020953-EI

From:

Coats, Ron

Sent:

To: Subject:

Monday, May 13, 2002 11:17 AM Roeder, Dan HINES RFP

Attached is a revised matrix dated May 13, 2002. The matrix reflects the vendor responses to questions previously posed. Overall, all three of these bidders are close, however I have provided a ranking to show how I fell they shake out relative to each other.

In the ranking, I placed bidder F slightly higher than Bidder D on the basis of their clarification that they will connect to both Gulfstream and FGT pipelines. Having two pipelines should enhance fuel reliability and offer a more competitive pricing situation. Bidder F is also providing 100 hours of oil backup versus 72 hours for Bidder C.

Bidder D ranks a close second. They are planning to use only Gulfstream. The fact that a precedent agreement is in place with Gulfstream is a strong positive, as well as the fact that they have indicated that they have secured 100% of their transportation needs. Bidder D also plans for 100 hours of oil backup.

Bidder C ranks third. At Bidder C's site, the capability exists to connect to both FGT and Gulfstream; however, connection to either pipeline is dependent on some major construction. Gulfstream is 10 miles away and use of FGT will require pipeline expansion. Bidder C states that both Gulfstream and FGT have indicated that they can meet project needs within the limits of the schedule, Bidder C's proposal does not seem as firm as that of Bidders D and F.



CONFIDENTIAL

DOCKET '		E COMMISSN	W
NO. OROCOMPANY/	153-EI	EXHIBIT NO	Name and Address of the Park
WITNESS: _	FPC		Name and Address
DATE: 12	3.02		

FPC002649