PANEL EVALUATION

A RFEI prospectus, inviting the public to submit proposals
Proposals were accepted from proposals were submitted timely to the National Park Service in response to the prospectus. Those proposals were received from:
1. XXXX 2. XXXX 3. XXXX 4. XXXX
The evaluation Panel consisted of federal employees from the National Park Service and member of the Fort Hancock Federal Advisory Committee. It convened, at the The following served as evaluation Panel members:
1. XXXX 2. XXXX 3. XXXX 4. XXXX
The evaluation Panel reviewed and evaluated the proposals received. A score for each evaluation criteria was assigned on the basis of the evaluation. A or cumulative point score for each proposal was given based on the assigned score for each selection factor.
Preference will be given on the basis of: - the quality of rehabilitation and reuse of existing structures, and maintenance of the cultural landscape, and - the degree to which visitor use, enjoyment, and education are enhanced

The Panel evaluation follows:

CRITERIA 1

The compatibility of the applicant's proposal with the site's National Register and Landmark designations. For concepts that involve multiple buildings or mixed use concepts, respondents should describe the framework that unites differing elements of the proposed uses. The NPS seeks to adaptively reuse the historic buildings in an economic, visual, and programmatically compatible and cohesive manner.

(Pass/Fail or 0-5 POINTS)

CRITERIA 1 Proposal Descriptions/Narrative Analysis						
	·					
Offeror	Comment	Page				
	CRITERIA 1 Panel Summary for each proposals response					
	CRITERIA 1 Comparative Analysis					
The Panel awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 1. The Panel awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 1. The Panel awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 1. The Panel awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 1.						

The adequacy of measures that will be taken will ensure the proposed activity will not result in unacceptable adverse environmental impact to the ecological or cultural resources of the Sandy Hook peninsula.

(Pass/Fail or 0-5 POINTS)

	CRITERIA 2 Proposal Descriptions/Narrative Analysis				
	ORTEMAL 2 1 Toposai Descriptions/ Ivairauve futalysis				
Offeror	Comment	Page			
	CRITERIA 2 Panel Summary for each proposals response				
	CRITERIA 2 Comparative Analysis				
	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 2.				
	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 2.				
	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 2.				
The Pane	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 2.				

The financial capability of the applicant to carry out the terms of the proposal and any corresponding lease, including the ability to finance building preservation and intended uses. Note, selected applicants will be expected to provide more detailed information about 1) financial resources, 2) investment/development track record, 3) demonstrated experience and ability in raising money from investors, and 4) experience in public private partnerships.

(Pass/Fail or 0-5 POINTS)

CRITERIA 3 Proposal Descriptions/Narrative Analysis					
Offeror	Comment	Page			
	CRITERIA 3 Panel Summary for each proposals response				
	CRITERIA 3 Comparative Analysis				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
TT D					
	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 3.				
	The Panel awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 3.				
	The Panel awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 3.				
The Pane	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 3.				

The demonstrated experience of the applicant and evidence of the applicant's managerial capability to carry out the terms of the proposed lease.

(Pass/Fail or 0-5 POINTS)

	CRITERIA 4 Proposal Descriptions/Narrative Anal	ysis	
Offeror	Comment	Page	
	CRITERIA 4 Panel Summary for each proposals response	onse	
	CRITERIA 4 Comparative Analysis		
The Pane	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 4.		
The Pane	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 4.		
The Pane	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 4.		
The Pane	l awarded a score of to XXXX for Criteria 4.		

The ability and commitment of the applicant to conduct its activities in the park in an environmentally enhancing manner through, among other programs and actions, energy conservation, waste reduction, and recycling.

(Pass/Fail or 0-5 POINTS)

Offeror Comment Page CRITERIA 5 -- Proposal Descriptions/Narrative Analysis CRITERIA 5 -- Page CRITERIA 5 -- Panel Summary for each proposals response

CRITERIA 5 Comparative Analysis				
The Panel awarded a score of	_ to XXXX for Criteria 5.			
The Panel awarded a score of	_ to XXXX for Criteria 5.			
The Panel awarded a score of	_ to XXXX for Criteria 5.			
The Panel awarded a score of	to XXXX for Criteria 5.			

The benefit to the NPS of the financial and other terms and conditions of the proposal, including, without limitation, the preservation of historic structures, and other favorable lease terms and conditions.

(Pass/Fail or 0-5 POINTS)

CRITERIA 6 -- Proposal Descriptions/Narrative Analysis Offeror Comment Page CRITERIA 6 -- Panel Summary for each proposals response CRITERIA 6 -- Comparative Analysis The Panel awarded a score of ___ to XXXX for Criteria 6. The Panel awarded a score of __ to XXXX for Criteria 6. The Panel awarded a score of __ to XXXX for Criteria 6. The Panel awarded a score of __ to XXXX for Criteria 6. The Panel awarded a score of __ to XXXX for Criteria 6.

CRITERIA 7

The compatibility of the proposal with the historic qualities of the building(s) to be utilized.

(Pass/Fail or 0-5 POINTS)

CRITERIA 7 -- Proposal Descriptions/Narrative Analysis

Offeror	Comment	Page

CRITERIA 7 -- Panel Summary for each proposals response

CRITERIA 7 -- Comparative Analysis

The Panel awarded a score of	to XXXX for Criteria 7.
The Panel awarded a score of	to XXXX for Criteria 7.
The Panel awarded a score of	to XXXX for Criteria 7.
The Panel awarded a score of	to XXXX for Criteria 7.

SUMMARY OF NUMERICAL SCORES

PROPOSAL	Criteria 1	Criteria 2	Criteria 3	Criteria 4	Criteria 5	Criteria 6	Criteria 7

PROPOSAL	Cumulative Score for All Selection Factors