

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

- ***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):				
Comments:				

Offer Letter

Was an offeror's letter submitted as required?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments:				

Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Offer submitted as required.						

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): Pg. 2 of 45 (bottom numbers) offeror is Goldbelt, Incorporated. It is a native corporation owned by Tlingit people. They have 3000 shareholders of the Tlingit people. Goldbelt is the parent corporation in this matter. Two subordinate entities are described at 3., below.				
Comments: Goldbelt Incorporated, an ANCSA Native corporation with 3000 shareholders.				

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

2. Was adequate information provided?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Certificates of Incorporation are before after the Annual Report which include financials. Six Offeror/Entity forms are provided (6-11 of 45) for Goldbelt, Incorporated, Goldbelt Enterprises, Inc., Glacier Bay Park Concession Inc., Goldbelt Voyager Cruise Line, Inc., Glacier Bay Tours & Cruises, and Raven-Eagle Gifts, Inc. All are 100% owned by Goldbelt, Incorporated except that Glacier Bay Tours & Cruises is a DBA of Glacier Bay Park Concessions, Inc. and Raven-Eagle is a wholly owned subsidiary of Glacier Bay Park Concession, Inc. They refer to page 4 of 5 but that page is not included.				
Comments: Goldbelt Incorporated, an ANCSA Native corporation with 3000 shareholders.				

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?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See above and 3 of 45. They focus on GBNPCI as entity I and the entity NPS will deal with. GVCLI is entity II will be responsible for vessel operation and ownership. (Pg. 3 of 45) They refer to page 4 of 5 but that page is not included.				
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?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See 1-3 above. They refer to page 4 of 5 but that page is not included.				
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 1-3 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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): pgs 12 of 45 and 13 of 45. Goldbelt, Inc. has a majority of shareholders residing within 100 miles of Glacier Bay National Park & Preserve. Corporate headquarters are also within 100 miles of Glacier Bay National Park & Preserve.				
Comments: Goldbelt, Inc. qualifies as a local resident under ANILCA section 1307 and is entitled to "local" preference.				

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): pg. 12 of 45 and 13 of 45. Goldbelt, Inc. applied for most directly affected Native corporation status.				
Comments: The application was evaluated in comparison with the single existing most directly affected Native corporation (Huna Totem) [note there can be more than one (equally affected) corporation]. Goldbelt was not deemed most directly affected Native corporation and therefore is not entitled to this preference.				

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	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Goldbelt, Inc does not provide currently cruise ship services.				
Comments: Goldbelt subsidiaries provide <i>tour vessel services</i> under permit in Glacier Bay [tour vessel is a smaller vessel category, under 100 US ton]				

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): The answer is no since they have no current entries.				
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?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): They operate in Icy Strait and Inside Passage and are holder of the Glacier Bay Lodge hotel operating contract. Offerors limited liability company Auk Nu Tours operates day cruises between Juneau and Gustavus. Pg. 15 of 46				
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): They offer there strategic plans (Appendix C-1 and C-2) in response to this question. See also the discussion on page 15 of 45.				
Comments: Good targeted answer.				

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): Seven people are identified from 17 – 23 of 46 as to their management background. More was evidently intended but page 16 of 45, referenced on page 14 of 45, is not in the package submitted.				
Comments:				

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): They operate the Glacier National Park Lodge under contract with the National Park Service.				
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?		Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 17 – 23 of 46 include seven of the forms on the principal people: CEO, CFO, VP Tourism, GBPC Pres. & CEO, VP Operations, VP Marketing, REGI Manger.				
Comments: Information not provided on vessel personnel [note: vessel note yet built]. In this case we would expect qualification standards for key positions.				

Cr. 1a Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: They already are in the tour vessel business through the contract NPS has with them. They clearly define all the entities involved and who owns what. There are two pages missing from the offer. The necessary information is included on other pages, however. [Note the missing pages were provided after the proposal submission date, but were not considered in this evaluation.]						

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?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 24 of 45.				
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): See pg. 24 of 45. They propose to build a ship. Schematics are at Appendix A. They propose a 150 passenger ship, 69 rooms, each at 175 sq. ft., diesel direct drive, U.S. crew. Pg. 24 of 45.				
Comments: Ship design appears to have included consideration for NPS interpretive program needs/requirements.				

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)?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Pg. 24 of 45, say 19 entries.				
Comments: They want 19 entries.				

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): pg. 25 of 45.				
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):				
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):				
Comments:				

Cr. 2a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: They propose to build a ship to use the requested 19 entries to provide the services required by the park. They have no builder or launch date. This is an ANCSA Urban Native corporation with ANILCA local operator status.						

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): (Appendix A) The boat they propose has on deck five a lounge and retail area that includes a naturalists station. On Deck 4 there is a separate library and interpretive center. They commit to all of the a – f items as a minimum. (pg. 27 of 45) They have a Legends and Landscapes program they are developing to relate Tlingit culture to the park. They will interrelate handcraft goods with their park interpretation. They are developing natural history materials about the park to go with the cultural history information. They are developing videos for sale and use in their interpretive efforts. They are producing a photo book with a local photographer. (27 of 45)				
Comments: Permanent Naturalist Station a plus. Good Cultural program.				

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): They own a native handcraft company, Raven Eagle, it fits with their corporate charter to employee Tlingit people to advance this goal. They have fine space designed prominently into their boat to do this.				
Comments: Goldbelt has a strong Native handcraft program through a subsidiary, REGI.				

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
Comments: Applicant Statements (reference page number): Having an actual interpretive center on the boat and a naturalist station and a separate library space are all clear and firm demonstrations of their goals.				

Cr. 2b. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The goals of this company and the dedication of prominent space on the boat to interpretation and education and their commitment to all of the park goals demonstrate an outstanding commitment to visitor services focused on the park's Glacier Bay mission. They have an outstanding Native handcraft program.						

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): Pg. 15 of 25, they agree.				
Comments:				

Cr. 3a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: They agree to pay the stipulated fee of \$5. Per passenger.						

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):Page 31 of 45				
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):Page 31 of 45				
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): Page 33 of 45				
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.	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 34 of 45				
Comments: Offeror checked yes on this question but didn't need to respond as they responded "yes" in question #2 above.				

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): Page 34-5 of 45 – mentions assuring programs with material for children, offers a shipboard library with VCR and a "Naturalist Station" for presenting programs.				
Comments: Response did not address the question to provide details on the above listed elements. Offeror mentions vague possibilities without substantial information to support these ideas.				

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): Page 35 of 45 and 27 of 45 – Offeror is developing a unique cultural history program, “Legends & Landscapes”.				
Comments: Offeror describes this program as unique and under development. The program will relate the natural wonders of Glacier Bay NP&P to the cultural history of the Tlingit people. If provided this innovative program could well enhance current interpretive programming. Information provided offers few details.				

Cr. 4b. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Not able to rate this criteria for lack of detail on additional elements that would exceed minimum interpretive programming.						

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
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Air Quality - Burns higher, more refined, low sulfur diesel fuel (pg.36) - Vessel design will effect fuel efficiency (pg.36) - Modern medium speed diesel engines (pg. 38) - Electronic ignition controls enhance fuel efficiency (pg. 38) “nearly zero” sulfur fuels (pg. 38) - Hull design will reduce fuel consumption (pg. 38) Underwater Noise - Hull design, controllable prop pitch and ability to optimize prop to vessel speed will lessen underwater noise due to less vibration (pg.36) - Hull design will reduce resistance, wavemaking, propulsion power (pg. 38) - Wake-adapted props designed for minimum cavitation and prop noise (tested on similar sized research vessels with stringent acoustic requirements) (pg. 38) - Prop will incorporate moderate skew and reduce pitch near blade tips (pg. 38) - Design features used in low acoustic signature research vessels will be employed including vibration isolating foundations, and mounting for engines and generators (pg. 38) Oil Spill - Member of SEAPRO (pg.36)				
Comments: Offeror did not include any document labeled specifically as “Pollution Minimization Plan.” Information above was gleaned from general responses to Criterion 5A and 5B. The information provided was general in nature (most likely because the vessel is still under design). The offeror indicated that the vessel would burn ‘near zero” sulfur fuel, but did not provide sulfur percentage so it is difficult to determine how effective this would be. The offeror indicated that the vessel was being designed incorporating features of a research vessel with a reduced sound signature; although details were not provided, such design could significantly reduce underwater noise. 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.				

Cr. 5a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Although the offeror did not provide detailed information on fuel types, engine types, etc. their application indicates that the vessel is being specifically designed to reduce environmental impacts (specifically stack emissions and underwater noise).						

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): • Zero discharge operation policy (all gray and black water retained while in NPS waters, no solids) (pg. 38) • Design steps will reduce emissions into water (closed heat exchanger engine cooling system, oil-free shaft seals, hard coat non-ablative bottom paints and four stroke outboards on excursion boats) (pg. 38) • Waste recycled and retained for shoreside recycling agents (pg. 38) • Non-recyclables compacted and stored (pg. 38) • Biodegradable waste processed and retained for shoreside disposal (pg. 39) • Littering deterred through education and policy, placement of trash receptacles and ashtrays in all outside areas (pg. 39) • Signs describing zero discharge policy (pg. 39) • Solid bulwarks on decks will prevent accidental loss overboard of light trash (pg. 39) • All public address systems will be internal (pg. 39) • All helicopter operations would be under guidelines of NPS (pg. 39)				
Comments: In addition to those points made in 5A that exceed strict requirements and laws, the offeror describes standard zero discharge and recycling policies. Bulwark design may reduce accidental littering.				

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): (pg. 39) • Normally collected data will be made available • Offeror will work with NPS to coordinate additional data gathering • Onboard space provided for data gathering				
Comments: Offeror appears willing to provide any existing data ("normally collected") as well as willingness to cooperate with NPS on additional data collection.				

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): see above				
Comments: Offeror does not describe the kinds of data "normally" collected or how/when this data would be made available to NPS, but indicates a willingness to cooperate with NPS on data collection.				

Cr. 5b. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Offeror describes standard policies for zero discharge and recycling. Wildlife protection mechanisms are not described. Offeror's willingness to cooperate with NPS in collecting baseline data (and providing space for this function aboard the vessel) indicate a general willingness to assist NPS in minimizing environmental impacts.						

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?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Applicant indicates on page 40 that they have had no reportable marine casualties.				
Comments: Applicant provides no information regarding operating histories/casualties for any of the 4 tour boats operated in Southeast Alaska, including, Wilderness Discover, Wilderness Adventure, Executive Explorer, and Spirit of Adventure. Applicant proposed to construct a new 285' vessel to operate in Glacier Bay NP under cruise ship concessions permit.				

1a. Were copies of the reports submitted?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): N/A				
Comments: Applicant did not provide any information regarding marine casualty histories of the 4 tour boats it does operate; no operating history exists for the vessel proposed for entry as it has yet to be constructed. The lack of information hindered analysis and evaluation of Goldbelt, Inc.'s operating history since entering the marine passenger tour business 2 years ago.				

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.

1b. Did a background check identify any additional casualties?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Applicant indicated no reportable marine casualties in responding to Question 6.A.1.				
Comments: The USCG Port State Information eXchange web site provided marine casualty information on the Spirit of Adventure and the Executive Explorer, two tour boats operated by the applicant. These marine casualty reports primarily describe equipment deficiencies and repairs, but also list a collision involving the day tour boat in the park (8/26/96, Spirit of Adventure), and a 6/4/97 grounding of the Executive Explorer.				

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): Applicant indicated no violations/citations in responding to Question 6.A.2 on page 42.				
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?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments: USCG records verified information provided by the applicant.				

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): Applicant indicated no violations/citations in responding to Question 6.A.3 on page 42.				
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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments: Subsidiary of Goldbelt, Inc, GBPCI was found to have an unsatisfactory USPHS report for the facilities operated under concession contract at Bartlett Cove (an <i>Unsatisfactory</i> for the Glacier Bay Lodge dining room in 1997).				

Cr. 6a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Applicant is considered successful in meeting this criterion. The applicant failed to report operating histories any vessel. USCG records list 2 reportable marine casualties for the applicant's 4 tour boats; neither of these casualties raises undue concerns about the applicant's ability to safely/responsibly operate passenger vessels. . There was nothing in the preliminary marine casualty information received from the USCG that would – in and of itself – prevent the applicant from successfully meeting this criterion. Rather, the lack of reporting forms the basis of this rating. A secondary deficiency is failure to provide information on public health scores for other subsidiary operations. This alone would not have made them not successful, since the facilities were of a somewhat different service.						

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?	☒ X	☐ Yes	☐	☐ No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Statements are at Appendix B and include audit reports.				
Comments:				

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): Applicant says that they have relationships with banks for competitive, long term financing and name two banks. They also say that they will sell \$20 million in private debt placement this year through S.P.P. Hambro as the agent. They expect 8.5%, fifteen year financing for the boat if the opportunity is awarded to them. (pg. 44 of 45)				
Comments: There is nothing from Hambro about the debt or from the two banks. The compelling evidence test is not meet.				

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): Other than six lines of text on page 44 of 45, there is no description.				
Comments: The cost of the boat and outfitting it and startup cost and marketing and the other things one would expect to have discussed are not in this offer. We do not know the degree of commitment by S.P.P. Hambro or even who they are and how successful with private debt placements.				

Cr. 7a. Summary		Superior		Successful	X	Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: They do not present any case that the needed funding is available or is supportable within any kind of income statement and balance sheet. Therefore, there is no assurance that even if they got the necessary entry authorizations that they could have the boat build as proposed, at a cost that is reasonable given the business opportunity, put it into service on time, and have a likelihood of operating it successfully.						

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

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

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):. On page 45 of 45 they offer \$10 per passenger in 2000, \$11 in 2001, \$12 in 2002, \$13 in 2003, and \$14 in 2004				
Comments: There is nothing in the financial information provided to suggest that the proposed fee would be inappropriate.				

Cr. 8b. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: \$10 per passenger in 2000, \$11 in 2001, \$12 in 2002, \$13 in 2003, and \$14 in 2004.						

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
Mary Beth Moss /s/ Mary Beth Moss	

End

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.