

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:	World Explorer Cruises
Evaluator(s):	Stephen G. Crabtree, Concessions Team Leader, Western Region
	Randy King, Chief Ranger, Glacier Bay NPP
	Jerry Case, Chief of Interpretation, Glacier Bay National Park & 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): Certificate of Corporate Officer signed by same person as signed offer letter.				
Comments: Legality of Certificate of Corporate officer questionable.				

Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Offer submitted as required. Legality of Certificate of Corporate officer questionable.						
Clarification Information: A revised offer letter certified by KY Tang was submitted.						

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?		Yes	X	No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): Offeror is World Explorer Cruises a California corporation and is a wholly owned subsidiary of Hemisphere Cruises & Tours, Inc. which is a Liberian corporation. (Page 2, bottom numbers.) Hemisphere has 1060 share of stock outstanding. Of the two required identification forms required, one was provided that includes some of the information for both companies. We have address information for World Exploration but not for Hemisphere, for example.</p> <p>Clarification Information: Address as provided along with additional details regarding Hemisphere Cruises.</p>				
<p>Comments: There are no materials provided that explain the legal form and ownership of the entity as was asked in question 2. The formal structure is not explained as required in question 1. The relationship between the entities is not described other than that one is owned by the other. We do not know who owns the 1060 shares of stock outstanding in Hemisphere. For these reasons, we do not really know who owns this company and therefore who we are dealing with.</p> <p>Ownership of Hemisphere Cruises, a “Hong Kong interest”, is still a mystery.</p>				

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

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

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

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

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	X	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	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): See 1. Above.				
Comments: See 1. Above.				

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): Not a local resident., pg 3.				
Comments: Entity would not qualify for 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): Not Native corp., pg. 3.				
Comments: Entity would not qualify for 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): Pg 3: WEC provides cruise ship services under a concession permit with Glacier Bay NP.				
Comments: This company has 4 entries currently.				

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): Has 4 of 139 or <3%.				
Comments: WEC has less than 14% of available entries and would be favored in a tie-break.				

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): They say that they do not on pg 4.				
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	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): They say that they have 21 years of specific experience in this type of business. They say that they have met or exceeded visitor goals established by senior management.				
Comments: They do not give specific examples as requested. They do not detail their experience and skills as requested. There is no indication of what the "visitor goals" were.				

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): On page 4 they say "senior marketing and operations management" have 30 years combined general business management experience in the private sector and 20 years as a concessioner.				
Comments: This is a very weak answer since it gives no information about actual qualifications.				

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 say, "Yes, with the United States Forest Service."				
Comments: WEC provides the minimal information required. The answer does not identify the experience, it identifies who it is with or where.				

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	X	No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 5, enclosure 1 and page 6, enclosure 2: Only two employees are identified as within the frame of the question, K.Y. Tang who is President of World Exploration Cruises and Dennis Myrick, who is Vice President. The vice- president was many years with Continental airlines and then with American Hawaii Cruises and then with World Explore Cruises starting in 1984. The president has a broad experience in the shipping business with the Tung Group. No information on key ship-board personnel.</p> <p>Clarification Submittal: Information on key ship-board personnel provided.</p>				
<p>Comments: WEC provided information on two of those who will be actively involved with the management of this business but nothing on the key-shipboard personnel who will be operating in Glacier Bay. Information such as duties and responsibilities and role in the proposed business for the two resumes included was not clearly detailed.</p>				

1a. Summary		Superior		Successful	X	Not Successful
<p>Summary Comments on this Factor: Required information was not provided. There are no materials provided that explain the legal form and ownership of the entity as was asked in question 2. The formal structure is not explained as required in question 1. The relationship between the entities is not described other than that one is owned by the other. We do not know who owns the 1060 shares of stock outstanding in Hemisphere. For these reasons, we do not really know who owns this company and therefore who we are dealing with. Resumes not submitted for any ship-board personnel and some required information not included in the two resumes included.</p> <p>Clarification Submittal: Information of Hemisphere Cruises and key personnel provided.</p>						

CRITERION 1B. NONE.

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

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

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

1. Does the offeror agree to provide the required services under the conditions specified in the Permit?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 7, bottom numbers.				
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): Pages 7 and 8, bottom. numbers.				
Comments: Ship is now called SS Universe Explorer, is steam turbine driven, carries 800 max in 188 sq ft cabins. Crew is primarily (79%) Filipino.				

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): Page 8, bottom numbers,				
Comments:				

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

4. Did the offeror answer this question (enter number of entries under comments)?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 8				
Comments: Seven (7) entries wanted.				

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

<p>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:</p>	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 9.				
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.)

<p>6. Does the offeror intend to utilize all entries?</p>	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 9				
Comments:				

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

7. Does the offeror agree to notify the NPS of any unused entries ?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 9.				
Comments:				

2a. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: WEC met all requirements of this criteria.						

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
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number):</p> <p>Page 10-11, bottom numbers. 21 years in Alaska, dedicated educational at cultural experience, on-board experts give instruction/commentary, they do educational oriented cruising, say they are unique in that, use local experts as the trip progresses, Yakutat Tlingit Tribe used in 1998 for onboard narrative and story telling, 1999 ship calls at native community of Metlakatla, largest library afloat at 16,000 titles, hands on rotating collection in library from Sheldon Jackson Museum in Sitka. Elder-hostel of Alaska and National Geographic Alliance use their tours.</p> <p>On page 2 (bottom numbers) there is a statement about visitor preparation to Glacier Bay describing “hours of lectures on glaciation, ecosystems, and marine biology” designed to prepare the visitor for their visit. This is part of their on board experts program.</p>				
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Elsewhere in the offer it says that the library replaced the casino that used to be in the space. This particular company is evidently strongly into educational tourism with less attention to the purely recreational activities.</p>				

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
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number):</p> <p>They say (pg. 11, bottom numbers) that they are working to acquire gifts for sale that are American made and native Alaskan art and crafts. They need to find sources, will develop their program, expect significant resident and native Alaska art and craft by 1999, they will monitor to assure compliance.</p>				
<p>Comments:</p> <p>They do not have much of a program now but plan to. Not too clear as to the extent to the extent of the program planned – no gift shop size of target inventory list or type of good discussed.</p>				

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
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number):</p> <p>Page 11. They have no other activities on board from 6 AM to 3 PM except those things related to Glacier Bay. They point to Enclosure 4, their newspaper on board for the schedule. They have a video they show on the ship TV system.</p> <p>Number of wheelchair accessible cabins: 50 (of 365): 13%</p>				

Comments:
This ship relies on the NPS interpreters to provide information while in Glacier Bay. Very high percentage of wheel chair accessible cabins.

2b. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
<p>Summary Comments on this Factor: The existing program of educational orientation and highly qualified lecturers is outstanding. A large percentage of rooms are wheel chair accessible. WEC is participating with Yakutat Native program and makes calls at Native villages. Has agreement with Sheldon Jackson College for Native cultural program. Park focused program while in the park. Very large library (information on specific titles not provided).</p> <p>No evidence of programs related to protection of marine environment (ship-board recycling, waste reduction & management, etc.).</p>						

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

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

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

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

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

1. Does the offeror agree to pay the fees as shown?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 11 at bottom of page. Agrees to \$5. Fee.				
Comments:				

3A. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
<p>Summary Comments on this Factor: WEC agrees to minimum fee.</p>						

CRITERION 3B. NONE

CRITERION 4A. THE OFFEROR PROPOSES TO PROVIDE INTERPRETIVE SERVICES (EITHER THORUGH THE NPS INTERPRETIVE PROGRAM OR THORUGH AN APPROVED

**CONCESSIONER PROGRAM) WHICH MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
PROSPECTUS AND PERMIT.**

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

1. Does the offeror agree to provide an interpretive program meeting these minimum criteria?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application, page 12				
Comments:				

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

2. Will the offeror participate in the NPS Interpretive Program (including cost-recovery)?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Application, page 12				
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?

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

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 13				
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?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 13 – Offeror suggests an “optimal” itinerary that arrives between 0600 and 0700.				
Comments: The suggested arrival time is 1 hour earlier, but falls within the acceptable range. Also suggests two formal NPS presentations are needed and this is listed as an option in the prospectus.				

Additional Elements of the NPS Interpretive Program

The following items are elements of the NPS Interpretive Program which exceed the minimum requirements listed in 4A. If you indicated in 4A #2. (above) that you would participate in the NPS Interpretive program, you will be credited with providing these additional items. Applicants who will not be participating in the NPS Interpretive

Program would need to specifically address each item in order to receive consideration for exceeding minimum standards for that item.

- Provide interpreters with the opportunity to visit libraries, museums or institutions that have Alaska and Glacier Bay specific information or reference materials.
- Provide opportunity for interpreters to work with experts on interpretive program subjects such as communication and interpretive techniques.
- Offer mentoring program(s) for southeast Native individuals to introduce the field of interpretation and provide the passengers with cultural interpreters.
- Offer supplementary field trips both ashore and on the waters of Glacier Bay to provide interpreters with added personal experience to further enhance their programs.
- Provide the interpreters additional training and materials to develop more specialized and in-depth programs.
- Conduct focus groups and additional surveys to determine if passengers understand and appreciate the significance of Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve.

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

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

Additional Elements Not Included in the NPS Interpretive Program

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

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

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

5. Does the offeror propose to meet any or all of the elements shown above?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Page 15 and Enclosures 3-4 - offers youth activities, a video on “Glacier Bay” prior to entry and lecture series.				
Comments: Youth programs consist of Q&A with the NPS ranger and little else for the young traveler. A single video is shown and no mention of supplemental materials prior to entry. They do have an impressive list of expert lecturers in the natural/cultural history field. Statement is made that prior to arrival to GB the guests have received hours of lectures. No further details were provided.				

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): Page15-17 – No additional from #5 above.				
Amended Proposal: Offers to provide at least 331 specific books related to park values available to passengers. Offered to provide on-board lecturers to assist with NPS Interpretive program. Offered to provide an on-board youth program including park theme related activities. Offered to provide a in-room programming related to the natural and cultural history of Southeast Alaska.				
Comments: No additional from #5, above.				
Amended Proposal: The additional elements would result in an improved interpretive program. The additional information regarding the onboard library confirms that this offer is exceptional in this element.				

4B. Summary	X	Superior		Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: Only slightly superior from minimum interpretive programming. Expert lecturers in the natural/cultural field could provide quality interpretive programming to enhance the visitors experience but few details provided on how the program works or how the experts are used.						
Amended Proposal: The additional elements offered in the amended proposal meets the terms of the best initial offer and raises this category to clearly superior.						

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): Enclosure 5, Pgs. 6-12.				
Comments:				

1a. Was an adequate pollution minimization plan provided?	X	Yes		No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): Enclosure 5, Pgs. 6-12</p> <p>Air Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steam turbine engine • Main boilers fitted with modern combustion control equipment • New solid-state general regulator combustion control equipment fitted • Boiler exhaust gases monitored electronically and visually • Alarm systems on boilers when stack emissions smoke white or black • RMG35 380CST fuels used to reduce emissions (sulfur content 1.95%) Enclosure 5) • Preventative Maintenance Program ensure proper combustion • Operational: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operate at constant RPM • Reduce use of bow and stern thrusters • Limit to 2 of 3 boilers in sensitive areas • Universe Explorer does not have incinerators • No emissions violations have occurred <p>Underwater Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steam turbine engine – inherently quieter than conventional diesel • Built in US to military standards – constructed to meet US requirements associated with Underwater Sound Signature Noise Levels for National Defense purposes. • PMS ensures proper maintenance of machinery • Operational: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operate at constant RPM in sensitive areas • Discontinue use of forward and after thrusters in sensitive areas • Limit to 2/3 of boilers in sensitive areas • Maintain constant slow speed of engines • Bolt Beranek and Newman 1982 study – steam turbine engine quieter than diesel (Application, pg. 16; Enclosure 7) <p>Oil Spill Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive contingency plans available onboard • Oil Spill Response Kit (Enclosure 5, pg. 10) • SOPEP manual <p>Verification Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued implementation of the Quality and Safety Management Systems ensures compliance (verification) of Explorer’s performance with respect to stack emissions, underwater noise, spill response. • Sighting o onboard documentation including log books, deck and engine logs, maintenance records, PMS records will verify compliance 				
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The offeror basis much of their pollution minimization strategies on the steam turbine engine system installed in the vessel. The only existing data available does reflect that this engine system is quieter underwater than other propulsion systems. There is no evidence presented that this system reduces stack emissions as the offeror claims. The fuel used by the vessel has a standard sulfur content. Operational measures described by the offeror to reduce emissions and underwater noise are standard and/or minimal. Oil response capabilities described are minimal. The offeror indicates that onboard documentation (log books, etc.) would verify compliance with pollution minimization strategies but does not explicitly state that these documents would be made available to NPS. NPS could request that such documentation be made available.</p>				

5A. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The offeror describes standard/minimal pollution minimization strategies and base much of their strategy on the steam turbine engines installed.						

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 ?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Not addressed in the application.				
Amended Proposal: Offers to provide enough sorbant boom to encircle each ship.				
Comments: The offeror did not describe any actions associated with discharge into park waters, wildlife protection, litter, shipboard noise or helicopters.				
Amended Proposal: Additional element meets the terms of the best initial 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): Application, pg. 17				
Amended Proposal: Offers to install stack emission monitors, match reading to location and provide data to the NPS. Offers to connect monitors to an engineering department alarm system. Offers to install centrifical and gravity oil water separators. Offers to provide sound signature information.				
Comments: Amended Proposal: Amended elements meet the terms of the best initial offer.				

1a. If yes, did the offeror describe the nature and format of the data, procedures for data submission and constraints, if any, for data use or distribution?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments: The offeror provided no information on what kind of baseline information would be provided.				

5B. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: The offeror did not address additional strategies aimed at reducing environmental impacts. The offeror indicated willingness to provide baseline data, but did not describe what kind of data would be provided.						
Amended Proposal: The additional elements offered raise the rating in this factor to superior and meet the terms of the best initial offer.						

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

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

- 1. Has the offeror had any reportable marine casualties (as defined by USCG regulations), including but not limited to grounding, loss of primary propulsion, collision, flooding, capsizing, fire,**

explosion, loss of life or reportable injury for the period beginning three years prior to the date this prospectus was issued through the present¹? *If yes, submit a copy of the official report (U.S. Coast Guard or other), except for injuries (submit a brief summary, including reason for each injury).*

1. Has the offeror had any reportable marine casualties?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): The applicant indicated reportable marine casualty incident(s) in responding to Question 6.A1 on page 18 and referred the reader to see Enclosure 7.				
Comments: One marine casualty incident reported in Enclosure 7.				

1a. Were copies of the reports submitted?	X	Yes		No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): Enclosure 7 comprises a Panamanian accident report that briefly describes a marine casualty incident involving an onboard fire in which 5 crewmembers died near Juneau on July 27, 1996.				
Comments: World Explorer provided a Panamanian report form summarizing the incident; no information was provided to describe enforcement or other actions by USCG or other regulators as result of this serious incident, or actions taken by the company to prevent similar incidents. USCG has not released its report/findings on the incident. However, the National Transportation Safety Board has. The NTSB report describes a fire in the main laundry room that killed 5 crewmembers and injured 55 crew members and 1 passenger before the fire was contained. The vessel was enroute from Juneau to Glacier Bay with 1,006 people aboard when the fire occurred. Sixty-nine persons were transported to area hospitals, with 13 admitted; damage to the vessel was estimated at \$1.5 million. NTSB determined "that the probable cause of this accident was lack of effective oversight by New Commodore Cruise Lines, Ltd., and the predecessor of V. Ships Marine, Ltd. (International Marine Carriers, Inc.), who allowed physical conditions and operating procedures to exist that compromised the fire safety of the Universe Explorer, ultimately resulting in crewmember deaths and injuries from a fire of undetermined origin in the vessel's laundry. Contributing to the loss of life and injuries was the lack of sprinkler systems, the lack of automatic local-sounding fire alarms, and the rapid spread of smoke through open doors into the crew berthing area." NTSB made a number of specific equipment/fire system and planning/response recommendations to the applicant as result of the fire.				

1b. Did a background check identify any additional casualties?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number):				
Comments: USCG confirmed no other reportable marine casualties.				

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.

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

2. Did the offeror report any such citations, notices of violation, etc.?		Yes	X	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): The applicant indicated no violations in responding to Question 6.A.2 on page 18.				
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 reported no violation notices or enforcement actions.				

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): The applicant indicated unsatisfactory food service ratings in responding to Question 6.A.3 on page 18 and provided a summary description of 2 unsatisfactory ratings.				
Comments: 2 public health scores below 85 reported in the preceding two years (out of 5 total inspection reports).				

3a. Were copies of the reports submitted?		Yes	X	No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number): The applicant describes the 2 unsatisfactory ratings, and subsequent corrective actions and satisfactory ratings, on pages 18 and 19. Copies of satisfactory ratings provided in Enclosure 8 and Enclosure 9. Applicant states that 1 of the unsatisfactory reports was not available; no explanation for the 2nd unsatisfactory report not being included.</p>				
<p>Comments: Applicant provided copies of 3 satisfactory inspection reports, but did not provide copies of the 2 unsatisfactory inspection reports. Enclosure 10 is the applicant's corrective action response letter for 12/13/97 unsatisfactory report (score of 80). Corrective actions were apparently taken by applicant to correct deficiencies, as reflected by subsequent satisfactory inspection reports, the most recent being 6/20/98.</p>				

3b. Did a background check identify any additional unsatisfactory reports?		Yes	X	No
<p>Applicant Statements (reference page number):</p>				
<p>Comments: No additional unsatisfactory reports were identified from CDC records.</p>				

6A. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
<p>Summary Comments on this Factor: The applicant described a very serious marine casualty incident (classified as a major marine casualty by USCG) involving an onboard fire on the Universe Explorer that killed 5 crewmembers and injured 56 other in July 1996 while the vessel was travelling from Juneau to Glacier Bay. USCG and NTSB investigated the fire casualty; NTSB identified a number of actions to correct fire safety and response deficiencies in its report. It is not clear what the applicant has done to improve fire safety on the Universe Explorer. It is difficult under any circumstances for NPS to evaluate current risks to passenger safety on large passenger vessels. The applicant reported no violations within the 3-year reporting period; WEC had unsatisfactory CDC reports but made appropriate effort to correct deficiencies. The applicant is considered successful in meeting this criterion.</p>						

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): 25 of 26, Funds needed to come from operations, have a 20 year successful history, Provide an unqualified opinion from their CPA with a financial statement ended December 97 at Enclosure 11.				
Comments: Company seems sound. Their auditor raises no issues.				

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): They have no specific needs for funds. They say that have been meeting any financial obligations to NPS since 1978.				
Comments: The company only needs to pay its routine operating costs. There seems quite sound enough to do that easily. No major financial changes are proposed .				

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 item 2.				
Comments: See 2 item 2.				

7A. Summary		Superior	X	Successful		Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: WEC appears to be an on-going cruise ship operator.						

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".	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No
Applicant Statements (reference page number): 26 of 26				
Comments: None				

8A. Summary	<input type="checkbox"/>	Superior	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Successful	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not Successful
Summary Comments on this Factor: A higher fee not offered. Under current 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