

Reference Summary

5.4.1 Evaluation of the Conceptual Development Plan

Evaluation Criteria: Conceptual Development Plan	Section Number	Page
A. Level of reasonableness, internal consistency, and identification of sources of data and assumptions;	4.3.1	1-106
B. Level of understanding of, and experience with, participation with public and private entities;	4.3.1.3 4.3.1.4 4.3.1.7 4.3.1.9 4.3.1.10	5-6 6-7 15-16 17-21 21-82
C. Knowledge of regional and local issues as related to the Project;	4.3.1.1 4.3.1.2 4.3.1.3 4.3.1.4 4.3.1.6 4.3.1.7 4.3.1.10 4.3.1.11	1-4 4-5 5-6 6-7 11-15 15-16 21-82 82-83
D. Consideration of a comprehensive list of modes in the Project;	4.3.1.5 4.3.1.6 4.3.1.7 4.3.1.10 4.3.1.11 4.3.1.12 4.3.1.15 4.3.1.17 4.3.1.19 4.3.1.20 4.3.1.21	8-10 11-15 15-16 21-82 82-83 83-84 90-91 93-97 102 103 104
E. Effectiveness and viability of overall schedule of development of Facilities;	4.3.1.5 4.3.1.9 4.3.1.15 4.3.1.20 4.3.1.22	8-10 17-21 90-91 103 105
F. Consideration of intermodal connections, interconnection to cities, and relationships to other planned and existing facilities;	4.3.1.5 4.3.1.6 4.3.1.9 4.3.1.10 4.3.1.11 4.3.1.17 4.3.1.21 4.3.1.22	8-10 11-15 17-21 21-82 82-83 93-97 104 105

Evaluation Criteria: Conceptual Development Plan	Section Number	Page
G. Integration of general/potential locations for rest stops, service centers, and other auxiliary requirements;	4.3.1.8 4.3.1.21	17 104
H. Understanding of traffic and revenue study methods and requirements to meet Master Development Plan and Master Financial Plan needs;	4.3.1.9	17-21
I. Understanding of order of magnitude for estimating costs;	4.3.1.1 4.3.1.2 4.3.1.12	1 4 83-84
J. Knowledge of right of way acquisition, corridor preservation, and related revenue generation activities;	4.3.1.8 4.3.1.12 4.3.1.13 4.3.1.21	17 83-84 85-89 104
K. Comprehensive list and understanding of risks and their management, allocation, hedging, and mitigation strategies;	4.3.1.4 4.3.1.18	6-7 97-101
L. Integration of schedule, phasing, costs and sequence of Facility development, maintenance, and operation;	4.3.1.5 4.3.1.6 4.3.1.9 4.3.1.12 4.3.1.15	8-10 11-15 17-21 83-84 90-91
M. Understanding of the relationship between minimum level of service and capacity requirements;	4.3.1.9 4.3.1.16 4.3.1.12	17-21 92-93 83-84
N. Understanding of revenue collection strategies and operations;	4.3.1.10 4.3.1.16	21-82 92-93
O. Strategies for securing 3rd party arrangements including major supply issues and supply chain partnering methods for all modes;	4.3.1.3 4.3.1.17 4.3.1.21	5-6 93-97 104
P. Understanding of delivery methods and contractual arrangements for design, planning, finance, construction, operation and maintenance of Facilities in conjunction with public and private partners;	4.3.1.4 4.3.1.13 4.3.1.18 4.3.1.20	6-7 85-89 97-101 103
Q. Strategy for updating the overall Master Development Plan in accordance with the CDA, including shifting Facility(ies) from mid-term to near-term,; and	4.3.1.22	105
R. Understanding and approach to environmental management.	4.3.1.12 4.3.1.14	83 89

**5.4.2 Evaluation of the Conceptual Financial Plan and Proposer Financial Strength**

5.4.2.1 Evaluation of the Conceptual Financial Plan:

A summary of how the CFP meets each of the evaluation criteria is included at the opening of Section 4.3.2. These summary responses are noted as “4.3.2 Eval Summary” in the table below. Because the CFP presents an integrated response to the financing requirements of the corridor, some evaluation criteria will have more than one reference in the body of the CFP.

Evaluation Criteria: Conceptual Financial Plan	Section Number	Page
A. Minimization and efficiency in the use of public funds, loans, and guarantees;	4.3.2 Eval Summary A, 4.3.2.1, 4.3.2.3	128 146-149 133-144
B. Understanding of innovative financial techniques and capital market instruments;	4.3.2 Eval Summary B, 4.3.2.3	128-129 133-144
C. Commitment to revenue sharing, reinvestment, equity participation, and debt support;	4.3.2 Eval Summary C, 4.3.2.3 A	129-131 146-148
D. Level of reinvestment of financial resources generated by the Facilities.	4.3.2 Eval Summary F, 4.3.2.1, 4.3.2.3	131 146-149 133-144
E. Level of risk assumed by Developer in developing the Project and Facilities;	4.3.2 Eval Summary E, 4.3.2.3 C	131 143-144
F. Consistency with the Conceptual Development Plan, current financial market conditions, and the current economic environment;	4.3.2 Eval Summary F, 4.3.2.1, 4.3.2.3	131 146-149 133-144
G. Extent and reasonableness that the Conceptual Financial Plan anticipates or relies upon the merger, combination, and/or conversion of existing or future facilities to toll or public/private ownership;	4.3.2 Eval Summary G, 4.3.2.1 D	131 149
H. Management and allocation of financial risks to the party best able to handle the risks, including reasonableness of risk hedging strategy;	4.3.2 Eval Summary H, 4.3.2.3 C	131-132 143-144
I. Comprehensive, consistent, and integrated proforma analyses for the project as an aggregate and for near-term facilities;	4.3.2 Eval Summary I, 4.3.2.1, 4.3.2.3 A-B	132 146-149 133-142
J. Comprehensive and realistic schedule for reaching Close of Finance for near-term Facility(ies); and	4.3.2 Eval Summary J, 4.3.2.5	132 145-146

Evaluation Criteria: Conceptual Financial Plan	Section Number	Page
K. Strategies with regard to the evolving nature of the overall Master Financial Plan over the term of the CDA.	4.3.2 Eval Summary K, 4.3.2.6	132 149

5.4.2.2 Evaluation of the Project Management Plan

Evaluation Criteria: Proposer Financial Strength	Section Number	Page
Using the audited financial statements for Fiscal Year 2003 (and more recent financial statements, if any), the financial strength of each Equity Owner within the Proposer will be evaluated qualitatively and quantitatively using the information submitted in Section 4.2.15 through Section 4.2.18. Note that only fiscal year 2003 information will be assessed qualitatively and quantitatively and that fiscal year 2002 information will be assessed on a pass/fail basis as described in Section 5.3.2 above. With respect to Section 4.2.18 (A), if the Proposer submits a letter indicating that it has the ability to obtain at least an investment grade credit rating, then the Proposer will be evaluated as though it could obtain the lowest notch within investment grade status.	4.2.15 - 4.2.1.8	N/A <i>(see separate volumes containing financial information for Cintra and Zachry.)</i>

5.4.3 Evaluation of the Project Management Plan

Evaluation Criteria: Project Management Plan	Section Number	Page
A. Overall understanding and ability to manage similar projects;	4.3.3 B 4.3.3 C 4.3.3 D	109-111 111-113 113-117
B. Strategies for management and budgetary control of planning, financing, and implementation;	4.3.3 B 4.3.3 C 4.3.3 D	109-111 111-113 113-117
C. Strategies for project management of Facilities;	4.3.3 B 4.3.3 C 4.3.3 D	109-111 111-113 113-117
D. Comprehensive organizational structure and management hierarchy;	4.3.3 A 4.3.3 B	107-108 109-111
E. Proposer’s list of team members and description of responsibilities (Form E) demonstrates understanding of the requirements for engaging key team members;	Form E	N/A <i>(see “Proposer Information, Certifications and Documents” tab)</i>

<b>Evaluation Criteria: Project Management Plan</b>	<b>Section Number</b>	<b>Page</b>
F. Strategies for the development and implementation of the Project as a whole, as well as its individual Facilities;	4.3.3 B 4.3.3 C 4.3.3 D	109-111 111-113 113-117
G. The effectiveness and viability of the Proposer’s work breakdown structure and schedules for development;	4.3.3 C	111-113
H. Integrated approach to project management and liaison with TxDOT, its consultants and other third parties;	4.3.3 B 4.3.3 C 4.3.3 D	109-111 111-113 113-117
I. Key procedures for monitoring, auditing and controlling costs and performance;	4.3.3 B 4.3.3 C	109-111 111-113
J. Detailed approach to contract administration and the description of Proposer’s contract administration procedures and systems;	4.3.3 B 4.3.3 C	109-111 111-113
K. Comprehensive and reasonable approach to, and understanding of, environmental management procedures; and	4.3.3 B 4.3.3 C	109-111 111-113
L. Demonstrated experience related to tasks to be performed during the Initial Scope of Work.	4.3.3 A 4.3.3 B 4.3.3 D	107-108 109-111 113-117

#### 5.4.4 Evaluation of the Quality Management Plan

<b>Evaluation Criteria: Quality Management Plan</b>	<b>Section Number</b>	<b>Page</b>
A. Systematic approach to quality management;	4.3.4 A	118-119
B. Integrated quality management organizational structure;	4.3.4 C	121-122
C. Process for auditing and management review of Project activities;	4.3.4 F	124
D. Experience of quality management team members;	4.3.4 B	120
E. Internal quality management systems, processes, and procedures that are consistent with the generally accepted standards of practice; and	4.3.4 F	124
F. Approach and procedures for integrating and controlling systems established by 3rd parties.	4.3.4 E	123