

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:	Cunard Line Limited
Evaluator(s):	David Nemeth, Chief of Concession, Glacier Bay NP&P
	Jerry Case, Chief of Interpretation, Glacier Bay National Park & Preserve
	Mary Beth Moss, Chief of Resource Management, Glacier Bay NP&P
	Stephen G. Crabtree, Concessions Team Leader, Western Region
	Randy King, Chief Ranger, Glacier Bay NPP

- ***Submittal of Offer***

Was the offer received no later than 4 p.m., June 22, 1998?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

Was the offer submitted to the proper location?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

Were two complete copies of the offer submitted?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Actually, four copies were submitted				
Comments:				

Offer Letter

Was an offeror's letter submitted as required?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Both letter and certificate of corporate officer signed by Larry Pimentel, CEO				
Comments: Larry Pimentel, CEO signed both the offer letter and the corporate certification, which seems unusual. Normally a second officer is necessary to certify another corporate officer's actions.				

Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: All submission requirements were met. Legality of same individual certifying offer letter questioned. Verification needed that CEO is authorized to certify his own documents.						

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
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 8 of 26 & Addendum ("Criteria 1"): Cunard Line Limited (formerly Seabourn Cruise Line), 6100 Blue Lagoon Drive, Suite 400, Miami, FL 33126 Contact: Lyall J. Duncan, Esq., Phone: 305-463-3136, Fax: 305-463-3030 Bahamian Corporation Controlling interest (68.33%) held by: Carnival Corporation, One Carnival Place, MLGL-815N, 3655 NW 87th Ave, Miami, FL 33178 Carnival is Publicly owned, traded on New York Stock Exchange A controlling interest (~47%) of Carnival stock owned by the Arison family				
Comments: Adequate information provided.				

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

2. Was adequate information provided?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 8 of 26 & Addendum "Criteria 1" & Addendum 2: "Preliminary Balance Sheet." Cunard Line Limited was purchased by Carnival and a banking group in May 1998.				
Comments: Only preliminary financial information was provided by the offeror, presumably due to the recent change in ownership.				

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
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 8 of 26 & Addendum "Criteria 1"				
Comments: Information provided				

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): Page 8 of 26 & Addendum "Criteria 1"				
Comments: Information provided				

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): Page 8 of 26				
Comments: Information provided				

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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Cunard is not making an offer as a local operator				
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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Cunard is not making an offer as a most directly affected Native corporation				

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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 9 of 26: Answered NO.				
Comments: Cunard actually had a concession permit for cruise ship services until 12/31/97. Cunard advised the park that they would not be providing cruise ship services in Glacier Bay in 1998 or 1999. Because of this an interim permit for these two years was not issued to Cunard and they lost their preference on renewal.				

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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 9 of 26: Answered NOT APPLICABLE.				
Comments:				

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): Page 10 of 26: Answered NO.				
Comments:				

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?	☒	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Addendum to application Criteria 1, page 1 & 2: Cunard brand name represents 158 years of ocean travel services. The new entity is formed from a purchase and merger of Cunard and Seabourn, two established cruise lines, under a parent company, Carnival, the largest cruise line in the world.				
Comments: There was relatively little information demonstrating that the new entity would be utilizing the experience of the prior company, merge partner or parent company. None-the-less, there is no reason to believe that this experience would not be utilized.				

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?	☒	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Addendum to application Criteria 1, page 1 & 2 (see 11, above). Ships and management personnel which had operated in Glacier Bay under previous Cunard entities, would continue to be involved.				
Comments: See #11, above.				

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?	☒	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 10 of 26: the offeror indicated they did not have experience in these areas.				
Comments:				

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): Page 11 of 26 (6 actual pages): Experience forms for Vessel Masters and Hotel managers provided with brief descriptions of duties.				
Comments: No information on current and proposed partners, sole proprietors, and key management employees. Information on Masters and Hotel Managers very brief and general, but indicates acceptable levels of experience and training for the positions indicated.				

Cr. 1a Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Cunard Line Limited provided only the minimum information required. Financial information was limited to a "preliminary" balance sheet. Information on management personnel was limited to two ship personnel positions.						

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):				
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?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 12 of 26 (two actual pages): Royal Viking Sun & Seabourne Legend. Royal Viking Sun – launched 1988, due for refit 1998, 828 max. passengers in 380 cabins of 200 sq. ft., diesel, mixed crew.; Seabourne Legend – launched 1992, refit 1996, 204 max. passengers in 102 cabins of 277 sq. ft., diesel, mixed crew.				
Comments: Basic information provided.				

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?	☒	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)?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Cunard is applying for 30 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:	☐	Yes	☒	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 13 of 26: See below.				
Comments:				

Category	Entries (enter number)
----------	---------------------------

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

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?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
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 ?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

Cr. 2a. Summary	☐	Superior	☒	Successful	☐	Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Cunard Line Limited provided all information required, but only minimal supplemental information regarding vessels to be operated.						

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): Addendum to application, page 3: "Cunard will make every effort to ensure passengers and crew are knowledgeable about the region ... Native culture...". Cunard has hired Alaskan Cruise Lectures in the past and will "institute a program" with this company, or one like it, to supplement NPS lectures. Cunard ... shall provide slide shows about ... ecology, ..Native culture. ... lecturers wearing Alaskan ... parkas will also be made available to ...passengers.				
Comments: No indication that Native handcrafts will be offered. No indication of reference materials on board. No indication of featuring local or Native artists. Some indication they will insure shipboard activities contribute to visitor understanding of the park. No indication of significant corporate and/or shipboard programs related to protection of the (marine) environment. No indication of significant minimum standards of knowledge about Glacier Bay and the National Park Service for officers and crew members				

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?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Addendum to application, page 3: Programs directing passengers on shopping ideas				

Comments:
Minimal commitment to promote sale of authentic handcrafts.

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): Addendum to application, page 3: See #1, above.				
Comments: See #1, above.				

Cr. 2b. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Imply they would have supplemental lectures about the park, wildlife, and environmental issues. Offers few other elements that would make this a superior offer in this 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):				
Comments:				

Cr. 3a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Cunard offers the minimum required fee.						

CRITERION 3B. NONE

**CRITERION 4A. THE OFFEROR PROPOSES TO PROVIDE INTERPRETIVE SERVICES
(EITHER THOROUGH THE NPS INTERPRETIVE PROGRAM OR THOROUGH 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 17				
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 17				
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 19				
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?		Yes		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?		Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

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):				
Comments:				

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 21 and Addendum, page 4 – Offeror states they will provide information to passengers in advance of visit, will arrange for guest lectures, and schedule programs for children about park related subjects.				
Comments: Offeror restates elements suggested by NPS with no detail on how this would be accomplished.				

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?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application, page21				
Comments:				

Cr. 4b. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The Offeror gives no details of elements to provide interpretive services beyond the minimum levels listed in Criterion 4A						

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: Page 22 of the application which contains the check-off box for completing a Pollution Minimization Plan (5A) is missing. However, the PMP is attached to the application as a response to criteria 5B.				

1a. Was an adequate pollution minimization plan provided?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Attachment to application (pgs.5-6) Air Quality/Stack Emissions - Diesel electric engines “Do not foresee any probability of excessive smoke emissions” Underwater Noise Vessels will be operated with park’s vessel operating restrictions Marine engineers do not believe that the vessel’s slow cruising operation produces any noise radiation				
Comments:				

Cr. 5a. Summary		Superior		Successful	X	Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The offeror did not provide an adequate Pollution Minimization Plan. Instead, the offeror noted that they did not believe that stack emissions or underwater noise were a concern and failed to provide any information about oil spill response.						

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
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Addendum to application (pg. 5-6)				
No sewage discharge in park waters Passengers and crew instructed not to feed birds (newsletters and port lecturers) Vessels will not approach within 150 feet of sea bird nesting colonies Ships have never discarded trash and will not in the future Will inform passengers and crew to reduce noise level Will not make shore excursion arrangements with helicopters				
Comments: The offeror offers very little that goes beyond existing environmental restrictions. The offeror does not commit to a zero discharge policy per se, but only to not discharging sewage in park waters. The offeror does not commit to no helicopter use, but only to not using helicopters for shoreline excursions.				

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
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Addendum to application, pg. 6				
Cunard will assist in baseline data collection. Data will be provided at a later date in an effort to meet application deadline.				
Comments: No baseline data was received from Cunard.				

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?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

Cr. 5b. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The offeror provides little or no information and few commitments that go beyond existing laws and regulations.						

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 indicated reportable marine casualties in responding to Question 6.A.1 on page 23 and referred the reader to Addendum #2 for additional information. Addendum #2 contains supplemental information for several criteria, including a report summary of a grounding involving the Royal Viking Sun on 4/4/96 while travelling from Yemen to Jordan.				
Comments:				

1a. Were copies of the reports submitted?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): A copy of the Bahamas Maritime Authority report describing the grounding of the Royal Viking Sun is included in Addendum #2. Only 7 of 21 pages of the report are provided.				
Comments: The report describes a serious marine casualty incident in which the vessel hull was holed, water flooded areas of the ship, the ship lost navigational power, and passengers were made ready to debark in lifeboats. No cause or explanation is provided in the summary report provided; nor description of damages.				
Analysis:				

1b. Did a background check identify any additional casualties?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				

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: Marine casualty records for the Royal Viking Sun and Seabourn Legend, the two ships proposed by the applicant for operation within the park were verified with USCG. No additional marine casualty incidents involving either vessel during the 3-year reporting period were reported. Marine casualty records checks were also confirmed with the USCG database at Port State Information eXchange on other ships operated by the Cunard – Queen Elizabeth II, Vistafjord, Sea Goddess I, and Sea Goddess II. The only reportable marine casualties listed for these 4 ships were 14 personal casualty incidents on the Queen Elizabeth II. These were spread out over the 3 year reporting period and may reflect stringent reporting of onboard injuries. No details are provided on the USCG report.

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.?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): The applicant answered negatively in responding to Question 6.A.2 on page 23.				
Comments:				

2a. Were copies of the reports submitted?		Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): N/A				
Comments:				

2b. Did a background check identify any additional violations?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments: USCG records note a violation (MV96007968) for the Seabourn Legend out of the Juneau MSO on 10/21/96. USCG provided no description of this violation. USCG reported documented 2 other oil spill/pollution violations involving 2 Seabourn Cruise vessels during the reporting period: the Queen Odyssey 3/30/96 \$250 fine, and Seabourn Pride, 3/21/95 \$500 fine. Queen Odyssey is the previous name of the Seabourn Legend (see page 12 of application), hence a reportable offense for the purposes of this application. Seabourn Cruise Line, as of May 1998, is now a subsidiary of Carnival Corporation, operated as Cunard Line Limited (see, Addendum to Application, Criteria 1.)				

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?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): The applicant stated that they had not had any unsatisfactory food service ratings in responding to Question 6.A.3 on page 24.				
Comments:				

3a. Were copies of the reports submitted?		Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): N/A				
Comments:				

3b. Did a background check identify any additional unsatisfactory reports?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments: Verification checks with the U.S. Public Health Service confirmed the applicant's information.				

Cr. 6a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor:						
The applicant reported a marine casualty/grounding incident involving the Royal Viking Sun in 1996 and none for the Seabourn Legend – the 2 vessels proposed for operation within the park by this application. No other marine casualties were reported by USCG for these vessels; checks on 6 other vessels operated by Cunard Line Limited revealed a spate of personal casualty incidents on a ship not proposed for entry in the park - the Queen Elizabeth II. Personal casualty reports frequently document onboard injuries of varying severity and it is difficult to fairly evaluate or consider these incidents in this summary rating based on the limited information provided by USCG. However, USCG records for the Seabourn Legend revealed a March 1996 \$250 fine for an oil spill (then operated under the name Queen Odyssey). A similar oil spill violation was reported for another Seabourn Cruise Line vessel, Seabourn Pride, for a May 1995 violation. This vessel is not proposed for operation in the park. The fine amounts involved in these two violations would indicate that they were minor oil spills, timely reported and responded to by the applicant. None of the marine casualty incidents or violations reported indicates a pattern of con-compliance or negligence. The applicant is considered successful in meeting this criterion. The applicant reported no violations or unsatisfactory food services.						

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
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Addendum page 7 & Addendum # 2: a "preliminary" balance sheet provided. On that statement current assets are \$46 million and current liabilities \$200 million.				
Comments: The proforma consolidated opening balance sheet that was provided is almost worthless and does not respond to the question. There would be financial statement from the prior companies and statements from the new parent company available. There could also have been a more thorough explanation of the financial circumstance of the company. The financial information provided does not support offeror as an on-going cruise ship operator.				

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): Addendum page 7 & Addendum # 2: a "preliminary" balance sheet provided.				
Comments: Some preliminary information provided about the Offeror, no information from parent company provided. Since the company does not propose to build ships for the Glacier Bay service, there is no need to prove they have the capital to do so.				

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): Addendum page 7 for statements as to the financial condition of the company.				
Comments: Some preliminary information provided about the Offeror, no information from parent company provided. Since we have virtually no information it is not possible to make any informed judgement about this company's financial circumstances.				

Cr. 7a. Summary		Superior		Successful	X	Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Cunard did not provide the requested financial information. Information about parent company not provided.						

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): Cunard offers \$6.00 per passenger each year.				
Comments: One ship has passenger capacity over 500 the other less than 500. Under current law the higher fee would only be paid for passengers on one of the vessels.				

Cr. 8b. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Cunard offers a minimally higher fee. The financial information provided suggests that a higher fee would be reasonable.						

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

Dave Nemeth /s/ Dave Nemeth	Stephen Crabtree /s/ Stephen Crabtree
--------------------------------	--

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.

Jerry Case /s/ Jerry Case	Randy King /s/ Randy King
Mary Beth Moss /s/ Mary Beth Moss	

End