contractor, and the BSMT met to review the Sub-Phase 1A Project Scope and corresponding cost expenditures with reference to the Sub-Phase 1A Maximum Prime Compensation. In the event the BSMT and the Contractor identify and mutually agree upon the necessity for adjustments to the Sub-Phase 1A Project Scope, including adjustments pertaining to the Sub-Phase 1A Maximum Prime Compensation, the BSMT will prepare a Change Order incorporating such adjustments into the Sub-Phase 1A Project Scope.

4.2 Sub-Phase 1B: Proposal

During Sub-Phase 1A, the BSMT and the Contractor have covenanted and agreed to hold regular meetings to mutually develop the Sub-Phase 1B Scope and establish the terms and conditions of the Sub-Phase 1B Change Order. In conjunction with the foregoing negotiations, the Contractor will submit to the BSMT a draft Sub-Phase 1B proposal (the "Sub-Phase 1B Proposal") in a form agreed to by the Parties, which will include (a) a proposed scope of work for Sub-Phase 1B Project Scope, including a list of all plans, reports, and other documents required to be developed by the Contractor, (b) a schedule for the performance of such Sub-Phase 1B Work and a preliminary schedule for the Phase 2 Work as required by PDBC Exhibit T (Critical Path Method Progress Schedule) and (c) the proposed Sub-Phase 1B Maximum Prime Compensation developed in accordance with Exhibit G (Opinion of Probable Cost (OPC) and Pricing Process).

The BSMT will review the Contractor's Sub-Phase 1B Proposal and the BSMT and the Contractor will engage in good faith negotiations to finalize the Sub-Phase 1B Proposal prior to the expiration of Sub-Phase 1A. At the BSMT's request, the Contractor will meet with the BSMT to review and discuss the draft Sub-Phase 1B Proposal and adjust the Sub-Phase 1B Scope. When the Parties have agreed to the Sub-Phase 1B Proposal, the BSMT will prepare a Sub Phase 1B Change Order incorporating the Sub-Phase 1B Proposal.

4.3 Early Work Proposal

The BSMT may request by written notice that the Contractor submit an Early Work Package Proposal to the BSMT for the performance of a part of the Phase 2 Work concurrent with the performance of the Phase 1 Work, in which case the Contractor will submit that Early Work Package Proposal within 30 Days of the BSMT's request (or such other period agreed by the Parties).

During the performance of the Sub-Phase 1B Work, the Contractor may elect to submit an Early Work Package Proposal or the BSMT may elect to request an Early Work Package Proposal from the Contractor. In each case, any Early Work Package Proposal will include the performance of a portion of the Phase 2 Work concurrent with the performance of the Phase 1B Work.

The BSMT reserves the right to establish a DBE participation goal for each Early Work Package. All Early Work Packages are included in the Phase 2 DBE goal and should be considered for DBE participation along with all other Phase 2 Work that is identified in each subsequent Change Order.

Any Early Work Package Proposal will be subject to the BSMT's approval in its sole and absolute discretion.

Upon submittal to the BSMT by the Contractor, an Early Work Package Proposal will constitute an offer that is binding on the Contractor for the validity period stated in that Early Work Package Proposal.

Each Early Work Package Proposal that is agreed to by the BSMT will be deemed a sub-set and a part of the build-up of the Phase 2 Proposal, and any Phase 2 Change Order agreed and executed will be deemed to incorporate any Early Work Package Change Order.

4.4 Phase 2 Proposal and Change Order

The Contractor will, upon request by the BSMT, present the Phase 2 Proposal to the BSMT, the Cabinet, the ICE, and others invited by the BSMT to attend the proposal meeting.

If the Phase 2 Proposal submitted by the Contractor is acceptable to the BSMT, in its sole discretion, the BSMT will Notify the Contractor of its acceptance, following which:

- A. The Parties will execute the Phase 2 Change Order; and
- B. Subject to all other conditions in the PDBC with respect to the notice to proceed requirements being satisfied the BSMT will issue the Phase 2 NTP.

If the BSMT, in its sole discretion, notifies the Contractor that the Phase 2 Proposal is not acceptable within 60 days of delivery of the Phase 2 Proposal, then the Contractor and the BSMT will enter into good faith negotiations prior to which the Contractor will resubmit its Phase 2 Proposal incorporating those terms and conditions upon which the Contractor and the BSMT are in agreement and the Parties will continue to negotiate until the earlier of (i) the BSMT's acceptance of the resubmitted Phase 2 Proposal, (ii) the BSMT's election to issue a written notice to not proceed to the Contractor in accordance with PDBC Section 2.3.3.3.2 (Failure to Agree to a Phase 2 Change Order), (iii) the expiration of the term of Sub-Phase 1B as set forth under the Sub-Phase 1B Change Order, or (iv) the BSMT's election to terminate this PDBC for convenience in accordance with PDBC Section 21(Termination for Convenience).

Phase 2 will commence upon the BSMT's issuance of a Phase 2 NTP and will continue until the completion and acceptance of the Phase 2 Work as set forth in the Phase 2 Change Order. If authorized in an executed Early Work Package, Early Work may begin before Phase 1B is completed, with Early Work and Phase 1B proceeding concurrently.

The Phase 2 Change Order will include the content specified in the Project Scope and generally apply to all Work Packages. The executed Phase 2 Change Order will not be modified except through a Change Order.

4.4.1 Failure to Agree to a Phase 2 Change Order

Without limiting the BSMT's rights under PDBC Section 21 (Termination for Convenience), with respect to the Phase 2 Proposal the BSMT may by a written notice delivered to the Contractor either:

- A. Not proceed with requiring the Contractor to submit a Phase 2 Proposal, including as a result of a delay or failure in the satisfaction of the conditions under PDBC Section 2.3.3.2 (Phase 2 Proposal); or
- B. Reject, at its sole discretion, the Phase 2 Proposal and not proceed to negotiate, agree or execute a Phase 2 Change Order.

4.4.2 Actions Following Notice of Failure to Agree Phase 2 Change Order

Following delivery of a written notice under PDBC Section 2.3.3.3.2 (Failure to Agree to a Phase 2 Change Order) or a failure by either Party to execute a Phase 2 Change Order after the BSMT's acceptance of the Phase 2 Proposal in accordance with PDBC Section 2.3.3.3.1 (Initial Review and Negotiation of Phase 2 Proposal):

- A. The BSMT and Contractor may agree to a Change Order that obligates the Contractor to perform and complete any part of the Phase 2 Work as an Early Work Package prior to expiration of the term of Phase 1B, or such longer period as may be agreed upon between the Parties;
- B. The Contractor will continue to perform and complete the Phase 1B Work (other than that part of the Phase 1B Work requiring preparation of a Phase 2 Proposal or solely for the purposes of preparing a Phase 2 Proposal);
- C. Upon the BSMT's written notice, the Contractor will assign to the BSMT all of the right, title, and interest of the Contractor in and to the work products developed under the Phase 1 Work; including the Design Work; if the BSMT elects to terminate the Contractor prior to completion of Final Design Documents, the Contractor will be released from all liability (under contract, tort, or any other legal theory) that may arise in relation to any BSMT use

of the design produced by the Contractor. Final Design Documents approved and signed by the Engineer of Record will remain the liability of the Contractor.

- D. Upon completion and the BSMT's written acceptance of the Design Work and any remaining obligations under the Phase 1B Work, this PDBC will expire in accordance with PDBC Section 1.5 (Term);
- E. Title to the Design Work will remain vested in or pass to the BSMT in accordance with PDBC Section 26.15 (Ownership and Copyright of Submittals). Any Submittals which are provided to the BSMT by the Contractor or Subcontractors as part of the Phase 1 Work may be used and disclosed by the BSMT in accordance with PDBC Section 26.16 (Intellectual Property);
- F. The BSMT may, in its sole discretion, proceed with any other action as the BSMT deems appropriate for delivery of the Phase 2 Work, including soliciting from, negotiating with, or awarding a contract to any other Person for any part of the Phase 2 Work; and
- G. The BSMT may, in its sole discretion, terminate the PDBC pursuant to Section 21 (Termination for Convenience) if it determines to not proceed with the Phase 2 Work.

4.5 Requirements for FAR Participants

Applicable to those Component Firms that establish and maintain acceptable, fully articulated financial and cost accounting systems that track, classify, and allocate costs in accordance with the requirements of Part 31 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR Part 31) and applicable Cost Accounting Standards (the "FAR Participants").

To qualify as a FAR Participant, the Component Firm must submit an indirect cost rate schedule (ICRS) compliant with FAR Part 31, applicable Cost Accounting Standards, and related Federal regulations. The ICRS must be approved by either ODOT's Office of External Audits or KYTC's External Audit Branch. As evidence of approval, the Component Firm provided the project team an ICRS approval certificate or letter from ODOT or KYTC, as applicable.

FAR Participants will maintain labor-time records in a manner that will permit, at any time during the performance of the Phase 1 Work or at the conclusion of the Phase 1 Work, a direct comparison of estimated labor listed in any Price Proposal that is accepted by the BSMT and incorporated into a Sub-Phase 1A Change Order or Sub-Phase 1B Change Order to actual labor expended. In accordance with FAR Part 31 the FAR Participant bears the burden of proof to establish the allowability, allocability, and reasonableness of any costs. This applies to all costs, including costs directly assigned to the Work and indirect costs recovered through the application of an overhead rate and/or facilities capital cost of money (FCCM) rate.

The BSMT may conduct interim and final audits and/or financial reviews to determine the actual, allowable costs incurred during Phase 1. In all cases, the BSMT will apply the cost principles and procedures set forth in FAR Part 31, as amended from time to time, and any other special criteria established in the PDBC. This includes additional BSMT policies and/or interpretations of Federal laws and regulations, including the AASHTO Uniform Audit & Accounting Guide, the State of Ohio Travel Regulations (Ohio Administrative Code Rule 126-1-02), and/or the KYTC Professional Services Policies and Regulations as applicable.

In compliance with 23 U.S.C. 112(b)(2)(B), all FAR Participants that perform any Professional

Services will submit indirect cost schedules compliant with FAR Part 31 and related Cost Accounting Standards. ODOT does not require CPA-audited indirect cost schedules; however, if a CPA has performed such an audit, it will be included in the submittal package.

4.6 Open Book Basis of Negotiations

The development of all Change Orders and Work Packages will be on an Open Book Basis, and the BSMT and applicable Authorized Representatives will have the right to access all records, accounts, and other data used by the Contractor in connection with the preparation of any draft or final Proposal, subject to the provisions of PDBC Section 25.7 (Escrow Documents). The Contract Price will be developed in a cooperative manner in accordance with the guidelines and principles described in PDBC Exhibit G (Opinion of Probable Cost (OPC) and Pricing Process).

5. DESIGN PRECONSTRUCTION COSTS RECEIVED

The Contractor provided the following Sub-Phase 1A Design Proposal and met the PDBC FAR requirements.

Table 5-1: Sub-Phase 1A Design Proposal Costs

Group Description	Manhours	Total
Pre-Phase 1A	2,408	\$ 1,801,092
Project Management	15,558	\$ 8,909,689
Design and DB Coordination	4,018	\$ 31,964,456
OPC Estimating	20,339	\$ 5,308,800
Phase 1B Proposal	640	\$ 252,511
Other Costs	0	\$ 1,749,815
Incidental Fees		
Field Trucks		
Staff Relocation and Recruiting Fees		
Ohio Cat Tax		
Phase 1A Insurances		
Phase 1A Project Bonds		
Phase 1A TOTAL	42,963	\$ 50,000,000
Phase 1B Items (Bonding, Tax, Insurance)		\$ 2,708,526

6. INDUSTRY AND 3RD PARTY REACTION

Interest in the project was strong. Over 100 contractors and designers attended an Industry forum and nine (9) one-on-one meetings with lead contractors were held after the forum to seek industry input. The table below provides a summary of events and communications with the industry prior to the RFP release.

Table 6-1: Industry Outreach Events and Communication

Events and Communications	Date	Description
Released Requests for Letters of Interest to Industry	May 6, 2022	State of Ohio and Commonwealth of Kentucky's requests for non-binding Letters of Interest is posted at the link LOI Request
LOI Distribution and Industry Forum Flyer	May 13, 2022	Sent to top 25 largest per ENR roadway and bridge contractors in the United States
LOI Distribution and Industry Forum Flyer	May 13, 2022	Sent to top 25 largest per ENR civil designers in the United States, to AGC (through OCA), and Dodge Analytics for nationwide postings. See Appendix A for LOI respondents.
Procurement specific website / email created and distributed	May 13, 2022	Project Website link: Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Project Procurement Information
Industry Forum	June 7, 2022	Held Industry Outreach Forum in Covington, KY. Forum Meeting information and Attendees were posted on the project website and are provided in Appendix A
One-on-One Industry Meetings	June 7-8, 2022	Met with the following Contractor teams: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walsh-Kokosing • American Bridge (Southland Holdings) • Traylor Brothers • Tutor Perini (Lunda) • Flour Enterprises, Inc. • DL E&C • FCC Construction SA One-on-One meeting minutes are provided in Appendix B
Industry Survey	July 2022	Provided Industry Survey to contractors to confirm comments provided during one-on-one meetings to determine procurement method. See results in Appendix C and resulting final PDB procurement approach exhibit.
One-on-One Meeting	July 21, 2022	Held meeting with Halmar. Meeting minutes provided in Appendix B
One-on-One Meeting	July 27, 2022	Held second meeting with Walsh-Kokosing. Meeting minutes provided in Appendix B

Events and Communications	Date	Description
One-on-One Meeting	July 28, 2022	Held meeting with Flatiron. Meeting minutes provided in Appendix B
One-on-One Meeting	August 5, 2022	Held meeting with Kiewit. Meeting minutes provided in Appendix B
Procurement Change Announced	August 19, 2022	Announced procurement would be Progressive Design-Build per Industry feedback on project website and notified through email alert distribution list.
Progressive Design-Build (PDB) contracting approach / DB Key Elements provided to Industry	September 16, 2022	Contracting approach, procedures, and key Project considerations posted on the project procurement website and notified through email alert distribution list.
Informational call with Kiewit Construction	September 21, 2022	Discussion on available preliminary information for consideration. Discussion centering on offramp liability and intention of pricing methods.
One-on-one Meeting – Kiewit Team	October 4, 2022	Held meeting with Kiewit to discuss questions and comments based on Industry information provided on the Project procurement website. Focus on pricing methodology of PDB, preferred practices, and general concerns/risks.
One-on-on Meeting – John R. Jurgensen Co.	October 12, 2022	Held meeting with JRJ Company. With a likely intention of not being the lead contractor, question centering on subcontractor pricing methods and contracting requirements.
Brent Spence Bridge PDB Elements and Document Sharing	October 14, 2022	Project reference files provided to Industry for review along with Project risk register posted on the project procurement website and notified through email alert distribution list
One-on-One Meeting – Kiewit Team	November 23, 2022	Held meeting with Kiewit to discuss questions and comments based on Industry information provided on the Project procurement website
One-on-One Meetings – Walsh Kokosing Team	November 4, 2022 January 25, 2023 February 9, 2023 February 23, 2023	Held meetings with Walsh-Kokosing to discuss questions and comments on the information provided on the project procurement website.

Events and Communications	Date	Description
	March 9, 2023 March 14, 2023	

The reactions of both the construction and design industries have been supportive of the first Progressive-Design-Build project for the state of Ohio.

7. SUMMARY

The use of the Progressive Design-Build contracting method has accomplished the purposes stated in the Work Plan of producing a savings in contract award duration for the Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Phase III and allowing the BSMT to explore this innovative contracting method. Procurement for conventional design-build contracting process was anticipated to be 14 months from the date the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was issued to award. The PDB procurement took five (5) months for apparent best value offeror to be determined and five (5) months for negotiations for a total of ten (10) months. While the BSMT's initial opinion is that the Progressive-Design-Build contracting method has been successful for this project, some aspects of this project cannot be fully evaluated until the project is completed. The lessons learned in this project will prove valuable and directly applicable to future Progressive-Design-Build projects in the state of Ohio and Kentucky.

Appendix A: LOI Respondents and Industry Forum Attendees

Company Name	Address	City, State, Zip:	Phone #	Contact Name	Email	Role	Intend to Submit a Qualification Package?	Date Received	Comments
DLZ Ohio, Inc. Compass Infrastructure Group, LLC Lunda Construction Company	6121 Huntley Road 2800 Corporate Exchange Drive, Suite 215 P.O. Box 669	Columbus, OH 43229 Columbus, OH 43231 Black River Falls, WI 54615	614-888-0040 614-204-1964 651-437-9666	Gary Bowen, Senior Vice President Gary Gardner, Principal Dennis L. Behnke President/CEO and Mark Olsen VP of Marketing	gbowen@dlz.com ggardner@compassinf.com dbehnke@lundaconstruction.com molsen@lundaconstruction.com	Designer Designer Lead Contractor	Yes No Yes	5/10/2022 5/10/2022 5/11/2022	We intend to be on a Design-Build Team and/or pursue the CE&I contract.
HDR, Inc.	9999 Carver Road, Suite 210	Cincinnati, OH 45242	(513)984-7500	Jake Stremmel, Transportation Business Development Lead	Jake.stremmel@hdrinc.com	Designer		5/11/2022	
FCC CONSTRUCTION INC.	1101 BRICKELL AVE, N-1601	MIAMI, FL, 33145	305.775.0133	JESUS M DE LA FUENTE, VP DEVELOPMENT NORTH AMERICA	jmfuente@fcco.com	Lead Contractor	Yes	5/11/2022	FCC is a leading international construction company with 120 years of experience in all areas of engineering and construction, with more than 25 years in North America. FCC is an industry leader in execution of civil works including roads, railways, airports, hydraulic works, maritime, tunnels, bridges, underground etc. It has delivered some milestone infrastructure projects including the I-95 Express Lanes in Miami, FL, and the Gerald Desmond Bridge in Long Beach, CA. Recently, FCC has been awarded with the PennDOT Pathways Major Bridge P3 Initiative. FCC is currently working on assembling a team for the DB SERVICES FOR BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE CORRIDOR PROJECT to be ready to participate in the procurement process.
Stantec Consulting Services Inc.	3052 Beaumont Centre Circle	Lexington KY 40513	859-797-7269	Tony Hunley, Vice President / Bridge Practice Leader	tony.hunley@stantec.com	Designer	Yes	5/11/2022	Stantec Consulting Services looks forward to the opportunity to understand the project further and support ODOT and KYTC in delivering this critical infrastructure project.
Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc. Terracon	2480 Fortune Drive Suite 250 611 Luken Park Drive	Lexington, KY, 40509 Cincinnati, OH 45226	859.264.0281 513-600-9826	Dani Hall, Operations Manager Steve Mary, Program Manager	dhall@vaughnmelton.com steve_mary@terracon.com	Designer No Response	Yes No	5/11/2022 5/11/2022	Terracon desires to be on the email distribution list for all upcoming project announcements.
Strand Associates, Inc.	615 Elsinore Place, Suite 320	Cincinnati, OH 45202	(513) 861-5600	Jeff Heimann, Project Manager	Jeff.heimann@strand.com	Designer	No	5/11/2022	Strand does not intend to submit a qualifications package as the lead engineer/engineer of record. However, we do intend to discuss the potential to provide significant engineering services with several design-build teams.
PRIME AE Group, Inc. Bear Environmental	4701 Creek Road, Suite 227 565 Metro Place South Suite 300	Cincinnati, OH 45242 Dublin OH 43017	513-401-6301 614-329-3848	Shawn Mason, Interim Director – Ohio Transportation Shyam Rajadhyaksha, Principal	smason@primeeng.com sraj@bearev.com	Designer Sub-Contractor	No No	5/13/2022 5/13/2022	Bear Environmental is a ODOT DBE Certified Contractor/Consultants that provides sampling and analysis, environmental consulting, waste transportation, and remediation services. We own our own equipment and have the staff resources to self-perform. Please visit our website at www.bearev.com for more information.
Burgess & Niple, Inc Kokosing Construction Company, Inc.	525 Vine Street Suite 1300 6235 Westerville Road	Cincinnati, OH 45202 Westerville, OH 43081	513-579-0042 614-309-4073	Jon Brunot, Director of Transportation Cincinnati Kevin Ohi, Vice President	Jon.brunot@burgessniple.com kao@kokosing.biz	Designer Lead Contractor		5/13/2022 5/15/2022	Kokosing intends to submit as a Lead Contractor on this project as part of the Walsh-Kokosing Joint Venture. We look forward to participating in the upcoming Industry Day and following One-on-One meeting with ODOT and KYTC.
Halmar International, LLC	429 E. Route 59	Nanuet, NY 10954-2908	214-906-7669	Joe Iniguez, Director-Alternative Delivery	jiniguez@halmarinternational.com	Lead Contractor	Yes	5/15/2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm that this is a DB Delivery Method Will there any toll elements Will there be a financing or O&M component. Please confirm the procurement agency Will there be a need for independent Quality Assurance by the Contractor. Will there be a need for a Public Relations and Community Outreach by the Contractor.
AECOM Traylor Bros., Inc.	525 Vine St; Ste 1800	Cincinnati, OH 45202	214-263-4763 972-821-1014	Aaron Flautt, SVP Alternative Delivery Pursuit Manager/Alternative Markets Kevin White, Director of Operations, Columbus	Aaron.Flautt@aecom.com kwah@traylor.com kwhite@elrobinson.com jwise@elrobinson.com	Designer Designer	Yes Yes	5/17/2022 5/16/2022 5/16/2022	We will submit a qualifications and seek a one-on-one meeting with a Walsh-led Contractor team.
E.L. Robinson Engineering Shelly & Sands, Inc.	950 Goodale Boulevard, Suite 180 1450 N Bailey Road 1073 A Oregonia Rd	Grandview Heights, OH 43212 North Jackson, Ohio 44451 Lebanon, Ohio 45036	43212614-586-0642 330 351-6262 513-200-3432	Andy Leffler, Director Tyler Holden, Vice President	aleffler@shellyandsands.com holden.tyler@gmail.com	Sub-Contractor Sub-Contractor	No No	5/16/2022 5/16/2022	E.L. Robinson Engineering intends to participate as a design sub-consultant. Please include Jason Wise, jwise@elrobinson.com on email distributions as well.
KT Supply Ltd John R Jurgensen Company Gresham Smith STRUCTURAL TECHNOLOGIES, LLC (a.k.a. VSI)	11641 Mosteller Rd 333 West Vine Street, Suite 1650 15600 Trinity Blvd., Suite 118	Cincinnati, OH, 45241 Lexington, KY, 40507 Fort Worth, TEXAS 76155	513-771-0820 859-785-7561 817-585-2272	Josh Carter, Vice President Arlen Sandlin, PE – State Transportation Leader Bob Sward, V.P.	Josh.Carter@rjnet.com Arlen.sandlin@greshamsmith.com bsward@structuraltec.com	Sub-Contractor Designer Sub-Contractor	No No No	5/17/2022 5/17/2022 7/17/2022	We would like to be included in the industry forum on June 7th. We are interested in teaming up with potential design-build lead contractors.
GRW Engineers, Inc. Haydon Bridge Co., Inc. DL E&C Fluor Enterprises, Inc. American Bridge Company	801 Corporate Drive PO Box 175 Jongno-gu, Seoul, 03181, S.Korea 1000 American Bridge Way	Lexington, KY 40503 Springfield, KY 40069 Coraopolis, PA 15108	(859)223-3999 859-336-7533 82-2-2011-8535 614-560-6484	Ben Fister, Senior Vice President Kevin Wolfe, President Hobi Kim, PhD, PE, General Manager / Civil Division Hope Grumbles	bfister@grwinc.com kevinwolfe@haydonbridgecompa hobi@dlenc.co.kr Hope.Grumbles@fluor.com	Designer Sub-Contractor Sub-Contractor	Yes	5/18/2022 5/19/2022	
Arcadis US Inc.	1111 Superior Avenue; Suite 1300	Cleveland, Ohio 44114	216/298-5226	Jim Moldovan, Director Business Development/Pursuit Manager Edward J. Adamczyk, Associate Vice President	JMoldovan@southlandholdings.com edward.adamczyk@arcadis.com	Lead Contractor Designer	Yes	5/20/2022 5/22/2022	Interested to know if the Brent Spence project will have an Independent Quality Firm responsible for design related services. In addition, will this IQF be part of the Design Build Team. Arcadis is evaluating being part of an IQF Team and also considering a design role.
H.W. Lochner, Inc. Tutor Perini / Lunda JV Massman Construction Co.	2365 Harrodsburg Road, Suite B400 15901 Olden Street 4400 W. 109th Street, Suite 300	Lexington, KY 40504 Sylmar, CA 91342 Overland Park, KS 66211	859-224-4476 818-362-8391 (913) 291-2600	Phil Logsdon, AICP Office Manager, Vice President Ronald N Tutor, Chairman and CEO Thomas Tavernaro, Chief Estimator	plogsdon@hwlochner.com ron_tutor@tutorperini.com ttavernaro@massman.net	Designer Lead Contractor Sub-Contractor	No Yes No	5/23/2022 5/23/2022 5/23/2022	We are interested in construction of the companion bridge over the Ohio River.
Resource International, Inc. S&B USA Construction	6350 Presidential Gateway Novo Tower 1, Suite 300, One Allegheny Square	Columbus, Ohio 43231 Pittsburgh, PA 15121	614-823-4949 412-471-4200 x210	Marcia Lampman, EVP Aggai Dror, VP Business & Strategy	marcial@resourceinternational.com hdror@shikususa.com jlwason@shikususa.com cluncefors@shikususa.com	Sub-Contractor Lead Contractor	No Yes	5/24/2022 5/24/2022	Final decision regarding lead contractor or sub-contractor role to be decided at a later date.
Traylor Bros., Inc.	835 N. Congress Avenue	Evansville, IN 47715	(972) 821-1014	Glenn Walsh, P.E., Pursuit Manager, Heavy Civil and Underground	gwalsh@traylor.com	Lead Contractor	Undecided	5/24/2022	Thank you in advance for having an industry day for this very important project. We look forward to learning more about the project at the industry day and engage in 1:1 discussions afterwards.
FCC Construcion S.A. Palmer Engineering Company Schnabel Engineering, LLC	1101 Brickell Ave, Suite 1601-North, Miami, FL 33131 400 Shoppers Drive 9800 Jeb Stuart Pkwy, Suite 200	Winchester, KY 40391 Glen Allen, VA 23059	1.305.372.2536 (859) 744-1218 859-475-8788	Jesus M. de la Fuente, Ph.D. David Lindeman, President Ben Webster, PE / Senior Vice President	JMFuente@fcco.com dlindeman@palmer.net bwebster@schnabel-eng.com bbanks@schnabel-eng.com	Designer Designer	No Yes	5/24/2022 5/24/2022	Although we are still working on assembling the team, FCC Construcion S.A. (www.fcco.com) would like to request a one-on-one meeting with your Team.
Dragados USA	810 Seventh Avenue, 9th Floor	New York, NY 10019	9493455717	Kevin Kurz	kkurz@dragados-usa.com	Lead Contractor		5/25/2022	We have an interest in learning more about the project delivery approach; scope and other aspects.
TranSystems GAI Consultants	400 West Nationwide Blvd., Suite 225 5399 Lauby Road, Suite 120	Columbus, Ohio 43215 North Canton Ohio, 44720	614-433-7800 234-203-0761	Brent Downing, Vice President Art Romet, Senior Engineering Manager	bdowning@transystems.com a.rometo@gaiconsultants.com	Designer Designer		5/26/2022 5/27/2022	

Company Name	Address	City, State, Zip:	Phone #	Contact Name	Email	Role	Intend to Submit a Qualification Package?	Date Received	Comments
Modjeski and Masters	100 Sterling Parkway, Suite 302	Mechanicsburg, PA, 17050	717-790-9565	Tom Murphy, Senior Vice President	tpmurphy@modjeski.com	Designer	No	5/27/2022	We are currently in discussions with Contractors and other designers regarding teaming arrangements. We hope to be part of a team that submits a Qualification Package, but will not be submitting one ourselves.
AECON GROUP INC.	1055 Dunsmuir Street, Suite 2124	Vancouver, BC V7X 1G4	236.317.3070	Frank Daams	fdams@aecon.com	Lead Contractor	Yes	5/27/2022	We are a large design firm specializing in long span bridges and planning to form a J/V partnership for the Brent Spence Bridge Project. Our industry discussions with potential contractor teaming partners is indicating some reluctance to pursue this project based on the current market conditions. We would like to discuss procurement strategies that could expand the group of contractors willing to participate.
SYSTRA International Bridge Technologies	9325 Sky Park Court, Suite 320	San Diego, CA, 92123	858-566-5008	Christopher Hall, Sr. Vice President	chall@ibtengineers.com	Designer	Yes	5/27/2022	
Parsons	151 W 4TH STREET	CINCINNATI, OH 45202	330.607.6643	Todd Bergstrom, PE, DBIA, Vice President	Todd.bergstrom@parsons.com	Designer	Yes	5/27/2022	numerous....
Europa-Americana Business Organization Inc	405 Lexington Avenue 37th fl, The Chrysler Building	New York City, NY 10174	2129723035	Sven Oehme, President & CEO	soehme@esbo.biz	Sub-Contractor		5/27/2022	numerous....
WT Partnership	PO Box 20224	Cincinnati, OH 45220	(206) 930-7399	Jake Witt, Senior Program Manager	jake.witt@wtpartnership.com apanwalkar@haleydrich.com suthav@dymotecinc.com	Sub-Contractor	No	5/27/2022	numerous....

Name	Company	Email
John Crigcon	Structure Tec	Jcrigcon@structuretec.com
Kim Gilmore	All Contractors Supply	Kg@allcontractorssupply.com
Matt Sterling	Beaver Excavating	matt@beaverexcavating.com
Gary Obert	Kokosing Construction	geo@Kokosing.biz
Chris Pizeto	Mott MacDonald	chris.pix@mottmac.com
Matt Reinhart	SAM	Mreinhart@sam.biz
Dave Cole	SAM	dcole@sam.biz
Bob Porter	Congressman Massie	bob.porter@mail.house.gov
Scott Stone	FHWA	Scott.stone@dot.gov
Steve Bonaman	Mimic Smith Group	sbonaman@mimicgroup
Doug Vanslambrook	Walsh Construction	
Jeff Lawson	Fay, Sibusa Construction	jlawson@shikonusa.com
Stephen Sewell	Palmer Engineering	ssewell@palmernet.com
William Serrano-		
Franklin	City of Cincinnati	william.serrano@cincinnati-oh.gov
Stephanie Duncan	Crossroads Highway Products	sduncan@crossroadshighway.com
Ram Rajadhyaksha	DLZ	Ramr@dlz.com
Joe Zwietzinski	DLZ Corp.	jcz@dlz.com
	African American Chamber of	
	Commerce	deborah@africanamericanchamber.com
Deborah R. Davis		
Jeff St. John	Walsh Construction	jstjohn@walshgroup.com
Ed Adamczyk	Arcadis	Edward.adamczyk@aracadis.com
Enoch Chipukarzer	Barr (NEAS)	echipukarzer@neasinc.com
Mark Olsen	Lunda construction	molsen@lundaconstruction.com
Mike Cash	ODOT	mike.cash@ohio.dot.gov
Tyler Holden	KT Supply	holden.tyler@gmail.com
Jeremiah Littleton	QK4	jlittleton@qk4.com
Brian Umbright	EXP	brian.umbright@exp.com
Victor Bacon	Geco Enterprise	victorbacon@hotmail.com
Wayne Sloan	Erie Ins.Co	Waynesloan@gmail.com
Nicol Nolte	Walsh	nnotle@walshgroup.com
Cody Kerr	Kokosing	mck2@kokosing.biz
Dan Lucas	Tye Bar	dlucas@tyerebar.com
Mike Abruzzo	Goettle	Mabruzzo@goettle.com
Joe Larson	TPC/Lunda	jl Larson@luncaconstruction.com
Dennis Behnke	TPC/Lunda	dbehnke@luncaconstruction.com
Kate Holden	KT Supply LTD	ktsupplyltd@gmail.com
Tyler Holden	KT Supply LTD	
Josh Epperson	VS Engineering	jepperson@vsengineering.com
Steve Johnson	Resource International	stevej@resourceinternational.com
Steve Revitshi	S&B USA Construction	srevitshi@shikunusa.com

Jill McMcauley	African American Chamber of Commerce	jill@africanamericanchamber.com
Andrew Proffit	Keller	aproffit@keller-na.com
Gregory Parker	African American Chamber of Commerce	gregory@africanamericanchamber.com
James Ballinger	Kentucky Transportation Cabinet	James.ballinger@ky.gov
Brad Koestr	Walsh	bkoester@walshgroup.com
Jeffery Bryan	Hoeworx	Hoeworx@hotmail.com
Annette Tanver	African American Chamber of Commerce	annette@africanamericanchamber.com
Lynette Smith	Securidine Logistics	Lynettesmith@securidinelogistics.com
Scott Piefer	Walsh	spiefer@walshgroup.com
Bethany Natali	Weintraut and Associates	bethnay@weintrautine.com
Donald Cash	Kokosak Construction	Dcash@kokosing.biz
Nikki Crenshaw	Laborers Local 265	dcrenshaw265@gmail.com
James Inslap	Laborers Local 265	Jamesinslap265@gmail.com
Tyler Harris	Hilltop Co.	tharris@hilltopcompanies.com
Jamie Moore	Hilltop Co.	jmoore@hilltopcompanies.com
Rick Roth	Hilltop Co.	rroth@hilltopcompanies.com
Larry Thompson	Laborers Local 265	lthompson@laborerslocal265.com
Tyler Southworth	Kosmus Cement Co.	tsouthworth@kosmuscement.com
Hope Grumbles	Fluor	hope.grumbles@fluor.com
Anthony Brice Jr.	Laborers Local 265	abricejr265@gmail.com
James Stocks	DJX Construction	jstocks@djxconstruction.com
Clyde Grey	Blackboard Marketing	513-325-1181
Chad Conley	Hinkle Construction Serv.	859-351-5191
Vinay Polepalli	Stantec	Vinay.polepalli@stantec.com
Brad Slabaugh	Hilltop Co.	hilltopbslabaugh@hill

Contact Name	Email Address	Phone Number	Company Name	Company Address	City	State	Zip Code
Joel Halterman	jhalterman@walshgroup.com	219-608-6097	Walsh Construction Company II, LLC	1260 East Summit Street	Crown Point	Indiana	46307
JESUS DE LA FUENTE	JMFUENTE@FCCCO.COM	3057750133	FCC CONSTRUCTION INC	1101 Brickell Ave, Suite 1601-N	Miami	FL	33131
Tony Hunley	tony.hunley@stantec.com	8597977269	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.	3052 Beaumont Centre Circle	Lexington	KY	40513
Dani Hall	dhall@vaughnmelton.com	865.964.6976	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	12480 Fortune Drive Suite 250	Lexington	KY	40509
Jon Brunot	jon.brunot@burgessniple.com	5135196845	Burgess & Niple, Inc.	525 Vine Street Suite 1300	Cincinnati	OH	45245
Steve Mary	steve.mary@terracon.com	513-600-9826	Terracon	611 Lunken Park Drive	Cincinnati	Ohio	45226
Gary Bowen	gbowen@dlz.com	6143329183	DLZ	6121 Huntley Road	Columbus	OH	43229
Kevin Ohl	kao@kokosing.biz	6143094073	Kokosing Construction Company, Inc	6235 Westerville Road	Westerville	OH	43081
Joe Iniguez	jiniguez@halmarinternational.com	214-906-7669	Halmar International, LLC	421 E. Route 59	Nanuet	NY	10954
Josh Cook	josh.cook@burgessniple.com	13174175340	Burgess & Niple	Burgess & Niple	Indianapolis	IN	46204
Bill Basich	wbasich@geotechnology.com	8597469400	Geotechnology, LLC	1398 Cox Ave	Erlanger	Kentucky	41018
Jeff Heimann	jeff.heimann@strand.com	5138615600	Strand Associates, Inc.	615 Elsinore Place, Suite 320	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Glenn Walsh	gwalsh@traylor.com	9728211014	Traylor Bros., Inc.	835 N. Congress Avenue	Evansville	IN	47715
Stephen J McDevitt	steve.mcdevitt@burgessniple.com	5025937145	Burgess & Niple, Inc.	400 Blankenbaker Parkway, Suite 300	Evansville	KY	40243
Larry Owens	lowens@traylor.com	812-449-2353	Traylor Bros., Inc.	835 N. Congress Avenue	Evansville	IN	47715
David Rinehart	drinehart@wallacepancher.com	4195240074	x217 Richland Engineering	29 North Park Street	Mansfield	Ohio	44902
Taylor Kelly	tkelly@qk4.com	5022292226	Qk4	1046 East Chestnut St	Louisville	KY	40204
Ron Wibbels	ronald.wibbels@irvmat.com	5026434074	Irving Materials Inc	1440 Selinda Ave	Louisville	Ky	40213
Valeria Cummings Swope	valeria.cummings@cincinnati-oh.gov	5133523156	City of Cincinnati	805 Central Ave., Suite 610	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Scott Harris	sharris@kapurinc.com	202 258-6534	Kapur and Associates	2603 Sycamore Run Court	LaGrange	KY	40031
Kevin Rust	krust@hwlochner.com	18594622704	H.W. Lochner, Inc.	2365 Harrodsburg Road, Suite B400	Lexington	Kentucky	40504
Bryan Cavan	bryancavan@twc.com	15026493833	Javier Steel Corporation	1301 Clear Springs Trace #110	Louisville	KY	40233
Jason Tucker	jtucker@greatlakesway.com	2162100132	The Great Lakes Construction Co.	2608 Great Lakes Way	Hinckley	OH	44333
Adam Bohnhoff	abohnhoff@civildesigninc.com	2178219380	Civil Design, Inc.	9400 Bunsen Parkway, Suite 150	Louisville	KY	40220
Lynn Stevens	Lynnette.stevens@dot.ohio.gov	614-578-0513	Ohio Department of Transportation	1980 W. Broad Street MS 3270	Columbus	Ohio	43223
Lake Barrett	lbarrett@kta.com	4129526622	KTA-Tator	145 Enterprise	Pittsburgh	pa	15275
Jeremiah Morrell	jeremiah.morrell@cmc.com	765-256-1092	CMC Rebar	1810 S Macedonia Ave	Muncie	IN	47302
Adam Knuckles	avknuckles@vaughnmelton.com	6062429220	Vaughn and Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	100 S 24th Street	Middlesboro	KY	40965
Mary McConnell	mary.mcconnell@kzf.com	5136023602	KZF Design	700 Broadway Ave	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Amy O'Connell	amy.oconnell@kzf.com	15134008331	KZF Design	KZF Design	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Collin Mays	collin.mays@cincinnati-oh.gov	(513) 439-8534	City of Cincinnati	805 Central Ave	Cincinnati	OH	45202
Raymond G. Robison, Jr.	ray.robison@burgessniple.com	5022542344	Burgess & Niple, Inc.	400 Blankenbaker Parkway, Suite 300	Evansville	Kentucky	40243
Brenna L Angel	brenna@c2strategic.com	502-751-1699	C2 Strategic Communications	911 Blankenbaker Pkwy	Louisville	KY	40243
Dani Hall	dhall@vaughnmelton.com	865-964-6976	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	12480 Fortune Drive Suite 250	Lexington	KY	40509
Douglass Robb	drobb@gpinet.com	(443)753-5511	Greenman-Pedersen, Inc.	11000 Broken Land Parkway, Suite 500	Columbia	Maryland	21044
Todd Bergstrom	todd.bergstrom@parsons.com	3306076643	Parsons	2667 Laurie Lane	Norton	OH	44203
Rob Harris	rob.harris@aecom.com	5025500048	AECOM	500 W. Jefferson St., Suite 1600	Louisville	Kentucky	40202
David Crowell	dcrowell@graypape.com	5134848156	Gray & Pape, Inc.	1318 Main Street	Cincinnati	OH	45202
Dave Ayala	dave.ayala@parsons.com	317-616-1006	Parsons	101 West Ohio Street	Indianapolis	IN	46204
Joey Gallagher	johngallagher@gpinet.com	6143954896	GPI	5178 Blazer Parkway, Suite A	Dublin	OH	43017
Nikki Boden	nikki.boden@greshamsmith.com	18594210719	Gresham Smith	333 West Vine Street Suite 1650	Lexington	Kentucky	40507
Greg Groves	greg.groves@aecom.com	5023457370	AECOM	500 West Jefferson Street, Suite 1600	Evansville	Kentucky	40202
Rick A Roth	RRoth@Hilltopcompanies.com	513-401-2197	Hilltop Companies	900 Kieley Pl	Cincinnati	Ohio	45217
kenneth Beache	kennethb@metricenv.com	317679522	METRIC ENVIRONMENTAL, LLC	810 Plum Street, Suite 3	Cincinnati	OH	45204
Vince Epps	vincee@metricenv.com	3178092819	Metric Environmental	6958 Hillsdale Court	Indianapolis	Indiana	46250
Barry Barger	bbarger@prestressservices.com	2607063698	Prestress Services Industries, LLC	250 N Hartford Ave	Columbus	OHIO	43222
David Szydluk	dszydluk@prestressservices.com	859-402-6063	Prestress Services	250 N Hartford Ave	Columbus	OH	43222
Andy Barber	andy.barber@HDRinc.com	5026451586	HDR, Inc	401 West Main St. Suite 500	Louisville	Kentucky	40202
Michael F. McCarthy	Michael.McCarthy@mottmac.com	(216) 406-9102	Mott MacDonald, LLC	13071 Mariner Dr.	North Royalton	OH	44133
Travis Baker	travis.baker@aecom.com	15134193404	AECOM	525 Vine St., Ste. 1800	Cincinnati	OH	45202
Arlen Sandlin	arlen.sandlin@greshamsmith.com	8597857561	Gresham Smith	333 West Vine Street, Suite 1650	Lexington	KY	40507
Derek Manz	drmanz@stupp.com	(270) 715-2971	Stupp Bridge	445 Century Street	Bowling Green	Kentucky	42101
Hardy Willis	hwillis@vaughnmelton.com	8286911278	Vaughn & Melton Consulting Engineers, Inc.	1318-F Patton Avenue	Asheville	NC	28806

Katie Nolan	katie.nolan@greshamsmith.com	8594627729 Gresham Smith	5151 Pfeiffer Rd, Suite 220	Cincinnati	OH	45242
Lisa Wilson-Plajer	lisa.wilson@terracon.com	18592407009 Terracon Consultants, Inc.	Terracon Consultants, Inc.	Cincinnati	OH	41005
Adam P DeMargel	apdemargel@stupp.com	13145447575 Stupp Bridge Company	3800 Weber Road	St. Louis	MO	63125
Gregory Kreutzjans	gkreutzjans@grwinc.com	859-628-6080 GRW Engineers, Inc.	GRW Engineers, Inc.	Fort Mitchell	Kentucky	41017
HARVIND K SINGH	hkaur@singhinc.com	8477701829 SINGH + Associates, Inc.	SINGH + Associates, Inc.	Northbrook	IL	60062
HunterJudy	hjudy@hallky.com	502-992-3741 Hall Contracting of Kentucky	3800 Crittenden Drive	Louisville	KY	40209
Peter Overmohle	povermohle@aei.cc	2706705394 American Engineers, Inc.	American Engineers, Inc.	Glasgow	KY	42141
Barb Smith	bsmith@journeysteel.com	5137312930 Journey Steel, Inc.	Journey Steel, Inc.	Cincinnati	OH	45237
Tom Garten	tgarten@journeysteel.com	5137312930 Journey Steel, Inc.	Journey Steel, Inc.	Cincinnati	Ohio	45237
Joseph Rikk	jrikk@gfnet.com	6145815100 Gannett Fleming	2500 Corporate Exchange Drive, Suite 200	Columbus	Ohio	43231
Shawn Thompson	shawn.thompson@jacobs.com	6145357502 Jacobs	Two Easton Oval, Suite 500	Columbus	OH	43219
Mike Yeager	myeager@primeeng.com	8599121920 PRIME AE, Group, Inc.	2101 Chamber Center Dr	Ft Mitchell	KY	41017
Mark Polston	mark.polston@wsp.com	8592453892 WSP USA Inc.	1792 Alysheba Way, Suite 230	Lexington	Kentucky	40509
Michael Ciammaichella	mciammaichella@ruhlin.com	13303501728 The Ruhlin Company	The Ruhlin Company	Sharon Center	OH	44274
Jim Ruhlin Jr.	jruluhlinjr@ruhlin.com	13302392800 The Ruhlin Company	6931 Ridge Road	Sharon Center	OH	44274
Jimmy Stahl	jstahl@gpdgroup.com	502.259.0810 GPD Group	2718 River Green Circle	Louisville	KY	40206
Kevin Wolfe	kevinwolfe@haydonbridgecompany.com	8593367533 Haydon Bridge Co., Inc	PO Box 175	Springfield	KY	40069
Hobi Kim	hobi@dienc.co.kr	281-686-6806 DL E&C USA, Inc	14701 St. Mary's Lane Suite #335	Houston	TX	77079
Tom Hibbard	thibbard@structurepoint.com	6142846088 American Structurepoint	2550 Corporate Exchange Drive, Suite 200	Columbus	OH	43231
Joseph DiFiore	jdifiore@wallacepancher.com	412-719-7761 WallacePancher Group	WallacePancher Group	Cranberry Township	Pa	16066
Doug Stachler	douglas.stachler@jacobs.com	614-825-6754 Jacobs	2 Easton Oval, Suite 500	Columbus	OH	43219
Ed Green	ed@c2strategic.com	502.544.2917 C2 Strategic Communications	911 Blankenbaker Parkway	Louisville	KY	40243
Warren Iulg	wiulg@grwinc.com	15133040928 GRW Engineers, Inc.	250 Grandview Drive Suite 110	Ft. Mitchell	KY	41017
Marlene Fout	marlene@african-americanchamber.com	5134757145 Minority Business Assistance Centers	2303 Gilbert Avenue	Cincinnati	OH	45206
Cindy Rice	crice@kta.com	724-272-4344 KTA-Tator, Inc.	145 Enterprise Dr	Pittsburgh	PA	15275
Keith Rahe	Keith.raeh@kiewit.com	312-735-7113 Kiewit	2 Pierce Place Suite 1600	Itasca	IL	60143
Keith Sommer	keith.sommer@fluor.com	8642814758 Fluor	100 Fluor Daniel Drive	Greenville	SC	29609
TJ Gilpin	tgilpin@hwlochner.com	15023313119 HW Lochner	HW Lochner	Lexington	KY	40504
B. Cato Mayberry	cato.mayberry@daytonohio.gov	9373331033 Minority Business Assistance Center (MBAC)	Minority Business Assistance Center (MBAC)	Columbus	Ohio	45402
Matt Carter	matt.carter@arup.com	9175657297 Arup	77 Water St	New York	NY	10583
Luke Tarasuik	luke.tarasuik@arup.com	3102274384 Arup	77 Water Street	New York	NY	10005
Phil Logsdon	plogsdon@hwlochner.com	5023708482 Lochner	2365 Harrodsburg Road, Suite B400	Lexington	KY	40504
Doug McCrae	dmccrae@cjmahan.com	6143143615 C. J. Mahan Construction Company, LLC	C. J. Mahan Construction Company, LLC	Columbus	OH	43123
Jeff Wernert	mwernert@harrisrebar.com	15025525894 Nucor Harris Rebar	Nucor Harris Rebar	Louisville	KY	40242
Phillip McIntosh	psmcintosh@jmcaa.com	8592634399 J.M. Crawford & Associates	131 Prosperous Place #18A	Lexington	KY	40509
Anne Rahall	arahall@teceng.com	5137718828 TEC Engineering, Inc.	7288 Central Parke Boulevard	Mason	Ohio	45040
Edward Williams	ewilliams@teceng.com	5137718828 TEC Engineering, Inc.	7288 Central Parke Boulevard	Mason	Ohio	45040
Kris Smith	ksmith@cjmahan.com	2705566153 CJ Mahan Construction Company	3458 Lewis Centre Way	Grove City	OH	43123
Doug McCrae	dmccrae@cjmahan.com	614.314.3615 CJ Mahan Construction Company	3458 Lewis Centre Way	Grove City	OH	43123
Dennis Behnke	dbehnke@lundaconstruction.com	6128193615 Lunda Construction Company	Lunda Construction Company	Black River Falls	WI	54615
Shawn Mason	smason@primeeng.com	5134016301 PRIME AE GROUP	PRIME AE GROUP	Cincinnati	Ohio	45242
Jose de Iturriaga	jdeiturriaga@dragados-usa.com	212.779.0900 Dragados	810 7th Avenue, 9th Floor	New York	NY	10019
Dan Prevost	daniel.prevost@parsons.com	513-552-7013 Parsons	151 W. 4th Street, Suite 600A	Cincinnati	OH	45202
Joseph Warino	jwarino@primeeng.com	6144191078 PRIME AE Group	PRIME AE Group	Dublin	OH	43016
Jared Love	Jared.Love@wsp.com	614-940-2137 WSP USA	312 Elm Street, Suite 2500	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Scott Shogan	scott.shogan@wsp.com	313-506-1632 WSP USA	312 Elm Street, Suite 2500	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Chris Barrow	chris.barrow@wsp.com	859-582-0385 WSP USA	1792 Alysheba Way, Suite 230	Lexington	Kentucky	40509
Duane Phelps	duane.phelps@wsp.com	513-639-2138 WSP USA	312 Elm Street, Suite 2500	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Jim Hancock	jim.hancock@nucorskyline.com	3312198031 Nucor Skyline	1200 Internationale Parkway	Woodridge	IL	60517
Robert Hill	rhill@hwlochner.com	8593915138 HW Lochner	2365 Harrodsburg Road	Lexington	KY	40504
Diana Martin	dmartin@rlrecord.com	513-226-0608 RL RECORD LLC	1150 W 8th Street Suite 248	Cincinnati	OH	45203-1270
Keith Damron	kdamron@aei.cc	5024092544 American Engineers, Inc.	American Engineers, Inc.	Lexington	Kentucky	40509
Aaron Griffith	agriffith@massman.net	3157619735 Massman Construction	4400 W 109th St, Suite 300	Overland Park	Kansas	66211
Rick Record	Rrecord@rlrecord.com	513-744-9778 RL RECORD LLC	1150 W 8th Street Suite 248	Cincinnati	OH	45203-1270

Scott D Vannoy	svannoy@jmt.com	4123351057 JMT	5313 Campbells Run Road, Suite 100	Pittsburgh	PA	15205
Joseph Salzano	jsalzano@sunesiscc.com	5135099609 Sunesis Construction Co.	Sunesis Construction Co.	West Chester	Ohio	45069
Matt Ventura	mventura@sunesiscc.com	5133266000 Sunesis Construction Co	2610 Crescentville RD	West Chester	OH	45069
Austin Hill	austin.hill@austinslogistics.com	7346127039 AUSTIN LOGISTICS LLC	AUSTIN LOGISTICS LLC	Detroit	MI	48226
Andrew Eribo	aeribo@ribwaygroup.com	614-221-6009 Ribway Engineering Group, Inc.	300 East Broad Street, Suite 500	Columbus	OH	43215
Michelle Kruse	michelle@hkmfgusa.com	260-414-5557 HK Manufacturing, Inc.	203 Hunters Ridge	Auburn	Indiana	46706
Larry Ivory	livery@ribwaygroup.com	614-221-6009 Ribway Engineering Group, Inc.	300 East Broad Street, Suite 500	Columbus	Ohio	43215
Jon Cox	jcox@ribwaygroup.com	614-221-6009 Ribway Engineering Group, Inc.	300 East Broad Street, Suite 500	Columbus	Ohio	43215
Dan Bates	dan@hamilton-ohio.com	15134545066 Greater Hamilton Chamber of Commerce	Greater Hamilton Chamber of Commerce	Hamilton	Ohio	45011
Mark Brueggemann	MBrueggemann@ctconsultants.com	8598021790 CT Consultants	2161 Chamber Center Dr,	Fort Mitchell	Kentucky	41017
Josh Conley	jconley@jmt.com	6149423666 JMT	2800 Corporate Exchange Drive, Ste 2500	Columbus	OH	43143
Carmine Borea	carmine.borea@exp.com	7862088449 EXP US Services Inc	201 Alhambra Circle Suite 800	coral gables	FL	33166
Ben Webster	bwebster@schnabel-eng.com	8594758788 Schnabel	2580 Sungale Ct.	Lexington	KY	40513
Adam Bohnhoff	abohnhoff@civildesigninc.com	2178219380 Civil Design, Inc.	9400 Bunsen Parkway, Suite 150	Louisville	KY	40220
Steve Mary	steve.mary@terracon.com	513-600-9826 Terracon	611 Lunken Park drive	Cincinnati	ohio	45140
Rob Hans	ROBERT.HANS@MBAKERINTL.COM	15138106014 Michael Baker International	1502 Vine Street, Suite 200	Cincinnati	OH	45202
Joy Lanham	joy@lanhamengineering.com	6142160448 Lanham Engineering, LLC	2421 Reginald Ct	Powell	OH	43065
Harvind Singh	Hkaur@singhinc.com	847.770.1829 Singh & Associates, Inc.	6035 Huntley Road	Columbus	Ohio	43229
Steve Bergman	sbergman@mannaiksmithgroup.com	513-218-1382 The Mannik & Smith Group	10200 Alliance Road, Suite 135	Cincinnati	Ohio	45242
Bronson Funke	bfunke@palmernet.com	15134691600 Palmer Engineering Co.	8350 E Kemper Road, Suite B	Cincinnati	Ohio	45249
Edward J Holmes	holmes@ehiconsultants.com	859-425-4881 EHI Consultants	President	Lexington	KY	40507
Andy Shahan	ashahan@ljbinc.com	19372595180 LJB Inc.	2500 Newmark Drive	Miamisburg	Ohio	45342
Joel Holcomb	jholcomb@ljbinc.com	6062246497 LJB	12800 Townepark Way Suite 201	Louisville	Kentucky	40243
Dan Springer	dspringer@ljbinc.com	9374759161 LJB	2500 Newmark Drive	Dayton	Ohio	45342
Matt Lehmenkuler	matt.lehmenkuler@terracon.com	5136129096 Terracon Consultants, Inc.	611 Lunken Park Drive	Cincinnati	Ohio	45226
Gregory L Smith	greg@kyconcrete.org	5026825481 Kentucky Concrete Association	Kentucky Concrete Association	Frankfort	KY	40601
Rick	RRoth@Hilltopcompanies.com	513-401-2197 Hilltop Companies	900 Kieley Place	Cincinnati	Ohio	45217
Sammy Van Pelt	svanpelt@kapurinc.com	502-269-5418 Kapur & Associates, Inc.	590 Missouri Ave Suite 202	Jeffersonville	IN	47150
Heath Phillips	hphillips@kapurinc.com	502-546-8002 Kapur	590 Missouri Avenue Suite 202	Jeffersonville	IN	47130
Sonja Simpson	Sonja.Simpson@mbakerintl.com	6148320807 Michael Baker International	250 West Street, Suite 420	Columbus	OH	43215
Ben Webster	bwebster@schnabel-eng.com	8594758788 Schnabel Engineering	Schnabel Engineering	Lexington	KY	40513
Ryan McAleer	ryan@ohioconcrete.org	6147833255 Ohio Concrete	Ohio Concrete	Madeira	OH	45243
Kevin Jasinski	kevin.jasinski@burgessniple.com	3177755101 Burgess and Niple	251 N. Illinois St, Suite 920	Indianapolis	Indiana	46204
Lair Marin-Marcum	lair.marin@dot.ohio.gov	614-560-9541 ODOT	1980 W. Broad St.	Columbus	Ohio	43223
John Dietrick	jdietrick@mbakerintl.com	2167766626 Michael Baker International	Michael Baker International	Cleveland	OH	44087-3215
Craig Klusman	craig.klusman@aecom.com	5029385433 AECOM	AECOM	Louisville	KY	40205
Jose de Iturriaga	jdeiturriaga@dragados-usa.com	212.779.0900 Dragados USA	810 7th Avenue, 9th Floor	New York	NY	10019
David Lindeman	DLINDEMAN@PALMERNET.COM	8592299696 Palmer Engineering Company	400 Shoppers Drive	Winchester	KY	40391
Mark Policinski	mpolicinski@oki.org	513-315-2059 OKI Regional Council of Governments	720 E. Pete Rose Way	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Allen Biehl	acbiehl@transystems.com	4403465189 TranSystems	1100 Superior Avenue, Suite 1000	Cleveland	OH	44114
Paul J Carter	paulcarter@cftransport1.com	18128258156 CF Transport 1 LLC	PO Box 200	Stanford	Indiana	47463
Shane Campbell	scampbell@fnet.com	6147536987 Gannett Fleming	2500 Corporate Exchange Drive Suite 200	Columbus	OH	43231
Holly Wilson	hollye.wilson@ky.gov	502-782-4071 KYTC Office of Civil Rights and Small Business	200 Mero Street 6th Floor West	Frankfort	Kentucky	40622
Jamal A Adhami	Jadhami@shaengg.com	15132367909 SHA Engineering LLC	SHA Engineering LLC	Mason	ohio	45040
Tylor Crawley	tylor.crawley@ky.gov	502-564-3601 Kentucky Transportation Cabinet	200 Mero Street	Frankfort	KY	40602
Kevin Bird	kbird@veritassteel.com	7152150048 Veritas Steel	Veritas Steel	MENOMONIE	WI	54751
Jake Hesseling	jhesseling@oki.org	7404978488 OKI	OKI	Cincinnati	OHIO	45202
Brent Downing	bdowning@transystems.com	614-433-7800 TranSystems	400 West Nationwide Blvd., Suite 225	Columbus	Ohio	43215
Rich Markwith	rpmkwith@transystems.com	404-290-8801 TranSystems	400 W Nationwide Blvd, Suite 225	Columbus	OH	43215
Alisia Garcia	algarcia.bac@gmail.com	5138744695 Battle Axe Construction	11435 Sebring Drive	Cincinnati	OH	45240
Dane Redinger	dredinger@mtcsg.net	6143091560 Mt. Carmel Stabilization Group	5860 Venture Drive, Suite C	Dublin	OH	43017
Greg Boyer	gboyer@bgenggroup.com	614-615-6499 BG Engineering Group	5910 Wilcox Place, Suite C	Dublin	Ohio	43016
Brad Putty	brad.putty@ky.gov	502-782-4846 KYTC	200 Mero St.	Frankfort	KY	40622
Ravinder Gupta	rgupta@bgenggroup.com	614-886-8045 BG Engineering Group	5910 Wilcox Place, Suite C	Dublin	Ohio	43016

Jose M. de Iturriaga, P.E.	jdeiturriaga@dragados-usa.com	212-779-0900 Dragados USA	810 Seventh Avenue	New York	NY	10019
Mike Brite	mbrite@ushydrovac.com	3175035297 US Hydrovac Inc.	125 W South Street #1751	Indianapolis	IN	46206
Arthur C Rometo	a.rometo@gaiconsultants.com	234-203-0761 GAI Consultants	5399 Lauby Road	North Canton	Ohio	44720
Tony Matutis	tony.matutis@canamgroupinc.com	3125432815 Canam Bridges US inc	386 River Road	Claremont	NH	2773
Tom Bolte	tom.bolte@burgessniple.com	6144592050 Burgess & Niple, Inc.	5085 Reed Road	Columbus	OH	43220
Adam	adam.bullard@ky.gov	502-782-4809 Kentucky Transportation Cabinet	200 Mero St	Frankfort	Kentucky	40622
Frank Daams	fdaams@aecon.com	6042305589 Aecon Group	1055 Duinsmuir Street, Suite 2124	Vancouver	BC	V7X 1G4
Todd Hood	todd.hood@peraton.com	5022907201 Peraton	TRIMARC / Peraton	Louisville	Kentucky	40202
David Schoenwolf	dschoenwolf@haleyaldrich.com	17033366206 Haley & Aldrich, Inc.	1497 Chain Bridge Road, Suite 304	McLean	VA	22101
Jim Barna	Jim.Barna@2lmn.com	614-832-1815 2lmn, Inc.	1105 Schrock Road Ste 516	Columbus	Ohio	43299
Janine Cunningham	hoeworx@hotmail.com	502-492-1879 Hoeworx, LLC	P. O. Box 455	Shepherdsville	Kentucky	40165-5319
Sutha Vallipuram	suthav@dynotecinc.com	6146342051 Dynotec, Inc.	2931 E Dublin Granville Rd, Suite 200	Columbus	OH	43231
Matt Baxendell	mbaxendell@dynotecinc.com	6148807320 Dynotec, Inc.	2931 E Dublin Granville Rd, Suite 200	Columbus	OH	43231
Sven C Oehme	oehme@eabo.biz	12129723035 European-American Business Organization	405 Lexington Avenue	New York City	NY	10174
Jim Moldovan	jmoldovan@southlandholdings.com	614-560-6484 American Bridge Company	1000 American Bridge Way	Coraopolis	PA	15108
Ron Quesenberry	ron.quesenberry@trueinspectionservices.com	19376819000 True Inspection Services	871 s Main street	Urbana	OH	43078
Christopher Hall	chall@ibtengineers.com	8589457910 SYSTRA-IBT	SYSTRA-IBT	San Diego	CA	92123
anant panwalkar	apanwalkar@haleyaldrich.com	6033913333 Haley Aldrich	3 Bedford Farms Drive	Bedford	New Hampshire	3110
Emily Preston	epreston@compassinf.com	5676442818 Compass Infrastructure Group	2800 Corporate Exchange Drive Suite 100	Columbus	OH	43231
Gary Gardner	ggardner@compassinf.com	6142041964 Compass Infrastructure Group	2800 Corporate Exchange Drive Suite 100	Columbus	OH	43231
Nathan Weldy	Nathan.Weldy@peraton.com	502-710-1372 Peraton - TRIMARC	901 W. Main St	Louisville	KY	40202
Anu Bansal	tracy.powell@bansalinc.com	5138745410 Bansal Co	3271 Homeward Way	Fairfield	ohio	45014
Jason Sharpe	jason.sharpe@zachrycorp.com	2108712874 Zachry Construction Corporation	Zachry Construction Corporation	San Antonio	Texas	78248
Ken Shovlin	KShovlin@americanbridge.net	412-631-1000 American Bridge Company	1000 American Bridge Way	Coraopolis	PA	15108
Neil Napolitano	nnapolitano@americanbridge.net	412-631-1000 American Bridge Company	1000 American Bridge Way	Coraopolis	PA	15108
Joseph Rikk	jrjikk@gfnet.com	6145815100 Gannett Fleming	2500 Corporate Exchange Drive, Suite 200	Columbus	Ohio	43231
Jay Chiglo	jay.chiglo@hdrinc.com	7735203746 HDR	17111 Preston Road, Suite 300	Dallas	tx	75248
Mark Policinski	mpolicinski@oki.org	513-315-2059 OKI Regional Council of Governments	720 E. Pete Rose Way	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Bob Campbell	rbccampbell05@yahoo.com	614-205-0196 Carpenter Marty Transportation	6612 Single tree Drive	Columbus	Ohio	43229
Jeffrey Andrews	jeffrey.andrews@tylin.com	12074151692 T.Y. Lin International	T.Y. Lin International	CUMBERLAND CENTER	ME	4021
Marcia Lampman	marcial@resourceinternational.com	614-361-7755 Resource International, Inc.	6350 Presidential Gateway	Columbus	OH	43231
Vanessa Nghiem	vanessa.nghiem@aecon.com	5134193451 AECOM	525 Vine Street, Suite 1800	Cincinnati	OH	45202
Robert Harris	rob.harris@aecon.com	5025500048 AECOM	500 W. Jefferson St., Suite 1600	LOUISVILLE	KY	40202
Brent Grow	Brent.grow@beaverexcavating.com	15136043004 The Beaver Excavating Company	2000 Beaver Place Ave. S.W.	Canton	Ohio	44706
Rick Lance	Rick.lantz@beaverexcavating.com	3304884196 The Beaver Excavating Company	2000 Beaver Place Ave. S.W.	Canton	Ohio	44706
Brandon Howell	brandon@buildapogee.com	7657448371 Apogee Construction, LLC	6301 E 32nd Ct, Suite E	Indianapolis	IN	46226
Jon Carroll	jpcarroll@fishbeck.com	513-247-8571 Fishbeck	10856 Reed Hartman Highway, Suite 100	Cincinnati	ohio	45242
Michael F McCarthy	michael.mccarthy@mottmac.com	(216) 406-9102 Mott MacDonald, LLC	Mott MacDonald, LLC	Cleveland	OH	44135
Christy Miller	cmiller@bclitconsulting.com	5133832198 BCL Enterprises	5796 Treese Dr	Liberty Township	OH	45044
Ron Estes	restes@calmerconstruction.com	3053188682 CALMER Construction	5796 Treese Dr	Liberty Township	OH	45044
Chris Kunz	chris.kunz@jrjnet.com	5135828196 John R Jurgensen Co.	John R Jurgensen Co.	Cincinnati	OH	45241
Sivaraman Venugopalan	siva@sivacorrosion.com	16106926551 Siva Corrosion Services, Inc.	1313 Wilmington Pike, Suite 2B	West Chester	PA	19382
Josh Carter	Josh.carter@jrjnet.com	5135323024 John R Jurgensen Company	11641 Mosteller Rd	Cincinnati	Oh	45241
Mohammed Haque	haque@dhdinc.com	16145277656 DHDC Engineering Consulting	DHDC Engineering Consulting	Columbus	Ohio	43228
David Rich	drich@sitesafeonline.com	270.287.2646 Site-Safe, LLC	200 Judge Kenneth Goff Drive	Leitchfield	KY	42754
David Hynes	david.hynes@trin.net	2705056557 Trinity Highway Products	15601 Dallas Parkway, Suite 525	Addison	TX	75001
Ken Sperry	ksperry@hmbpe.com	502-229-9019 HMB Professional Engineers	3 HMB Circle	Frankfort	KY	40601
David Wormald	dave.wormald@aecon.com	513 419 3497 AECOM	525 Vine Street, Suite 1800	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Todd Guzek	tag@kokosing.biz	6149424110 Kokosing Construction	6235 Westerville Rd.	Westerville	OH	43081
Brian West	bwest@laneconstruct.com	7254006818 Lane Construction Corporation	901 N. Green Valley Pkwy. Suite 200	Anderson	NV	89074
Paul Gluck	pgluck@mbakerintl.com	2164084218 Michael Baker International	1111 Superior Ave.	Cleveland	OH	44114
Daniel Woo	daniel.woo@peraton.com	5022907290 Peraton	901 W Main St	Louisville	KY	40202
Ben Dusina	bdusina@smeinc.com	5135187325 S&ME, Inc.	862 E. Crescentville Rd.	Cincinnati	OH	45246
Hurley Gammon	hgammon@qespavements.com	724-322-5706 Quality Engineering Solutions, Inc	405 Water Street, PO Box 3004	Conneaut Lake	PA	16316

Todd Moore	tmoore@qespavements.com	(740) 310-1174 Quality Engineering Solutions, Inc	405 Water Street, PO Box 3004	Conneaut Lake	PA	16316
Greg Bickley	Gbickley@sitesafeonline.com	614-404-0964 Site Safe	1740B Harmon Ave.	Columbus	Ohio	43223
Clay Seifert	clay.seifert@peri-usa.com	5022607220 PERI Formwork Systems	7135 Dorsey Run Rd	Elkridge	Maryland	21075
Jim Bintrim	jim.bintrim@hdrinc.com	412-497-6096 HDR Engineering, Inc.	301 Grant Street, Suite 1700	Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania	15219
Bob Koehler	rkoehler@oki.org	513-619-7676 OKI Regional Council of Governments	720 E. Pete Rose Way	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Teresa Daniel	kopsinfo@kopsinc.com	8778805677 Kentuckiana Off-duty Police	PO Box 75	Bardstown	KY	40004
Preston Vineyard	prvd@cowi.com	6462402358 COWI	COWI	COWI, New York, NY, USA	United States (+1)	10005
Erika Hango	ehango@southlandholdings.com	802-370-4243 American Bridge Company	1000 American Bridge Way	Coraopolis	PA	15108
Andy Thomas	althomas@mbakerintl.com	7174334546 Michael Baker International	4431 North Front Street	Harrisburg	PA	17110
Mica Flanagan	Mica.Flanagan@dot.Ohio.gov	6144664325 ODOT	1980 W Broad St	Columbus	OH	43223
Steven Johnson	stevej@resourceinternational.com	6143953354 Resource International, Inc.	6350 Presidential Gateway	Columbus	OH	43231-7653
Melvin Bynes	Melvin.Bynes2@ky.gov	502-782-4816 Kentucky Transportation Cabinet	200 Mero Street	Frankfort	KY	40601
Marcia Lampman	marcial@resourceinternational.com	6143617755 Resource International, Inc.	6350 Presidential Gateway	Columbus	OH	43231
Craig Finley	bridges@finleyengineeringgroup.com	850-212-1457 COWI	1589 Metropolitan Boulevard	Tallahassee	FL	32308
Tim Sharp	tim.sharp@kzf.com	513 621 6211 KZF Design, Inc.	700 Broadway Street	Cincinnati	OH	45202
Charles Alexander	alexama@fuse.net	18592502884 First World Architects Studio	13 East 9th Street	Covington	Kentucky	41011
Zack Deems	zack.deems@aecom.com	13308152535 AECOM	525 Vine Street, Suite 1800	Cincinnati	OH	45202
Ryan Holmes	rholmes@ehiconsultants.com	5029923194 EHI Consultants	www.ehiconsultants.com	Louisville	KY	40202
Branden Shelton	lcsllc123@icloud.com	5132038491 Sheltons Enterprise Inc	1750 shuler ave	Hamilton	Oh	45011
Michael Culbertson	mike.culbertson@keller-na.com	3304131787 Keller	4141 Rockside Rd Suite 210	Independence	OH	44131
Anthony Jefferson	hqfinancial@outlook.com	7735411273 HQ Financial	4702 Wineleaf ln	Aberdeen	MD	21001
Richard Sutherland	richard.sutherland@stantec.com	859-333-1800 Stantec	3052 Beaumont Centre Circle; Lexington, KY	FRANKFORD	KY	40601
Terrance Dull	terry.dull@groupnei.com	5132273972 Neenah Foundry Company	3831 Zane Trace Drive	Columbus	OH	43228
Brad Bowers	rbb@kokosing.biz	614-228-1029 Kokosing Construction Company, Inc.	6235 Westerville Road	Westerville	OH	43081
Ben Stansbery	bls2@kokosing.biz	614-228-1029 Kokosing Construction Company, Inc.	6235 Westerville Road	Westerville	OH	43081
Steve Shadix	steve.shadix@stantec.com	5136196470 Stantec	11687 Lebanon Road	CINCINNATI	OH	45241
Kevin Chatary	kchatary@hrvinc.com	412-299-2000 HRV Conformance Verification Associates	400 Rouser Road, Suite 400	Moon Township	PA	15108
Mike Belsky	mbelsky@hrvinc.com	412-299-2000 HRV Conformance Verification Associates	400 Rouser Road, Suite 400	Moon Township	PA	15108
VINOD VEMPARALA	Vinod@v2solution.com	9.11E+12 V2V Solutions LLC	V2V Solutions LLC	Pepper Pike	Ohio	44124
Aaron Flautt	aaron.flautt@aecom.com	214-263-4763 AECOM	525 Vine St	Cincinnati	Ohio	45202
Ken Butler	ken.butler@aecom.com	804-240-8244 AECOM	4840 Cox Road	Glen Allen	VA	23060
Joseph K. Tse	joseph.tse@aecom.com	7188640980 AECOM	605 Third Avenue, 2nd Floor	NEW YORK	New York	10158
Jeff Lawson	jlawson@shikunusa.com	2347881383 Fay, S&B USA Construction	Nova Tower 1, Suite 300, One Allegany Square	Pittsburgh	PA	15090
Gary Obert	geo@kokosing.biz	614-679-9329 Kokosing Construction Co., Inc.	400 Techne Center Dr. Suite 200	Milford	OH	45150
Daniel Lucas	Dlucas@tyerebar.com	724-518-0127 TyE Bar	1050 Ohio Avenue	Glassport	PA	15045
Jeremy Angel	jangel@ruhlin.com	330-239-2800 The Ruhlin Company	PO Box 190, 6931 Ridge Road	Sharon Center	OH	44274
Dan Schweiger	djs@kokosing.biz	6146798347 Kokosing Construction Co., Inc. - Fredericktown, OH	400 Techne Center Dr Suite 200	Milford	Ohio	45150
Glen Kelly	gkelly@qk4.com	5026936278 Qk4	1046 East Chestnut Street	Louisville	Kentucky	40204
Alison Chadwell	aschadwell@gmail.com	859-312-8434 Prime Engineering	3307 Kenton Road	Hebron	Ky	41048
Mark Mills	Anthony@amtlogistics4.com	614-902-0236 Am Transport Logistics	www.amtlogistics.com	Canal Winchester	Oh	43110
Brian Saylor	bls@kokosing.biz	6143150336 Kokosing Construction Company	6235 Westerville Road	Westerville	Ohio	43081
Steve Revitsky	srevitsky@shikunusa.com	(412) 508-4617 Fay, S&B USA Construction	Nova Tower 1, Suite 301, One Allegany Square	Pittsburgh	PA	15212
W.C. Benton	wcbenton@aol.com	6146336115 Benton & Associates	500 Envoy Circle, Suite 502	Louisville	Ky	40299
Enoch Chipukaizer	echipukaizer@neasinc.com	6146386650 NEAS	2800 Corporate Exchange Drive, Suite 200	Columbus	OH	43231
Kim Gilmore	kg@allcontractorssupply.com	14404798344 All Contractors Supply	All Contractors Supply	Mentor	Ohio	44060
J.J. O'Rielly	jjo@kokosing.biz	614-228-1029 Kokosing Construction Company, Inc.	6235 Westerville Road	Westerville	Ohio	43081
Rick Lantz	Rick.lantz@beaverexcavating.com	13304884196 Beaver excavating company	Beaver excavating company	CANTON	Ohio	44706
Genaro	gevz@cowi.com	917-834-5681 COWI	88 Pine Street	New York	NY	10005
Stephen Sewell	ssewell@palmernet.com	8597441218 Palmer Engineering	400 shoppers Drive Winchester Ky	Winchester	KY	40392
Tom Graf	tjg@kokosing.biz	6146798327 Kokosing	6235 Westerville Rd	Westerville	Ohio	43081
Scott D Vannoy	svannoy@jmt.com	4123351057 JMT	JMT	Pittsburgh	PA	15010
Josh Epperson	jepperson@vsengineering.com	859.433.3779 VS Engineering	445 Hutchinson Ave, Suite 695	Columbus	OH	43235
Joseph Zwierzynski	jcjz@dlz.com	574-514-8425 DLZ Corporation	6121 Huntley Road	Columbus	Ohio	43229
John David Householder	jdjdh@kokosing.biz	6146798371 Kokosing Construction	Kokosing Construction	Westerville	OH	43081

Scott Boyd	sboyd@sitesafeonline.com	8003886884 Site-Safe, LLC	200 Judge Kenneth H. Goff Drive	Lietchfield	Kentucky	42754
Jeremiah Morrell	Jeremiah.morrell@cmc.com	765-256-1092 CMC Rebar	1810 S Macedonia Ave	Muncie	IN	47302
Mike Gruver	Michael.Gruver@cmc.com	317-538-1412 CMC Rebar	1810 S Macedonia Ave	Muncie	IN	47302
Bethany Natali	bethany@weintrautinc.com	317-733-9770 Weintraut & Associates, Inc.	PO Box 5034	Zionsville	IN	46077
Clyde Gray	Clyde@BlackboardMarketing.com	513-325-1181 Blackboard Marketing / VS Engineering	300 E-Business Way, Suite 200	Cincinnati	OH	45241
Dustin Fisher	dfisher@kokosing.biz	4192046554 Kokosing Construction	6235 Westerville Rd	Westerville	OH	43081
Doug Engle	dengle@midwestfoundation.com	3148526722 Midwest Foundation	8800 Page Ave	St. Louis	MO	63114
Daniel Lucas	dluca@tyerebar.com	17245180127 TyE Bar	1050 Ohio Avenue	Glassport	PA	15045
Stephanie Duncan	sduncan@crossroadshighway.com	317-628-4034 Crossroads Highway Products, LLC	236 E Washington St	Mooresville	IN	46158
Sutha Vallipuram	Suthav@dynotecinc.com	6148807732 Dynotec	2931 Dublin Granville Rd	Columbus	Ohio	43231
Vinay K. Polepalli	Vinay.Polepalli@stantec.com	15022962534 Stantec	Stantec	PROSPECT	KY	40059
Tyler Southworth	tsouthworth@kosmoscement.com	859-321-6179 Kosmos Cement Company	15301 Dixie Highway	Louisville	Kentucky	40272
Paul Axtell	paxtell@dba.world	8162101954 Dan Brown and Associates	6424 Baum Drive	Knoxville	TN	37919
Dane Redinger	dredinger@mtcsg.net	6143091560 Mt. Carmel Stabilization Group	5860 Venture Drive, Suite C	Dublin	OH	43017
Rob Dierig	rob.dierig@jrjnet.com	5132402561 John R. Jurgensen Co.	John R. Jurgensen Co.	Cincinnati	Ohio	45241
Ron Quesenberry	ron.quesenberry@tisl.com	19376819000 True Inspection Services	TISLLC.com	Urbana	Ohio	43078
Ursula Ann Miller	ursula.miller@cincinnati-oh.gov	15132505171 City of Cincinnati Department of Transportation	City of Cincinnati Department of Transportation	Cincinnati	OH	45202
Jill McCauley	jill@african-americanchamber.com	51334757152 Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky African American Chamber of Commerce	203 Gilbert Avenue	Cincinnati	OH	45206
Chad Conley	chad.conley@hinkle-cs.com	859-340-1026 Hinkle Construction Services	360 North Middletown Rd.	Paris	KY	40361
Craig	cbond@alberici.com	2482451626 Midwest Foundation	109 Eastgate Drive	Washington	IL	61571
Tyler Holden	holden.tyler@gmail.com	5132003432 KT Supply Ltd	1073 A Oregonia Rd	Lebanon	OH	45036
Jeff Johnson	jeff@johnsongroupky.org	8593073832 Johnson Group of KY LLC	P.O.Box 261	WILLIAMSTOWN	ky	41097
Sarah Rahall-Lunsford	slrahall-lunsford@transystems.com	6144337800 TranSystems	400 W nationwide Blvd #225	Columbus	ohio	43215
Kate Holden	Ktsupplyltd@gmail.com	513-846-0257 KT Supply LTD	1073 Oregonia Rd STE B	Lebanon	Ohio	45036
Jeremiah Littleton	Jlittleton@qk4.com	606.261.0684 Qk4	1046 E. Chestnut Street	Louisville	Ky	40204
Tyler Harris	Ty.wayneharris@gmail.com	5136146709 Hilltop	50 W River Center, Covington, KY	Covington	Ky	41011
Nathan Weldy	nathan.weldy@peraton.com	5027101372 Peraton - TRIMARC	901 W. Main St	Louisville	KY	40202
Annette Tarver	Annette@african-americanchamber.com	5132360993 Greater Cinti/NKY African American Chamber of Commerce	203 Gilbert Avenue	Cincinnati	OH	45206
Dan Bates	dan@hamilton-ohio.com	5134545066 Greater Hamilton Chamber of Commerce	201 Dayton Street	Hamilton	Ohio	45011
Phyllis Proffitt	phyllisp@ernstconcrete.com	8594854462 Ernst Concrete	Ernst Concrete	Walton	KENTUCKY	41094
Brian Umbright	brian.umbright@exp.com	312-218-6714 EXP	Exp U.S. Services Inc.	Chicago	IL	60601
Gregory Parker	gregory@african-americanchamber.com	5134757140 African American Chamber of Commerce	203 Gilbert Avenue	Cincinnati	OH	45206
Larry Thompson	LTHOMPSON@LABORERSLOCAL265.COM	5136170136 Laborers Local 265	3457 Montgomery rd	Cincinnati OH	Ohio	45207
James Inskip	Jamesinskeep265@gmail.com	513-377-4097 Laborers Local 265	3457 Montgomery rd	Cincinnati	Ohio	45207
Donald Cash	dcash@kokosing.biz	513-987-8530 Kokosing Construction	400 Techne Center DR	Milford	Ohio	45150
Nikki	dcrenshaw265@gmail.com	5133764252 Liuna	3457 Montgomery Rd	Cincinnati	OH	45207
Dan McCaffrey	demccaffrey@modjeski.com	7177909565 Modjeski and Masters	100 Sterling Parkway, Suite 302	Mechanicsburg	PA	17050
Musse Mohamud	Roadtofinish@icloud.com	6149730196 Road To Finish LLC	Columbus Oh	Columbus	OH	43230
Tommy Mosure	tpmosure@msconsultants.com	614-898-7100 ms consultants, inc.	2221 Schrock Rd.	Columbus	Ohio	43229

Appendix B: One-on-One Meeting Minutes

Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

NOTE: FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting: Walsh-Kokosing Joint Venture

AECOM and Jacobs - lead designers

Walsh - Kokosing 60/40

Joel - Kokosing executive level

Dustin Fisher pursuit lead for Kokosing

Aaron Flood - AECOM DB/P3 market and principle on the project

Ken Butler - AECOM finishing up with Walsh on the Duns Memorial project and working with Kokosing on the Maryland Potomac bridge.

Shawn - 70/670 Kokosing PM Jacobs.

Walsh (60) / Kokosing (40) split. Will have one point of contact on the project.

AECOM is lead and Jacobs will be a subconsultant to AECOM. Ohio side will manage by Jacobs; Kentucky and Main Span will be AECOM.

5-year construction includes design period: confirmed with Walsh

- Difficult to answer without knowing MOT criteria. Generally, thinks 5 years is aggressive. 6 years more comfortable. Will need to look at the MOT before answering the question. Interchanges will drive the schedule. Getting I-71 out of the corridor would be a big help.
- The \$ and resources with the footprint for MOT are challenging.
 - Define the work areas to give them the ability to erect beams.
 - Nightly restrictions: how many nights are going to be added. Will be a lot of night work needed.
- MOT big driver to duration and how many phases for the interchange construction
 - Allow to start work at risk? For example, removals.
 - Reduce review times - focus on railroad review time, third-party review time.
- Allow Design Unit splits out - foundation, substructure, and superstructure, bearings.
 - AECOM will provide examples.
 - ODOT/KYTC will allow design units to be broken down; Tim was not completely on board with breaking out the tier 1 bridges into separate DU. Indicated the critical path tasks would be reviewed and considered in the RFP.
 - Requesting a robust team on the Owner side to be able to turn around the reviews. Please do not limit the submittals to max 10.
 - Suggesting using the IDQF to do the quality review and IDR and Owner is an audit function against the contract terms and specifications.
- Procurement schedule is doable, but the sooner they see draft documents the better
- Move the RFP meetings into the RFQ stage.



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- They believe they will need to be in RFE for estimating in mid-June to get the price proposal done by October 2023.
- Walsh Kokosing asked if it is possible to pull up the RFQ timing? BSMT indicated they are requesting all feedback to evaluate.
- W-K: Maybe you know what you want on the companion bridge then send out the draft RFP requirements on it out. Or on the Kentucky side release it as draft for the teams to start to review. It allows them to work on ATCs sooner. They are asking for tracking a redline version of the draft RFP.
 - The procurement schedule is going to impact the number of ATCs.
- Maybe change or review what is included in the interim proposal to minimize their risk and allow more innovation.
- Payment Bonds / Project specific insurance policy
 - Options on the GL are great; liked the downtown Ohio River bridge contract GL.
 - Builder's risk would like to see a requirement.
 - Currently the project specific policies are running 20~30% higher than before. They however like the idea of project specific policy.
- DBE
 - Look at the market and set a % the market can bear given the size of this project. They are concerned of running out of firms that can do the work. They will do the programs and do the outreach, but concerned with DBE market capacity in Ohio and Kentucky
 - Committed to the key personnel for tracking.
 - W-K: Can the EDGE list and City lists be opened to be used? BSMT: Discussion with FHWA would be required. W-K is asking to keep all the avenues open.
 - Some firms might be able to get DBE after the project bids. Ask Gary about ORX language.
 - W-K: They are not in favor of a local hiring goal. They need to pull workers from wherever they are.
- Size of the Project
 - Not an issue with it being one project.
 - They see it as a challenge sequencing.
- Contract type
 - W-K: Show us something we have seen in the past; easier for them to evaluate contract term risk. Do not want new contract type.
 - If they cannot control and item and they will price it.
 - A new contract type will be difficult to administer from the contractor side if they have not seen it before.
- Railroads
 - Flagger are an issue; look at hiring a full-time flagger for the project.
- Design Reviews
 - The more documents they have the right to rely on during pre-procurement and after aware the better
- Workforce risk will still be a challenge.
 - Suggest Owner negotiating labor contract with the unions.
- Escalation Risk was identified; would like flexibility or modifying the caps.



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- Sign structures cannot be purchased until we have design complete. There needs to be a shift in how to procure the materials. i.e., rebar, sign trusses, guardrail, piling, etc. Review with KYTC other items that were added for ORX.
- Tech to price ratio
 - Starts with the shortlisting; prefer the tech % be higher than rather someone buying the job. Want higher than 60/40.
- Any concerns on the shortlisting items
 - W-K said no;
 - W-K asked if they were open to ATCs on geometrics or changing of access points. The access changes would need to be coordinated with FHWA; BSMT indicated if you keep access points and update geometrics is open to it.
 - W-K Local Stakeholders? What are their concerns?
 - BSMT: They are focused on developer space.
 - BSMT: Currently working with them on stakeholders on what is important. If there can be a strategy between 4th and 5th for more convention space.
 - BSMT: Will need to define the criteria - example drip line or foundation locations. Will not allow development on top of the foundations.
 - Kentucky side needs improvements with east - west connectivity; BSMT is committed to looking at it.
 - Walsh-Kokosing asked if they had an ATC with more ROW would this be considered? BSMT indicated no not necessarily rejected if it improves the constructability and meets the goal of the project.
 - Incentive opening?
 - Currently have not discussed within the BSMT.
- W-K Value engineering after the fact?
 - BSMT is open to scope changes; KYTC is open to VE concepts after award. Will need to discuss further in BSMT.
- Payment terms
 - BSMT: Leaning toward SOV approach; cost loaded schedule approach has been discussed. W-K says cost loaded schedule adds another level complexity to the DBT.
 - Track materials and payments; and one big lump sum and track the material amounts for future contracts. W-K did not have an opinion on this.
- Bridge type
 - There is the ability to adjust the main span and working through re-eval. It will be difficult to go out of a cable stay or arch.
 - Design Life on the Companion - there will be specific requirements; W-K would like FIB model. Define testing methods to approve.
- MOT
 - W-K: Have we looked at moving traffic out of downtown?
 - BSMT: Re-route 71 to 471 could be done out of the mix.
 - Currently working on the MOT concepts.
 - W-K stands this is critical to have early to evaluate.



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- Wrap up
 - BSMT: Will consider additional phone calls and keep dialog open while finalizing the RFP.
 - Consider the value of the stipend. The 0.25% needs to be increased or consider increasing it. W-K thinks they are going to spend \$10M on the pursuit.

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting: American Bridge (Southland Holdings)

- Jim maldone - southland holdings (own six subsidiaries and one is American bridge)
- Erica Hango

1920s founded and has been in business 122 years. Have been participating in the past 10 years; Tappan Zee in New York and Scotland mega bridge projects. \$3m up to \$2 billion. They are a self-performing contractor. North of 3000 employees; one of the largest equipment fleets and includes marine fleet to float structures.

They have a construction engineering / erection engineering they do in house; they do not do preliminary / design in house. American Bridge fabrication does exist and does only temporary currently and not permanent.

BSMT: Did you like what you heard this morning?

- AB: They recognize this is a challenge and are careful on what to pursue. The jobs they have seen are not as attractive on what BSMT is doing. BSMT needs to make themselves attractive to builders and AB recognizes this.
- Current schedule 5 years
 - BSMT: Can an industry produce this much work?
 - AB says yes it can be done; the question is the phasing if it is possible, and the permit requirements might make things not work in the 5 years. Construction staging will play a huge roll to be able to confirm the 5 years will work. AB having the schedule flexibility in the RFP / proposal submittal to give them time to look at the construction sequencing. AB says key milestone dates might increase the cost and risk. 5.5 could be less risk and less cost.
 - AB: Will there be Lane rentals for restrictions or ramp closures? BSMT would give a duration for closures, but not defining when in the RFP. AB thinks this would be a better approach than rentals.
 - AB: Scoring of the schedule / days / durations in tech proposal?
 - BMST -What can occur is the design duration gets squeezed on the designers upfront. BSMT: Thoughts of an A+B approach with an only construction duration? For example, an overall construction duration once, construction starts. AB has concerns because of the permit requirements and delays. (Not in favor)
- Procurement Schedule



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- AB: It is ambitious; but not unreasonable. If you want more ATCs than this timeframe will restrict that. It will require quick decisions back from the BSMT to the teams for them to make internal decisions.
- AB: For the RFP the backend timeframe is all intertwined and this sometimes makes the pricing risky because not everything is complete.
 - BSMT: would you like tech/proposal at the same time? AB: Yes, it is most efficient to turn them in together. It gives the DBT time to change the tech proposal to match the proposal price.
- 100% performance payment bonds
 - No comments on this from AB; typical for this type of project. They are more concerned about staffing this size of project than bonding it.
 - Project specific policy; professional design liability
 - AB thinks there is not a company policy that will be able to cover this project.
 - CGL will see the insurance / builders risk policy? AB should have something, but not an issue of the limits.
- Local Firms / Local workforce
 - AB: The bigger the project the bigger the effort it is to do this. It takes time to manage the program and there are a lot of things that compete with delivering this plan. Consider the flow down terms to designers or to a small business on what they must provide. (AB already does this)
 - AB: If there are smaller pieces in the project it is easier to manage the amounts flowing down to the DBEs.
 - The downside is there are only a few DBEs that will continue through the years of construction. Suggestion allow flexibility to allow more participation in the flow down requirements.
 - Gave an example in Bahamas that has an 80% Bahamian workforce. They are meeting this and using 20% ex-pat workforce to deliver it.
 - DBT will try to meet / do good faith however the goal of opening the project will sometimes take over the DBE requirement. The labor force outreach can be by zip codes and drives labor resources. BSMT indicated it is state law prohibits having local workforce requirement. AB does see it as more cost effective to use local workforce. Requests BSMT to get the unions involved to help with the local workforce.
 - When does the BSMT think the DBE% should be set? The goal needs to be set and provided in RFP. Requesting BSMT to give a range % to be scored (Note: not allowed). FHWA would still require an outreach plan.
 - BSMT will be doing significant DBE outreach ahead of the RFQ.
- Size of the project
 - AB thinks it should be broken up.
 - BSMT indicated the reason it is one project is due to the phasing of the project.
 - AB thinks there could be a milestone date to complete the Kentucky side and the companion bridge to leave the Ohio interchange as a separate contract.



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- AB risk discussion is because of the size of the project it magnifies the risk %. There was 58~60% of large projects like this had issues / change orders. AB loves the companion bridge and the Ohio side. AB thinks getting into smaller buckets it will allow more contractors in the market. It would reduce the project risks.
 - If they would overlap the procurement schedule; then each part would have milestone dates that would shift the risk \$ to those dates than the overall delivery of the project.
- AB: Agree the ROW and Utilities work is on target to reduce the risk. Environmental / permit would also reduce the risks.
- Inflation of materials is a risk to keep in mind.
- Labor
 - They think north of 500 staff at the peak for phase III.
- Market conditions
 - BSMT anticipates inflation steel, asphalt, etc.
 - AB said to consider lead time on materials.
- Price/Tech score - AB thinks 50/50 with heavy weighted on the footprint and design.
- Any concerns with the scoring criteria?
 - Experience on delivering this large project; need people who can deliver the project.
 - Require a delivery plan included in the proposal requirement. Staffing the project due to the shortage of key personnel. BSMT should set key leads for each segment. Instead of Project Manager, recommend "Project Director" with many section/area managers to be named. Management structure of construction important.
 - Requests for multi-contracts; AB does not think they can do it if it is not split.
 - What would they need to pursue the project?
 - They want to see things continue to go well. What they see a design build that has been under design for 20 years and now they have funding; concerned if the BSMT is organized to deliver it. There is concern from AB of what other projects are in the industry that are less risk.
 - AB - how much contract negotiations do you see going on during the RFP? BSMT do not see a lot of contract changes and would be using the ATC process and would want to define the scope prior to the tech scope and pricing.
 - AB said consider posting the requirements as soon as possible or before RFQ to define how the risk is being allocated. It allows teams to decide to pursue the project.
 - BSMT can put draft terms out on the website.
 - AB will send a list of high valuable items they would like to see to prior to deciding pursuit.
 - Where have you seen lesson learned from the owner side?
 - Large contracts mean bigger Joint Venture teams and bringing 2 to 4 contractors to come together to be one company has challenges. Not only learning the Project, also learning the other companies approaches (takes



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

time to organize and immediate construction difficult due to “new” company growing pains).

BSB Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting: Traylor Bros

- Larry Owens
 - Two operating divisions - heavy civil and marine.
 - \$100 million is the bottom of the construction costs and up to tappen zee size.
 - Interested in the bridge and not the land side interchanges.
 - They are undecided if they are going to forward with it and if it is one big job or split into a couple contracts. They would want to focus on a team to deliver the companion bridge. It is not just the size of the project it is the mix of the quantities of the project. The bridge is 1/3 of the project and to bring on another JV it is an equity risk for them to JV. Since they do not do pavement or interchange construction.
 - Splitting of the project would allow them to prime the project.
- Size of the project
 - Complexity of the touchdown points. How would that work if we were to split into separate packages?
 - TB said that question is not unexpected to ask but did not provide an answer to bring on a minority highway contractor to building the connection points. They would only focus on bank to bank. TB said they would consider doing the approach work and subcontract out the ramps/interchanges. Their sweet spot is the companion bridge and marine bridge work.
 - TB: Teaming discussions are challenging from their perspective. BSMT asked if there were land side competition issues?
 - They are seeing some of the landside contractors are not interested in the river work. The bigger the job and design build pushes contractors away from pursuing the work.
 - TB is concerned that there is history of these type of large design build projects that cause contractors to not pursue. They said it is the risk to the size of the project.
- Major items BSMT is minimizing risk.
 - Biggest risk TB has is delays caused by the client or client's engineer. It delays getting construction started. Owner preferences can be key issue on the design build projects. They lose days on the front end and not on the back end due to design revisions to gain RFC.
 - It is owner design change comments. BSMT indicated if it meets minimum standards then it is acceptable and if there is a request to change design the BSMT will pay for the change.
 - TB confirmed the Geotech, ROW, utilities are manageable risk.
 - What other risks for the river crossing do you see?
 - Coast Guard permit took 2 years, and they did not change the clearance envelope from what the owner provided. 20 months. Schedule delay risk. BSMT asked if they were given an assumed approval duration in the CPM would this reduce the risk? TB indicated this would reduce the schedule risk.



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- TB liked the commercial term meetings added outside of the technical meetings. Request a draft RFP to formally vet internally and then come prepared at those meetings.
- BSMT: Procurement timeframe appropriate?
 - TB indicated it depends on prescriptive the design is. Cost estimating takes a couple months and to get design deliverables ahead of those sometimes reduces the number of ATCs because of schedule constraint to get to pricing.
- BSMT construction duration appropriate?
 - TB said a river crossing duration would be around 48~54 months. They added complexity for the double decker and have not built a double decker bridge.
- Professional Liability / insurance
 - TB: They would prefer a project specific policy and use the design engineers as secondary
- DBE / workforce diversity
 - TB flows down the same DBE % to the final designer too. TB current projects on \$1B has 15~17% and not an issue for them.
 - BSMT indicated there would be an owner side diversity team to help the DBT finalize the plan.
 - TB said seeing more owners put in a person responsible for workforce development.
 - TB said there was a predetermined matrix of local workforce used on the project.
- Reduction of footprint criteria
 - This is about permanent footprint reduction. TB is not sure how to evaluate the reduction of the footprint; TB concerned if the proposal design is defined enough to be able to evaluate this.
- Price to tech proposal %
 - BSMT indicated a range 50/50 to 70/30, TB not an issue.
- Other items
 - Technical specifications TB on I-64 with MoDOT allowed any specification or design detail could be used. MoDOT encouraged it for innovation; BSMT is somewhat open to this during the ATC process.
- What happens if the bids come in greater than the cost estimate?
 - TB said there are strategies; A+B+C, etc.
- What would TB typically spend on the procurement?
 - \$15~\$20 million
- BSMT indicated the preliminary design will be wrapped up later this month; estimate the design is around 20%.
- TB was requesting a list of engineering firms currently under contract delivering the project. BSMT will post, but still responsibility of engineering firms to identify conflict of interest.
- BSMT is working through the QC/QA specifications from ODOT to KYTC requirements.
- TB asked about utility companies.
 - In Ohio if a utility is in their own ROW or easement then they are reimbursed. If they are a private utility and in public ROW, then they move at their expense.
 - Kentucky can pay in both situations.

Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- TB do you have master agreements? BSMT indicated no master agreements will be provided.

TB asked about Railroads and construction on the railroad property. BSMT is finalizing the preliminary design to define the initial railroad agreement. Railroad coordination will occur before RFP. Currently, we do not anticipate any force account work.

BSB Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting: Tutor Perini / Lunda JV

Based out of Black River falls Wisconsin. They do complex bridge projects and river crossings. Davenport Iowa I-74 and Columbia Mo River crossing; light rail project around \$1B; Did complete the longest St. Croix River with precast segment / cable stay segment for the scenic byway.

- Mark Olsen
- Joel Larsen
- Dennis Binke

- Design/Construction schedule
 - TPL: 5 years might be aggressive, but if you go longer then the risk increases because of inflation of materials.
 - The Marquette interchange took 3 years, and this seems very similar in scope.
 - The steel pricing is an issue.
 - Supply chain issue risk? TPL: It has not gotten any better lately. Labor and craft personnel might be more critical.
 - Question on 5-year construction duration; would assume a year to 1.5-year final design period. Is ODOT / KYTC ramped up to do the design reviews?
 - Prestress / post tension steel is shortage; huge trucking shortage right now; contractors are now self-performing trucking of the materials.
 - The bridge leads to a precast and floating it down the river to lift in place.
- Procurement duration?
 - The more time you give a DBT the more \$ they will spend on the procurement. TPL liked the pre-approval of the design concept (Interim Proposal)
 - BSMT will have the decision makers in the room of the ATCs to give a response if those are able to move forward. They must be submitted and define what will change in the contract. BSMT will then approve the change to the contract and the reason. It will be specific to the location requested. It is equal to or better; functionally equal.
 - Is BSMT limiting the amount of ATCs?
 - No BSMT is not anticipating limiting the number to submit.
 - BSMT is not limiting a VE concept either and will allow splits of the cost.
- BSMT will indicate items that do not meet criteria in the interim technical proposal will be identified. BSMT will not tell the score. The Interim technical is a pass/fail. The interim proposals with nonconforming criteria will give areas to be addressed with the final proposal.
- Two commercial term meetings



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- ODOT does not think so; but asking for input. Will be using the current ODOT Design Build contract with commercial terms changes addressing contract size.
 - TPL asked about the insurance meetings and potential discussion on defining changes. Project specific is what TPL would prefer.
 - BSMT to review the flow down insurance requirements. Per TPL the flow down has caused subconsultants to drop out due to the amounts.
- DBE participation
 - TPL question: is 8% what BSMT is considering?
 - BSMT Indicating goal is not set yet.
 - Their Minnesota goal is at 16% and they are meeting, but the firms are graduating from the firm.
 - Any recommendation on the program or set up?
 - TPL likes how MoDOT set separate goals for designers and construction team.
- Contract break out comments.
 - Said simplest part is the bridge. Concerned on staging the project if it is split it out.
- Excusable / compensable
 - Haz/mat and unknown condition is excusable.
 - TPL: Who owns float? BSMT: It is whoever needs it first.
- Cost Loaded CPM vs. Schedule of Values payment approach:
 - TPL said they assumed this would be a cost loaded CPM. BSMT said they have done it both ways.
 - If quantities go up and down, then the SOV would also change if lump sum contract. Could be managerial issue.
- Reduction of risk methods?
 - TPL: How is design mod impacting utilities handled- private in their own easement then ODOT pays 100% and if private utility is in public right of way, then utility pays to relocate. KYTC can pay for both. The relocation is a time risk.
 - Railroad construction - TPL confirmed the construction over the railroad is aerial and not about excavating foundations on their property. Flagging is the risk to address.
- Current Market conditions
 - BSMT: The RFP will use an inflation index. Structural steel, fuel, stone, asphalt. TPL said to check into adding reinforcing steel. Confirm H-Pile is included in the structural steel. Pipe pile has also been going up. Epoxy coated rebar is also an item. AMM escalation index.
- Value based price ratio - 70/30 - 30% technical proposal. There will be a scoring criteria and expectations.
- Existing Bridge Rehab Quantity or change on a lump sum contract.
 - Rivets / section loss and how is the structural deficiency found during rehab going to be handled in the contract? RFP needs to define the change order requirements on the rehab. BSMT is going to give quantities to get unit prices / bid item pricing to allow for changes to the overall rehab. TPL likes this approach to the contract and reduces risk to pricing.
- 10-month procurement question

Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- The 0.25% with the number of staff needed to work on it puts the amount is \$12~\$15M. BSMTL Will take this under consideration.
- LDs not sure what those are yet. If TPL has mobilization or LD information to address provide the feedback.
- Reviewed questions provided by TPL.
- The signing of the contract is considered NTP.
- Geotechnical borings TPL likes the concept of taking more borings.
- Incentive on the schedule of completion? BSMT no not currently.

BSB Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting: Fluor Enterprises, Inc.

Hope - previously from KYTC

Keith Summer - head of business development

- Currently building Gordie Howe Bridge, \$12.5 billion. \$3.2 billion tappan zee bridge, Gordie Howe is \$4B. They specialize in infrastructure and large complex projects. MOT is also part of the experience.
- Risk allocation and sharing with incentives is better to discuss. The assumption to carry some risk for utility delays or issues is acceptable, but not all of it. Requesting a partnership to take the first number of days or \$s and then go to a sharing ratio. Suggesting a cap out risk amount that goes back to the owner. Discussed TxDOT programmatic approach and outlines the risk capping.
- Packaging / size of project
 - FL concerned about the size of the project.
 - Bi-state authority and how that works and how the specifications are issued. The decision-making process on the specifications a concern; may result in delayed responses as through Ohio – to Kentucky – back to Ohio will delay answers.
 - BSMT addressed that the change management process is ODOT will lead and KYTC will have a contract with ODOT. Dispute resolution has a process that will be followed with ODOT as the lead. KYTC will be a liaison providing input on design reviews. Contractual dispute resolution will follow ODOT.
 - Schedule and resources and can the market support the volume of work.
 - Labor availability is an issue all over the country. This leads to the suggestion of revising the project packaging. Suggest reducing the peak staffing by splitting into 3 projects.
 - BSMT: Would it help if the project schedule was longer than 5 years? Could we get the same thing if we extend?
 - FLR: If you make a longer schedule, then escalation becomes an issue in the contract terms. 5-year durations are now making the industry nervous due to escalation costs.
 - It is important to include local contractors on the team. This will tie up their capacity on this project.



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- DBE requirement impacted by the size of this project because it might graduate them out. One approach to consider is certain scopes are excluded by the construction %. For example, do not count structural steel on the DBE% goal. So, modify the % based on the scope they can deliver.
 - Action Item HNTB: Pull the language from Purple Line contract language. Good idea. We should also get more detail on what the issues were in Georgia.
- Escalation clauses
 - Structural steel, asphalt, fuel; North Carolina just came up with an escalation on steel suggested to review.
 - ODOT / KYTC uses indexes currently.
- Contracting approaches
 - FLR: Seeing more owners switch to CMGC and progressive design build. It helps with escalation because the price is fixed closure to construction. For example, design takes 1 year and pricing on materials changes. Discussed both ODOT/KYTC have not delivered a progressive design build and have concerns delivering this project under a new contract approach. This reduces the risk for owner coordination.
- Project Risks / Risk Sharing
 - FLR: Geotech risks and likes our approach on getting additional borings. While it would be nice for DBT to give the locations. Suggest continuing getting the borings. If it is their ATC; they want to control their own destiny to get right of way permit and they take the geotechnical testing.
 - Hazmat testing? Concerned about building demo and asbestos remediation concern.
 - FLR: Bridge asbestos and remediation and how to mitigate it. There are lawsuits on past abatement; fluor currently has 30,000 lawsuits on asbestos because they have deep pockets. Fluor will not participate in building demolish due to the asbestos abatement lawsuits.
 - Permits
 - FLR: Third party out of both DBT and Owners hands. It is a risk because it is outside of the project decision makers. Request durations be added into the contractor to have relief on schedule. Flour liked the response from BSMT that a duration will be included in the RFP after the final design is complete and submitted to the agency.
 - Railroad flagging - this will also be a shared duration to put into the proposal. Also, a third party on railroad right of way.
- Procurement Schedule / Best Value approach - overall procurement schedule is long enough. The SOQ period is too short. Could they start before 10/31 add two weeks to accommodate Thanksgiving.
- Technical Score/ Price ratio - FLR: comes down to owner priorities and comes down to complexity of project. Straight forward scope 80/20 and on major complexity 50/50. They have also seen a schedule approach. Flour suggests adding schedule in the technical proposal score rather than separate evaluation.
- Criteria for the SOQ are the categories are the correct buckets.



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- Insurances - FLR: \$50 million professional liability insurance. Fluor says there is capacity for this size of policy. Fluor will provide feedback on this amount.
- DBE local firms' risk
- Project schedule - anticipate over a 5-year period; open to traffic in 5 years. Fluor thinks it is aggressive, but they have not run a P6 on it. They were thinking 6 years and with seasons / MOT constraints.
- FLR: Referenced GDOT and ADOT procurements failed. GDOT failed reasoning due to contract terms, the P3s are going sideways. Carolina crossroads design build only got one bidder due to contract terms were challenging.

BSB Pre-Procurement One-On-One Meeting: DL E&C

- Introductions - DL E&C – based on presentation provided have not constructed a bridge in the USA. Also, discussed cable stay strands to improve design of bridge, but would not be allowed due to Buy America Act.
- Rebar price in 2020 \$400/\$500 and now up to \$2000. The tight arch bridge will be very expensive due to the amount of reinforcing steel.
- Project Schedule - 5 years
 - Due the complex ramps and urban location 5 years would be challenging. Assuming the project will take around 6 years based on looking at it increase by 1~2 years (6 or 7 years).
- Procurement schedule is tight (9 months)
 - Gave an example of quality of the technical proposal if only providing 9 months using notebook computer reading only 60% of the computer manual to put it together. Comment is to extend the schedule to get a better quality of proposal. What do you think it would be more appropriate? He thinks it would be better at 11 months. Would like more time added to the RFQ stage to pull qualifications together.
- Insurance - more research is needed to be able to answer the question.
- General commercial liability and professional design liability insurance
 - There was an issue on their Kuwait bridge (\$100~\$200M) and they continued to fix the issue and build/open the bridge. Confirm if they can self-perform insurance? DLEC assumes small contractors will not be pursuing the project. Requesting a reasonable deductible to allow small subcontractors to team.
 - DLEC held insurance presentations to insurance companies to improve terms.
- Maximizing the local workforce
 - Suggest creating a steering committee for local advisory group to maximize the local resources to the project.
- Size of the project
 - One package looks reasonable but would split up into phases with regional contractors to perform the paving / interchange work in Kentucky. Systematic approach to traffic control will give more value to the Owners.
- Major Risks



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- Utilities - provide duct bank pictures in area of major foundation to allow contractors to decide risk of duct banks. Provide draft utility locations and level of SUE as draft at RFQ timeframe to start their risk assessment.
- Railroad Interfaces - what is the railroad future projects and track usage to include in agreement. With increased freight activity the railroad might want to add more capacity causing an issue with flagging and construction over the railroad.
- Waterway shutdown - provide information on what has been coordinated so far for them to take into their internal risk assessment. BSMT indicated there were no waterway closures, but to lift the arch would require short closures. Add this to action item to finalize with RFP.
- Current Market Conditions
 - Supply Chain disruption and Fuel price surge are a concern.
 - Causing a construction delay and increased cost increases. As related to BSB construction duration adjustment to account for material delay and CAPEX adjustments
 - Suggest sharing the inflation risk or providing an index within the RFP to reduce risk. This could reduce the contractors risk pricing in the bid proposal just by providing a sharing capacity. Discussed fuel pricing index and steel materials. BSMT intends to use these in the RFP. BSMT was not going to use a whole project wide sharing agreement.
- Value Score to price ratio
 - Their experience is 70% technical and 30% price or 60% technical and 40% price. Suggest putting more value on technical score due to the complexity of the project. Technical score to price ratio should be greater than 50%.
 - By having a more defined technical proposal it factors into the price of the project.
- Consider adding sustainability to the RFP scoring.
 - specific greenhouse (GHG) emission reduction. Singapore project gave incentive over substituting cement with blast furnace.
 - Aesthetic enhancement - landmark project and should be important to include in scoring.
 - Consider adding future value by accounting for future O&M cost in price evaluation. For example, arch bridges vs. cable-stayed bridges: painting, corrosion, design life, etc. This will be added into the scoring formula in the technical proposal. Suggesting adding an option for them to bring in future O&M costs to present dollars for scoring.
- They work with ARUP and AECOM, etc. They want to add value to the BSB and bring experience to Ohio/Kentucky to allow the BSB to be an iconic bridge.

BSB Pre-Procurement One-On-One Meeting: FCC Construcción S.A.

- Company Overview Summary -Based in Miami headquarters for American operations. Group founded in 1900. working in three countries. They acquired a cement production company in 1986. FCC construction - dollar wise \$2~\$2.5 billion everything in heavy civil construction and they do vertical construction too. They were the lead on the port of Miami tunnel construction. Familiar with progressive P3 program. Pennsylvania pathway P3 was put on hold, and they had started working on it and it is \$800 million. So, they are looking at other opportunities in north America. They have large



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

experience in complex bridges. They are a public traded company, but Bill Gates owns 5%, daughter of founder owns 5%, and rest is in stock market. They are interested in bringing value from their prior projects to BSB. They will be looking at two other partners for the project and would focus on a regional contractor.

- BSMT: What are construction partner concerns? Is it the size or anything to share?
 - FCC: Main issue they are facing now because market is busy, and some companies do not have capacity to build \$2 Bill to \$3 Bill projects. The partners are saying they are pursuing smaller projects. There is also the stability of the overall economy and materials. Escalation is causing them to not bid because of the construction duration does not allow them to price the risk and the risk pricing causes them to not submit.
 - They have received subcontractor pricing and receiving a 100% markup due to market labor and materials.
 - FCC bids around 2~3 projects a year, and the market has several projects competing against.
 - How attractive is the BSB project?
 - FCC did not anticipate the project and saw the RFQ was coming out and with the scope being very aligned with their experience.
 - BSMT: Is there anything BSMT could do to help find partners?
 - Lump sum prices are not very popular in the industry. The 5 years will be tight, the main issue is not the main bridge it is the MOT staging of the approaches. Going with a more collaborated approach.
 - Progressive design build on spending money on the proposal; there are companies not interested in spending millions to pursue a project of this size.
 - Potential to lower contingencies through the RFP process.
 - Are the partners focused on the land side or the bridge part?
 - the local contractors do not want to deal with the main span but are interested in the landside interchanges. But looking for contractors to share the risk. It is more about finding companies will share the risk with an integrated JV. Requested attendees from meeting would be made to the attendees.
 - They also want exclusive subcontractors for bridges, demolition, paving, etc.
- Construction of 5 years
 - FCC thinks it is a short duration for the complexity. Not an issue on the Kentucky or main bridge. The Ohio side has some schedule complexity due to the MOT.
- Procurement timing
 - 9 months to fast / to short?
 - It will take time to pull team together. RFQ in end of October. Should be able to have team in place in 4 months from now. The concern is 9 months because of the interim submission. The number of ATCs is also a concern and to prepare a meeting and then to do follow.
 - BSMT: Should we have less ATC meetings?



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- Maybe consider 3~4 meetings. Keep the same time frame? First one in February, March, and April. 3 minimum up to 5.
- BSMT: What information would you want earlier to help with conversation with teaming?
 - FCC: Payment performance requirement / bond / insurance terms would help the discussion.
 - 100% is high on insurance, suggest an escalation. The insurance makes the project expensive.
- BSMT: Would you want to split up the project?
 - The size is fine for FCC. Main concern is dividing the project at the interfaces for other partners to manage. This is where the length of the procurement could be extended.
- Major project risks
 - FCC: Union area on workforce; is a concern. BSMT is not going to negotiate a labor agreement and will follow ODOT contract prevailing wage. Labor market capacity is an issue.
 - FCC: Escalation / inflation and market uncertainties is to be addressed. BSMT is intending to escalation clauses for cement, fuel, asphalt, steel, aggregate, etc. Request to share the escalation terms as draft for companies to analyze risk profile of the project.
- Technical proposal to price ratio?
 - Technical solutions can help with ROW and schedule of construction. Give more weight to technical than price. Technical can help on the price. 60/40 or 70/30.
- Any scoring criteria suggestions
 - Footprint is acceptable. Keep this.
 - Geometric improvements. Keep this as a criterion.
 - They would like to use these as a goal to work with design team to maximize those criteria provided in the RFP.
- Level of Geotechnical Studies
 - FCC: Agree on the amount of the boring information and to provide information as soon as possible.
 - FCC: The river crossing boring locations are an issue since starting from scratch with smaller width foundation.
 - Allowing flexibility with the type of structures
- FCC: Try not to include aesthetics on the DBT. BSMT indicated to RFP will be prescriptive.
- ROW - no additional questions on it.
- Utility relocation - major ones are relocated and minor will need to be relocated. There will be some schedule risk. Shared risk discussion. FCC said utilities are always an issue on schedule but not cost.
- Stipend
 - Thoughts on range? Similar size project and have \$5 million. They are spending more on it. So, it is a business decision internally for them to pursue. \$5~\$6 million
- Prequalification
 - They are bidding in states they have not worked before. They have had experience were the pre qualifications have not been fast. Consider giving waiver. BSMT said it is a quick processing Ohio and Kentucky side.



Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Design-Build Contract

Pre-Procurement One-on-One Meeting Notes

ODOT PID 116649

KYTC Kenton County 6-17

- Concern is for specific projects the pre-qualification could be changed to submitting the proposal rather than RFQ. BSMT indicated the design pre-qualification before award would be the ones to secure. The construction should start earlier to ensure completed, but not a lengthy process.
 - FCC: Concern is with prequalification is financial information request and timing of internal audit requirement. If not done internally at correct time, then may miss prequalification window.
- FCC: Requested to provide the escalation pricing information and approach on the website.
- Insurance pricing requirements to put those out to have discussions with insurance companies for teams to evaluate the risk of insurance premiums.
- The biggest challenge for FCC currently is to get their team formed. While they were tracking the project 10 years ago did not believe the project was moving forward as quickly as provided in the presentation.

IMPORTANT NOTICES

Please note that any written material shared at one of the individual company meetings will be a public record for purposes of Ohio's Public Records Act and the Kentucky Open Records Act. Therefore, participants should be aware that such materials will be subject to public disclosure, inspection and copying.

Please note that any firms that participate in an individual company meeting will not have any preference, special designation, or advantage whatsoever in any subsequent procurement process related to the project.

Appendix C: Industry Survey Results

Question	Traylor Bros	Flatiron	American Bridge/Southland Holdings	DL EBC	Lunda	Fluor	FCC	Walsh/Kiewit	Kiewit	Halmir	
1) Does PDB provide a more effective delivery method for this Project?	Yes	Yes	Included (inferred)	Yes	No (inferred)	Yes (inferred)	Yes	Yes	Yes (inferred)	Yes (inferred)	
1) Does PDB provide a more effective delivery method for this Project? - Comments	PDB is well suited as the preferred delivery method for this Project.	PDB has multiple advantages, some of which are underscored in the current economic climate: Increased Cost and Schedule Certainty. While it appears that the owner is looking to the price on bid day with Lump Sum Design-Build (LDB) delivery, the reality is that projects delivered with LDB have traditionally been fraught with delays and cost overruns, exceeding any program level contingency the owner may have set aside. This issue required the owners to seek additional funds to complete construction and manage the negative public sentiment due to the delayed opening of projects. PDB entirely avoids this issue. Both the cost model and the project schedule are developed and advanced progressively as the design develops, which allows the collective team (BMT and DBT) to identify cost and schedule issues early and take action to mitigate them. By the time Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) is reached, design has been optimized through value engineering and innovation, there is a high level of certainty on cost and delivery schedule, and contingencies have been built in place for any remaining risks. Through risk efficient pricing and collaborative environment, we have delivered multiple large, complex projects on time and on budget with this model. Joint Management of Contingencies. LDB requires the Design-Build Team (DBT) to provide a fixed price for an early level design, which requires pricing of significant contingencies by the contractor into the pricing due to expected, inevitable changes during design progression. Alternatively, in PDB, design is developed in a collaborative fashion and the contingencies are developed and tracked through a Project Risk Register. As the design develops to GMP level (80-85%), these contingencies are reduced by mitigating these risks. In the current market with high inflation, uncertainty, and price volatility, this process allows both BMT and the contractor to manage risks more effectively and allow BMT to avoid paying for risks that do not materialize. For example, we do not have to lock in commodity pricing (i.e., oil, steel, etc.) on bid day, but these can be managed jointly and procurement can be made at the most advantageous time possible, resulting in cost savings.	Our opinion is that PDB has both positive and negative implications for this pursuit. It does seem to mitigate much of the cost and schedule risk for the Design-Build team, and it creates a more collaborative process during Phase one. It also greatly reduces pursuit costs during the initial procurement. We believe, however, that it will drive up overall project costs as the majority of the competitive element is removed from the procurement process. As a result, the Design-Build teams do not have the same competitive engineering effort during the pursuit to drive down scope, schedule and cost.	Yes	Absolutely not	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2) On a scale of 1 to 5, how will PDB change your firm's interest in participating in this procurement (1 - Decreases Interest / 3 - no impact / 5 - Increases)	4	4	5	2	5	1	3	5	4	5	
2) On a scale of 1 to 5, how will PDB change your firm's interest in participating in this procurement (1 - Decreases Interest / 3 - no impact / 5 - Increases)	PDB facilitates involvement of the design-build team during the earliest stages of the owner's project development, ensuring they are part of the project team developing design and constructability solutions with real time price, risk allocation and schedule development. This promotes the greatest amount of collaboration between the three key players in a construction contract - the owner, the PDB contractor, and the designer. Also, the owner has the benefit of one group to work through as the designer is a member of the PDB Contractor's team. What prevents our rating from being a five (5) is that, in our perspective that the project is too large and should be broken down into three separate contracts (Ohio, Bridge and Kentucky).	Except for very rare circumstances, we no longer pursue mega projects delivered with the LDB model. This decision is based on the delivery method's undervalued risk profile, the difficulty of accurately pricing an early level design and this delivery method's propensity to create conflict between the DBT and the owner. While we recognize the benefits to the successful proposer, we feel that the evaluation criteria used in the proposed cost, but some of them might not be assessed quantitatively to be included in the proposed cost. These unquantified risks could be a good trigger to withdraw the participation of the tender for the project. This process requires a commitment of engineering and support staff that traditional design-build approach over an extended period of time.	While we recognize the benefits to the successful proposer, we feel that the evaluation criteria used in the proposed cost, but some of them might not be assessed quantitatively to be included in the proposed cost. These unquantified risks could be a good trigger to withdraw the participation of the tender for the project. This process requires a commitment of engineering and support staff that traditional design-build approach over an extended period of time.	Yes	No (inferred)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
3) On a scale of 1 to 5, how do you believe using PDB affects each Project risk item (listed below) (1 - Increases Risk / 3 - no impact / 5 - Decreases Risk)? Why?	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	
3) On a scale of 1 to 5, how do you believe using PDB affects each Project risk item (listed below) (1 - Increases Risk / 3 - no impact / 5 - Decreases Risk)? Why?	General Comments: Start by Identifying Risk Use a Matrix to Track the Risk Ask the Question - Which Entity is best to manage the risk? Ensuring equitable risk allocation occurs and reach agreement on who owns the risk Evaluate each risk item with each pricing iteration and identify the cost and liability agreed to project contingency - and the guidelines to access the risk	No general comments on Risk	No General Risk comments	No General Risk comments	No General Risk comments	No General Risk comments	No General Risk comments	No General Risk comments	No General Risk comments	No General Risk comments	
3A) Ability to address site conditions (1 - Increases Risk / 3 - no impact / 5 - Decreases Risk)	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	
3A) Ability to address site conditions - Comments	No Comments	No comments	Our past PDB projects, through constructability reviews, we identified opportunities to perform additional, targeted investigations that allowed us to optimize the design and de-risk the project. For example, additional borings, probing, and soil verification at critical locations could reveal conflicts early and avoid costly delay by adjusting the design. We also mitigate issues and design and/or phase the project in a way that allows for those issues to be managed appropriately without impacting the project timeline.	The understanding on site conditions increases with the progress. Please note that the progress does not simply refer to the physical design work to be carried out by the tender team, but rather encompasses all the discussions and communications made with the client, the public, and the ability of addressing the conditions constructively improves if PDB is adopted.	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating
3B) Ability to address permitting risk (Cost/Guaranteed Contingent) (1 - Increases Risk / 3 - no impact / 5 - Decreases Risk)	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	
3B) Permitting risk (Cost/Guaranteed Contingent) - Comments	No Comments	No comments	Our past projects, we collaborated with our clients and jointly managed the permitting process. We often find that having the contractor in the room with agency staff is beneficial. Our ability to provide feedback on means and methods streamlines the permitting process, results in realistic construction mitigation measures and improves working relationships with permitting agencies.	Similar manner with 3) c. We take here "the project" referring to the communication with relevant agencies such as Coast Guard, US Coast, and other relevant agencies including ODOT and KYTC.	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	
3C) Material Inflationary risk - Comments	1	1	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	
3C) Material Inflationary risk - Comments	No Comments	No comments	As stated above, buying materials and executing subcontractors at the right time is more important than ever in the current economic conditions. By collaborating during preconstruction, the owner can avoid paying excessive contingencies for future price increases and the team is able to optimize cost and schedule by procuring certain materials earlier or later along the project. In the past, we allowed raw material costs and/or schedule certain aspects of the design materials can be ordered early and avoid anticipated price increases.	Material inflationary risk should include many items as well as the inflation of the material cost itself. For example, what if we could find out multiple ways of delivering concrete with the same cost? Even though this search of finding multiple sources do not provide any alternatives in the proposed project cost, this would reduce risks of material inflationary risk since we have multiple ways of delivering the concrete with the same price. If one way of the delivering concrete is inflated, we could find the alternative easier. In addition, nowadays the trend of inflation is somewhat abnormal. As the PDB is moving on, we may be able to judge how the trend goes well in for the next year, which will aid in understanding (and defining) the risk.	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating
3D) Labor availability risk - Comments	1	1	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	
3D) Labor availability risk - Comments	No Comments	No comments	Both LDB and PDB allow for a lengthy period prior to the start of construction, which allows the DBT to bid for the anticipated labor needs for the project. However, PDB has similar cost savings associated with labor cost increases as it does with material costs, as the owner generally avoids excessive labor contingencies with PDB.	Similar manner with 3) c. The progress is the project implying that we are able to understand the labor and overall construction markets and labor overall with finding out more options to be taken.	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	No direct rating	
4) What do you see as your biggest risks with a PDB procurement and delivery?	1	1	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	
4) What do you see as your biggest risks with a PDB procurement and delivery?	Determining proper risk allocation, contingency determination/funding methodology and overall pricing certainty. Ensuring that the project can be built without having to utilize an off-ramp to put the completed plans on the street for open bidding in event the PDB Contractor and the Owner(s) cannot arrive at a mutually agreeable GMP.	1) inability to reach GMP and off-ramping the DBT. In this scenario, BMT will need to procure another contractor through a competitive bidding process, and complete the design separately. This generally results in the project start being delayed during the procurement of the new contractor. However, as the PDB delivery method continues to mature, we are seeing very few projects that do not reach GMP, which is especially true for large, complex projects. 2) Not achieving the intended benefits of the Preconstruction Phase. In PDB, the owner is paying an additional procurement fee to achieve cost and schedule benefits through early planning and optimized design. If the owner and contractor are not able to partner and work cohesively, or if either side does not assign the necessary resources to this critical phase of the project, it becomes difficult to achieve the benefits that the owner is expecting.	The biggest risks are the ability to deliver the project within the overall budget. With some of the competitive element removed, some opportunities for innovation can be lost.	We do not see any risk involved. Rather, the biggest risk of PDB delivery method may go to the client. As the progress (i.e., time) goes assuming that a single entity was chosen to carry out PDB, the entity may enlarge the project cost and schedule which may create issues for the client at later stages. In this manner, it would be beneficial for the client to share multiple entities to carry out PDB. All costs incurred due to having multiple entities performing PDB will be paid back at the cost price and schedule commitment towards the end of the bidding process.	Yes, Level of contingencies in a traditional DBB approach nowadays have increased in the past months.	Yes, Level of contingencies in a traditional DBB approach nowadays have increased in the past months.	Yes, Level of contingencies in a traditional DBB approach nowadays have increased in the past months.	Yes, Level of contingencies in a traditional DBB approach nowadays have increased in the past months.	Yes, Level of contingencies in a traditional DBB approach nowadays have increased in the past months.	Yes, Level of contingencies in a traditional DBB approach nowadays have increased in the past months.	Yes, Level of contingencies in a traditional DBB approach nowadays have increased in the past months.
5) Would using PDB delivery result in any significant differences in your approach to the Project?	1	1	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	
5) Would using PDB delivery result in any significant differences in your approach to the Project?	It would make the project more attractive. However, for us, we still believe that breaking the project into three manageable sections (Ohio, Bridge, Kentucky) would make this project even more attractive and create a larger pool of contractors to propose on the project. Also, using PDB allows for better/successful collaboration among contractors who would be working on the three sections.	First, as stated earlier, it makes the difference between pursuing or not pursuing the project for us. From a project technical and management perspective, we would look to provide extensive resources to the project very early starting in the first two weeks) in the process to make sure we can take advantage of all of the innovative ideas and early risk mitigation opportunities as we can.	It would really depend more on differences in evaluation criteria. We would conform our approach to best fit the evaluation criteria established. We also believe that it would be human nature to gravitate towards less risky solutions during Phase one design development.	Yes, it is.	Absolutely not	Yes (inferred)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Question	Traylor Bros	Flattron	American Bridge/Southland Holdings	DL EBC	Lunda	Fluor	FCC	Walsh/Koko	Kiewit	Halmar	
4) Do you believe using PDB delivery would lengthen or shorten the project duration?	PDB provides the best chance to maintain the planned schedule. We also believe that the project has the best chance of being completed by using PDB due to escalation/inflation risks.	Past experiences indicate approximately similar overall timeframes however PDB typically leads to a longer preconstruction phase and a shorter construction phase. In addition, PDB procurements are significantly shorter than LS DB procurements (average 6 months shorter). In addition, through early investigations and early risk mitigation, PDB projects generally avoid the lengthy delays often experienced on LS DB projects due to unforeseen issues such as ground conditions, utilities, and hazardous materials. This has resulted in a superior on time delivery track record for PDB projects. Finally, the PDB delivery method allows the project team to identify important milestones that can be prioritized (both in design and construction) with the traveling public and stakeholders in mind.	In reality, this could go either way. In a perfect world, we believe that a good, collaborative process in a PDB should shorten the overall duration. As mentioned above, however, more aggressive schedule commitments commonly come in a competitive environment, and it leaves control and responsibility for the aggressive schedule largely in the hands of the Contractor. The more risk that is shared between Owner and Contractor during the course of the project, the more difficult it can be to come to consensus which can lengthen durations and cause milestones to be missed.	In the long run, PDB delivery method will shorten the project. We believe that PDB delivery will minimize the "hiccups" of the project which can lengthen the project significantly with providing the negative impact to the project.		PDB delivery should shorten the Project duration. Unlike a traditional alternative delivery projects, the months spent developing proposals, prior to award, is eliminated and Project design can be started six to nine months early leading to the overall Project schedule also being shortened by a similar duration.		Neither, not necessary.	As we discussed during our industry one-on-one meeting, the BSMT's year timeline is appropriate for a project of this size and scope based on our experience. While the timeline to make a qualifications-based progressive design-builder selection during the procurement can be shortened significantly through a PDB delivery, the more iterative nature of the Phase 1 collaborative environment of a PDB can lead to a longer overall design schedule, and thus a net zero change in overall project duration. Also, the owner's level of involvement in the Phase 1 design and/or their budgetary constraints can lead to an excessive number of design iterations and independent cost estimates leading up to GMP negotiations, further extending the design schedule. The potential for a longer design schedule can be partially offset by the BSMT providing a well developed set of technical design criteria to govern the initial efforts of the progressive design-builder. And through the eventual development and issuance of early work packages toward the end of Phase 1. To facilitate the latter, the progressive design-builder's Phase 1 and Phase 2 services could be covered at the outset in a single contract to include terms and conditions allowing for early work packages to be identified and issued in advance of the GMP when needed to maintain the overall schedule or simply to mitigate schedule risk. A Phase 1 PDB collaboration would also afford the BSMT more input into controlling the schedule as it can elect to pay for different options in development of the design and construction plans that can be used to shorten the project time if necessary desired. A PDB basically allows for a "menu" approach to project planning and sequencing that could be used to optimize the construction schedule. On an	Through early collaboration, PDB allows the integrated team to determine the optimal schedule and work packaging that maximizes working time and minimizes cost and impacts. This could shorten the Project duration without impacting quality.	In theory the process should be shorter. Small Bid-Build subcontracts to implement utility relocations and enabling work, could be ongoing while major structure are ongoing. In addition working with a HUB office with the Ohio DOT provides for a more "partnering" atmosphere, with Over-the-Shoulder review for each discipline by the DOT, Contractor and Stakeholders. This eliminates rejection of read for construction documents and the review period starting all over when all parties are working together in the same location ("Co-Location")
7) For Ohio law, ODOT is required to include "competitive bidding elements" into the selection process. What are the most effective approaches you have encountered for recommending a "competitive bidding element" or a competitive pricing component into final GMP selection?	Prices for professional/construction services during the preconstruction services phase prior to agreeing to GMP Prices) to how this "competitive bidding element" is handled by other agencies (i.e., county, state or federal, etc.). Some agencies use hourly rates for predetermined items such as labor while others have requested/contracted a firm fixed price for the preconstruction services phase.	We recommend the cost component of the procurement reflect 15-25% of the scoring. Consistent with recent procurements, we would recommend the following: Competitive LS Preconstruction Fee. Phase 1 can be a lump sum amount that is competitively bid. BSMT will have to clearly outline the scope of services that should be priced by the contractor, but this type of pricing has been successful in the past. For any additional Phase 1 work that may be required, BSMT could consider a competitive staff hourly rate multiplier as well. Competitive O&M. Profit can be bid competitively as a percentage to be added to construction costs. This can be a single percentage figure to be applied to all work or two separate numbers, one to be applied to self-performed work by the contractor and the other to be applied to subcontracted work.	Preconstruction rates and/or General Conditions above won't do much to establish overall budget for the project. The best solution would likely be a bid for preconstruction effort and total Project Margin (applied to a placeholder project total cost), a requirement for open book negotiation in Phase one for direct and indirect costs, and an established criteria for risk/contingency negotiation.	We understand that "competitive bidding elements" must be included in the selection process. However, when we refer to so-called "pricing" elements, we should define carefully what are the elements encompassing the price. In response, the price element should not be solely the bidding price, instead reflect (1) sustainability, (2) aesthetic enhancements, and (3) Operation & Maintenance cost (O&M). For instance, if a team can build the Brent Spence Bridge with spending the additional 100 million USD but saving 150 million USD (i.e., based on Net Present Value, NPV), the team proposed lower O&M cost should be appreciated as a preferred bidder. In regards to the sustainability and aesthetic enhancements, though, it may not be straightforward to quantify the NPV. Note that Bixby Suspension Bridge built over 100 years ago is still standing in the vicinity. Although the Brent Spence Bridge should be designed with 100-year		Competitive bidding elements can be incorporated into the procurement process by including an indicative price submission in the qualifications submission with the understanding that this price will be refined during Phase One when the final lump sum price is developed in an open-book approach with the Owner. Furthermore, the weighting of the pricing for the best value selection should be reflective of the emphasis that is place on the qualifications of the contractor as opposed to the price which is preliminary.	Hourly rates, with a fixed number of hours estimated for Phase one and fee.	Relative to GMP development as the Phase 1 design progresses, we would caution against any competitive bidding requirements that would preclude a progressive design-build team such as ours from electing to self-perform aspects of the work when appropriate from a risk mitigation perspective. The local market does not have the resources to cover the volume of work that the Cincinnati area will experience over the Brent Spence Project's duration, so our capacity and resources to self-perform nearly every aspect of the project scope can be leveraged to ODOT's advantage if the PDB contract terms are structured accordingly.	A two-step procurement is more appropriate for complicated projects utilizing a best value selection. Step One is largely based on corporate qualifications and past performance, key trade partners and resumes of key personnel. Upon evaluation of the Step One submissions, a shortlist is developed. Shortlisting encourages those proposals to put their best efforts on the table during the RFP. Our experience is when there are more shortlisted proposals, industry will shorten itself and teams will decline to proceed. Kiewit recommends a shortlist of no more than three firms to receive the RFP. Shortlisted firms will be invited to submit a Step Two proposal. The total qualitative assessment should go across both steps. It is also best that the quantitative assessments from Step One carry over to Step Two. The Step Two technical proposals focus on what the owner needs to meet its objective of selecting the right team, including a deep understanding of project needs and goals, the technical expertise to deliver the project successfully, and innovations that will potentially save the client money and ensure the project is completed within the allotted schedule. Proprietary one-on-one meetings are often used in two-step processes and provide an excellent way to have confidential discussions about ideas developed by the proposers and get a sense of how proposers interact within their team, as well as with the BSMT team. All of these factors together will help BSMT select the best value contractor.	Halmar recommends the following competitive measures: • Have established and date certain milestones for enabling early work packages. • Provide financial incentives for an absolute "No Excuse" financial bonus tied to meeting a pre-established GMAX price date in order to procure Long Lead equipment. "No Excuse" applies to any and all force majeure, weather, or pandemic-related events. • Ohio DOT considers directly pricing the long lead materials and other equipment based on the contractor's requirements early in the interim agreement period, thus potentially saving at least 6 months in the overall schedule. After agreement on GMAX, the long lead materials can be transferred to the contractor. If there is no agreement on GMAX, the Materials can be transferred to the successor contractor, who would be able to make minor adjustments prior to delivery. • Co-locate Ohio DOT representatives, Designer of Record, PDB Contractor and the Quality control team in one location to facilitate partnering atmosphere and daily communication. • Establish Technical Work Force Groups (TWFG) comprised of Ohio DOT representatives, Designer (DR) and Contractor to meet on a week or bi-weekly basis to discuss design, estimating, cost control and construction operations such as utilities, foundations, marine operations, drainage, ROW, AOT, Roadway and Pavement, Superstructure, substructure and S&I. • Conduct "over-the-shoulder" reviews by Ohio DOT representatives to support design and cost approval and eliminate any surprises during GMAX milestone submitted dates. • Select PDB contractor based on relevant qualifications and resources in working in a complex urban environment. ("The bridge is the key part") operations, project controls, estimating, scheduling, fee proposal for Phase 1 (estimating, project controls, etc.), identification of on location office space, willingness to co-locate. • Establish Phase 1 fee proposal as a percentage of construction cost, T&M or as a percentage of design cost. • Prioritize GMAX milestones for early enabling work packages and actively engaging O&E and small business participation. • Ensure that measures for the "best value" selection of a Contractor are fair and result in a level playing field for the firms that are shortlisted. Selection of a PDB contractor on qualifications and without a price competition can sometimes be "politicized". • Establish mandatory self-performance requirement of at least 50 percent to assure the Ohio DOT they will get quality product with date certainty. • Do not require that a minimum amount of subcontractor and vendor participation be competitively bid based on price alone. This	
Additional Comments	(No Additional Comments)	(No Additional Comments)	We think the consideration of PDB is worthwhile despite the tradeoffs discussed above. That said, our most significant comment would be the request to break the project into 2-3 packages to allow more competition and projects that are tailored to a wider range of contractor who can focus on smaller but more uniform scopes. We fully understand the procurement effort and schedule implications of that type of change, but we feel that the positives still outweigh the negatives. What we are seeing in the current market is limited competition is a primary driver of cost overruns.	We hope that the above responses help the client set up an appropriate procurement for the BS.	(No Additional Comments)	(No Additional Comments)		In summary, we believe PDB offers many benefits to the Brent Spence Project including the following: • Allow the BSMT to more clearly define the scope that it desires through a collaborative design development environment that, in turn, informs the ultimate cost for design and construction. • Minimize risk to the project by moving the development of the GMP deeper into design (ideally at 90%) and allowing decisions on risk to be made jointly, which would otherwise be tilted into the project on a traditional design-build delivery. • Helps ensure that the budget is met as Phase 1 design progresses through effective coordination and a linked estimating process with an Independent Cost Estimator, offering the BSMT transparency into the progressive design-builder's cost basis. • Provides the BSMT with an excellent opportunity to meet their procurement timeline goal of having a progressive design-builder selected by November 2022. The Walsh Kokoing Design-Build Team has the flexibility and capabilities to deliver this project under either contemplated delivery method. We welcome the opportunity to meet with the BSMT again to offer more details on our experience with the delivery of major projects in this model, give candid feedback, and help with any suggestions to make the Brent Spence Project a success.	Additional Promotional Information was transmitted)		

PROGRESSIVE DESIGN-BUILD PROCESS

