



**Mississippi Department of Transportation  
Response to Questions  
Received July 5 – July 11, 2008  
Regarding the Airport Parkway Project**

**Question 1:** Regarding “Volume 2.1.1 Surety letter”, page B-8 of the RFQ, we propose you consider the following points:

- The amount asked of \$350 M USD is far away off market standards, even for a Payment and Performance Bond or a LOC. This should take in consideration the level of investment required and should be between 10 and 20% of the Estimated Contract Value. These have always been the standard ranges in Texas and Florida. Please consider.
- As for the Credit support, the amounts should be reduced and the RFQ should give the option of presenting one of two alternatives and not both. Please consider.
- In the case that you allowed for that option, the relation between the LOC amount and the Performance and Payment Bond should be 1 USD LOC by 3 USD of Performance Bond. Please consider.

**Answer:** The evidence of bonding capacity required under Section 1.1 may be submitted on behalf of either the Responder or the team member with primary responsibility for construction. The evidence of ability to obtain the standby letter of credit with respect to construction required under Section 1.2(a) must be provided on behalf of the Responder. Both must be included with the SOQ. However, the RFQ will be revised in Addendum #1 to clarify that the final required amounts for the payment and performance bonds and the letter of credit have not yet been determined and will be set forth in the RFP.

**Question 2:** According to these points in the above question, we propose to change the requirement of the RFQ in the point “Volume 2.1. Surety and Bank Letters” regarding the performance obligations.

**Answer:** See Response to No. 1 above

**Question 3:** Regarding “4.1 General / Format”, page A-12 and A-13 of the RFQ:  
(1) Please confirm that the 16 copies of the SOQ in separately-bound volumes properly labeled, could be submitted in one or more boxes which contain the total number of binders.  
(2) Please confirm that we have to submit a pdf. copy of the Volume.1 and Volume.2 of the proposal.

**Answer:**



- (1) Yes. The required number of copies and volumes may be submitted in one or more sealed boxes.
- (2) No. There is no requirement to submit a .pdf version of the SOQ.

**Question 4:** Regarding “1.5.1 Relevant experience and capability” of the RFQ, page B-3, the companies that form our team have developed a huge number of projects during the last 5 years. It will be impossible for them to add all the information and comply with the 60 pages limitation. This team assumes that it is enough if each company adds to the proposal the most important projects developed by the company and the most important project developed in the last 5 years.

**Answer:** Yes, list the most relevant and important projects.

**Question 5:** To answer “1.5.1 Relevant experience and capability” and first part of the point “1.6 Project References”, we will provide a table with the list of projects performance by each company in the different categories specified in “Section 1.5.1” and we will provide in this table the information regarded in the five bullets points that we can find at the beginning of the “Section 1.6”. The description of each project and the paragraph describing the relevance of each project and why the project experience will provide value to MDOT will be added to the “Appendix B of the Volume 2”.

Please confirm whether it is correct to respond to Sections 1.5 and the first part of the section 1.6 in the way described above.

**Answer:** Responder is free to organize the requested information in this manner, taking into consideration the 60-page limit for Volume 1 of the SOQ and the opportunity to supplement information submitted in response to Sections 1.5 and 1.6 in Appendix B to Volume 1.

**Question 6:** Regarding “1.6 Project References” of the RFQ, page B-4, please confirm which option is correct:

- (1) Each equity member, each Major Non-Equity Member and each Construction Contractor will present 5 projects.
- (2) Only 5 projects picked from the list provided in the point 1.5 must be submitted.

**Answer:** Your second option is correct. Responder is required to submit the information requested in the second part of Section 1.6 only for a total of five of the projects identified in Section 1.5.

1. **Question 7:** Regarding “Volume 2.2 Financial Statements and Credit Ratings”, page B-10 and B-11 of the RFQ, Financial Statements are included in this point and 16 copies of the volume must be submitted. Please consider that if a pdf. copy of the Vol.1 and Vol.2 is submitted the Team could submit a lower number of copies of the financial statements.



**Answer:** Responder is required to submit one original and 15 copies of each set of required financial statements. There is no requirement to submit a .pdf version of any set of financial statements.

**Question 8:** Regarding “Volume 2. 3 and 4 Material Changes in Financial Condition”, page B-12 and B-13 of the RFQ:

(1) Please confirm that the financial information of each company could be packaged in the same binder. In this case the only condition is to separate the financial information of each company by a cover sheet identifying the name of the organization and its role in responder’s organization.

(2) Could we add the financial statements of each company at the end of the volume 2 in order to facilitate the reading of the points of the volume? The statements are located just in the middle of the volume and could be difficult to read the different documents that must be provided in points 1, 3, 4 and 5.

**Answer:**

(1) Yes, the required financial information may be submitted in one binder but must be separated by a clearly-marked cover sheet identifying the name of the organization and its role in Responder’s organization.

(2) No, please organize as stated in the RFQ and the checklist provided in Addendum #1 of the RFQ.