

Evaluation Document For Cruise Ship Services Prospectus issued February 19, 1998

Notes: Evaluation document instructions: All evaluator comments/references must be inside the tables. "Track Changes" (control/shift-e) should be turned on so that individual evaluator comments can be tracked (to be removed in the final document).

Offeror:	West Travel, Inc. (Alaska Sightseeing/Cruise West)
Evaluator(s):	David Nemeth, Chief of Concessions, Glacier Bay NP&P
	Jerry Case, Chief of Interpretation, Glacier Bay NP & P
	Mary Beth Moss, Chief of Resource Management, Glacier Bay NP&P
	Randy King, Chief Ranger, Glacier Bay NPP
	Stephen G. Crabtree, Concessions Team Leader, Western Region

- Submittal of Offer***

Was the offer received no later than 4 p.m., June 22, 1998?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Marked Received June 22, 1998 in ARO.				
Comments:				

Was the offer submitted to the proper location?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Yes, See above.				
Comments:				

Were two complete copies of the offer submitted?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

Offer Letter

Was an offeror's letter submitted as required?	X	Yes		No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): First page of concession offer. Certificate of Corporate Officer signed by same person as signed offer letter.</p> <p>Clarification: By-Laws of West Travel submitted in support of certification as submitted.</p>				
<p>Comments: Legality of Certificate of Corporate officer questionable.</p> <p>Clarification: The By-Laws submitted appear to require that the President sign "<i>with the Secretary</i>" offers such as this.</p>				

Summary		Superior		Successful	X	Not Successful
<p>Summary Comments on this Factor: The Offeror meets these submittal requirements. Legality of Certificate of Corporate officer questionable.</p> <p>Clarification: Legality of offer letter should be resolved in order to assure the offer complies with requirements of applying entity.</p>						

Factors, Criteria and Questions

- ***PRINCIPAL FACTOR 1. THE EXPERIENCE AND RELATED BACKGROUND OF THE OFFEROR***

CRITERION 1A. (1) THE COMPETENCE OF THE OFFEROR, AS REFLECTED IN THE APPLICATION, TO MANAGE AND OPERATE A CRUISE SHIP BUSINESS SIMILAR TO THAT DEFINED IN THE PROSPECTUS. (2) THE ENTITY WITH WHICH NPS WILL CONTRACT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO SUPERIOR AND SUBORDINATE ENTITIES IS CLEARLY DEFINED.

1. Identify the "OFFEROR" (or "PROPOSED ENTITY[S]," that the offeror intends to establish for the purpose of operating this concession) making this application. Clearly identify both the formal structure of the primary business ENTITY with which the National Park Service will be dealing, and its owner(s).

1. Was the offeror adequately identified?	X	Yes		No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 2-3 of 29 Offeror: West Travel, Inc. d.b.a. Alaska Sightseeing/Cruise West (AS/CW) 4th & Battery Building, Suite 700 Seattle, WA 98121 Contact: Tim R. Jacox Phone: 206-441-8687 Fax: 206-441-4757 Email: timj@cruisewest.com A Washington State corporation</p> <p>Majority of voting shares owned by: Charles B. West 3220 Point White Drive Bainbridge Island, WA 98110 Majority voting ownership</p> <p>Other voting and non-voting share-owners listed</p>				
<p>Comments: The offeror clearly identifies the entity submitting the offer and the owners.</p>				

2. Provide materials to explain the financial circumstances, legal form, and ownership of that ENTITY.

2. Was adequate information provided?	X	Yes		No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): Exhibit 1A.2.1</p>				
<p>Comments:</p>				

3. Identify related, subordinate, and superior ENTITIES and any other organization, ENTITY, contractor, or subcontractor that will have a role in managing, directing, operating, or otherwise carrying out the service to be provided.

3. Were related, subordinate and superior entities adequately described?	X	Yes		No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): See #1 above.</p>				

Comments:

4. Where there are layers of Entities, subordinate or superior entities, significant contractors/subcontractors, or other organizations or individuals that will act in concert to provide the services required, describe each of them and the relationship between or among them.

4. Were layers of entities adequately described?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See #1 above.				
Comments:				

5. Using the format and instructions on the next page (duplicate the form as needed) identify the Offeror, each ENTITY, the New Concessioner, and the Operator and all similarly involved parties or people. Add information as necessary to make the relationships clear.

5. Were these forms provided?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See #1 above.				
Comments:				

ANILCA Section 1307 Preferred Operator

Refer to the ANILCA Section 1307 regulations in the appendix to answer the following questions:

6. Is the entity a local resident, as defined in 36 CFR 13.81(f), for the services offered under this prospectus? If yes, provide documentation to support this determination, as described in these regulations.

6. Was this information provided as required?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application Page 3 of 29				
Comments:				

7. Is the entity applying for "most directly affected Native corporation" status, as defined in 36 CFR 13.85? If yes, provide the documentation to support this determination, as described in these regulations.

7. Was this information provided as required?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application Page 4 of 29				
Comments:				

Preference for New and Small Operators

8. Does the entity provide cruise ship services within Glacier Bay National Park under a current limited permit with the National Park Service?

8. Was this information provided as required?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application Page 4 of 29				
Comments:				

9. If yes, does the number of cruise ship entries from June 1 to August 31 exceed 19 entries (14 percent of 139 cruise ship entries allocated for Glacier Bay from June 1 - August 31)?

9. Was this information provided as required?		Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application Page 4 of 29				
Comments: Not Applicable.				

10. Do any of the above have operations or interest in other operations in areas adjacent to this national park area or operations in other national parks? If Yes, please identify.

10. Was this information provided as required?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application Page 4 of 29 ASCW provide tour vessel services in Glacier Bay. Also provides bus tour services outside Denali.				

Comments:

ASCW has been a satisfactory tour vessel concessioner at Glacier Bay.

11. The NPS is looking for an ENTITY that has demonstrated experience in managing this type of business activity. Give specific examples of business operations undertaken by ENTITY. Detail the OFFEROR's experience and skills in developing efficient, effective, defined, targeted goals for business programs according to pre-established management parameters.

11. Was this information provided as required?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 4-6 of 29: Alaska tour operator since 73. Tour vessel operator since 1989.				
Comments: History of successful bus and small vessel tour operations. No direct cruise ship experience detailed.				

12. Describe the business management qualifications and experience of the ENTITY and the NEW CONCESSIONER proposed to manage and operate this business.

12. Was this information provided as required?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See #11, above and Page 6-7 of 29 Alaska cruise/tour experience since mid-1970's				
Comments: Evidence of extensive specific business management experience in State, park and regional area.				

13. Does the ENTITY have experience providing services under contract for an agency like NPS, United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, city, state, large corporation, or other organization with significant philosophical and operational constraints? If Yes, please identify.

13. Was this experience identified?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See #11, above. Page 7-9 of 29: Glacier Bay, Denali, USFS, Army Corps of Engineers, DOT, Klondike Gold Rush NHP. Experience working with Native communities.				
Comments: Evidence of extensive specific management experience in providing services under federal and State agencies. Experience with Alaska Native communities a plus.				

14. Use the format on the following page and add to it as necessary, or use your own format as long as it provides all of the requested information. Provide detailed resumes for all current and proposed partners,

sole proprietors, and key management employees who will be actively involved in the management of this business and key ship-board personnel who will be operating in Glacier Bay. Identify the specific role the individual is to play and establish that person's ability to play that role.

When discussing work experience, be specific with respect to size of operation, dates, area of operation, specific duties, number of people supervised, hours worked per week, and other factors that would be helpful to reviewers in establishing a clear understanding. Do not omit training and education and do not omit special qualifications, ratings, or licenses that are needed in some special occupations.

14. Was this information provided as required?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Exhibit 1A.14: Detailed information provided for principals from owners through vessel masters.				
Comments: Impressive tourism related experience for principal controlling owner (Chuck West). Appropriate levels of experience detailed for the positions included. Many operational employees have backgrounds involving Glacier Bay.				

Cr. 1a Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Very strong experience in Alaska tourism. Limited experience with cruise ship operations (vessels larger than 100 tons). No reason to doubt ability to successfully move into the cruise ship area. Information well organized and evidently complete.						

CRITERION 1B. NONE.

- ***PRINCIPAL FACTOR 2. CONFORMANCE TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE PROSPECTUS IN RELATION TO QUALITY OF SERVICE TO THE VISITOR***

CRITERION 2A. THE OFFEROR AGREES TO PROVIDE THE SERVICES AS REQUIRED BY THIS PROSPECTUS.

1. Indicate below whether you agree to provide the required services under the conditions specified in the Permit.

1. Does the offeror agree to provide the required services under the conditions specified in the Permit?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 10 of 29				
Comments:				

2. Provide a basic description of the ship(s) which the offeror proposes to operate in the park, including, as a minimum, the following, and any other vessel design information the offeror feels is pertinent.

2. Was all information provided?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 10 or 29: Temptress Explorer (185 ft., 438 gross ton, 99 passengers). 2A.2: two photos provided.				
Comments: Unable to confirm that the offeror owns or currently leases this vessel. No insurance on vessel listed (financial interest, page 2 of 3). Photos show vessel in tropical area. No additional information on vessel provided (layout, etc.)				

3. Do you agree not to use a substitute ship without the approval of the park superintendent and that any substitute must meet or exceed the standards of the ship approved in the proposal?

3. Does the offeror agree not to substitute ships without approval?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

4. Specify the total number of cruise ship entries into Glacier Bay from June 1 - August 31 for which you are applying.

4. Did the offeror answer this question (enter number of entries under comments)?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 11 of 29: 14 entries				
Comments:				

5. Do you wish to apply and compete in all categories in order to maximize your opportunity:

5. Does the offeror wish to apply and compete in all categories in order to maximize your opportunity? If "NO", specify the category or categories under which they are applying and the number of entries in the following table:	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 11 of 29				
Comments:				

Category	Entries (enter number)
Category A (maximum 38 entries)	
Category B* (maximum 13 entries)	
Category C* (maximum 4 entries)	
Category D* (maximum of 7 entries)	
Category E* (maximum of 4 entries)	
Category F* (maximum of 2 entries)	

The best proposal will be selected in each of the above six categories.

* An incumbent concessioner has a right of preference in renewal for these entries (see "Application of Preference in Renewal", this section - above). [NOTE: Except Cunard]

6. Do you intend to utilize all entries authorized throughout the term of the permit? (Unforeseen events or circumstances that intermittently interfere with operations may, with the approval of the superintendent, be excused.)

6. Does the offeror intend to utilize all entries?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 11 of 29				
Comments:				

7. Do you agree to notify the NPS of any unused entries that may become available in a timely manner and, if necessary, assist to facilitate the reallocation of the unused entry?

7. Does the offeror agree to notify the NPS of any unused entries ?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 12 of 29				

Comments:

Cr. 2a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The Offeror agrees to provide the services as required. Information about the vessel is limited. It appears that the offeror does not currently own or lease the vessel proposed.						

CRITERION 2B. DESCRIBE WHAT ADDITIONAL SERVICES AND/OR FACILITIES WILL BE PROVIDED AND/OR HOW THE COMPANY WILL IMPROVE UPON THE SERVICES OR SCHEDULES REQUIRED BY THIS PROSPECTUS, TO PROVIDE A SUPERIOR PARK EXPERIENCE FOR ITS PASSENGERS.

The National Park Service expects that concessioners will support the NPS in its mission to inform park visitors and concession employees about park resources and values. Some examples of services and facilities which might improve the visitor experience:

- a. Offer Native Alaskan art and handcrafts prominently in shipboard gift shops.
- b. Provide an expanded library of resource materials on Glacier Bay, Alaska, Native Culture including standard references, books, periodicals, videos, maps, etc.
- c. Feature local Alaskan artists and craftspersons in shipboard displays and in gift shops.
- d. Insure that ship board activities, gift shop items etc. contribute to visitor understanding of the area (e.g. gift shops offer only stuffed toy animals which are native to the area).
- e. Implement corporate and/or shipboard programs related to protection of the (marine) environment.
- f. Establish minimum standards of knowledge about Glacier Bay and the National Park Service for officers and crew members.

1. Describe the services and facilities related to the above that you propose to offer.

1. Were any services and facilities described?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 12 or 29: Expanded library, program related to environmental protection, standards for officers and crew. Exhibit 2B.1.2.: Library book & video list Exhibit 4B.4: Daily newsletter used for tour vessel visit. Exhibit 2B.1.3: Minimum standards, outline format. On-board sales feature Native and local handcrafts. 92% of inventory is US made. Page 12-13: Discussion of current policy for Native and other speakers				

Comments:

Very good general library, not too much specific to Glacier Bay. Newsletter provide minimal information about park. Minimum standards covers important areas, but little to indicate how this program will be implemented or to what depth.
Do not state to what extent they will have Native and other speakers on proposed service.

Management Policies Manual, Chapter VIII. "Promoting the sale of United States made handcrafts including Native American handcrafts relating to the culture, historical, natural and geographic characteristics of park areas is encouraged and there shall be a continuing effort to enhance the scope and supply of local handcrafts where they exist and to establish them where they do not."

2. Describe what measures the company will take to implement this policy in your service.

2. Were such measures described?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 13 of 29: ...additional Native crafts ... walking tours ... funds for additional Native art ... and expansion of already existing Native ... speaker program...will be expanded.				
Comments: No specifics on current level or to what extent these services will be "expanded". Hard to tell exactly what will be offered.				

3. Describe other services, facilities, programs, itineraries, etc., your company will implement that will provide a superior park experience for the visitor.

3. Were other services, facilities, programs, itineraries, etc. described?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 13 of 29: Discussion of current program (bulletin boards, narratives for hearing impaired, umbrellas, hot beverages on deck). No wheelchair accessible cabins.				
Comments: No particularly innovative programs currently offered. Lack of wheelchair accessibility a problem. Written narrative is a good feature (for hearing impaired). A sign language interpreter on board would be preferable. No specific statement that these existing services would be implemented on proposed service.				

Cr. 2b. Summary	Superior	X	Successful	Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Offeror describes an adequate existing program, but does not provide specific information regarding what would be done on the proposed service. Presuming they would provide the same services, the offer would be marginally successful in the area.				

CRITERION 3A. THE OFFEROR AGREES TO A FEE OF NOT LESS THAN THE AMOUNT DESCRIBED BELOW.

The NPS has determined that the fees described below is the minimum required offer:

\$5.00 per passenger (including both revenue and non-revenue passengers)

Please see the sample permit for specific details of the fee program.

1. Do you agree to this initial level of fees as shown above and in the sample permit?

1. Does the offeror agree to pay the fees as shown?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 14 of 29.				
Comments: ASCW agrees to minimum fee.				

Cr. 3a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: ASCW agrees to minimum fee.						

CRITERION 3B. NONE

CRITERION 4A. THE OFFEROR PROPOSES TO PROVIDE INTERPRETIVE SERVICES (EITHER THORUGH THE NPS INTERPRETIVE PROGRAM OR THORUGH AN APPROVED CONCESSIONER PROGRAM) WHICH MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROSPECTUS AND PERMIT.

1. Do you agree to provide an interpretive program meeting these minimum criteria?

1. Does the offeror agree to provide an interpretive program meeting these minimum criteria?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):Application, page 14				
Comments:				

2. Will you participate in the NPS Interpretive Program (including cost-recovery)?

2. Will the offeror participate in the NPS Interpretive Program (including cost-recovery)?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application, page 14				
Comments:				

If you do not participate in the NPS Interpretive Program, submit a full description of your proposed interpretive program, including employment standards (resumes for existing interpretive staff or position descriptions for currently unfilled interpretive positions), staffing levels, staff and supervisory training program, monitoring and mentoring program, native and local hire program, procedures for updating interpretive program with current research and park management directives, sources for information, description of resource and reference materials available for the interpretive staff, description of slide file (or other media) available for audio-visual and other presentations, and other materials that would assist in evaluating the program. Minimum criteria for the Interpretive program (as stated above) must be met in order for the offer to be considered responsive.

2a. If not, did the offeror submit an alternative Interpretive Program?		Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

Cr. 4a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Offeror agrees to meet minimum criteria by participating in NPS Interpretive Program.						

CRITERION 4B. THE OFFEROR PROPOSES TO PROVIDE INTERPRETIVE SERVICES BEYOND THE MINIMUM LEVELS LISTED IN CRITERION 4A.

1. Do you propose to operate in accordance with an *optimal itinerary* ...?

1. Does the offeror agree to operate in accordance with an <i>optimal itinerary</i>?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application, page 14				

Comments:

2. If NO, provide the proposed itinerary or itineraries, including, at a minimum, all areas to be visited, activities in each area and the times for each activity (one format for this is the table below).

Was an alternative itinerary provided?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

The itinerary submitted should also include a list and timetable for all passenger activities, including meals, while in Glacier Bay, noting any activities that would restrict public address system interpretive commentary or impact the interpretive focus on the park.

3. If you answer yes to item 1, but would also like to propose possible alternative itineraries which you feel would provide a superior visitor experience, please do so here. Provide details of why you feel this would be a superior itinerary and whether or not this itinerary is an optional or integral element of your proposal (*optional* meaning implementation of the itinerary would be at the NPS’s discretion; *integral* meaning that, under your proposal, some entries would *need* to use the alternative itinerary).

3. Were itineraries in addition to the “optimal itinerary” proposed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application, pages 14-18-Provides two optional “Interpretive Sail Plans” and supporting discussion for promotion as a superior itinerary.				
Comments: Two itinerary options are presented as optional. Both are described in great detail with support for preference over the optimal itinerary. With the exception of pick up and disembarking times for the NPS Interpreter, these schedules appear to exceed the standards of the NPS “optimal itinerary”. Discussion of activities presented with these optional itineraries provide opportunities for passenger enjoyment and understanding of the park that are superior to the optimal itinerary.				

Additional Elements of the NPS Interpretive Program

The following items are elements of the NPS Interpretive Program which exceed the minimum requirements listed in 4A. If you indicated in 4A #2. (above) that you would participate in the NPS Interpretive program, you will be credited with providing these additional items. Applicants who will not be participating in the NPS Interpretive Program would need to specifically address each item in order to receive consideration for exceeding minimum standards for that item.

- Provide interpreters with the opportunity to visit libraries, museums or institutions that have Alaska and Glacier Bay specific information or reference materials.
- Provide opportunity for interpreters to work with experts on interpretive program subjects such as communication and interpretive techniques.

- Offer mentoring program(s) for southeast Native individuals to introduce the field of interpretation and provide the passengers with cultural interpreters.
- Offer supplementary field trips both ashore and on the waters of Glacier Bay to provide interpreters with added personal experience to further enhance their programs.
- Provide the interpreters additional training and materials to develop more specialized and in-depth programs.
- Conduct focus groups and additional surveys to determine if passengers understand and appreciate the significance of Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve.

4. **Do you propose to meet any or all of the elements shown above?** [Applicable only if you will **not** be participating in the NPS Interpretive Program: the NPS Interpretive Program meets these elements.]

4. Does the offeror propose to meet any or all of the elements shown above? If the offeror is participating in the NPS program, they will meet all elements.		Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				

Additional Elements Not Included in the NPS Interpretive Program

The following items are potential areas where applicants could exceed minimum interpretive program requirements whether they are participating in the NPS interpretive program or not. All applicants should provide details of how each item would be addressed or provided if the item is to be included in the applicant's operation.

- Schedule programs and provide materials specifically for children on board with a park related theme.
- Provide passengers and crew the opportunity to view video(s) about GLBA prior to arrival.
- Provide passengers and crew with supplemental materials about Glacier Bay prior to arrival in Glacier Bay.
- Provide programs for passengers by specialists on park related subjects, i.e. geology, ecology, natural history, Alaska history, native Alaskan culture and art, prior to arrival in Glacier Bay.

5. **Do you propose to meet any or all of the elements shown above?** If yes, provide details.

5. Does the offeror propose to meet any or all of the elements shown above?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application, page 18-20, Exhibits 2B.1.1 and 4B.4-few children...AS/CW vessel is geared toward adults. Onboard cruise coordinator lecture topics – 3 lectures, of 30-45 minute duration, on a 7-night cruise.				
Comments: Attempts to adapt adult activities to include children in interpretive lectures. States vessel has children's books, art supplies, and games for children. No children's programs. Offeror implies guest lecturers present natural/cultural history programs, but provides few details of who actually presents the programs. Offeror does state that three lectures are given during a seven night cruise. Left with the impression that on board staff present most of these programs.				

Opportunity for Applicants to Propose Innovative Interpretive Program Elements

Applicants are encouraged to provide details of any additional interpretive services or interpretive program details (not listed above) which they propose to provide and which would result in improved interpretive program.

6. Do you propose to any additional interpretive elements or services? If yes, provide details.

6. Are additional interpretive program elements proposed?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application, page 20 and Exhibit 2B.1.1 – “provide the enhancement of local speakers on all of our longer itineraries”, this refers to a one page brochure titled, “Up Close & Personal”				
Comments: No details are provided with this one page submission. If individuals, such as those listed, were providing the additional interpretive programming this would provide support for #5, above.				

Cr. 4b. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Slightly superior as it may exceed the minimum interpretive program level. Does show a serious attempt to improve the optimal itinerary to provide a superior visitor experience. Guest lecture series may be a valuable program that would exceed NPS minimum standards but offeror provides few details of its use.						

CRITERION 5A. THE OFFEROR AGREES TO SUBMIT A POLLUTION MINIMIZATION PLAN

1. Do you agree to submit the required *Pollution Minimization Plan* as part of your application and, after approval, implement the plan as approved? If yes, attach the plan (see Criteria 5B for additional elements which may be included).

1. Does the offeror agree to submit the required <i>Pollution Minimization Plan</i> as part of your application and, after approval, implement the plan as approved?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

1a. Was an adequate pollution minimization plan provided?	X	Yes		No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number):</p> <p>Air Quality (pg. 21-22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turbocharged diesel engines known for clean burning characteristics; small engines so emissions not significant compared to larger ships • Injector timing ret ed, NOX reduction can be achieved (if 2% increase in fuel burning) • Installed electronically controlled diesel engines – reduce NOX by 49% over standard mechanical injected engines • Air-sep crankcase breather filters installed <p>Underwater Noise (pg. 22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If sound signature should prove to be “excessive” AS/CW would “install various sound-dampening devices on the engine mounts as well as on the propeller shaft coupler.” • Cruise speed – 12 knots reduces underwater noise <p>Oil Spill</p> <p>Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan (Exhibit 5A.1) International Safety Management (ISM) Code Manual (Exhibit 1A.12.2)</p>				
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Offeror describes existing engines/other equipment as being state-of-the-art for pollution minimization and has indicated willingness to further modify engine mounts, prop shaft coupler should sound signatures prove “excessive.” Offeror provided a standard SOPEP document and SIM code manual, but did not describe any additional actions, modifications, training, etc. that would be implemented to reduce the risk of oil spills. Offeror did not describe any monitoring techniques which could/would be used or any mechanisms by which NPS could verify that offeror employed techniques, methods, equipment described.</p>				

Cr. 5a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
<p>Summary Comments on this Factor:</p> <p>Vessel designs and existing equipment are described as minimizing stack emissions and underwater noise. No operational measures were described to minimize pollution risks. The offeror meets minimum requirements of the Pollution Minimization Plan.</p>						

CRITERION 5B. THE OFFEROR PROPOSES TO MINIMIZE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IN THE PARK.

- Offerors should address in their proposal measures they would take which go beyond law and regulation to further minimize or eliminate these environmental impacts while operating in the park (Address each item as an element of the *Pollution Minimization Plan* required in 5A.). [These include Stack emissions, Discharge into park waters, Underwater noise, Wildlife (Harbor Seals, Sea Birds, Sea Bird Nesting Colonies), Litter, Shipboard noise, Helicopters.]

Did the Offeror address in their proposal measures they would take which go beyond law and regulation to further minimize or eliminate these environmental impacts while operating in the park ?	X	Yes		No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): (pg 22-23)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero discharge (black and gray water held on board) • No petroleum products bunkered or discharged near Glacier Bay • Smaller size of ship increases maneuverability so seals, whales can be avoided • Crews receive training before the season and prior to entering Glacier Bay on littering, feeding birds, noise • Guests encouraged to use re-usable cups and glasses • Guests educated about littering and feeding wildlife • Daily newsletter – info about not feeding wildlife (Exhibit 2B.1.3) • Reduce on board noise by installing more speakers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ventilation systems have speed control devices to reduce sound in sensitive areas. No helicopters will be used for advertising or sightseeing from vessels 				
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Offeror does not describe how training of crew is provided nor how passengers are educated about littering, wildlife feeding etc. Offeror only indicates that guests are “encouraged” to use reusable cups/glasses (implying that disposable cups/glasses are available). Offeror agrees to not use helicopters. Except for those points made in 5A that exceed strict requirements and laws, the offeror provides very little beyond that required by law/regulation in terms of reducing environmental impacts.</p>				

1. Do you offer to provide baseline data from your vessel(s), such as stack emission opacity or noise levels? If yes, describe in detail the nature and format of the data, procedures for data submission and constraints, if any, for data use or distribution.

1. Does the offeror offer to provide baseline data from their vessel(s)?	X	Yes		No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): (page 23)</p>				
<p>Comments:</p>				

1a. If yes, did the offeror describe the nature and format of the data, procedures for data submission and constraints, if any, for data use or distribution?	X	Yes		No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): (pg. 23)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of a Fuel Flow Scan System – logs fuel burn and engine RPM setting; calculates emission opacity level or NOX. <p>“Our research shows that nothing is available for noise/vibration monitoring at this time.”</p>				
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Fuel Flow Scan System logs would be very useful in determining fuel consumption rates and calculating emissions. Offeror does not offer to collect or share underwater noise information.</p>				

Cr. 5b. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Offeror provides a few additional environmental measures aimed at reducing litter and wildlife feeding. Offeror agreed to provide very valuable baseline information using a Fuel Flow Scan System.						

CRITERION 6A. THE OFFEROR’S PAST RECORD RELATED TO MARINE CASUALTIES, VIOLATION NOTICES AND FOOD SERVICE SANITATION.

The past record of marine casualties, violation notices and food service sanitation reports for *each cruise ship* must be included in the offeror’s proposal. If there is less than a complete record for the time period described for any ship included in the proposal, establish a record for the company as a whole by providing the information requested for the company, including all cruise ships operated by the company.

1. Has the offeror had any reportable marine casualties (as defined by USCG regulations), including but not limited to grounding, loss of primary propulsion, collision, flooding, capsizing, fire, explosion, loss of life or reportable injury for the period beginning three years prior to the date this prospectus was issued through the present¹? If yes, submit a copy of the official report (U.S. Coast Guard or other), except for injuries (submit a brief summary, including reason for each injury).

1. Has the offeror had any reportable marine casualties?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): The applicant answered affirmatively in responding to Question 6.A.1 on page 23 and provided additional information on pages 23-25, and in Exhibit 6.A.1.1. The exhibit provides USCG reports on 14 marine casualty incidents (12 reportable), involving 8 different company vessels. The incidents included 5 groundings, 5 equipment failures, 1 fire, and 1 oil spill. Three of the groundings occurred in rivers, 2 in Alaskan marine areas. One of the Alaskan grounding incidents involved collision with an uncharted submerged object. The M/V Tempress is proposed by the applicant for entry to Glacier Bay, and was not involved in any of the noted casualty reports.				
Comments: The two Alaska groundings are perhaps the most notable and relative marine casualty incidents. One of these incidents involved striking an uncharted submerged object; in the other incident, cause of grounding is not attributable from the USCG report provided.				

1a. Were copies of the reports submitted?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See above.				

¹ Information which comes to the attention of the National Park Service for the period of time after a prospectus is issued but prior to the actual award of a permit will be considered in the selection process.

Comments:
Analysis:

1b. Did a background check identify any additional casualties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

2. Has the offeror received citations or notices of violation received from, or criminal information or indictments filed by local, state, or federal authorities in the United States, regardless of the outcome, for the period beginning three years prior to the date this prospectus was issued through the present? If yes, submit a copy of the citation, indictment, etc., and an explanation of the violation, settlement, penalty (if any), and any corrective actions taken by the offeror.

2. Did the offeror report any such citations, notices of violation, etc.?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): On page 24, under the section headed MARINE CASUALTY REPORTING, the applicant states “One of the two pollution citations was for a spill of less than 2-3 gallons; the other citation was for less than one-half gallon of fuel. These minor cases of spills were immediately contained and cleaned. “				
Comments: The larger spill is described in a marine casualty incident report in Exhibit 6.A.1.1, however, this report does not indicate that USCG levied a fine, as the applicant’s statement implies.				

2a. Were copies of the reports submitted?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See above. Also, applicant submitted an investigation activity ticket report from USCG describing a \$250 fine for a half-gallon oil spill in the Columbia River on 10/6/97.				
Comments:				

2b. Did a background check identify any additional violations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

3. Has the offeror received any unsatisfactory food service sanitation inspection reports from the U.S. Public Health Service for the period beginning two years prior to the date this prospectus was issued through the present? If yes, submit the reports for these inspections and a summary of any corrective actions taken by the offeror.

3. Did the offeror any unsatisfactory food service sanitation inspection reports?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): On page 25 the applicant answers affirmatively to this question. On pages 25 and 26, applicant describes two inspections involving unsatisfactory ratings out of 15 summarized. Exhibit 6.A.1.3 is referenced for copies of the reports.				
Comments: Problems were corrected in short order; vessel involved was the Spirit of Alaska. This is not the vessel proposed for entry to Glacier Bay.				

3a. Were copies of the reports submitted?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See above. Copies of inspection reports were provided in Exhibit 6.A.1.3.				
Comments: No reports were described or provided for the M/V Temptress, the vessel proposed for entry to Glacier Bay National Park.				

3b. Did a background check identify any additional unsatisfactory reports?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments: Verification checks with U. S. Public Health Service confirmed applicant's information.				

Cr. 6a. Summary	<input type="checkbox"/>	Superior	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Successful	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The applicant describes 12 reportable marine casualties, 2 violations, and 2 unsatisfactory public health inspection ratings involving 8 tour boats operated by the applicant. None of the incidents/violations is particularly serious or egregious, and in totality do not indicate a pattern of company neglect or disregard. The applicant is considered successful in meeting this criterion.						

CRITERION 6B. NONE

• **PRINCIPAL FACTOR 3. THE OFFEROR'S FINANCIAL CAPABILITY**

CRITERION 7A. THE OFFEROR DEMONSTRATES THAT NEEDED FUNDING (EQUITY AND/OR BORROWED) IS AVAILABLE AND IS DEMONSTRATED TO BE SUPPORTABLE WITHIN THE INCOME STATEMENT AND BALANCE SHEETS REQUIRED.

1. Provide the following information:

- a. For OFFERORS and CONCESSIONERS provide the latest financial statement for themselves and their parent company (if any) including the notes to the statements or similar explanatory material and the related audit report.
- b. For corporations, partnerships, or others that are OFFERORS, or that propose to provide the services or part of the services required: Provide the latest financial statement available including the notes to the statement or similar explanatory material and the related audit report.
- c. Sole proprietors and unconventional lenders and proposed individual investors: Provide personal financial statements.

1. Was the appropriate information provided?		Yes	X	No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): Exhibit 1A.2.1: Information provided. Audited by Grant Thorton.</p> <p>Clarification: Offeror indicates they were negotiating for the purchase of the proposed vessel and suggest that is this vessel is not available, they will request approval to use an alternative vessel.</p>				
<p>Comments: No indication that proposed vessel is owned or currently leased by the offeror, or what this will cost. It appears that there is adequate operating capital to finance the estimated cost of a vessel.</p> <p>Clarification: The additional information provided casts doubt on the ability of the offeror to provide services as described in the offer due to questions about what vessel would actually be used. Our question regarding funding of the vessel (or any vessel) was not answered.</p>				

2. Identify the source(s) of all needed funds. Document the source and availability of all funds with current audited financial statements, financing agreements, letters of commitment, and similar supporting documents from all sources. Present compelling evidence of offeror's ability to obtain the necessary funds. Be specific. Identify all sources and provide complete documentation. Explain fully the financial arrangements you propose to use.

- a. If funds are to be obtained from individuals, provide a current personal financial statement, documentation of assets to be sold, commitments from lenders, or other assurances that meet the need to make a compelling demonstration that the funds are available and committed.
- b. Funds from other sources must be supported by a current, audited balance sheet and income statement and whatever supporting documents are needed to provide compelling evidence that funds are available and committed.

- c. Funds obtained by the sale of assets must be supported by a description and condition of the assets and any encumbrances on those assets and/or the proceeds of their sale. Also, the condition of the market for such items should be indicated in a way that identifies both the ability to sell the asset at the necessary time and the ability to sell at a price sufficient to meet funding expectations. Qualified appraisals and other professional estimates of value must be provided. You must prove in a compelling way that the asset will yield the necessary funds at the necessary time.

2. Were funding sources identified?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See 1, above				
Comments: See 1, above				

- 3. Describe how your financing arrangements, taken as a whole, are advantageous terms for financing that both balance the financial interests of the NPS in this PERMIT and the need for a soundly financed concessioner with the least number of financing issues to be negotiated in the future.

3. Were financing arrangements adequately described?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See 1, above				
Comments: See 1, above				

Cr. 7a. Summary		Superior		Successful	X	Not Successful
<p>Summary Comments on this Factor: Financial Statements were provided, as well as a discussion of the financial arrangements of the company. There was little or no information provided regarding the fiscal arrangements for purchase or lease of the proposed vessel (M/V Temptress Explorer).</p> <p>Clarification: The additional information provided casts doubt on the ability of the offeror to provide services as described in the offer due to questions about what vessel would actually be used.. No information was provided as to funding of acquisition of any vessel.</p>						

CRITERION 7B. NONE.

SECONDARY FACTOR(S). FRANCHISE FEE OFFERED ABOVE THE MINIMUM

CRITERION 8A. NONE

CRITERION 8B. A FRANCHISE FEE ABOVE THE LEVEL REQUIRED AT CRITERION 3A IS OFFERED.

A franchise fee offer above the required level will be a secondary factor as explained by the terms of PL 89-249 (and Public Law 104-333, Section 704, below²). Secondary factors will be used in the evaluation of offers when a selection of the best offer cannot otherwise be made from the results of evaluating the three primary factors. Public Law 89-249, Section 3(d) and 36 CFR Part 51.4b(3), (Both are included in the Appendix) provides guidance as to franchise fees.

1. Do you propose to offer a franchise fee above the level required at Criterion 3A?

1. Was a higher franchise fee offered? If yes, enter fee offered under "Applicant Statements".	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 29 of 29: 2000-2002: \$7.00, 2003-2004: \$8.00 per passenger.				
Comments: Based on the financial information provided, the proposed fees do not appear to significantly impact the viability of the offer.				

Cr. 8b. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The proposed franchise fee of \$2.00-\$3.00 above the minimum fee makes this a superior offer in this area.						

This document accurately reflects the panel members evaluation of this offer.

Dave Nemeth /s/ Dave Nemeth	Stephen Crabtree /s/ Stephen Crabtree
Jerry Case /s/ Jerry Case	Randy King /s/ Randy King

²Public Law 104-333, Section 704, states: "Fees paid by certain permittees for the privilege of entering into Glacier Bay shall not exceed \$5 per passenger. For the purposes of this subsection, 'certain permittee' shall mean a permittee which provides overnight accommodations for at least 500 passengers for an itinerary of at least 3 nights". Therefore, the NPS may not be able to accept a higher franchise fee from applicants who fit the definition of 'certain permittee', but may accept such an offer from other applicants.

Mary Beth Moss /s/ Mary Beth Moss	
--------------------------------------	--

End