

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:	Holland America – Westours
Evaluator(s):	Stephen G. Crabtree, Concessions Team Leader, Western Region
	Mary Beth Moss, Chief of Resource Management, Glacier Bay NP&P
	Dave Nemeth, Chief of Concessions, Glacier Bay NP&P
	Jerry Case, Chief of Interpretation, Glacier Bay National Park & Preserve
	Randy King, Chief Ranger, 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): Holland America Line-Westours Inc. , Washington State corporation, 100% subsidiary of Holland America Line, Inc., Delaware; 100% subsidiary of HAL Buitenland B. V., A Dutch corporation; 100% subsidiary of HAL Antillen N.V., A Netherlands Antilles corporation; 100% subsidiary of Carnival Corporation, Miami, FL, publicly owned, traded on New York Stock Exchange, with a controlling interest (~47%) of stock owned by the Arison family				

Comments: Carnival owns Holland America Line and the Arison family has a controlling interest.

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): A complete response is at pg. 1 of 50. Various audited financial statements are provided as well as certificates of good standing. Also see 1. Above.				
Comments: See 1.,above				

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 1.,above.				
Comments: See 1.,above				

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., above.				
Comments: See 1.,above				

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?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See form I –IV at 3-6 of 50. Describe Expected Role section shows roles, operating company, boat manager, boat owner, etc..				
Comments: Very clear presentation.				

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	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Answer is no.(pg. 7 of 50)				
Comments: HALW would not have "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?	☒	Yes	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Answer is no. (pg. 7 of 50)				
Comments: HALW would not have " most directly affected Native corporation " 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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Answer is yes.				
Comments: Holland America – Westours has 39 historic entries.				

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): Answer is yes. They provide at pages 8 and 9 of 50 an explanation that says that they provide a great variety of trips, provide more inexpensive trips, are working to attract more young people, and have passengers that visit more park areas within the variety of trips they offer. They also say they are limiting the size of the ships rather than going with the mega ship direction being taken by other lines.				
Comments: They have 39 of the 139 or 28%.				

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): At 10 of 50 they point out that HALW worked with 434 business partners and had an economic impact of \$221 million in Southeast Alaska in 1997. They have extensive motor coach tour operations, they own the Westmark Baranof Hotel, the Westmark in Skagway, the Westmark Cape Fox in cooperation with the Cape Fox Native Corp. and the Westmark Shee Atika with the Shee Atika Native Corp. They have railcar service to Mt. McKinley NP &P and are very much involved with tourism at Kenai Fjords, Klonduck Gold Rush, Sitka, Wrangell and other areas.				
Comments: This company is a major player in tourism in Alaska and in other places. Much of what they do is connected to National Park visitation.				

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): They are the "largest and most experienced" operator in Alaska. Pg. 11 of 50. They go to 250 ports and cruise areas and virtually world wide. Best Value Cruise Award from Ocean and Cruise News seven years running. On 11 of 50 the write up goes on to recap the substantial diversity of the business conducted. They are active in support of activities that improve Alaska as a tourist venue and as a natural environment. (Pg. 11of 50)				

Comments:

This company is a substantial player in the cruise business and certainly has demonstrated experience in the cruise business and specifically in the Alaska cruise business. Their environmental stewardship programs appear to be a fine example of sound corporate citizenship.

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): The response on 12 of 50 tells us about HAL efforts to market Glacier Bay as a visitor destination. They have a strong commitment to the park and to its improvement.				
Comments: This answer does not focus directly on the question asked but this and the answer to 11 would not be possible without extremely able and adaptable long term management. That management is described at 15-20 of 50.				

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): Experiences with a variety of governmental agencies and regulatory bodies is shown at 13 of 50.				
Comments: This company is not new to legal and regulatory requirements.				

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): They provide background on 27 people who are involved with the Glacier Bay program. (Pgs. 15 – 20 of 50) : CEO, COO, VP Marine Ops, VP Marine Hotels, VP Govt. Relations, VP Passenger Prog., VP Legal, VP Marketing (2), VP Sales, VP AK Marketing, Dir. Nautical Ops, Dir Maritime Affairs, Dir Policy, Dir Marine Hotel, Dir Hotel Ops, Dir Port Ops, Chief Env. Prog, Mgr. Maritime Affairs, Captains (5), Chief Officers (3).				

Comments:
Clearly highly qualified and experienced people run this company.

Cr. 1a Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: There is no Superior level for this Criterion. But, if there were this company would have to be so rated.						

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): So stated on page 23 of 50.				
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): They name three ships, the M.S. Statendam, Maasdam, and Ryndam. All ships were new in 1992/93, are diesel electric powered, carry 1629 people max., in 633 198 square foot cabins. Crew is primarily Indonesian and Filipino. Officers are Dutch. (Pg. 23 of 50)				
Comments: Proposed ships are described as "S" class but this is not defined.				

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): Stated on page 24 of 50.				
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): They request 40 entries on page 24 of 50.				
Comments: They want 40 entries, out of the 68 available. [Note this would be in addition to the 39 entries HALW has historical operator rights to non-competitively renew.]				

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): they say all categories on page 24 of 50.				
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): See Application page 25 of 50				
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): See Application page 25 of 50				
Comments:				

Cr. 2a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: They have the needed ships already and apply for 40 new entries.						

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:

- Offer Native Alaskan art and handcrafts prominently in shipboard gift shops.
- Provide an expanded library of resource materials on Glacier Bay, Alaska, Native Culture including standard references, books, periodicals, videos, maps, etc.
- 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):				
HALW responds in a combined way to questions 1, 2, and 3 at question 3. 1. They are developing with the <i>Alaska Native Heritage Center</i> a Native Alaskan Artist-in-residence program for "for introduction on newly permitted "S Class" ships in 2000." 2. They have an art auction program with an "exclusive support arrangement with the new <i>Alaska Native Heritage Center</i> through which HALW will be provided with a consistent offering of art and handcraft starting 1999." 3. They will continue their on-board naturalist program which includes a lecture prior to Glacier Bay. 4. They will send their naturalists to our training (See Criterion 4A) 5. As part of newly granted permits they will have an exclusive arrangement with the Hoonah Tlingits to have interpreters on board and will develop with NPS a linked interpretive program. 6. Will have two copies each of at least 33 books, 7 videos in the library of each ship about Glacier Bay. See library list at tab 6 as well as the daily schedule at Tab 7. 7. They have a Club HAL youth program and wold like to strengthen it with Junior Ranger content with our help. 8. They offer handcrafts in the gift shops as well as kids oriented toys about Alaska animals.				
Comments: This is a very strong program and has several new initiatives for improvement both in the native craft area and in adult and children's interpretation. Significant proposals are offered in each area listed. Specific details lacking regarding relative amount of Native art and handcraft to be offered through auctions or in shops.				

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):				
For native handcraft they have an exclusive support agreement with the <i>Alaska Native Heritage Center</i> through which they will have a constant supply of art and handcraft beginning in 1999. This should stimulate the supply of such items (see 1. above).				
Comments: This seems to be a significant and positive proposed program. Specific details lacking regarding relative amount of Native art and handcraft to be offered through auctions or in shops.				

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): 1. They propose to develop with the park a Glacier Bay web site. See 26-28 of 50 for a complete presentation for questions 1, 2, and 3.				
Comments: Internet web site assistance is an innovative and creative proposal. A web site exists for the park, but park management has acknowledged that improvements are needed. HALW support could offer a significant improvement in making park information resources available off-site.				

Cr. 2b. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The initiative with the <i>Alaska Native Heritage Center</i> to supply handcrafts and the comprehensive nature of their overall presentation are really very good (but see comments in 2, above). The children's program is well developed. Reference materials to be available on board are appropriately detailed (with number of copies specified). [Note: following consultation with NPS Solicitor Chris Bockmon, it was determined that the offer of web site assistance was not within the scope of this offering and this element has not been considered in ranking this offer.]						

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): They agree to the \$5 per passenger fee.				
Comments: They agree to the \$5 fee.				

Cr. 3a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: They agree to the \$5 per person minimum.						

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 50				
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 50				
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 50				
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): Not Applicable.				
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	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Not proposed.				
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): Not applicable				
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): Pages 33-35 of 50 and Exhibits 5-10 1. Children's program, "Club HAL" developed to give kids an understanding and appreciation for Glacier Bay. Provides a variety of theme-related programs and activities, for younger visitors, kids and teens. Exhibit 8 describes the many programs/activities available. 2. Passengers and crew have the opportunity to learn about GB through a dedicated Alaska TV channel and video library with over a dozen selections on theme related topics (Exhibit 6). 3. Supplemental material (on-board newsletter article, Environmental Awareness flyer, daily quiz on GB) are provided to passengers and crew upon arrival at the park (Exhibits 7,9,10). 4. Exclusive agreement with Hoonah Tlingits to present the Alaska Native perspective on-board, development of Native Artist n Residence program, and "On Board Naturalist" program to educate passengers through lecture programs, ship commentary, and roving interpretation about natural/cultural history. (Page 34 of 50 and Exhibit 5)				
Comments: Description of programs, schedules, responsibilities, program objectives and many more details show much thought and effort has gone into this proposal. A sincere effort has been made to involve the younger passenger in as many park theme activities as available for adults. Exhibit 8: "Club Hal" activities for kids (ages 5-12) and teens (ages 13-17) are largely identical and do not appear to be geared towards teen level.				

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): Pages 35-37 of 50 – 1. Offeror proposes an exclusive relationship with the Hoonah Tlingits to sponsor Tlingit interpreters on Glacier Bay ships to supplement NPS program. 2. Offeror proposes a second exclusive contract with the <i>Alaska Native Heritage Center</i> to provide a Native Alaskan Artist-in-Residence program on-board. Artist will share their skills and traditions with visitors. Offeror proposes to fund and provide resource personnel to develop a comprehensive Glacier Bay website.				
Comments: The proposals as presented appear possible and would significantly improve on-board interpretive programming. They are creative and provide additional depth in our programming. There are few details regarding the proposed Huna Tlingit cultural program. It has the potential for great merit, but it is difficult to gauge the program based on the information provided. The <i>Alaska Native Heritage Center</i> program appears to be a significant program proposal.				

Cr. 4b. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: All elements have been addressed at a level that would significantly expand upon the minimum interpretive level. The variety and depth of this proposal shows commitment to providing the best possible interpretive programming. Much thought and research has gone into developing these elements. The Huna Tlingit cultural program, <i>Alaska Native Heritage Center</i> program have potential for expanding the park's cultural program. The children's program is very well developed. A good basic list of reference materials for the library is provided along with specific statement that two copies of each item will be on every ship.						

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): (pg. 37) • PMP submitted in 1996 provided only a small part of the comprehensive HALW environmental protection program. • HALW submitted more complete description of overall program in 1998-99 season. • This application further supplements PMP for 2000 season				
Comments: A comprehensive plan was submitted which covers all required elements and adds a number of additional potentially significant elements (see below).				

1a. Was an adequate pollution minimization plan provided?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): (pg. 38 of application and PMP) Safety Management System addresses environmental issues (pg. 37, application) Air Quality (PMP, pgs. 7-10) - Fuel type – meet ISO 8217 standards, low sulfur - For S Class ships – diesel electric engines allow constant RPMs - Engine Operating Procedures - Engine should be operated near optimum load, load kept steady (80% load capacity) - Maintain steady speeds - Make RPM and pitch changes slowly and smoothly - Avoid shifting generators - Emissions Monitoring - Opacity meters and closed circuit TV systems installed, monitored frequently (every 15 min.) - Bridge personnel check stack emissions visually (every 15 min.) - Each S Class ship has 2 opacity recorders - Annotated paper tape in opacity meter to allow later coordination with navigation info. - Opacity alarms set for not more than 15% opacity - Chief Engineer will review opacity records weekly - Maintenance - Engines and boilers tuned for minimal emissions enroute to Alaska - Opacity meters and other monitoring equipment cleaned and calibrated enroute to Alaska - Function of meters checked weekly - Incinerators not used in Glacier Bay Underwater Noise (PMP, pg. 17) - Operate at reasonably constant RPM and pitch settings - Minimize speed - Minimize total number of machinery in operation - Minimize use of thrusters - Newer S Class ships (Statendam, Maasdam, Ryndam, Veendam) have resilient mount engines and diesel electric engines, isolation mounting of pipes, sophisticated controls allow precise slow changes - Engaged a specialist to gather baseline data (sound signature) and make recommendations Oil Spill Response (PMP, pgs. 12-16) - SOPEP onboard each ship - Ship Operations 95% of deck officers had Bridge Resource Management Training - Actively encouraging all Alaska/BC pilots to take Bridge Training - Onboard Response Capability - Enough sorbent boom to encircle ship, variety of sorbent pads - Instruction provided in how to use equipment, training required - Training, Drills, Etc. 1996 exercise conducted in Alaska with HAL - Oil and chemical spill exercises held quarterly aboard each ship - Audits/Inspections - Weekly inspection conducted on each ship - Annual audit by company - Annual audit by outside environmental specialist				
Comments: The offeror provides information on numerous technological, operational and monitoring strategies incorporated/used to minimize air pollution. These actions would likely reduce stack emissions. The offeror does not commit to specific strategies to minimize underwater noise, but instead describes operational strategies which				

“could” be used or would be “minimally” used (i.e., use of bow thrusters will be minimized).

Importantly, the offeror agrees to contract with an acoustical expert to gather baseline data on S Class vessel underwater noise. The offeror does not, however, commit to incorporating recommendations provided by this expert.

The offeror offers excellent means by which oil spill response capabilities could be improved including equipping each vessel with short-term response equipment/supplies, appropriate training, and offsite equipment placement.

Cr. 5a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The application includes numerous strategies/actions/operating conditions/monitoring methods by which air, noise and water pollution could be minimized in Glacier Bay. The offerer's actions exceed that required by law and regulation.						

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): - Seagoing Environmental Awareness Programs (Exhibit 9) - Passenger elements include: flyer about Alaska environmental concerns, video on Alaska environmental issues, card with Code of Environmental Ethics with room keys) - Crew elements include: special training enroute to Alaska, video tape, flyer, card as above) - Aggressive approach to minimizing use of packaging including bulk dispensers - Paper straws, wooden stirrers, etc. substitute for plastic - Recycle program - Computerized hazardous waste management program - Infectious waste separated and stored for disposals - Processed oil separated from bilge water, used cooking oil burned as fuel - Use recycled packaging, paper when possible - Daily programs include environmental notice advising passengers of strategies - Zero Discharge Policy (PMP, pg. 2) MARPOL standards No black or gray water discharge in Glacier Bay - No disposable serviceware on deck in Park - No smoking by crew on open decks - Helicopters not used without prior agreement with Supt. - Bridge watch for seals and whales; exceed minimum recommended distance guidelines - Litter patrol maintained on each outside deck - Outside games (ping pong, etc.) stowed away - Oily water separators not operated in park - PA systems limited to use by Park rangers - Passengers advised about littering in daily program and signage - Signs re: littering in crew areas (English and appropriate foreign languages) - No feeding wildlife – cabin flyers, Alaska Code of Environmental Ethics, signage, on board announcement, Daily Program, videos. - Equipment and personnel needed to respond to spill provided during cruise ship season if 20 permits granted including: 34 ft. aluminum spill response vessel w/ twin outboards - RBS-6D Rotating brush skimmer system with extra disc cassette for light oil recovery - FL-5 (1320 gal.) surface response bags 2,000 ft boom, tow bridles, anchoring, accessories - training (in selection, use of equipment as well as Hazwop) 2 full-time staff during cruise ship season to maintain equipment, conduct drills, activate equipment Oil spill response training programs for local residents and Park personnel Provide expert assistance to prepare full response plans including risk assessment, definition of resources to be protected, actions required				

Comments:

In addition to those points made in 5A that far exceed the requirements and laws, the offeror describes numerous strategies for reducing litter, wildlife disturbance, water pollution and excessive waste.

Note: HALW offer of a 34 ft. spill response vessel and associated equipment and personnel "if granted at least 20 new permits" was not considered in ranking this offer, following consultation with NPS Solicitor, Chris Bockmon, due to the conditional nature of the offer coupled with the lack of specifics as to the type of service that would be provided make it incomplete as to that portion. As a result, an incumbent cannot be provided an opportunity to match that portion of the offer.

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): See Application page 44 of 50				
Comments:				

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
Applicant Statements (reference page number): (Application, pgs. 44-45)				
Class S ships – 2 opacity meters and recorders for main engine exhaust and boiler/incinerator emissions. Matched with GPS position and provided to NPS				
Sound Signatures: Task 1: Conduct radiated noise signature of vessel and perform on board vibration test Task 2: Identify radiating sources and paths of transmission Task 3: Compare data with info obtained from prior naval studies and studies regarding whales				
Comments: The baseline data the offeror proposes to supply the NPS would be invaluable in assessing and mitigating both air and noise pollution.				

Cr. 5b. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The offeror's proposal goes far beyond that required by law or regulation. If the actions described were appropriately implemented (including suggestions described in comments above), environmental impacts would be substantially reduced.						
The most significant additional elements are zero discharge in the park, strong crew and passenger environmental program, offers to provide stack emission opacity data and provide sound signature data for of a typical company vessel.						

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	☐	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): The applicant responded affirmatively to Question 6.A.1 on page 45. A summary was provided on pages 45-46 describing an emergency generator failure on the ms Statendam in October, 1996. The applicant indicated that USCG did not require an official report for the incident, so none would be on file with that agency. This was the only reportable marine casualty incident that the applicant identified from its records on the 3 vessels proposed for operation within the park (ms Statendam, ms Maasdam and ms Ryndam).				
Comments:				

1a. Were copies of the reports submitted?	☐	Yes	☒	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Applicant indicated on page 45 that a USCG report was not required or completed for the reported marine casualty described above. A summary of the incident was provided by the applicant on pages 45-46 that adequately described the reported casualty.				
Comments:				
Analysis:				

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 that a check of their records on the 3 proposed vessels found only 1 reportable marine casualty incident (as defined by USCG).				
Comments: A check of USCG records through the USCG's Port State Information eXchange web site revealed 1 additional marine casualty incident for the ms Ryndam. This incident, MC96005708, occurred on 4/14/96 and is described by the USCG as a personal casualty. More detailed information about the incident is not provided by the USCG in this format, however, personal casualty reports are used to describe injuries to passengers or crew.				

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.?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): On page 46, the applicant responded affirmatively to Question 6.A.2 and describes two violations involving the 3 vessels proposed for entry in the park. One violation involved the ms Ryndam on 1/1/97, for anchoring in a prohibited area in the Virgin Islands. HALW paid a \$50 fine and voluntarily contributed \$14K to repair 4 sq./meters of damaged reef. The second violation involved the ms Statendam on 3/29/98, for spilling oil in San Pedro, CA while discharging ballast during bunkering. Spill was caused by oil leaking through a defective bulkhead and into the ballast tank. HALW reports a quick company response/repairs; \$20K paid to California for resources damage (not a fine), and an \$800 USCG fine under the Clean Water Act.				
The applicant explains in the footnote, bottom of page 46: "HALW has previously informed the Park Service that one of its affiliates (not HALW) will enter a guilty plea involving the activities of the former SS Rotterdam in 1994. Information on this matter has been omitted from this Application because the plea does not relate the Statendam, Maasdam or Ryndam, nor is it being made by HALW. The same affiliate has also entered into a Compliance Agreement with the Environmental Protection Agency, acting on behalf of itself and the Department of Interior, pursuant to which neither HALW's existing Concession Permit, nor any subsequent Concession Permit, will be impacted by these events. HALW will provide additional information on these matters upon request."				
Comments: The plea agreement involving the SS Rotterdam is between HAL Beheer BV and the U. S Attorney and was signed on June 18, 1998. Under The Agreement section of the plea agreement, section B.1 states "that nothing contained in this Plea Agreement is meant to limit the rights and authority of the United States to take further civil or administrative action against the defendant." At time of this evaluation, NPS does not have a copy of the Compliance Agreement with EPA that HALW references in the above paragraph. It is not clear to what degree either the Plea Agreement, or the mentioned Compliance Agreement, preclude NPS from considering violations involving the SS Rotterdam as part of an overall evaluation of the applicant's operating history.				

2a. Were copies of the reports submitted?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Applicant summarized violations involving the ms Ryndam and ms Statendam on page 46, and provided copies of the citations/notices under Exhibit 11.				

Comments:

2b. Did a background check identify any additional violations?

X

Yes

No

Applicant Statements (reference page number): See above.

Comments: USCG records checks provided information on two other violations by Holland American ships, not reported above. These include a \$250 fine for an oil spill involving the Statendam on June 30, 1998 in Juneau. This violation occurred following the applicant's submittal and could not have been reported. A second violation involved a \$250 fine for an oil spill involving the Rotterdam on May 27, 1995. This ship is not proposed for entry and has been sold by the company.

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 report any unsatisfactory food service sanitation inspection reports?

X

Yes

No

Applicant Statements (reference page number): On page 47, the applicant responded affirmatively to Question 6.A.3 and provided a summary description of two 1997 food service inspection ratings. These involved the Maasdam and Statendam. The summaries indicate that the deficiencies were timely corrected and subsequent food service inspection ratings were high for each ship.

Comments:

3a. Were copies of the reports submitted?

X

Yes

No

Applicant Statements (reference page number): Applicant, on page 47, refers reader to Exhibit 12 for copies of the reports.

Comments:

3b. Did a background check identify any additional unsatisfactory reports?

Yes

X

No

Applicant Statements (reference page number):

Comments: Verification checks with U. S. Public Health Service confirmed applicant's information.

Cr. 6a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Applicant was forthcoming in providing information on the 3 ships proposed for entry into the park – Statendam, Maasdam and Ryndam. All 3 of these vessels have been operating long enough to develop operating histories that can be fairly evaluated. Information was not provided on other company ships, several of which have long histories of operation within the park. Question remains to what degree the recent Plea Agreement involving the SS Rotterdam can or should be considered in developing this summary rating. The applicant described 1 marine casualty (equipment failure), 2 violations, and 2 unsatisfactory food service ratings in total for the 3 proposed ships; another marine personal casualty incident involving the Ryndam was not reported. The applicant was proactive and responsive following each of these incidents/events, including two instances of laudable, voluntary environmental remediation efforts at company expense. 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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See Tabs IV and V.				
Comments: No new ships are proposed to be built. Consolidated financial statements are provided for Holland America Line –Westour, Inc. and its parent company HAL Antillen N.V.				

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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): No new ships are to be financed. There are no mortgages on the existing ships. They have minimal long term debt. Operating funds are in the current financial statements. (Pg 49 of 50)				
Comments: Information provided as required.				

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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See 49 of 50: Offeror emphasizes lack of debt and strength in any economic down turn.				
Comments: Information provided as required.				

Cr. 7a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Company seems financially sound enough to carry out our interests including the permits requested.						

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 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.

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".		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): They do not offer a fee above the basic \$5.				
Comments: Higher fee not offered. Under existing law a higher fee would not be accepted.				

Cr. 8b. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Higher fee not offered. Under existing law a higher fee would not be accepted.						

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