Caneel Bay Request for Proposals (RFP) Questions & Answers

All questions received by June 11, 2026

Executive Summary

Prospective offerors submitted an extensive set of inquiries (359 individual questions) reflecting the complexity, sensitivity, and uncertainties associated with redeveloping the former Caneel Bay Resort within the Virgin Islands National Park (VIIS or Park). The questions collectively highlight the need for greater clarity around environmental conditions, historic preservation requirements, financial terms, and operational constraints, as well as the interplay between federal and territorial regulatory frameworks.

This document organizes the Caneel Bay Request For Proposals (RFP) questions into twelve categories and provides answers to all questions received by June 11, 2026. The questions are numbered based on the order in which they were received, and the related answers address issues including environmental liabilities, cultural resource preservation, architectural design requirements, public access, infrastructure, permitting pathways, lease terms, operational constraints, submission logistics, local workforce participation, transportation systems, and safety and emergency preparedness.

Environmental Permitting & Remediation

- Question 70: Will the NPS make available existing as-built drawings, historic construction documents, prior engineering studies, the complete EE/CA and Environmental Site Assessment reports, and the GPS tree-species mapping referenced in the RFP?
    - A. **The NPS has limited as-built documentation available for the area. The selected offeror may, at its own expense, contract on-site scanning and digitization of existing documents. All scanning, raw data collection, and resulting deliverables shall comply with NPS standards and requirements. All digital files produced and hard-copy documents under this effort shall remain the property of the Government. NPS will provide the selected offeror with copies of applicable and readily available digital files. Certain maps and drawings showing buildings and utility layouts from 1954 to 1997, which were provided to the NPS by the prior resort operator, are available at 2022 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis Addendum.**

The complete Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and EE/CA Addendum are available electronically at https://parkplanning.nps.gov/CaneelBayAssessment. Prior environmental assessments conducted by or on behalf of the NPS are included in the administrative record supporting the environmental cleanup, which is available at the Virgin Islands National Park Visitor Center located at 1300 Cruz Bay Creek, St. John, VI 00830 on Mondays through Thursdays from 8:15 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and Fridays from 8:15 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Existing tree species mapping data may be made available to the selected offeror upon request.

- Question 73: Given the Recognized Environmental Conditions identified in the ESA and EE/CA (including the stained soils and the Honeymoon Beach landfill), will the NPS remediate pre-existing contamination prior to lease execution, or will responsibility and cost fall to the lessee?

  A. The NPS implemented a CERCLA response action to address asbestos-containing debris at the Caneel Bay Resort in 2024. On-site work associated with the removal of asbestos containing debris began in January 2024 and concluded in April 2024. Approximately 58 tons of asbestos-containing debris were removed from three areas near Little Hawksnest, Scott Beach, and Turtle Point to address risks to human health and the environment.

  In 2025, the NPS began a second phase of cleanup, which includes removal of contaminated soil and sediment containing barium, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and pesticides, from the site's landscaping, maintenance and engineering area and associated drainage channel (Area 2). Approximately 570 tons of contaminated soil and sediment were removed from the site between July and September 2025. The NPS is moving forward with plans to complete additional removal of contaminated soil in Area 2, but it is currently unknown if this work will be completed prior to lease execution.

  NPS has not yet implemented a response action to address hazardous substance contamination in the unpermitted landfill near Honeymoon Beach (Area 3) but intends to do so. It is currently unknown whether this work will be completed prior to lease execution. Responsibility for pre-existing environmental conditions that have not yet been addressed will be resolved during the lease negotiation process. If offerors are interested in including plans to address Recognized Environmental Conditions in their proposals based on their knowledge and understanding of the market, the business opportunity, and experience in the redevelopment of resort properties, NPS is open to considering those plans.

- Question 74: How will the lease allocate pre-existing environmental liability, and will the NPS provide an environmental indemnity and/or confirm CERCLA bona fide prospective purchaser protections for the lessee?

    A. Hazardous substances located in on-site buildings, including but not limited to lead and asbestos, are not considered environmental conditions and are the responsibility of the lessee. Responsibility for pre-existing environmental conditions that have not yet been addressed will be resolved during the lease negotiation process. The NPS is open to considering all legally available options to ensure a clear and equitable agreement regarding potential cleanup obligations. However, the NPS cannot provide an environmental indemnity, as doing so would violate the Antideficiency Act, which prohibits the expenditure of funds in advance or in the absence of an appropriation from Congress for that purpose. Potential lessees may wish to seek legal counsel as to any liability protections they may qualify for under federal or territory laws and regulations. Prior to the lease execution date, the Selected Offeror will be given an opportunity to conduct environmental due diligence in accordance with the terms and conditions of a special use permit issued by the Park.

- Question 75: Is there a current estimate of remediation scope, cost, and schedule for the known conditions, and must any required removal action be completed before construction may begin?

    A. See response to Question 73 for information regarding removal actions that have already concluded. In addition to the work that has already been completed, NPS anticipates removing an additional 200+ bank cubic yards (BCY) of contaminated soil from Area 2. The cost and timing of the additional Area 2 removal work is yet to be determined. For information regarding NPS's initial cost estimate for the previously completed Area 2 removal work, please see Appendix D to the 2021 EE/CA Report, available at

    Caneel Bay EECA Report, FINAL, with Tables, Figures, and Appendices.

    The NPS is continuing to evaluate options to address hazardous substance contamination at the landfill located near Honeymoon Beach (Area 3), and the exact timing, scope, and cost of this work is subject to change. While specific details regarding construction timing will be discussed during lease negotiations, the NPS anticipates that construction outside of the landfill (Area 3) and the maintenance area (Area 2) may begin prior to completion of the CERCLA response actions in those areas.

- Question 76: During the site tour, reference was made to various ongoing or soon-to-be-incurred projects related to environmental clean-up (such as resolving the 100-plus drums containing primarily mineral oil located at the Maintenance Facility) and to structural mitigation (such as stabilization of the Sugar Mill Plantation buildings). Will the NPS provide a list of all Park open commitments — or those soon to be executed — related to the Caneel Bay site?

A. **See response to Questions 73 and 75. The NPS anticipates an additional contract will be solicited to complete the remaining soil removal in Area 2 and address the used oil drums, but the exact timing of that solicitation is yet to be determined.**

   In summer/fall 2026, the NPS's Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC) will be treating potential biological growth that poses a threat to the structural integrity of the Durloo Sugar Plantation ruins. The team will install structural support beams along the central wall of the structure. The HPTC team will reconstruct the three southernmost window openings on the project wall.

- Question 86: How many archaeological sites on the property have been determined to contain hazardous materials?

A. **Information regarding the presence of hazardous materials at the site is reflected in the EE/CA and EE/CA Addendum reports, which are available at https://parkplanning.nps.gov/CaneelBayAssessment. As noted in response to Question 89, cultural resource inventories are necessary for NPS to fully identify all of the cultural resources located within the lease boundary. No further information will be provided regarding cultural resources other than the summary of the Caneel Bay Historic District at this time.**

- Question 126: Lease Section 12(d) makes the Lessee responsible for abatement of Hazardous Materials in, on, or under the Premises as of the Commencement Date, which appears to conflict with LDDA Sections 2.3(a)(ii) and 7.3(a). Will NPS confirm in the final Lease that pre-existing and construction-discovered contamination remains NPS's responsibility, and will NPS provide CERCLA contribution protection or a bona fide prospective purchaser indemnity?

A. **As noted in the RFP, while the draft Lease and LDDA are provided as a starting point for negotiations between the NPS and the Selected Offeror, all terms of the final lease "are subject to negotiation and Agreement between the NPS and Selected Offeror, provided that they are consistent with the requirements of [the] RFP and comply with all applicable laws." The Selected Offeror will be given the opportunity, within a specified period of time, to negotiate the terms of the LDDA and subsequently a Lease, and any potential inconsistencies between the language in the Draft Lease and LDDA may be discussed and addressed during such negotiations. See the response to Question 74 for additional information.**

- Question 127: LDDA Section 2.3(a)(ii) commits NPS to complete the cleanup identified in the October 1, 2021 Action Memorandum. Is that obligation contingent on appropriations under Section 10.3, does it extend to the additional removal actions recommended in the 2022 EE/CA Addendum, and what is the current status, funding source, and pre-commencement completion timing of the Area 3 landfill remediation near Honeymoon Beach?

  A. **The Draft LDDA is not final and may be subject to further negotiation as described in the RFP. Any commitment by the NPS to complete CERCLA response actions that may be included in the final LDDA will be subject to the availability of appropriations. As noted in response to Question 73, the removal action recommended in the 2022 EE/CA Addendum (i.e., removal of asbestos-containing hurricane debris) was completed in 2024. The NPS is continuing to evaluate options to address hazardous substance contamination at the Area 3 landfill located near Honeymoon Beach, and the exact timing, scope, and cost of this work is subject to change.**

- Question 128: Will NPS make available to offerors the asbestos and mold survey data excluded from the structural assessment, the closure records for the 2025 soil and sediment removal, geotechnical and utility as-built records, a photographic and document set from the site, and the definitive list of reports comprising Exhibit H?

  A. **Since additional soil removal is required in Area 2, the NPS has not yet prepared a final Removal Action Completion Report (RACR). Once a final RACR for the Area 2 soil and sediment removal has been prepared, it may be made available upon request. NPS has not completed mold and asbestos surveys of the structures on-site. See the response to Question 70 for information regarding availability of other records and drawings.**

- Question 171: Who will bear the cost of pre-lease due diligence investigations (e.g., structural, environmental, geotechnical) conducted during the LDDA period?

  A. **All costs associated with pre-lease due diligence investigations shall be borne by the Selected Offeror.**

- Question 172: What is the current status of the recognized environmental conditions? Will NPS take responsibility for pre-existing contamination remediation costs, or will these be allocated to the Lessee?

  A. **See the responses to Questions 73-75, 126 and 127.**

- Question 177: The Structural Assessment (Exhibit I) explicitly excluded evaluation for asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, mold, and other environmental hazards, and the RFP includes a Lead-Based Paint Disclosure (Exhibit G). Has NPS commissioned a Phase I or Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the Leasehold Premises since the 2022 EECA Report? If so, will it be provided to Offerors? If not, will NPS permit the Selected Offeror pre-lease access to conduct Phase I/II ESA and environmental sampling as a condition precedent to Lease execution?

A. No additional Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) have been conducted or commissioned by NPS since the 2022 EE/CA Report. Prior to the lease execution date, the Selected Offeror will be given an opportunity to conduct environmental due diligence in accordance with the terms and conditions of a special use permit issued by the Park.

- Question 205: Provide all Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment reports conducted on the site, including any updates or supplemental investigations, particularly regarding soil, groundwater, and sediment contamination.

  A. Prior, available environmental assessments can be found here: ParkPlanning - Public Involvement for the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Site Assessment at Caneel Bay Resort.

- Question 206: Provide all surveys for hazardous building materials, including but not limited to asbestos-containing materials (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in building components, transformers, or other equipment and mold assessments within all existing structures on the site.

  A. Limited information regarding lead and asbestos in building components is included in the 2022 EE/CA Addendum report, which is publicly available at parkplanning.nps.gov/CaneelBayAssessment. Limited information regarding transformers is provided on page 16 of the 2021 EE/CA Report, available at Caneel Bay EECA Report, FINAL, with Tables, Figures, and Appendices.

- Question 208: Copies of all "No Further Action" letters, closure reports, or similar documentation from environmental regulatory agencies (federal, territorial, local) regarding any environmental contamination on the site.

  A. This information may be obtained from the issuing agency. Cleanup actions conducted by prior resort operators are summarized on page 16 of the 2021 EE/CA Report, available at Caneel Bay EECA Report, FINAL, with Tables, Figures, and Appendices.

- Question 209: Copies of all environmental permits, licenses, and approvals currently held for the site, along with all correspondence with environmental regulatory agencies (e.g., EPA, Virgin Islands Department of Planning and Natural Resources) regarding environmental conditions, violations, or compliance issues.

A. **This information may be obtained from the issuing agency. The NPS does not intend to make this information available at this time.**

- Question 210: Copies of all existing or proposed environmental remediation plans, brownfield assessments, risk assessments, and records of past remediation activities conducted on the site not included within the RFP.

  A. **Information regarding environmental cleanup activities conducted at the site, as well as CERCLA response actions that have been selected but not yet implemented, is available at https://parkplanning.nps.gov/CaneelBayAssessment**

  Additional supporting information including site risk assessments, environmental site assessments (sometimes referred to as brownfield assessments), and information about past investigation and cleanup activities is available at the same website listed above.

- Question 216: Please provide an update on the current status and expected completion date of the Non-Time Critical Removal Action (NTCRA) targeting a legacy unpermitted landfill and maintenance area.

  A. **See responses to Questions 73-75.**

- Question 239: Please provide a copy of the General Management Plan, Development Concept Plan and Environmental Assessment dated September 1983 and referred to in the recitals of the LDDA at Exhibit B.

  A. **The General Management Plan, Development Concept Plan and Environmental Assessment dated September 1983 is available at General Management Plan, Development Concept Plan, And Environmental Assessment.**

- Question 254: Provide records pertaining to underground storage tanks (USTs) and above-ground storage tanks (ASTs), including installation dates, contents, leak detection records, and decommissioning reports.

  A. **The information that was provided with the RFP, or that may be publicly available on the NPS PEPC website (NPS PEPC - Virgin Islands NP - All Docs and Projects), or in other locations, is all that the NPS is making available at this time. The NPS has no knowledge of any underground storage tanks located on the resort property. The NPS received the following information from the previous operator, which NPS has not independently verified:**

    - **One (1), 3,000-gallon aboveground storage tank that previously contained diesel fuel. Tank is owned by Puma (distributor/supplier company). Tank was emptied in the spring of 2024, however it may**

contain de minimis residual product. Puma is responsible for any tank closure procedures and to remove the tank along with any associated piping.

- **One (1), 4,000-gallon tank aboveground storage tank that previously contained gasoline. Tank is owned by Puma (distributor/supplier company). Tank was emptied in the spring of 2024, however it may contain de minimis residual product. Puma is responsible for any tank closure procedures and to remove the tank along with any associated piping**

- **One (1), 500-gallon aboveground storage tank that previously contained diesel fuel. Storage tank is owned by Puma (distributor/supplier company). Storage tank was emptied in the spring of 2024, however it may contain de minimis residual product. Puma is responsible for any tank closure procedures and to remove the tank along with any associated piping.**

- **One (1), 1,000-gallon aboveground storage tank that previously contained waste oil. Storage tank was emptied in the spring of 2024, however it may contain de minimis residual product.**

- Question 274: Notwithstanding the "as-is" condition of the Leasehold Premises, what are the specific legal parameters and limitations on the Lessee's liability for pre-existing environmental contamination that is not identified or fully characterized prior to lease execution?

  A. See responses to Questions 73-75, 126 and 127 for more information.

- Question 303: Even though investigations have been completed, there remains a risk that additional contamination could be discovered during demolition, utility work, excavation, or rebuilding. Who bears responsibility for unknown or newly discovered contamination?

  A. See responses to Questions 73-75, 126 and 127 for more information.

- Question 304: Will NPS provide liability protections for pre-existing environmental conditions?

  A. See responses to Questions 73-75, 126 and 127 for more information.

- Question 305: Is the lessee responsible for cleanup costs beyond currently identified conditions?

  A. See responses to Questions 73-75, 126 and 127 for more information.

- Question 306: Are there indemnification provisions protecting the operator from liability for environmental contamination related to past land uses?

  A. **See responses to Questions 73 and 126 for more information.**

- Question 307: What environmental baseline is being established by NPS for leased land, real property, and operations?

  A. **To the extent this question is requesting information regarding prior environmental investigations, the results of NPS's prior investigations regarding existing environmental conditions at the site are generally reflected in the EE/CA, EE/CA Addendum, Level I and II ESAs, and RSE. Prior to the lease execution date, the Selected Offeror will be given an opportunity to conduct environmental due diligence in accordance with the terms and conditions of a special use permit issued by the Park.**

- Question 308: Is there a plan to remove any hazardous material prior to the lease execution?

  A. **See responses to Questions 73-76.**

- Question 309: There is an onsite landfill. The landfill is known to have some hazardous waste and remediation is being considered by the US Parks Department. Will the landfill be available for disposal of debris or will the debris be required to be hauled off site for disposal?

  A. **Disposal of debris or other material in the existing, unpermitted landfill at the site is not permitted. All debris must be disposed off-site, in accordance with applicable law.**

- Question 314: Have the on-site transformers been serviced and inspected for the presence of PCB cooling oil?

  A. **The NPS has not performed any service or inspection on the on-site transformers. Please also see the response to Question 206.**

- Question 343: Will the National Parks Service reconsider paying for the remediation costs?

  A. **Responsibility for environmental remediation costs will be resolved during the lease negotiation process. See responses to Questions 73-75 for additional information.**

- Question 344: If remediation costs are not included, how do you recommend developers capture and price the scope of work and embedded risk without additional guidance and supporting data?

A. How to best capture and price these factors are business decisions that must ultimately be made by the offeror. However, bids may incorporate and reflect the costs of independent environmental due diligence and embedding contingencies or risk-sharing mechanisms in their pricing. They may also rely on environmental insurance and reserve structures to address uncertainties. To the extent this question is referring to structural remediation, such remediation costs within the footprint of the leased premises will be the responsibility of the lessee and should be factored into pricing and proposals as appropriate.

- Question 345: Will the National Parks Service provide a full environmental report so we better understand the environmental risks and associated timing of permits?

  A. Reports and information regarding prior environmental investigation and cleanup activities are available at https://parkplanning.nps.gov/CaneelBayAssessment.

- Question 359: How many fuel storage tanks are currently on-site? How many above ground? How many underground? What do they contain? What is their capacity When were they installed/built?

  A. See response to Question 254.

Historic Preservation & Archeology

- Question 4: Mention was made of an official Federal archeology assessment of the entire peninsula to begin shortly. Those results could severely limit any planned development. How will that impact this RFP process and evaluation of proposed development?

  A. The NPS recognizes the significant archeological and historical value of resources within the park, including sugar-plantation ruins and other cultural landscape features. The lessee will be expected to:
  - **Avoid disturbance to known archeological sites and ruins to the greatest extent practicable.**
  - **Coordinate with NPS on any ground-disturbing activities that could affect archeological resources, consistent with the stipulations of a Programmatic Agreement (PA).**

  The discovery and treatment of human burials will be governed by applicable federal law, including Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), where applicable, and NPS policy. Any known burial sites will be identified during the Section 106 consultation process outlined in the PA, and the lessee will be required to avoid disturbance to these areas.

The PA will identify the process for any post-review discovery. NPS will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and other federal cultural resource laws in the issuance of the lease.

- Question 9: What specific plans does the NPS have for the 1733 rebellion ruins?
  - **A. The NPS has no specific plans, but will ensure that all actions involving the historic ruins comply fully with applicable federal cultural resource laws and policies, and preservation work will be coordinated through the Caneel Bay lease process.**

- Question 10: Please verify that once the lease has been awarded, the lessee will have 100% responsibility for maintaining the ruins.
  - **A. The lessee will be responsible for preserving and maintaining the ruins in coordination with the NPS following federal cultural resource laws and policies.**

- Question 11: Please describe and provide all info for any nominations for historic status of any kind.
  - **A. The inventory and determination of eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) for cultural resources within the lease boundary is incomplete. The Caneel Bay Historic District is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Exhibit J provides a description of the historic district.**

- Question 26: While the RFP makes it clear that building on the current footprint of buildings that were part of the original resort is desired, it seems to leave open the possibility for building outside of that footprint if needed to provide for resiliency, to raise buildings out of the floodplain, etc. Would the NPS consider building up a story in height if that additional building will not disturb the view sheds of any other buildings?
  - **A. NPS provided initial visual structural assessments in Exhibit I, but additional deterioration has occurred and updated assessments may determine that several, if not all, structures are unsound. Offerors should document their preservation decision-making clearly and demonstrate that replacement is the result of a good-faith evaluation rather than a preference for new construction.**

    Where replacement is necessary, new or replacement buildings within the Historic District should follow the character-defining features of the Caneel Bay Historic District or employ compatible contemporary design that evokes the Mid-Century Modern character of the district while remaining clearly differentiated from historic fabric, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. NPS approval of any raised buildings would be subject to the impact that the proposed change in height would have on the overall defining characteristics of the property.

- Question 35: How will the National Park Service ensure that Virgin Islands historians, cultural practitioners, preservation professionals, and community members have meaningful opportunities to inform decisions regarding Caneel Bay's historic, archaeological, and cultural heritage resources?
  - **A. Prior to issuance of the new lease, a PA will be developed as part of NHPA compliance for this federal action. The development of the PA will provide an opportunity for those interested in cultural resources within the lease boundary to provide input.**

- Question 71: Will the NPS provide a definitive list and mapping of the buildings and features identified as contributing to the eligible Caneel Bay Resort Historic District?
  - **A. NPS completed draft documentation of the Caneel Bay Historic District in August 2012. Note that it predates the 2017 hurricanes and is no longer accurate regarding eligibility determination to the NRHP. The NPS will update the historic district's determination of eligibility to account for damage caused by the 2017 hurricanes and to assess whether contributing features retain sufficient integrity for listing on the NRHP. Exhibit J serves as a guideline for building and site character defining features recognizing that many of the Caneel Bay Historic District buildings and structures have been significantly damaged from the 2017 hurricanes and subsequent deterioration. Which buildings and structures that still contribute to the district's NRHP eligibility still needs to be determined. Once the Caneel Bay Historic District is updated the information will be shared with the selected offeror.**

- Question 79: Will the NPS lead, or require the lessee to lead, Section 106 consultation with the VI SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and what is the anticipated timeline?
  - **A. NPS is the lead federal agency for complying with the NHPA and other federal cultural resource laws. NHPA compliance will be completed prior to construction.**

- Question 82: What treatment approach does the NPS expect for contributing structures that are no longer structurally sound or sit in flood-prone areas — repair, rehabilitation, relocation, or replacement — and what is the standard for demonstrating conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards?
  - **A. NPS acknowledges that Section 110 inventories and updated determinations of eligibility will not be completed prior to the proposal due date. Offerors should factor this uncertainty into their proposals and clearly identify any contributing structures they believe are not feasibly preservable, supported by documented**

rationale. NPS provided initial visual structural assessments in Exhibit I, but additional deterioration has occurred and updated assessments may determine that several, if not all, structures are unsound. Offerors should document their preservation decision-making clearly and demonstrate that replacement is the result of a good-faith evaluation rather than a preference for new construction.

- Question 83: To what extent will the NPS permit relocation or elevation of historic structures for flood, surge, and sea-rise resilience, and what documentation supports such decisions?
  - **A. NPS does not anticipate the need to relocate or elevate eligible historic structures for flood surge, and sea-rise resilience; however, any such proposal would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the VISHPO and other consulting parties consistent with a PA. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance.**

- Question 84: What are the NPS's expectations for identification, protection, and interpretation of archaeological sites, ruins (including the sugar-plantation ruins), and any human burials, and is there an inadvertent-discovery protocol the lessee must follow?
  - **A. See response to Question 4.**

- Question 85: How many cultural resources of record are located on the property?
  - **A. Cultural resource inventories have not been completed so this information is not available at this time.**

- Question 87: Has a systematic survey of the approximately 150 acres ever been performed?
  - **A. No.**

- Question 88: Is an Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) permit required to perform due diligence studies (Phase I archaeological surveys) within the boundaries of the approximately 150-acre site?
  - **A. The NPS will be conducting the archeological surveys. We do not plan to issue an ARPA permit to our staff that meet the Secretary of the Interior Professional Qualification Standards.**

- Question 89: Is there any additional relevant information regarding cultural and archaeological resources on the property that the NPS can provide?

  A. **NPS acknowledges that cultural resource inventories within the lease boundary are not yet complete. As Section 110 inventories are finalized and additional information becomes available, it will be shared with the lessee. At this time, available information is limited to the Caneel Bay Historic District.**

- Question 90: The RFP's Overnight Guest Experience section calls for a guest experience that reflects The Resort's original mid-20th-century Modernist design, Criterion 7 requires compatibility with Laurance Rockefeller's original design intent, and Exhibit J enumerates specific character-defining features such as the wooden jalousie/louver-and-glass window system, floating exterior staircases, terrazzo flooring, decorative breeze-block masonry screens, flat roofs with deep overhangs, and poured-concrete construction. For new or replacement buildings that are not contributing resources, does the NPS expect the offeror to reproduce these specific character-defining features, or to design compatible contemporary structures that evoke the Mid-Century Modern character while remaining clearly differentiated from historic fabric in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards?

  A. **For new or replacement buildings that are not contributing resources located within the Caneel Bay Historic District the NPS would anticipate the offeror to follow these specific character-defining features, or to design compatible contemporary structures that evoke the Mid-Century Modern character while remaining clearly differentiated from historic fabric in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, including but not limited to Rehabilitation Standards 9 and 10.**

- Question 91: Exhibit J states, with respect to small-scale features such as pathway lighting, that modern replacements should perform the function of the historic feature using current technology without attempting to be an exact replica. Will the NPS confirm whether this "complement but do not duplicate" principle is intended to govern the design of replacement buildings and larger structures as well, and clarify how the evaluation panel will weigh literal mid-century reproduction against compatible-but-differentiated new design when scoring Criterion 7?

  A. **See response to Question 90.**

- Question 92: Will the NPS provide written design guidelines, or develop them with the Selected Offeror, that specify the governing Secretary of the Interior's Standards treatment approach (Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, or Reconstruction) and define the mid-century design parameters — including massing, rooflines, materials, fenestration, and the "natural tones" palette referenced in Exhibit J — against which the NPS will evaluate the architectural compatibility of both rehabilitated and newly constructed buildings?

A. **NPS provided Exhibit J for the Caneel Bay Historic District Description. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties is available online. Further the NPS provides technical preservation information and briefs at the following link [Technical Preservation Services Publications - Technical Preservation Services (U.S. National Park Service)].**

- Question 93: Of the character-defining features and treatments identified in Exhibit J, will the NPS identify which it considers essential to the integrity of the Historic District (and therefore expects to be retained, repaired, or replicated) versus those for which compatible substitution or contemporary reinterpretation is acceptable; and where a character-defining feature — such as flat roofs with deep overhangs, floating exterior staircases, jalousie window systems, or ground-level poured-concrete construction — cannot be retained while meeting current building-code, accessibility (ABA), wind, or flood-elevation requirements, how should offerors prioritize, and will the NPS treat such resilience- or code-driven deviations as consistent with Criterion 7?
  A. **NPS encourages offerors to incorporate as many character-defining features of the Historic District as possible while meeting any applicable code, safety, and resiliency requirements. Where strict compliance with a requirement makes retention of a specific character-defining feature infeasible, NPS will evaluate proposed deviations on a case-by-case basis through the Section 106 consultation process established under the PA.**

- Question 94: The RFP recognizes that some contributing buildings may require redesign or replacement when they are no longer structurally sound or sit in recurring flood-hazard areas, while also assigning offerors responsibility to independently determine building viability and noting that the Exhibit I structural assessment did not evaluate the condition of historic materials or whether character-defining elements remain intact. Before the proposal due date, will the NPS establish a process by which an offeror's determination that a contributing structure cannot feasibly be preserved — and must therefore be reconstructed or replaced — can be recognized or concurred in by the NPS, or must all such determinations await Section 106 consultation during the LDDA period?
  A. **Section 106 will not be completed prior to the proposal due date. As stated previously, NPS will develop a PA as part of the process of complying with the NHPA. NPS acknowledges that Section 110 inventories and updated determinations of eligibility will not be completed prior to the proposal due date. Offerors should factor this uncertainty into their proposals and clearly**

identify any contributing structures they believe are not feasibly preservable, supported by documented rationale.

- Question 95: Criterion 7 asks offerors to identify and mitigate adverse impacts to contributing elements of the Historic District, while the RFP simultaneously expresses a preference to preserve as many historic properties as feasible. Where extensive hurricane damage, structural failure, or flood exposure makes preservation infeasible for a significant number of contributing structures, will a redevelopment concept that necessarily replaces or reconstructs a larger number of those structures be scored less favorably under Criterion 7 than one that retains more structures — even where replacement is driven by life-safety or resilience — and how should an offeror demonstrate that such replacement remains consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards?

  A. **NPS recognizes that extensive hurricane damage, ongoing deterioration, and life-safety and resilience requirements may make preservation of a significant number of contributing structures infeasible. NPS provided initial visual structural assessments in Exhibit I, but additional deterioration has occurred and updated assessments may determine that several, if not all, structures are unsound. Offerors should document their preservation decision-making clearly and demonstrate that replacement is the result of a good-faith evaluation rather than a preference for new construction.**

     Where replacement is necessary, new or replacement buildings within the Historic District should follow the character-defining features of the Caneel Bay Historic District or employ compatible contemporary design that evokes the Mid-Century Modern character of the district while remaining clearly differentiated from historic fabric, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

- Question 96: For contributing structures that are damaged beyond repair and proposed for reconstruction, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Reconstruction require accurate documentary and physical evidence. Will the NPS make available the historic master plans, planting plans, historic photographs, original or as-built construction drawings, and the horticulturist and architect interviews referenced in Exhibit J in sufficient detail to support a documented reconstruction, and will the NPS accept reconstruction (as distinct from compatible new construction) as conforming to the RFP and the Secretary's Standards?

  A. **NPS is not intending to reconstruct the contributing buildings or structures that are determined structurally unsound. Upon execution of the lease NPS will make available existing documents related to the construction and**

documentation of the historic Caneel Bay Resort to which the NPS has legal ownership.

- Question 97: The RFP states that the NPS will consider elevating or relocating buildings to address flood, storm-surge, and sea-rise risk. For a contributing structure specifically, will the NPS clarify whether elevation or relocation can be accomplished while retaining the structure's contributing status and supporting a finding of no adverse effect under Section 106, and what design treatment, documentation, or mitigation the NPS will expect offerors to provide in order to support such a determination?
  - **A. It is premature to determine effects to buildings or structures located within the Caneel Bay Historic District at this stage. NPS intends to develop a PA to comply with the NHPA prior to lease execution.**

- Question 98: Because all replacement and reconstruction of damaged structures requires NPS approval prior to construction (Section 9 of the Draft Lease), and because post-selection NEPA and Section 106 compliance may alter the approved concept, will the NPS clarify how a proposal's rebuilding plan should treat structures whose final treatment cannot be confirmed until compliance is complete — including whether offerors may propose a phased approach that stabilizes and mothballs contributing structures before rebuilding, and how the NPS will accommodate material changes to the rebuilding program resulting from compliance without disadvantaging the Selected Offeror?
  - **A. See response to Question 97.**

- Question 129: For mitigation obligations identified in Exhibit I, and any arising from the new NEPA, Endangered Species Act, and Section 106 review for the selected concept, who bears the cost and performance obligation as between NPS and the Lessee, and are Lessee-borne mitigation costs eligible to offset rent?
  - **A. The lessee will be responsible for all mitigation costs. They are not eligible for offset rent.**

- Question 150: Do the pre-resort historic and archeological resources, including the Durloo Sugar Plantation ruins, fall within the leased Premises, and is their preservation and maintenance the Lessee's responsibility under Lease Section 10.3 or retained by NPS, given the public viewing area NPS established at those ruins in 2024? What is the anticipated scope of the Preservation Maintenance Plan for these resources, and are any preservation works currently ongoing or expected to be completed before the Lessee takes over the Premises?

A. **Yes, Durloo Sugar Plantation ruins, archaeological sites, and potential additional cultural resources are located within the lease boundary. The cost to preserve, protect and maintain cultural resources within the lease boundary will be borne by the lessee. The scope for repairing, preserving and maintaining the Durloo Sugar Plantation ruins has not been determined.**

   In summer/fall 2026, the NPS's Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC) will be treating potential biological growth that poses a threat to the structural integrity of the Durloo Sugar Plantation ruins. The team will install structural support beams along the central wall of the structure. The HPTC team will reconstruct the three southernmost window openings on the project wall. No other ruin preservation projects are planned.

- Question 155: Exhibit J identifies 675 historically significant trees representing 72 species, all GPS-mapped. Will NPS provide the GPS-mapped tree survey data file to Offerors for use in site planning prior to proposal submission?
  A. **Existing tree species mapping data may be made available to the selected offeror upon request.**

- Question 159: The Historic District description (Exhibit J) does not provide a formal classification of structures as "contributing" versus "non-contributing" to the NRHP-eligible Historic District. Will NPS provide or confirm a formal contributing/non-contributing classification for all structures within the Leasehold Premises prior to proposal submission, or will the Offeror's proposal be the vehicle for proposing that classification?
  A. **NPS completed draft documentation of the Caneel Bay Historic District in August 2012. Note that it predates the 2017 hurricanes and is no longer accurate regarding eligibility determination to the NRHP. The NPS will update the historic district's determination of eligibility to account for damage caused by the 2017 hurricanes and to assess whether contributing features retain sufficient integrity for listing on the NRHP. Exhibit J serves as a guideline for building and site character defining features recognizing that many of the Caneel Bay Historic District buildings and structures have been significantly damaged from the 2017 hurricanes and subsequent deterioration. Which buildings and structures that still contribute to the district's NRHP eligibility still needs to be determined.**

- Question 160: During the Site Visit NPS indicated that certain repair projects were underway on the Sugar Mill, can these please be shared?

A. **NPS is scheduled to stabilize a wall at the Durloo Sugar Plantation. In summer/fall 2026, the NPS's Historic Preservation Training Center (HPTC) will be treating potential biological growth that poses a threat to the structural integrity of the Durloo Sugar Plantation ruins. The team will install structural support beams along the central wall of the structure. The HPTC team will reconstruct the three southernmost window openings on the project wall. NPS will post information on our social media pages once the project is underway or complete.**

- Question 161: During the site visit NPS indicated that in the past the Sugar Mill had been purposed as a restaurant. Given the historic nature of the structure, is it still permissible to intervene in and use the structure for resort program?

  A. **It is premature to determine effects to buildings or structures located within the Caneel Bay Historic District at this stage. NPS intends to develop a PA to comply with the NHPA and will require that any improvements follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR Part 68).**

- Question 167: Will the proposal evaluation panel include a licensed architect, historic preservation specialist, or landscape architect as a technical consultant, so that Offerors can calibrate the appropriate level of technical detail in their drawing and rendering submissions?

  A. **The panel will include a Historical Architect and an Archeologist.**

- Question 179: Is there a map outlining which of the existing buildings must be preserved? Does NPS have documentation, such as an inventory, that identifies the archaeological sites located within the leasehold areas?

  A. **Many of the Caneel Bay Historic District buildings and structures have been significantly damaged from the 2017 hurricanes and subsequent deterioration. Which buildings and structures that still contribute to the District's eligibility to the NRHPs still needs to be determined. No map will be provided identifying archaeological sites.**

- Question 180: What archaeological investigations have already been completed?

  A. **Some preliminary, ad hoc archaeological investigations have occurred during previous resort operations; however, no systematic archeological investigations have occurred within the lease boundary.**

- Question 181: Which areas have the highest likelihood of future restrictions?

A. **The areas with the highest potential for development concerns associated with natural and cultural resources are those areas that have existing cultural resources determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, buried archeological sites, human burials, Heritage Trees, areas of extreme slopes, turtle nesting grounds, coral reef habitats, seagrass beds, mangrove habitats, salt flats, wetlands, rock and coastal hedge, and areas of late-secondary successional forest habitats.**

- Question 182: Who bears cost and schedule risk if new discoveries are made?

A. **It is unclear what is meant by "new discoveries", but assuming this is related to archeological sites or other cultural resources, the discovery and treatment of human burials will be governed by applicable federal law, including Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), where applicable, and NPS policy. Any known burial sites will be identified during the Section 106 consultation process outlined in the PA, and the lessee will be required to avoid disturbance to these areas. The PA will identify the process and cost for any discovery.**

- Question 183: Please provide all archaeological survey reports, cultural resource inventories, and any findings regarding pre-contact or historic-era archaeological sites within the site.

A. **This is not information provided to the public. Locations are protected on federal lands and governed by a combination of federal laws (NHPA sect 304, Archaeological Resource Protection Act section 9 & 407hh) and implementing regulations 43 CFR Part 7.18.**

- Question 184: Any available Historic Structure Reports or detailed architectural surveys for contributing buildings within the Caneel Bay Historic District.

A. **See response to Question 159.**

- Question 185: Any Cultural Landscape Reports or studies detailing the historic landscape features, plantings, and site design of the Caneel Bay Resort.

A. **NPS is in the process of documenting/gathering this information and will ensure that it is available to the future lessee.**

- Question 187: Exhibit J - Historic building and site character defining features and landscape features - to what extent do these need to be maintained?

A. **Per the RFP General Lease Objectives - The lease will adequately ensure the preservation of the historic property. The lease boundary is situated within the Caneel Bay Historic District.**

- Question 193: Provide records of past consultations between the NPS and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), or other consulting parties regarding the Caneel Bay Historic District or any undertakings within it.

  A. **NPS does not generally share records of past consultations between the NPS and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), or other consulting parties. In 2023, a PA was executed with the VISHPO associated with previous Caneel Bay planning efforts. It is available as Attachment C to the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) located here: ParkPlanning - Caneel Bay Finding of No Significant Impact**

     Prior to issuance of the new lease, a PA will be developed as part of NHPA compliance for this federal action.

- Question 194: The original resort was designed in a "Mid-Century Modernist Style" - what obligation is there to redevelop in line with these original designs?

  A. **NPS encourages offerors to incorporate as many character-defining features of the Historic District as possible while meeting any applicable code, safety, and resiliency requirements. Where strict compliance with a requirement makes retention of a specific character-defining feature infeasible, NPS will evaluate proposed deviations on a case-by-case basis through the Section 106 consultation process established under the PA.**

     Offerors should document their preservation decision-making clearly and demonstrate that replacement is the result of a good-faith evaluation rather than a preference for new construction. Where replacement is necessary, new or replacement buildings within the Historic District should follow the character-defining features of the Caneel Bay Historic District or employ compatible contemporary design that evokes the Mid-Century Modern character of the district while remaining clearly differentiated from historic fabric, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, including but not limited to Rehabilitation Standards 9 and 10.

- Question 199: Is there a map and inventory of existing historic buildings that must be preserved?

  A. **No. See response to Question 159.**

- Question 217: Please provide any archive records of the historic master plans, planting plans, photographs, and interviews with horticulturist Eleanor Gibney and former resort architect Glen Speer. Please clarify how the ecological benefits of planting more native plants vs preserving cultural heritage with historic plants will be considered and evaluated.

A. The lease boundary is located within the Caneel Bay Historic District which includes cultural resource landscape elements. Per the RFP General Lease Objectives - The lease will adequately ensure the preservation of the historic property. NPS will evaluate each proposal in accordance with the stated criteria within the RFP. Archive records of the historic master plans, planting plans, photographs, and interviews with horticulturist Eleanor Gibney and former resort architect Glen Speer should they exist will be made available to the lessee.

- Question 224: During the period of the lease, how will decisions about active management of forests or beachfront balance the preservation of cultural heritage against greater resilience to pests and disease, storm or flood damage?

  A. Decisions about the management of the leased premises will be made in accordance with the final lease and applicable laws.

- Question 235: Copies of any previous Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) or Programmatic Agreements (PAs) under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act 1966 related to Caneel Bay.

  B. NPS does not generally share records of past consultations between the NPS and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), or other consulting parties. In 2023, a PA was executed with the VISHPO associated with previous Caneel Bay planning efforts. It is available as Attachment C to the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) located here: [ParkPlanning - Caneel Bay Finding of No Significant Impact]()

  Prior to issuance of the new lease, a PA will be developed as part of NHPA compliance for this federal action.

- Question 258: What is the NPS's position on underground infrastructure (buried utilities, cisterns, stormwater systems) given the archaeological sensitivity of the site? Are there pre-approved routing corridors?

  A. NPS is supportive of underground infrastructure in previously disturbed areas. Currently there are no pre-approved routing corridors. Planned cultural resource inventories may identify areas appropriate for underground infrastructure.

- Question 279: Please indicate the location of burial sites within the site.

  A. This information is not available to the public. Locations are protected on federal lands and governed by a combination of federal laws (NHPA sect 304,

Archaeological Resource Protection Act section 9 & 407hh) and implementing regulations 43 CFR Part 7.18.

- Question 281: Beyond the Durloo Sugar Plantation ruins, Exhibit J of the RFP defines the Caneel Bay Historic District. Which specific structures within the Historic District are classified as "contributing resources" under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and which are non-contributing? Please provide an itemized list.
  A. **The Caneel Bay Historic District shall be updated to reflect the damage from the 2017 hurricanes and remaining integrity of the resort buildings, structures and objects. No list of contributing resources to the eligibility of the District is available at this time. Additionally, cultural resource inventories of the entire lease boundary may identify previously unknown cultural resources. Once the cultural resource work is complete it will be made available to the lessee.**
- Question 328: What grants or other funding has been received for the restoration of the historically significant areas (e.g.,the sugar plantation) and how long will funds be received, if any?
  A. **No grants have been received and all funding to-date spent on the ruins since April 2024 has come from the Park's annual appropriated funds.**
- Question 349: Can the Service provide any of the GIS mapping done of the historically significant landscape and identify the 72 tree species?
  A. **Existing tree species mapping data may be made available to the selected offeror upon request.**

Design Guidelines & Architecture

- Question 29: Has the 166 unit maximum that was in the RFQ been removed to allow for additional site development?
  A. **The current RFP does not have a limit on the number of units.**
- Question 148: Will NPS commit to target review periods, outside dates, or deemed-approval mechanisms for design submittals, operator approval, sublease consents, and lender estoppels, given that the construction schedule and financing milestones depend on the timing of those approvals?
  A. **These design and construction related requirements will be negotiated through the lease process and dependent on the selector offeror's proposal.**
- Question 158: The RFP requires Offerors to use existing building footprints "to the maximum extent feasible" but acknowledges that some structures may need to be

elevated or relocated for flood resilience. Will NPS specify — or provide guidance on — the minimum finished floor elevation above current base flood elevation (BFE) that it would consider acceptable for beachfront structures, or will that determination be deferred to NEPA/NHPA compliance?

A. **The lease boundary is located within the Caneel Bay Historic District. Per the RFP General Lease Objectives - The lease will adequately ensure the preservation of the historic property. Additionally, the RFP states "Given the relatively undeveloped nature of the island of St. John, the scenic quality of the Park's viewsheds have been identified as a fundamental resource and value that contributes to the Park's purpose. The Lessee will be required to reduce the visual impacts of redeveloping the Leasehold Premises by utilizing the existing building footprints, where possible, utilizing materials and exterior paint colors that blend into the environment, installing downward facing lighting to minimize light pollution, and to install turtle safe lighting to reduce the potential negative impacts that lights may have on turtles and turtle nesting. The NPS will consider allowing buildings to be elevated where elevation is necessary to mitigate the impacts of rapid sea rise and provide flood and storm surge resiliency."**

NPS encourages offerors to incorporate as many character-defining features of the Historic District as possible while meeting any applicable code, safety, and resiliency requirements. Where strict compliance with a requirement makes retention of a specific character-defining feature infeasible, NPS will evaluate proposed deviations on a case-by-case basis through the Section 106 consultation process established under the PA.

- Question 196: Will there be any resilience standards required above/beyond local code?

A. **Per the RFP, refer to Criterion 5 – Energy, Waste Reduction, Recycling. Also refer to the Resilient Design section of the RFP. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.**

- Question 243: The RFP references the goal of creating "welcoming and equitable opportunities that promote access, visitation, employment, and use of local businesses." Is there a Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) template that NPS expects, or is the lessee free to design its own framework?

A. **There is no template.**

- Question 264: Is the historic room-key count a target? Can the property be substantially reduced in key count or footprint?

  A. The current RFP does not have a limit on the number of units.

- Question 292: Due to the geographic isolation, what are the protocols regarding emergency medical lifelines? Will the Lessee be permitted to design and operate a helipad within the property for medical evacuations?

  A. The emergency medical protocols will be dependent on the selected offeror's proposal.

- Question 315: Are there design plans for the wastewater treatment plant? What is the design flow of the original system?

  A. The NPS does not know the design flow of the original system. See response to Question 67 for additional information.

- Question 342: Are alternative models (e.g., all-inclusive) permitted?

  A. Yes. The RFP does not limit responses to a certain type of resort model.

- Question 348: What specifically is the "federal property that is adjacent to The Resort area" referenced under Optional Project Elements on page 1 of the prospectus?

  A. The NPS has not identified federal property adjacent to the approximately 150-acre Resort area.

Public Access & Community Engagement

- Question 1: The map below indicates the Caneel Bay Resort boundaries with a dark black line. The entire Caneel Bay and Little Caneel Bay area is included, however the 10 Exhibit I Caneel Bay Structures document pages 11 to 43 clearly shows the Little Caneel Bay structures along with the dock. A managers house and the M'Ocean Self Center all are being retained by the National Park and therefore are NOT included in the lease terms. A screen shot of pages 11 and 12 are shown. How does the VINP propose to access these locations and what activities do they propose to do with them? Will the hotel tenant be able to use the dock, and if so can they count on the dock being repaired quickly in order to allow usage for construction?

  A. Exhibit I (6/6) has been updated by replacing "Park Retained Structures" to "Additional Structures." Dock repairs and access will be negotiated based on the successful offerors proposed use and need.

- Question 2: There is no mention in any of the documentation of what was called the Presidents House located between Honeymoon and Salomon beaches and currently being used as NP employee housing. Is that included as part of the lease? If not what will the status be especially how it will be accessed.
  - **A. The property is not located within the 150-acre lease boundary and currently serves as NPS employee housing. Determinations on what buildings are to be included in the Leasehold Premises will be based on the successful offeror's proposal and may or may not include the "President's House."**
- Question 5: Trails mentioned do not include the Turtle Point Trail which is a legally designated NP trail. Will that need to be accessible by the public? Will the Lind Point trail need to be accessible to the public from the resort end?
  - **A. Per the RFP, at a minimum, the public may use navigable waters of the area, including the wet sand beach (foreshore) of Honeymoon Beach, Little Caneel Beach, Caneel Beach, Scott Beach, Paradise Beach, Turtle Bay Beach, and Hawksnest Beach (North). Offerors should identify in their proposals the degree to which public access beyond this requirement will be allowed. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP.**
- Question 6: Do any of the 7 beaches require public access from land according to the terms of the VI "traditional access" law?
  - **A. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.**
- Question 33: What information about submitted proposals will be made available to the public prior to a final decision being made, and what opportunities will Virgin Islands residents, elected officials, local agencies, and other stakeholders have to review proposals, provide input, and help inform the final selection?
  - **A. Decision regarding disclosures will be made in accordance with all applicable laws including the Freedom of Information Act and decisions regarding the RFP will be made in accordance with the laws, statutes, regulations, and policy applicable to the NPS.**
- Question 34: Caneel Bay currently provides important water access for portions of the St. John community. Will bidders be required to disclose any proposed changes to existing water access arrangements, and how will those impacts be evaluated and communicated to the public?

A. **Per the RFP, at a minimum, the public may use navigable waters of the area, including the wet sand beach (foreshore) of Honeymoon Beach, Little Caneel Beach, Caneel Beach, Scott Beach, Paradise Beach, Turtle Bay Beach, and Hawksnest Beach (North). Offerors should identify in their proposals the degree to which public access beyond this requirement will be allowed.**

- Question 59: Are the seven named public beaches within the Leasehold Premises, and what degree of management, programming, and operational control will the lessee have over the beaches, the foreshore, and the adjacent waters?

  A. **See response to Question 34.**

- Question 61: For the Red Hook dock area: what dock capacity, parking allocation, and scheduling will be available; with which other entities will it be shared; may the lessee improve it; will any fee apply; and will non-exclusive access be assured for the full lease term?

  A. **Dock capacity, parking allocation, scheduling, and improvements will be negotiated with the successful offeror based on its proposal and access will be granted in accordance with the final lease. The Red Hook Dock area, if included in the successful offeror's proposal and the use is acceptable to the NPS, may be included in the Leasehold Premises as a "non-exclusive" area. Access to the Red Hook Dock will be negotiated with the successful offeror.**

- Question 63: What public-access easement, security, liability, and maintenance obligations attach to the Water Catchment, Caneel Hill, and Lind Point Trails, and may the lessee improve or reroute trail segments?

  A. **The Lessee is responsible for the maintenance and security of the Premises. Any improvements or alterations to the trails located within the Premises must be approved by the NPS in accordance with the Final Lease.**

- Question 99: What level of public access does the NPS consider most favorable under Criterion 1, and can the NPS offer examples of public-access elements it would view positively (public beach access, trails, an interpretive center, community access days)?

  A. **As stated in the RFP, the NPS will evaluate a redevelopment and operational plan that will allow for greater public access more favorably than one that would seek to limit public access.**

- Question 149: The Caneel dock remains under NPS management and the Red Hook dock is non-exclusive and outside the Leasehold Premises. What assured, priority access to both can the Lessee obtain for the lease term, on what cost terms, and how will CUA-holder beach and mooring scheduling be coordinated with resort operations?

A. See response to Question 61 regarding the Red Hook Dock area. The Caneel Dock is located within the lease boundary and will not be managed by the NPS. Correction on the RFP documents was made.

- Question 151: The RFP contemplates access to the Leasehold Premises by vehicle, on foot, and by boat, including non-exclusive use of a portion of the Red Hook dock area for transporting visitors, employees, and goods. Will NPS permit the Lessee to provide or arrange air-based guest arrival, specifically seaplane or helicopter access serving the Leasehold Premises, and if so, what NPS, FAA, Coast Guard, or territorial approvals, and what viewshed, noise, and turtle and wildlife protections, would govern such use?

A. NPS is not considering access to the Leasehold Premises via seaplane or helicopter, except for potentially in the case of medical emergencies. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

- Question 157: RFP mentions relationship to community. Please provide more information on past.

A. Prospective bidders are to conduct their own research on the area, and outreach to the surrounding community to inform their own opinion and to develop a relationship. The following websites have additional background on previous NPS civic engagement associated with Caneel Bay:

ParkPlanning - Public Involvement for the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Site Assessment at Caneel Bay Resort

ParkPlanning - Caneel Bay Redevelopment

- Question 212: Copies of minutes of community engagement and consultation relating to the RFP process

A. The following websites have additional background on previous NPS civic engagement associated with Caneel Bay:

ParkPlanning - Public Involvement for the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Site Assessment at Caneel Bay Resort

ParkPlanning - Caneel Bay Redevelopment

- Question 215: Please provide a list of community representations and stakeholder organizations who NPS engaged with as part of the consultation process for the development of the RFP.

A. **The RFP was informed by numerous public meetings with community members and in consultation with local government officials. The following websites have additional background on previous NPS civic engagement associated with Caneel Bay:**

   ParkPlanning - Public Involvement for the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Site Assessment at Caneel Bay Resort

   ParkPlanning - Caneel Bay Redevelopment

- Question 222: What is the expectation on daily visitor numbers to achieve the level of public access desired?

  A. **The NPS will evaluate public access based on the information in the RFP. As stated in the RFP, the NPS will evaluate a redevelopment and operational plan that will allow for greater public access more favorably than one that would seek to limit public access.**

- Question 231: How will community benefits be scored? Is there a specific ranking or wishlist of these benefits?

  A. **The NPS will evaluate proposals in accordance with the information provided in the RFP.**

- Question 260: Can certain beaches or waterfront facilities be reserved for hotel guests?

  A. **See response to Question 34.**

- Question 269: Are there specific visitor education or interpretive programming requirements that must be integrated into the resort's operations, and would additional investment in such programming enhance evaluation scoring?

  A. **The NPS will evaluate proposals in accordance with the information provided in the RFP.**

- Question 270: Would it be permitted to build a jetty to provide direct access from the ocean to the resort (without having to access via the main dock and vehicle transfer)?

  A. **There is a dock located within the Caneel Bay lease boundary. The dock is to be the responsibility of the lessee. The dock is in need of replacement because it has been determined to be structurally unsound. No jetty is needed.**

- Question 272: Can the lessee charge commercial operators (water sports vendors, charter boats) for access to beach areas, or does public access preclude any form of commercial gatekeeping?

  A. **Whether a selected offeror may charge a particular fee is dependent on the selected offeror's proposal and will be negotiated with the selected offeror. As**

part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

- Question 277: "Given that the Red Hook Dock Area is described as an "optional project element" with "non-exclusive use" and a requirement to "continue to provide public access and use," please clarify the specific sharing arrangements NPS envisions. Specifically:

  A. Access and use of Red Hook Dock and area is not exclusive, and conditions of use will be dependent on the selected offeror's proposal and negotiated during the lease process.

- Question 278: Land access to several beaches (Little Hawksnest, Turtle Bay, Scott Bay) is currently water-access only. Will the lessee be required to provide or fund public water transport to these beaches, and if so, is there an obligation to operate this as a free service?

  A. Per the RFP "at a minimum, the public may use navigable waters of the area, including the wet sand beach (foreshore) of Honeymoon Beach, Little Caneel Beach, Caneel Beach, Scott Beach, Paradise Beach, Turtle Bay Beach, and Hawksnest Beach (North). Offerors should identify in their proposals the degree to which public access beyond this requirement will be allowed."

- Question 280: The RFP mandates minimum public access to seven beaches: Honeymoon Beach, Little Caneel Beach, Caneel Beach, Scott Beach, Paradise Beach, Turtle Bay Beach, and Hawksnest Beach (North). What infrastructure — parking, trails, restrooms, signage — must the lessee provide and maintain for public access to all seven, and is there a cost-sharing mechanism with NPS for these amenities?

  A. The RFP states "at a minimum, the public may use navigable waters of the area, including the wet sand beach (foreshore) of Honeymoon Beach, Little Caneel Beach, Caneel Beach, Scott Beach, Paradise Beach, Turtle Bay Beach, and Hawksnest Beach (North). Offerors should identify in their proposals the degree to which public access beyond this requirement will be allowed."

- Question 282: Is the Lessee responsible for provision of toilets and drinking water for public accessing the trails running through the leasehold property ? What is the expected daily visitor numbers ? What are the requirements on Cinnamon Bay and other commercial businesses in the park on infrastructure issues such as usage of energy and water, waste collection, noise and lighting control and prevention of pollution e.g. wastewater treatment?

A. Whether and to what extent a selected offeror must provide services and facilities to the public is dependent on the selected offeror's proposal and will be negotiated with the selected offeror. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

- Question 294: Is it possible to control public access to the area through a visitor registration system or similar, to ensure the safety and security of resort guests?

A. Whether and how a selected offeror may control public access is dependent on the selected offeror's proposal and will be negotiated with the selected offeror. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

- Question 339: Would you please confirm that the property (including all of the beaches within its borders) will be considered private property and no longer be open to the general public once the lease is executed? At a minimum, can they be closed during construction?

A. The Leasehold premises will be leased property, not private, still owned by the federal government. Closures can occur for various reasons on federal lands to include safety of the public during construction activities and prevent damage to natural and cultural resources. The RFP states "at a minimum, the public may use navigable waters of the area, including the wet sand beach (foreshore) of Honeymoon Beach, Little Caneel Beach, Caneel Beach, Scott Beach, Paradise Beach, Turtle Bay Beach, and Hawksnest Beach (North). Offerors should identify in their proposals the degree to which public access beyond this requirement will be allowed."

- Question 341: What level of public access must be maintained relative to guest-exclusive amenities?

A. The RFP states "at a minimum, the public may use navigable waters of the area, including the wet sand beach (foreshore) of Honeymoon Beach, Little Caneel Beach, Caneel Beach, Scott Beach, Paradise Beach, Turtle Bay Beach, and Hawksnest Beach (North). Offerors should identify in their proposals the degree to which public access beyond this requirement will be allowed."

Utilities & Infrastructure

- Question 12: Are there any known improvements required for the water desalination plant?

  A. The desalinization plant equipment is owned and operated by a third party and the NPS has limited information on the current condition of the plant. NPS can state the equipment is nearing its end of usable service period.

- Question 36: Will bidders be required to disclose plans for on-site energy generation, battery storage, microgrids, or other resilience measures, and how will those plans be evaluated during the selection process?

  A. The NPS will evaluate proposals based on the responsiveness of the proposal to the evaluative criteria outlined in the "RFP Evaluation Criteria" section of the RFP.

- Question 67: What is the condition, capacity, ownership, and functional status of the existing desalination plant, wastewater treatment facility, buried power distribution, transformers, and communications infrastructure; will these convey with the leasehold; and are existing permits transferable?

  A. The desalinization plant equipment is currently owned and operated by a third party and will not be conveyed with the lease. All other infrastructure located on the Leasehold premises will be assigned to the lessee and the maintenance and disposition will be the responsibility of the Lessee. The condition, capacity, and functional status of the utility infrastructure is unknown at this time and will need to be determined by the successful offeror under the terms of the Lease Disposition and Development Agreement.

- Question 140: LDDA Section 2.3(a)(i) commits NPS to complete additional infrastructure and site improvements mutually agreed at its own cost. What baseline infrastructure, including power, water, wastewater, dock, and roads, does NPS intend to fund versus what the Lessee builds, on what schedule, and what is the condition and remaining capacity of the existing desalination and wastewater treatment plants?

  A. The NPS does not have plans to fund any site improvements at this time. However, the NPS reserves the right to negotiate possible improvements with the successful offeror prior to lease execution. (For additional information see response to Question 67)

- Question 147: Will the Premises be delivered free of third-party occupancy and contracts, or is there a schedule of surviving rights, for example any food and beverage concession, beach or watersports operator, or utility operator, that the Lessee must honor, and do any of them generate or cost revenue from the Commencement Date?

A. There are numerous commercial entities that operate within the Park under commercial use authorizations (CUAs). These operators provide transportation services, guided hiking, guided kayaking, guided paddle boarding, water-based tours, land-based tours, scuba diving, wedding/event organization, vessel excursions, and photography. Access to the Leasehold Premises by CUA holders will be negotiated with the Lessee. Additional information on the services offered through the Park's CUA program can be found on the Park's website at Do Business With Us - Virgin Islands National Park (U.S. National Park Service) (nps.gov) (https://www.nps.gov/viis/getinvolved/dobusinesswithus.htm).

Upon execution of the final lease, the NPS intends to deliver the Leasehold Premises to the successful offeror free of any leases or operating agreements for any existing commercial operators.

- Question 153: Will NPS provide any as-built drawings or condition assessments for the buried utility infrastructure, including the location of any known fuel storage tanks and their current decommissioning or operational status?

  A. The NPS has limited as-built documentation available for the area. The selected offeror may, at its own expense, contract on-site scanning and digitization of existing documents. All scanning, raw data collection, and resulting deliverables shall comply with NPS standards and requirements. All digital files produced and hard-copy documents under this effort shall remain the property of the Government. NPS will provide the selected offeror with copies of available digital files that NPS has legal possession of should they exist.

- Question 154: The RFP states that the site may contain utilities and other assets not reflected in the Structural Assessment. Will NPS provide any existing utility as-built drawings, utility mapping, or infrastructure surveys for the Leasehold Premises, including the desalination plant, wastewater treatment facility, buried power lines, and communications infrastructure?

  A. The NPS believes that the utility infrastructure that is in existence on the Premises has reached the end of its useful life and will need to be replaced. However, the successful offeror will need to make their own determinations during the term of the LDDA.

- Question 156: What is the status of reverse osmosis water plant? Please provide dates of last assessment?

A. **The equipment of the reverse osmosis water plant is operated by a third party. NPS has no information on its condition.**

- Question 164: Will the existing desalination plant infrastructure (equipment, permits, and operating records) be conveyed to the Lessee in "as-is" condition, or does NPS contemplate that the facility has been decommissioned and will require entirely new permitting? Are there any existing USVI DEP permits or operating licenses for the desalination plant that remain active?

  A. **The desalinization plant equipment is owned and operated by a third party and the NPS does not have any information on the current condition of the plant equipment. NPS can state the equipment is nearing its end of usable service period.**

- Question 186: Are there restrictions on seawalls, shoreline stabilization, or flood mitigation infrastructure?

  A. **Per the RFP "General Lease Objectives: In addition to the purposes outlined in Public Law 925 Chapter 885, establishing Virgin Islands National Park, and as further outlined in the Foundation Document, Virgin Islands | Virgin Islands Coral Reef National Monument, U.S. Virgin Islands, December 2016 (Foundation Document), the NPS has a number of overarching objectives for this redevelopment project in order to comply with 36 C.F.R. § 18.4. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities. Link to the Virgin Islands Foundation document can be found at** viis-fd-2016.pdf.

- Question 191: Please provide a condition assessment on the existing structures. Please provide all detailed structural assessment reports for existing buildings and infrastructure on the site, including those damaged by Hurricanes Irma and Maria, beyond the summary provided in Exhibit I (Caneel Bay Structural Assessment July 2025).

  A. **Exhibit I contains all of the information that the NPS will be providing on the condition of the existing structures.**

- Question 200: Confirm availability and capacity of renewable energy infrastructure and interconnection options.

  A. **The NPS is not aware of any renewable energy infrastructure that is located on the premises and any interconnection options. Thiswill need to be determined by the offerors.**

- Question 219: Provide recent topographical surveys, bathymetric data (for coastal areas and potential marine infrastructure), and geotechnical reports for the site.

  A. **This information is not part of the exhibits and the NPS does not intend to make additional information available, other than what is already publicly available. Should this information be necessary as part of the redevelopment, the lessee will be responsible for coordinating with the NPS to complete the surveys and reports.**

- Question 230: Given that a full utility infrastructure assessment has not yet been completed by NPS, how should offerors address utility system uncertainty in their capital cost projections?

  A. **The NPS believes that the utility infrastructure, given its age and lack of maintenance in the intervening years since the hurricanes of 2017, has reached the end of its useful life and will need to be replaced. However, the successful offeror will be expected to determine the condition of the utility infrastructure under the terms and conditions of the LDDA.**

- Question 250: Will any commitments be made to the successful bidder to secure necessary permits for development and operation (e.g. solar panels, import duty, diesel/fuelling import, liquor, Tied House waiver, entertainment licensing, installation of new utility infrastructure)?

  A. **The NPS will process the necessary NPS permits in a timely manner and will work cooperatively with the successful offeror in the application for necessary permits issued by others.**

- Question 252: Could you please provide further details regarding the Reverse Osmosis water plant currently in operation? We would be particularly interested in maintenance reports, water analysis (for both treated water and reject streams), and the plant's rejection percentage/efficiency.

  A. **The reverse osmosis plant is currently owned and operated by a third party, and the NPS does not have this information.**

- Question 253: Provide detailed surveys, condition assessments and capacity analysis of all existing utility infrastructure, including water supply (potable and non-potable), wastewater treatment, electrical grids, communication systems, internet and storm drainage systems within the site and details of whether any of these are public utilities.

  A. **The operation and maintenance of all utility systems within the Leasehold Premises will be the responsibility of the successful offeror, including the evaluation of the condition and capacity of these systems. NPS anticipates the**

lessee to complete surveys and analysis of systems needed for the proposed redevelopment. NPS does not have these surveys.

- Question 255: Several overhead power lines are visible in the surrounding areas and within the resort's vicinity. Electricity supply is key to the resort's operation. Could you describe the electricity supply system, specifically whether it was provided via a WAPA connection or through generators? If there is an existing electrical connection, is it medium voltage? What is the condition of the transformers, switchgear, etc.? What is the maximum capacity it could supply?

  A. The NPS has minimal knowledge of the past or current electrical systems of the former resort. The infrastructure has received little to no attention and upkeep since the 2017 storms. Maintenance and operation of the electrical infrastructure within the Leasehold Premises will be the responsibility of the lessee. The electrical infrastructure outside of the Leasehold premises are owned, operated, and maintained by WAPA.

- Question 256: What are the specific water use and wastewater treatment standards that will be written into the lease, given the sensitivity of the surrounding marine ecosystem?

  A. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations, including but not limited to NPS Reference Manual 83A Public Health: Protection and Prevention, and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

- Question 257: Who owns and is responsible for the maintenance (including not only electrical maintenance operations but also posts, trees, etc.) of the overhead power lines that supply the resort, both within and outside the property?

  A. The poles and infrastructure within the resort belong to the NPS. The infrastructure has received little to no attention and upkeep since the 2017 storms. Maintenance and operation of the electrical infrastructure within the Leasehold Premises will be the responsibility of the lessee. The electrical infrastructure outside of the Leasehold premises are owned, operated, and maintained by WAPA.

- Question 259: Does the site have mobile phone and internet coverage and if so, will the lessee be required to enter into arrangements with the provider to house antenna/equipment?

A. **Cellular service is available within the approximately 150-acre Resort property. At this time, the NPS does not intend to require that the lessee enter arrangements with the provider to house antenna/equipment within the Leasehold Premises. Any installation of cellular telecommunication equipment by the lessee would require specific approval from the NPS in accordance with National Park Service Reference Manual #53B: Rights-of-way.**

- Question 299: Provide requirements for backup utilities

   A. **Requirements for backup utilities will need to be determined by the offeror based on the scope and scale of their proposed redevelopment.**

- Question 311: Are water and wastewater systems fully documented and evaluated? If so, is this document available for use in developing more accurate projections?

   A. **The wastewater treatment plant has not been evaluated, and the water treatment plant equipment is owned and operated by a third-party.**

- Question 313: Have evaluations been performed on the main electrical service and components to determine if the underground wiring is in serviceable condition? I.e., Megger Testing, load test, etc.

   A. **No.**

- Question 316: What type of treatment was used for the sludge from the Waste Water Treatment Plant? Sand beds would typically be used in the local environment. Are the drying features in good condition? Have they been inspected or observed?

   A. **The NPS does not know how the previous operator processed wastewater, and the wastewater treatment plant has not been evaluated.**

- Question 317: Have the sewer lines been inspected? This is especially important for the main sewer trunk lines based on the open areas adjacent to the manhole covers.

   A. **The NPS has not inspected the sewer lines.**

- Question 318: Is the condition of the sanitary sewer lift/pump stations known?

   A. **The NPS does not know the condition of the sanitary sewer lift/pump stations.**

- Question 319: Is the condition of the water mains on site known?

   A. **No.**

- Question 320: For the Reverse Osmosis plant, is further restoration of the building or components required?

A. **The need for restoration of the building or components associated with the reverse osmosis plant will need to be determined by the selected offeror based on their redevelopment plan.**

- Question 331: What is the current condition and capacity of water, wastewater, and power infrastructure, and who is responsible for upgrades?

  A. **The NPS does not know the current condition of the utility systems within the Leasehold Premises. The incoming lessee will be responsible for the utility systems as well as any upgrades to, or the replacement of, the utility systems.**

- Question 350: What is the current condition of the wastewater treatment plant?

  A. **The NPS has not evaluated the wastewater treatment plant, however, the NPS believes it to be inoperable and at the end of its useful life.**

- Question 351: What is the capacity volume and flow rate of the wastewater treatment plant? Is there a discharge limit?

  A. **The NPS does not know the capacity volume and flow rate of the wastewater treatment plant or if there is a discharge limit.**

- Question 352: Is the wastewater treatment facility (or effluent discharge point) located in the floodplain?

  A. **The NPS does not know the location of the effluent discharge point. However, in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § Part 6, sludge from a wastewater treatment plan, existing or newly constructed, may not be disposed of within the Leasehold Premises or the Park Area.**

- Question 353: Can you describe the existing technology and process of the wastewater treatment plant?

  A. **Unknown.**

- Question 354: How does the plant manage, treat, and dispose of generated biosolids?

  A. **The NPS does not know how the previous operator managed, treated, or disposed of generated biosolids.**

- Question 355: What is the capacity volume and flow rate of the reverse osmosis plant?

  A. **The NPS does not know the capacity volume or flow rate of the reverse osmosis plant**

- Question 356: Has the well for the reverse osmosis plant ever run dry?

  A. **The plant obtains its water from the seawater adjacent to the park.**

- Question 357: Does the reverse osmosis plant have protections for marine life?

  A. Unknown

- Question 358: Can you describe the existing technology and process of the reverse osmosis plant?

  A. The reverse osmosis plant draws water from an inlet pipe located adjacent to the leasehold premises and passes the water through a semi-permeable membrane under high pressure leaving the salt from the water behind in a concentrated solution which is discharged back into the ocean.

Permitting & Compliance

- Question 7: Section 4.2 discusses Federal building permit requirements and article 5 covers issuance of a Federal Certificate of Occupancy, and Historic District regulations. These requirements impact rent payments. However the US Virgin Islands has jurisdiction over all development of this property, and they will require adherence to CZM earth change permits, DPNR Building permits and certificate of occupancy, and Historic Preservation rules. How do the Federal Rules work with the US Virgin Islands laws? Why is there no statement of requirement of fulfilling local laws as part of the development process? Does the NPS require any evidence of compliance to local laws?

  A. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

- Question 13: Please provide all available flood zone information.

  A. Flood maps are maintained by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and are available on their website at http/Flood Data Viewers and Geospatial Data | FEMA.gov

- Question 24: What actions are to be taken with the Lead Paint Exhibit (Exhibit G)?

  A. The NPS as the owner will execute this exhibit with all known information prior to lease execution.

- Question 64: Will the NPS provide a copy of the survey showing topography, boundary, and existing improvements — including roads, all buildings, utilities, and amenities — for the property?

A. **The information that was provided with the RFP, or that may be publicly available on the NPS PEPC website ([Virgin Islands PEPC site]), or in other locations, is all that the NPS is making available at this time. Additional information may be shared with the selected offeror during lease negotiations based on their proposed redevelopment plan.**

- Question 77: Who determines the level of NEPA review (Environmental Assessment vs. Environmental Impact Statement); what is the NPS's estimate of its duration; and does NEPA/Section 106 compliance occur before lease execution and gate the start of construction?

  A. **The NPS will determine the level, timing, and scope of NEPA and Section 106 review based on overall scope, scale and complexity of the successful offerors proposed redevelopment plan.**

- Question 78: The RFP states the selected offeror funds compliance under NPS supervision — will the NPS provide an estimated budget range, schedule, and division of roles before offerors finalize their financial projections?

  A. **This will depend on the scope and scale of the selected offeror redevelopment plan, and therefore the NPS is unable to provide these estimates.**

- Question 80: What is the NPS's expectation for the interface with USVI Coastal Zone Management permitting, and will the NPS assist in expediting territorial and federal permits?

  A. **As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities. The NPS will work cooperatively with the Lessee in their efforts to obtain all necessary permits.**

- Question 100: Are there quantitative viewshed, building-height, lighting (dark-sky and turtle-safe), or site-coverage standards the lessee must meet?

  A. **The NPS has not established quantitative standards for the redevelopment of the Leasehold Premises.**

- Question 101: Will the NPS support the sale of excess desalinated water to the local community, and what permitting pathway would apply?

  A. **As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that**

each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

- Question 102: Is LEED or another sustainability certification required, or only viewed favorably, and is a specific certification level expected?

  A. LEED or other sustainability certification is not required but may be evaluated in connection with the criteria outlined in the RFP.

- Question 103: Does the NPS impose any maximum or minimum number of guest keys, building footprint, or overall density for the redevelopment?

  A. No. The NPS will not impose a maximum or minimum number of guest keys, building footprint, or overall density for the redevelopment. However, these factors may be considered in connection with the evaluative criteria outlined in the RFP.

- Question 105: May the lessee use existing previously disturbed areas and footprints for new parking and back-of-house facilities, and what is the approval pathway for added parking?

  A. The NPS will evaluate proposals based on the information and criteria outlined in the RFP. Compliance for additional parking will be handled in conjunction with the compliance for the overall redevelopment project.

- Question 125: How will the NPS treat optional adjacent-federal-property elements in scoring relative to a base concept that does not include them?

  A. The NPS will evaluate proposals based on the information and criteria outlined in the RFP.

- Question 141: Does NPS have a minimum or target overnight key count, are there any caps on building height or footprint within previously disturbed areas, what density, height, and permanence will NPS permit for staff housing for the full term, and will NPS permit temporary construction-workforce accommodation within the Leasehold or Permitted Areas during construction?

  A. The NPS does not have a minimum or target overnight key count. Offerors should take into consideration all aspects of the RFP including the evaluation criteria when developing their proposed concept.

- Question 144: Which authorized uses contemplated by Lease Section 6.1, for example alcohol service, spa, and event space, are already cleared under the 2023 Environmental Assessment and FONSI, and which will require new NEPA compliance tied to the selected concept?

A. **NPS will undergo the appropriate NEPA prior to the execution of the lease. The NPS will determine the level, timing, and scope of NEPA and Section 106 review based on overall scope, scale and complexity of the successful offerors proposed redevelopment plan.**

- Question 162: The RFP states that the Selected Offeror will fund and prepare NEPA compliance documents (EA or EIS) under NPS supervision. Has NPS made a preliminary determination as to whether the redevelopment is likely to require an Environmental Assessment or a full Environmental Impact Statement, given that a 2023 EA/FONSI was already incorporated into the General Management Plan? Will the prior 2023 FONSI provide any tiering benefit for the Selected Offeror's compliance process?

  A. **See response to Question 144.**

- Question 163: The VI Coastal Zone Management Act (12 V.I.C. § 903) is referenced as governing redevelopment. Will VI DPNR Coastal Zone Management permits be required in addition to NPS approvals, and if so, will NPS coordinate with DPNR as a cooperating agency during NEPA compliance, or will the Lessee be required to pursue territorial permitting independently?

  A. **See Sections 6.6 and 9.3 of the Draft Lease. NPS will work cooperatively with the lessee to obtain the necessary permits.**

- Question 165: Please provide additional information regarding permitting process. Does/Will the project have special concessions due to its National Parks Service designation, or do all standard permitting processes at regulatory agencies apply?

  A. **Permitting processes will conform with all federal laws.**

- Question 190: Is there any limitation on the height of constructions beyond standard zoning, not only in terms of the number of floors but also their overall dimensions?

  A. **NPS would recommend the offeror refer to the RFP General Lease Conditions, "the lease will adequately insure the preservation of the historic property." Additionally, the Cultural Resource Protection and Viewsheds section and Exhibit J.**

  New or replacement buildings within the Historic District should follow the character-defining features of the Caneel Bay Historic District or employ compatible contemporary design that evokes the Mid-Century Modern character of the district while remaining clearly differentiated from historic fabric, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. NPS approval of any raised buildings would be subject to the impact that the proposed change in height would have on the overall defining characteristics of the property.

- Question 195: Will NPS support distributed renewable microgrids?

  A. Offeror's proposals will be evaluated under the seven criteria. Please see criteria 5 and 6.

- Question 197: What NEPA and NHPA consultations have already been completed by NPS in anticipation of this RFP, and what, if any, Programmatic Agreements are already in place that would streamline the lessee's future approvals?

  A. In 2023, a PA was executed with the VISHPO associated with previous Caneel Bay planning and NEPA efforts. While it is available as Attachment C to the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) located here: ParkPlanning - Caneel Bay Finding of No Significant Impact, a new PA will be developed as part of NHPA compliance prior to execution of the lease.

- Question 198: The Structural Assessment (Exhibit I, July 2025) was provided in six parts. What are the NPS's own conclusions from this assessment regarding which structures are structurally viable for rehabilitation versus those that must be demolished? Does NPS have a preferred position, or is this entirely at the lessee's discretion?

  A. The NPS completed the Structural Assessment Report, and NPS findings are explained in the report. NPS recognizes that extensive hurricane damage, ongoing deterioration, and life-safety and resilience requirements may make preservation of a significant number of contributing structures infeasible. NPS provided initial visual structural assessments in Exhibit I, but additional deterioration has occurred and updated assessments may determine that several, if not all, structures are unsound. Offerors should document their preservation decision-making clearly and demonstrate that replacement is the result of a good-faith evaluation rather than a preference for new construction. NPS intends to develop a Programmatic Agreement to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act for this federal action since the full scope of potential effects on historic properties is not yet clear during these early stages of project planning.

- Question 201: Provide stormwater drainage design requirements and capacity constraints

  A. Stormwater management requirements in the U.S. Virgin Islands are defined under its Territorial Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES), administered by the U.S. VI Department of Planning & Natural Resources (DPNR). As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

- Question 202: Provide flood line plans (50 & 100 year) and coastal setback requirements

  A. FEMA has flood data see the following link, [http/Flood Data Viewers and Geospatial Data | FEMA.gov]()

- Question 203: Confirm construction constraints including logistics, access and staging areas

  A. Construction logistics, access and staging are dependent on the selected offeror's proposal and will be negotiated with the selected offeror.

- Question 204: Provide any existing or pending planning approvals applicable to redevelopment

  A. None exist.

- Question 207: Are renewable-energy installations eligible for accelerated approvals?

  A. NPS will process any approvals in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, policy and lease considerations. All approvals will be in accordance with the final lease.

- Question 211: Copies of any climate related risk assessment reports carried out for the site including mapping of near-term sea level rise data, storm surge zones, or flood zones.

  A. The NPS will not be providing additional information regarding this RFP beyond what has already been provided or may be publicly available. See response to Question 202 for information on FEMA data.

- Question 213: Is NPS seeking net-zero energy or carbon-neutral operations? Does NPS favor any specific certification?

  A. Determinations regarding utility redevelopment and operations should be made by the offeror based on their proposed redevelopment plan taking into consideration the requirements of the RFP.

- Question 214: Is the lessee responsible for coral reef or any other environmental monitoring on the site, in adjacent land or in adjacent marine areas, given the site's location within a National Park that includes marine environments?

  A. Monitoring within the Leasehold Premises will be covered by the base rent listed in the RFP and managed by NPS. Resource impacts caused by the lessee activities identified through monitoring would be the responsibility of the

lessee to work with the NPS to resolve and would be part of the lease negotiations.

- Question 220: Regarding the ponds, are they natural or artificial? Do they have any specific use (water collection, treated water storage, osmosis rejection, treated greywater used for irrigation, or others)? Do they hold any significant natural value or any special protection?

  A. **The NPS does not know the origin of the ponds and is unaware of their specific use.**

- Question 225: What measures are implemented to mitigate sargassum etc?

  A. **None. The Park does not actively remove sargassum. Per the RFP see General Lease Objectives: "In addition to the purposes outlined in Public Law 925 Chapter 885, establishing Virgin Islands National Park, and as further outlined in the Foundation Document, Virgin Islands | Virgin Islands Coral Reef National Monument, U.S. Virgin Islands, December 2016 (Foundation Document), the NPS has a number of overarching objectives for this redevelopment project in order to comply with 36 C.F.R. § 18.4 which are as follows: The lease will not result in degradation of the purposes and values of the park area."**

- Question 247: Which authority(ies) is mandated to issue and manage permitting for development and operation of the site?

  A. **As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.**

- Question 248: Have any exceptions / relaxations been made to building / zoning guidelines for this site?

  A. **As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.**

- Question 249: What federal, state or other incentive programs, grants or programs are available or expected to become available for the selected lessee?

  A. **The NPS believes that offerors could potentially take advantage of Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives. Information on these incentives can be**

found at https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/index.htm. There may also be other types of state and local programs and incentives that may apply related to historic preservation or otherwise. The NPS encourages offerors to contact local and state agencies for more information on what might be available.

- Question 288: Considering that the resort is surrounded by the dense tropical dry forest, what are the mutual responsibilities for wildfire mitigation along the property boundaries? Will the Lessee be permitted to clear and maintain defensive firebreaks and install fire-hydrant loops?

  A. **Further review General Lease Objectives: "In addition to the purposes outlined in Public Law 925 Chapter 885, establishing Virgin Islands National Park, and as further outlined in the Foundation Document, Virgin Islands | Virgin Islands Coral Reef National Monument, U.S. Virgin Islands, December 2016 (Foundation Document), the NPS has a number of overarching objectives for this redevelopment project in order to comply with 36 C.F.R. § 18.4 which are as follows: The lease will not result in degradation of the purposes and values of the park area; The lease will adequately insure the preservation of the historic property." Additionally, research into wildlife risks in the Virgin Islands and the previous resort historic cultural landscape is recommended along with reviewing Exhibit J.**

- Question 310: Do the evasive trees need to be eradicated?

  A. **The NPS believes that this question is directed at "invasive tress." With regard to invasive tree species not associated with the cultural landscape removal will be negotiated with the selected offeror based on their proposed redevelopment concept.**

- Question 330: Which existing structures are required to be preserved vs eligible for demolition and rebuild?

  A. **This has not been determined. NPS has provided Exhibit J for guidelines.**

- Question 333: What beach restoration has been contemplated, and what is allowable?

  A. **No beach restoration has been contemplated. Please see the RFP General Lease Objectives: "In addition to the purposes outlined in Public Law 925 Chapter 885, establishing Virgin Islands National Park, and as further outlined in the Foundation Document, Virgin Islands | Virgin Islands Coral Reef National Monument, U.S. Virgin Islands, December 2016 (Foundation Document), the NPS has a number of overarching objectives for this redevelopment project in order to comply with 36 C.F.R. § 18.4 which are as follows: The lease will not result in degradation of the purposes and values of the park area."**

- Question 336: Is the NPS involved in buildings inspections, liquor license, or certificates of occupancy?

  A. **Building inspections and certificates of occupancy are the responsibility of the NPS and liquor licenses will be issued in coordination with the local authority as may be applicable. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.**

Lease Terms, Rent & Finance

- Question 3: Currently there are tenants doing business on the property: a restaurant, a beach concession and the RO plant water business. Are there any other tenants or agreements? What are the terms of the existing tenants occupancy? Do they have leases/agreements that will need to be honored or does their occupancy expire upon execution of the new hotel lease?

  A. **See response to Question 147**

- Question 8: Can the development cost be used to calculate rent offsets?

  A. **In accordance with 36 CFR Part 18 and under additional terms as may be negotiated by the NPS with the selected offeror, the minimum fair market value rent that will be required will take into account any requirements under the lease for the lessee to restore, rehabilitate or otherwise improve the leased property. Based on the offerors proposed rental amount and structure, the NPS may allow rent offsets under the authority provided by 54 USC 102102(d)(2).**

- Question 14: There are currently operators within the property, such as Zozo's, the water treatment plant, Honeymoon Beach. Please provide their lease agreements.

  A. **See response to Question 147.**

- Question 21: Per Criterion 1, it appears that the NPS is open to "removable personal property structures that may be placed on the property in support of your operational concept". Can you please elaborate on what you might consider "removable personal property", the term by which it would need to be removed, and whether these temporary structures need to be built on land that was previously disturbed or built upon?

  A. **Removable personal property is property that is not permanently affixed to the land and can be moved or removed without altering or destroying the property**

or land on which it sits. The location of proposed personal property will be negotiated with the successful offeror based on their specific redevelopment plan.

- Question 22: In Criterion 2 the Exhibit F OMB Form 10-355B is required to be filled out, but it allows for additional information to be provided that supports our response. Our entity is a non-profit development company, and non-profit accounting is a little different from commercial accounting. This makes it difficult to fill out parts of the form since it needs to be expressed in a different way than the form requires. If we provide additional information that provides the same information required in the form, but in a way that complies with non-profit accounting, is that satisfactory in terms of responding to that particular form?

  A. Please complete and submit the required OMB form and provide the information requested and if you have additional information you would like to provide that is responsive to the selection criteria, you should provide that information in addition to the required form.

- Question 23: Under the “Planned Asset Acquisition”, in Exhibit F, it asks for assets necessary to operate the Lease Property that will be acquired by the Offeror if awarded the Draft Lease.

  A. “Lease Property” should have stated “Leasehold Premises”.

- Question 25: Can you please define “adjacent federal property” that may be available to be leased as part of the RFP? Exhibit A doesn’t provide any demarcated boundary areas nor indicate what is included in this property.

  A. Correct, there is no boundary determined. There is no formally identified or targeted federal property adjacent to the approximately 150-acre Resort area. The RFP allows for prospective offerors to include federal property immediately bordering or contiguous with the Resort area shown in Exhibit A to be included within the Leasehold Premises and to be managed as part of any new lease.

- Question 31: Will bidders be required to disclose any intention to seek Economic Development Commission (EDC) benefits or other public incentives?

  A. The selected offeror will need to develop a financing plan in accordance with the LDDA.

- Question 51: Please confirm the anticipated selection date, the length of the LDDA/lease negotiation period, and the anticipated lease commencement date.

  A. The anticipated selection date, as provided on page 2 of the RFP in the Fall/Winter 2026/27. And the length of the LDDA/ lease negotiation period will

depend on the scope, scale, and complexity of the selected offerors redevelopment and financing plan.

- Question 53: May financial capability and experience be demonstrated through the offeror's parent, members, affiliates, or named team partners (e.g., the operator and equity partner)? If so, whose Form 10-352, Form 10-354, and credit reports are required?
  A. **Yes, financial capability and experience may be demonstrated through offeror's parents, members, affiliates, or named team partners. Offeror should submit individual forms (Form 10-352 & 10-354) along with credit reports for each entity that the offeror would like to have considered toward their experience (Criterion 4) and financial capability (Criterion 2).**

- Question 54: If the offeror is a team or joint venture, which party must sign the Transmittal Letter and execute the forms, and how should a non-U.S. team member's (for example, a foreign operator's) financial and credit information be documented?
  A. **Form must be signed by a party that has the authority to guarantee all certifications, agreements, and obligations on behalf of the Offeror and make such certifications, agreements and obligations individually and on behalf of the offeror. Foreign offerors should provide financial and credit information in the same manner as domestic offerors.**

- Question 56: Are there any restrictions on foreign ownership of, or a foreign operator under, a federal lease of this property?
  A. **The NPS is not aware of any restrictions on foreign ownership or a foreign operator acquiring the leasehold interest for this property.**

- Question 58: Will the NPS provide GIS data, existing surveys, and a metes-and-bounds description of the approximately 150-acre Leasehold Premises, or is the surveyed legal description solely the selected offeror's pre-lease responsibility?
  A. **The information that was provided with the RFP, or that may be publicly available on the NPS PEPC website (Virgin Islands PEPC site), or in other locations, is all that the NPS is making available at this time. Additional information may be shared with the selected offeror during lease negotiations based on their proposed redevelopment plan. However, the final surveyed legal description is the selected offeror's responsibility.**

- Question 60: Please identify the specific "adjacent federal property" that may be included in the Leasehold Premises and evaluated under the criteria, and any constraints on its use.

A. **See response to Question 25.**

- Question 65: What is the legal status of the operations currently functioning within the premises — Zozo's restaurant, the Caneel Bay Beach Club, and the reverse-osmosis water facility — including any existing agreements, their terms and expirations, and how they will transition to or coexist with the new lessee?

  A. **See response to Question 147.**

- Question 66: Are there existing leases, concession contracts, CUAs, retained-use-estate remnants, or third-party rights within the premises that the selected offeror must assume or honor, or that the NPS will terminate prior to lease execution?

  A. **See response to Question 147.**

- Question 72: Will the NPS provide a PDF copy of the GPS survey for Caneel Bay as soon as practicable? During the site tour, reference was made to a GPS survey of approximately 650 plants (not solely trees) brought to Caneel Bay from various locations across the Caribbean; please confirm that the survey includes a description of each specimen.

  A. **The information that was provided with the RFP, or that may be publicly available on the NPS PEPC website (Virgin Islands PEPC site), or in other locations, is all that the NPS is making available at this time. Additional information may be shared with the selected offeror during lease negotiations based on their proposed redevelopment plan.**

- Question 81: Do federal requirements such as Davis-Bacon prevailing wage, Buy American provisions, or federal accessibility standards (Architectural Barriers Act/ABA) apply to construction and operation on the Leasehold Premises?

  A. **As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations, including but not limited to the International Code Council family of codes including the International Building Code (IBC), the International Fire Code (IFC), and the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA), and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.**

- Question 104: The authorized-use list is stated to be non-final — will the NPS consider additional uses such as a membership club, large-scale events/weddings, branded residences, fractional or whole-ownership real estate, or retail open to non-guests? Are any of these categorically prohibited?

A. **The NPS will consider uses not included in the authorized-use list but that are consistent with applicable laws, statutes, regulations, and policies. Section 2.4 of the Draft Lease (Exhibit C: Draft Lease VIIS001-2026) provides that "This Lease does not vest in the Lessee any fee interest in the Premises or Improvements thereon. Title to the Premises and Improvements at all times is with, and will remain solely with, the Lessor."**

- Question 106: May the lessee sublease discrete components (for example, spa, retail, or watersports) to third-party operators, subject to NPS approval?

  A. **Yes.**

- Question 108: Is the Base Rent of $442,462 (escalating 4% annually) fixed for all offerors regardless of concept and term; is the escalation rate negotiable; and what is the basis for that figure?

  A. **The base rent is fixed for all offerors and is not negotiable and is the minimum amount of rent necessary for the NPS to oversee and manage the leasehold interest and the lessee's operations.**

- Question 109: Please describe the methodology and timing of the fair-market-value rent determination, how proposed capital investment factors into it, and how and when rent offsets are calculated, documented, and applied.

  A. **Fair market value rent will be determined in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 18.5. How and when rent offsets are calculated, documented, and applied will be negotiated with the selected offeror based on the scope, scale, and timing of their proposed redevelopment project.**

- Question 110: Is there a cap on rent offsets, and can total fair-market-value rent above Base Rent be fully offset, such that only the Base Rent remains payable?

  A. **Rent offsets cannot exceed the total amount of rent due during the term of the lease, such that the NPS would have to compensate the lessee for unrealized rent offsets upon lease expiration. Yes, fair market value rent, above base rent, may be fully offset such that only the base rent remains payable.**

- Question 111: Under Criterion 3, will percentage-of-revenue rent qualify as guaranteed, non-offsetable rent, and is there a minimum amount above Base Rent the NPS seeks?

  A. **Offerors are expected to propose a rent structure based on the guidance provided in the Criterion 3 "Required Response". Annual Rent and Percentage Rent are both offsetable forms of rent, and offerors can propose a rent structure that includes one, or both of these types of rent. Rent will be considered based on the Offerors proposed rent structure. Base Rent, as**

presented in the Draft Lease (Exhibit C to this RFP), is the minimum amount of non-offsetable Rent that must be paid to the NPS.

- Question 112: How does the NPS reconcile Criterion 1's interest in substantial capital investment with Criterion 3's stated preference for non-offsetable rent over offsetable capital — how should offerors optimize between the two?

  A. **These are business decisions that need to be made by the offeror based on their knowledge and understanding of the market, the business opportunity, and experience in the redevelopment of resort properties.**

- Question 113: Is there a minimum required capital investment, and is a higher investment scored more favorably under any criterion despite the Criterion 3 offset preference?

  A. **There is no minimum required capital investment as this will depend on the scope and scale of the offerors' proposed redevelopment project. Greater investment would not in and of itself be scored more favorably but would have to be taken into consideration in the context of the overall return to the government.**

- Question 114: Will the NPS permit a leasehold mortgage and provide customary leasehold-mortgagee protections (notice, cure rights, and recognition/non-disturbance) that lenders will require to finance the project?

  A. **The NPS will allow for encumbrances in accordance with Section 16.2 of Exhibit C: Draft Lease VIIS001-2026.**

- Question 115: What are the lease's assignment and transfer provisions and the standards for NPS approval, given the stated "develop to hold" preference?

  A. **The NPS will allow assignments in accordance with Section 16.1 of Exhibit C: Draft Lease VIIS001-2026.**

- Question 116: Please confirm the insurance requirements in Exhibit B to the Draft Lease, including expectations for named-windstorm and builder's-risk coverage given Caribbean market conditions.

  A. **The insurance requirements in Exhibit B to the Draft Lease (Exhibit C to the RFP) may be negotiated with the selected offeror based on their proposed redevelopment plan. Lease terms and conditions will be negotiated between NPS and the Selected Offeror and must be substantially similar to the terms and conditions included in the Draft Lease.**

- Question 117: Please confirm the applicability of USVI ad valorem/real-estate and other taxes, and whether the lessee may pursue USVI Economic Development Commission or other incentives consistent with the lease.

    A. **As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.**

- Question 118: Will the NPS provide the Draft Lease and LDDA in editable form to facilitate the offeror's proposed redline, and which terms does the NPS consider non-negotiable?

    A. **Lease terms and conditions will be negotiated between NPS and the Selected Offeror and must be substantially similar to the terms and conditions included in the Draft Lease. The NPS will not consider changes or amendments to the LDDA of Draft Lease as part of evaluating the proposals pursuant to this RFP.**

- Question 119: Will the NPS share the key LDDA milestones, required deposits, and any performance security or completion guarantees expected, and the consequences if post-award compliance materially alters the approved concept?

    A. **The LDDA milestones will depend on the scope and scale of the selected offeror's proposed redevelopment project and will be negotiated with the selected offeror.**

- Question 121: During the LDDA/lease negotiation period, will the selected offeror have exclusivity, and what are each party's termination rights during that period?

    A. **The NPS will negotiate the LDDA exclusively with the selected offeror under the terms of a letter of intent that will be negotiated between the NPS and the selected offeror.**

- Question 122: Regarding the "Caneel Bay" trademarks held by Ataraxia Hospitality LLC: will the NPS facilitate or participate in any discussion with the trademark owner, and what is the process and timeline for NPS approval of an alternative project name if the offeror does not license the existing marks?

    A. **Discussions with the holder of any trademarks associated with the of the Caneel Bay Resort are between the two parties and do not involve the NPS and the NPS does not intend to facilitate or participate in these discussions. Naming of the resort will be negotiated with the successful offeror.**

Renaming of the resort will need to comply with the terms of the RFP and Exhibit C: Draft Lease VIIS001-2026 and may be negotiated with the successful offeror.

- Question 123: Please clarify the permissible scope of operator/brand identification (for example, association with a named luxury hotel collection) in light of the limitation on destination monikers that mimic corporate names.

  A. **Operator and brand identification will be negotiated with the selected offeror and will be in accordance with the laws, regulations and policies applicable to the NPS.**

- Question 130: Rent offsets under Lease Section 5.8 require a separate written agreement. Will NPS pre-agree the categories of cost eligible for offset, any cap expressed as a percentage of fair market value rent, the period over which approved costs amortize against rent above base, and whether above-code resilience costs qualify?

  A. **What may qualify for rent offsets and how they may be implemented will be negotiated with the selected offeror prior to and possibly, depending on the selected offeror's redevelopment plan, during the term of the lease.**

- Question 131: Do Base Rent and Annual Rent accrue from the Lease Execution Date, through the multi-year construction period before the property generates revenue, or from Certificate of Occupancy, and does any abatement apply during construction?

  A. **The structure of rent will be based on the selected offerors proposal and additional terms may be negotiated with the selected offeror based on the selected offerors proposal and the requirement that the NPS receive, at a minimum, fair market value rent.**

- Question 132: The Draft Lease applies a four percent fixed Base Rent escalator under Section 5.3 and a separate CPI adjustment on Annual Rent under Section 5.4. Please clarify how the two interact, confirm the actual CPI-U figure NPS will insert, and confirm the intended mechanic given that the cited year ranges in Section 5.4 are internally inconsistent and reference future periods.

  A. **Base Rent and Annual Rent are separate types of rent. Base Rent, as presented in the Draft Lease (Exhibit C to this RFP), is the minimum amount of non-offsetable Rent that must be paid to the NPS. Annual Rent and Percentage Rent are both offsetable forms of rent and offerors can propose a rent structure that includes one, or both of these types of rent. The CPI figure that will be inserted into the Annual Rent paragraph, if the offeror is proposing to pay Annual Rent, will be the average annual average CPI increase over the last (10) ten full calendar years.**

- Question 133: Does NPS intend to impose Percentage Rent under Section 5.5, at what rate, additive to or in lieu of fair market value rent above base, and with what treatment of affiliate and sublessee revenue, and does NPS intend to require the Maintenance Reserve Account under Section 10.4, at what percentage, and is the end-of-term forfeiture to NPS negotiable?
  A. **Offerors are expected to propose the amount of rent in all forms that they determine to be commensurate with the opportunity provided by the lease. The inclusion of maintenance reserve funds, as well as the percentage rate at which they accrue, is at the discretion of the offeror. Forfeiture of these funds at the end of the lease is not negotiable.**
- Question 134: Please confirm the coverage levels required under Lease Exhibit B, in particular whether named-windstorm and flood coverage at full replacement cost are mandatory, and the business interruption and professional liability sublimits left blank in the draft, given the mandatory rebuild obligation and the site's exposure.
  A. **The insurance requirements in Exhibit B to the Draft Lease (Exhibit C to the RFP) may be negotiated with the selected offeror based on its proposed redevelopment plan. Lease terms and conditions will be negotiated between NPS and the Selected Offeror and must be substantially similar to the terms and conditions included in the Draft Lease.**
- Question 135: Lease Section 16.2 permits an Encumbrance only where the lender, on foreclosure, may assume the Lease or select an NPS-approved replacement lessee, and bars the lender from altering any term. Will NPS negotiate customary leasehold mortgagee protections into the final Lease, including notice and cure rights, a right to a new lease on default or bankruptcy rejection, and recognition and non-disturbance, and will NPS recognize an operator non-disturbance or replacement arrangement so that the management agreement does not terminate with the Lease on a Lessee default?
  A. **The NPS may negotiate these terms based on the offerors proposed operational or financing structure and the requirements of the lender. Lease terms and conditions must be substantially similar to the terms and conditions included in the RFP.**
- Question 136: Lease Section 14 requires the Lessee to rebuild after casualty at NPS's direction, with no Lessee termination right and, under Section 14.2, no rent abatement during reconstruction. On a long-term lease in a Category 5 corridor, will NPS accept a casualty threshold above which the Lessee may elect to terminate, rent abatement during any post-casualty closure, and a more objective force-majeure rent-relief mechanism than the discretionary Section 5.7? Please also confirm that on any NPS

election to terminate after casualty under Section 14.1(b), insurance proceeds are applied to restoration or the leasehold mortgagee's interest in those proceeds is protected, rather than paid to NPS as Additional Rent.

A. **The NPS anticipates negotiating Section 14 with the selected offeror based on its redevelopment plan and the final financing structure. While the NPS will negotiate the provisions of the final lease, it must be substantially similar to the terms and conditions included in the Draft Lease. The final lease will comply with the applicable statutes, regulations, and policy governing this type of lease.**

- Question 137: Total rent must be at least fair market value, set by an NPS-selected appraisal on the approved plans at Lease Execution under LDDA Section 2.2(d), but the methodology is not stated. What valuation approach will the appraisal apply, if that appraisal exceeds the rent offered under Criterion 3 does the appraised figure or the offered rent govern, and how does Criterion 3 weigh higher non-offsetable rent against a shorter term?

  A. **Methodology for the appraisal will depend on the scope and scale of the selected offerors proposed redevelopment. The NPS is required by statute (54 USC 102102) to receive at least fair market value rent.**

- Question 138: LDDA Section 2.2(m) requires executed completion guarantees from NPS-approved guarantors. What guarantor credit standard, form, and amount will NPS require, will a payment and performance bond satisfy this in lieu of a corporate completion guaranty, and what completion deadline and term reduction does Lease Section 4.1 contemplate, tolled for Excusable Delay and Force Majeure including NEPA and permitting delays?

  A. **Guarantees will depend on the scope and scale of the redevelopment project and how the offerors propose to finance the construction. This is generally in the form of an executed agreement between the Lessee, contractor, and the guarantor (bank, lender, insurance company, etc.).**

  Section 4.1 of Exhibit C: Draft Lease VIIS001-2026 contemplates a completion timeline for the initial redevelopment of the property that would be negotiated with the successful offeror depending on the scope and scale of the redevelopment.

- Question 139: Where the LDDA is terminated for the fault of NPS, or for no fault of either party, will NPS allow the Developer to recover its documented, unrecovered project costs, given that Section 9.3 currently leaves termination as the Developer's sole remedy while Sections 9.4 and 9.5 preserve NPS's rights to damages, specific performance, and the Developer's plans and data on a Developer default?

A. **The NPS is unable to commit to any recovery of costs by the developer from the NPS upon termination of the LDDA.**

- Question 142: Will NPS permit a for-sale, fractional, residence-club, or membership residential component delivered through term subleases that expire with the Lease, is such a structure consistent with Part 18 and the General Management Plan, and would the optional Section 16.3 transfer premium apply to it?

  A. **Section 2.4 of the Draft Lease (Exhibit C: Draft Lease VIIS001-2026) provides that "This Lease does not vest in the Lessee any fee interest in the Premises or Improvements thereon. Title to the Premises and Improvements at all times is with, and will remain solely with, the Lessor." Any sublease would be subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Draft Lease.**

- Question 143: Given the requirement to use a single NPS-approved name, the statement that branding which mimics corporate or commercial affiliations may not be permitted, and Ataraxia Hospitality's ownership of the Caneel Bay trademarks, would a recognized luxury operator's brand name be acceptable, and what naming will NPS approve?

  A. **The NPS will negotiate branding and naming with the selected offeror.**

- Question 145: Will NPS accept a hospitality management fee structured as a base fee plus an incentive fee on gross operating profit, rather than only a flat fee or a percentage of gross income as described in LDDA Section 2.2(h), what benchmark defines the resort industry standard, and will a newly created or repositioned luxury brand satisfy the operator experience standard?

  A. **The final terms and conditions of the LDDA may be negotiated with the selected offeror based on the offeror's proposal.**

- Question 146: The RFP requires the final lease to be substantially similar to the Draft Lease and LDDA. What degree of deviation is consistent with that standard, which provisions does NPS regard as non-negotiable versus open to material modification, and what is the change-approval process if the concept evolves after selection?

  A. **Changes to the LDDA and Draft lease will be considered based on the selected offeror's proposed redevelopment plans and change to those plans may be considered during negotiations with the selected offeror.**

- Question 152: Will NPS provide any existing topographic surveys, grading plans, floodplain mapping, FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), or LIDAR data for the Leasehold Premises?
  A. The NPS will not be providing additional information regarding this RFP beyond what has already been provided or may be publicly available. See response to Question 202 for information on FEMA data.

- Question 168: Will Base Rent begin accruing on the date of lease execution, or will NPS provide a rent abatement period during the pre-opening/construction phase?
  A. Base rent will begin accruing on the Execution Date of the Lease.

- Question 169: When in the LDDA/Lease negotiation process will the final fair market value rent determination be made?
  A. The NPS intends on having the final fair market value determination prior to execution of the final lease.

- Question 170: Can NPS clarify what categories of expenditure are eligible for rent offset?
  A. The NPS has the statutory authority (54 USC 102102) to take into account amounts to be expended by a lessee for preservation, maintenance, restoration, improvement, or repair and related expenses. Final determinations on what expenditures may be eligible for rent offset will be negotiated with the selected offeror.

- Question 173: Would the Leasehold Premises be subject to USVI real property taxes?
  A. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

- Question 174: Are any federal tax incentives (e.g., Historic Tax Credits, New Markets Tax Credits, Opportunity Zone benefits) applicable to redevelopment at this location?
  A. Depending on the scope and scale of the selected offeror's proposed redevelopment plan both Federal and territorial tax incentives may be available and offerors are expected to do their own due diligence on the availability and applicability of these programs in the context of their proposed plan. Additional information can be found at the links below:

  https://www.nps.gov/subjects/taxincentives/index.htm and

  https://usvieda.org/tax-incentives/

- Question 176: At the expiration or termination of the Lease, will improvements revert to NPS at no cost, or will the Lessee be entitled to compensation for the value of improvements?

  A. **All improvements are the property of the NPS, and no compensation will be provided to the lessee other than through rent offsets during the term of the lease.**

- Question 178: Section 16.2 of the Draft Lease limits NPS approval of leasehold encumbrances to those that only grant the lender the right to assume Lessee's responsibilities or select a new lessee. Construction and permanent lenders typically require broader protections — including the right to complete a project and operate through a receiver upon borrower default — before they will commit to leasehold financing. Will NPS negotiate a Lender Recognition Agreement or a Non-disturbance and Subordination Agreement providing institutional construction and permanent lenders with sufficient step-in rights to make leasehold financing commercially feasible?

  A. **The NPS is willing to negotiate with the selected offeror specific rights of lenders that may be necessary in order for the offeror to obtain financing for their redevelopment project.**

- Question 188: In file 02-Exhibit-A-Caneel-Bay-Area-Map-and-Red-Hook-Area-Map.pdf, four framed areas appear as part of the resort, on the Eastern side. These zones were not visited, and from what we have been able to ascertain, they correspond to: 1. Water catchment, 2. Pond, 2. Small construction, 4. A fourth rectangle, in the steeper area close to Hawksnest beach, with an unidentified use. What were the uses of these spaces? Do they currently have any usage limitations or will they in the future?

  A. **The areas are part of the former 150-acre Resort area and NPS does not fully know of their past uses.**

- Question 192: Please provide copies of original "as-built" 1956 drawings for the resort.

  A. **NPS will provide access to drawings that it has legal ownership of to the selected lessee.**

- Question 218: Please provide any tree survey which has been conducted on the site.

  A. **NPS will provide access to the tree survey to the selected lessee.**

- Question 223: Will sustainability commitments become enforceable lease obligations?

  A. **The NPS will consider all commitments and reserves the right to include any commitments into the final lease.**

- Question 226: Can the lease include a reversion value mechanism at the end of the term?

  A. The NPS will not consider including a reversion value mechanism in the lease.

- Question 227: Exhibit F – OMB Form 10-355B Offeror Financial Projections: are financial projections required for the proposed duration of the lease? Or the initial 10-year period only?

  A. Offerors should provide projections for the entire proposed term of the lease.

- Question 228: What happens to rent after a major hurricane loss event?

  A. See the Draft Lease provided as Exhibit C to the RFP.

- Question 234: Will the lease mandate lessee employment practices beyond applicable law?

  A. This will depend on the selected offeror's commitments related to employment practices and the applicable laws.

- Question 236: Provide copies of specific territorial or local laws and regulations referenced in the RFP, Draft LDDA, or Draft Lease that are not readily available through general web searches, particularly those unique to the U.S. Virgin Islands.

  A. All of these laws and regulations are publicly available.

- Question 237: Exhibit B - LDDA - Recital F - is it a requirement for each member of the development team to be individually named?

  A. No.

- Question 240: Please provide any NPS policies relevant to the redevelopment or operation of the site.

  A. NPS policies are publicly available at https://www.nps.gov/subjects/policy/index.htm

- Question 241: The RFP states that "After lease execution the Service will consider proposals for the rehabilitation, replacement, and new permanent structures that are necessary for the operational function of the Leasehold Premises as envisaged in the Selected Offeror's proposal or to provide a more sustainable business operation". Please confirm intention that no expansive redevelopment will be approved prior to lease execution.

  A. The NPS does not intend to redevelop the Leasehold Premises prior to the execution of a lease.

- Question 244: All proposed management agreements, subleases, and affiliated-entity financing arrangements must receive NPS approval prior to lease execution. What is the typical approval timeline for these arrangements, and what criteria does NPS apply in evaluating them?

  A. Approval times will depend on the scope, scale, and complexity of the selected offeror's redevelopment plan.

- Question 245: On what basis does the NPS manage the site? Please provide copies of all governing documentation in relation to the same.

  A. The NPS manages Virgin Islands National Park under the several authorities, including but not limited to Title 54 of the United States Code and select portions of Title 16 of the United States Code, applicable implementing regulations, NPS policies, and park specific requirements.

- Question 246: Please identify the owner(s) of the site and details of ownership structure and their involvement (if any) in the lease and future operation of the site.

  A. The Leasehold Premises is currently under the control of the United States Government through the NPS, Virgin Islands National Park.

- Question 251: Is eventual acquisition / private ownership of the site a possibility?

  A. No.

- Question 261: Can third-party nonprofit partners participate in the leasehold?

  A. Possibly, based on the selected offeror's proposed redevelopment plans and negotiations with the selected offeror.

- Question 262: How much flexibility exists for future repositioning/changes of the hospitality product over 60 years?

  A. Any change not authorized under Section 6.1 of the final lease will require the approval of the NPS in accordance with Section 6.2 of the final lease.

- Question 263: If there is a conflict between guest experience and resource protection, what decision framework governs NPS approvals?

  A. Proposals are evaluated on the seven criteria. Offerors shall understand the RFP "General Lease Objectives" when designing their redevelopment plans.

- Question 266: What are the specific quantitative success metrics NPS will use to evaluate stewardship performance over the lease term?

A. **The NPS will ensure that the lessee complies with the terms of the final lease through oversite and management of the lessee's activities in accordance with the terms and conditions of the final lease.**

- Question 267: Where existing structures would be preserved, can these be reconfigured into larger guest accommodation at the expense of key count?

A. **There is no specified key count identified in the RFP.**

- Question 273: Please provide current title report for the Leasehold Premises, including any encumbrances, easements, or rights-of-way, and a recent ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey.

A. **This information will be shared with the selected offeror.**

- Question 276: Exhibit A - the Caneel Bay Resort is denoted in black outline. Is the redevelopment footprint limited to the marked area, or can other areas within the leased area which were not previously part of the Caneel Bay Resort be developed (sympathetic to the principles of the RFP around minimal impact)?

A. **The redevelopment footprint may include other areas that were not previously part of the historic Caneel Bay Resort.**

- Question 285: The RFP states the selected offeror will be invited to negotiate the final lease in Fall/Winter 2026. What is the anticipated duration of that negotiation period, and at what point does NPS consider negotiations to have broken down?

A. **The duration of the negotiations will depend on the scope, scale, and complexity of the selected offeror's redevelopment plan.**

- Question 323: Prior Rent – Would the Service share the amount and basis (percentage or other) of the rent paid under the last contract.

A. **The previous operator of the Caneel Bay Resort did not operate under a lease, and therefore there is no prior rent amount to provide.**

- Question 325: For an Offeror that is not yet formed, the RFP indicates that credit reports should be provided for entities or individuals with ownership or control. Should this requirement apply to all anticipated equity participants or only those expected to have controlling interests? Further, where a parent company or affiliate is expected to provide financial support or guarantees, would submission of that entity's credit report be acceptable in lieu of, or in addition to, ownership-level reports? Finally, are Offerors expected to submit formal financial statements (e.g., audited or unaudited balance sheets), and if so, at what entity level?

A. Proposals may be submitted under a "to-be-formed" entity where the anticipated ownership, control, and governance structure is clearly defined and the required information, including, but not limited to, financial information, bank statements, equity commitments, and credit reports, is submitted for each of the controlling members/owners regardless of the percentage of ownership or control. Any changes to the controlling members/owners after submission of the proposal will not be considered since evaluation of the proposal will be based on the experience and financial capability of the offerors collectively.

- Question 326: In cases where the Offeror entity is not yet formed, may documentation of funding sources (e.g., bank statements, equity commitments) be provided at the parent, sponsor, or partner level rather than in the name of the Offeror? Additionally, are conditional or indicative equity commitment letters acceptable where the final entity structure and ownership percentages are still being finalized? If multiple affiliated or partner entities will contribute capital, should supporting documentation be provided at each contributing entity level or consolidated at the proposed Offeror level?

  A. Proposals may be submitted under a "to-be-formed" entity where the anticipated ownership, control, and governance structure is clearly defined and the required information, including, but not limited to, financial information, bank statements, equity commitments, and credit reports, is submitted for each of the controlling members/owners regardless of the percentage of ownership or control. Any changes to the controlling members/owners after submission of the proposal will not be considered since evaluation of the proposal will be based on the experience and financial capability of the offerors collectively. Conditional equity commitments will not be considered firm commitments.

- Question 327: Is there any requirement to provide audited/unaudited financial statements for any of the proposing entities included balance sheets and statements of income.

  A. There is no requirement that offerors provide financial statements. However, offerors may provide additional information and exhibits to support responses as they determine may be necessary to present a complete financial picture of the intended use and operation.

- Question 329: Please clarify if 166 rooms is the maximum number that will be allowed.

  A. The RFP does not state a maximum number of rooms.

- Question 332: Will NPS allow phased development and/or phased rent commencement aligned to capital deployment?

A. **The NPS will negotiate the terms and conditions during the lease. Lease terms and conditions will be negotiated between NPS and the selected offeror and must be substantially similar to the terms and conditions included in the Draft Lease.**

- Question 337: Does the NPS complete periodic construction inspections?

  A. **See Section 9.4 of Exhibit C: Draft Lease VIIS001-2026.**

- Question 338: What are the hours and days of allowable construction?

  A. **These will be negotiated with the selected offeror but are generally restricted to normal business working hours of 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.**

- Question 346: After winning the agreement will the National Parks Service reimburse the developer for actual out of pocket due diligence work if NPS terminates the agreement?

  A. **No.**

Operations, Management & Existing Operators

- Question 28: Other than the Historic Sugar Mill and the current RO water plant, does NPS plan to retain control over any facility or land area within the project boundary?

  A. **NPS will maintain ownership of the property and does not intend to retain control of the operation and maintenance of any facility within the lease boundary, including the Durloo Sugar Plantation and the RO Plant.**

- Question 55: Does the NPS require the lessee to be the resort operator, or may the lessee engage a separate hotel-management company as operator?

  A. **See Section 2.2(h) of Exhibit B to this RFP.**

- Question 68: Does any salvageable furniture, fixtures, equipment, or material remain on site, and are any items reserved by the NPS or by others?

  A. **Yes. None of the items are reserved by the NPS and the NPS is not aware of any of these items being reserved by others. All furniture, fixtures, equipment, and materials remaining on the Premises upon lease execution will be the responsibility of the lessee.**

- Question 107: What coordination does the NPS expect with the Cinnamon Bay campground concessioner and with operations at Trunk Bay, particularly if guests are transported to Trunk Bay?

A. **It is suggested that the Lessee coordinate with the NPS and the commercial service operators within Trunk Bay, if the Lessee anticipates transporting guests to this beach on a regular or scheduled basis during the term of the lease. The NPS will negotiate any terms and conditions during the lease.**

- Question 175: Has NPS initiated any discussions with Ataraxia Hospitality LLC regarding the availability and pricing of the “Caneel Bay Resort” trademarks?

  A. **No.**

- Question 221: What are the governance arrangements between NPS management and Caneel Bay resort management?

  A. **The final lease will govern the relationship between the lessee and the NPS.**

- Question 238: Given that the RFP expressly states Caneel Bay is a national park asset first and a hospitality operation second, how will NPS adjudicate situations where a lessee's proposed programming changes during the 60-year term require a General Management Plan amendment — and who bears the cost and timeline risk of that process?

  A. **The lessee, under the terms of the lease, will be required to comply with all Applicable Laws and that term is defined in the lease. Any changes in uses outside of those defined in the lease must be approved by the NPS.**

- Question 242: What approval rights does NPS retain over future operators?

  A. **See Section 16 of Exhibit C to this RFP.**

- Question 265: Provide a list of commercial entities which operate within the site under CUAs, and details of basis of occupation in respect of operators of Zozo's and Caneel Bay Beach Club.

  A. **See response to Question 147.**

- Question 321: Historical operating performance – Can you share any information regarding the resort that existed back in 2017 and prior:

  A. **NPS has provided the historical operating information it has as part of the RFP. Refer to the RFP, including Exhibit J.**

- Question 322: Maintenance needs – Can you share the annual maintenance costs NPS has spent on maintaining the ruins

  A. **No. NPS has only taken over management of the location since April 2024. There are no annual maintenance costs to share that would be meaningful.**

- Question 334: Are there any structural or architectural plans/details available for Cottage 7?

  A. NPS has no structural or architectural plans/details for Cottage 7.

- Question 335: Are there any structural or architectural plans/documents available for the restaurant?

  A. NPS has no structural or architectural plans/documents for a restaurant.

- Question 340: Are there constraints on pricing tiers, branding, or positioning (e.g., luxury vs midscale)?

  A. None have been identified by the NPS.

Submission, Formats & Process

- Question 15: For Criterion 1, please confirm that the first question has a limit of 20 pages, but the second question has no page limits.

  A. Correct.

- Question 16: For Criterion 4, are the required OMB Form 10-353/354 and OMB Form 10-352 included in the 20-page response limit?

  A. No

- Question 17: Please further explain the proposal evaluation scoring. Page 18 of the prospectus states "The proposal judged to be the best Proposal under the RFP Evaluation Criteria section of this RFP…" Is "best" understood to be the proposal that earns the highest percentage total of the 100% available?

  A. Yes.

- Question 18: When does the Service estimate an award announcement will be made?

  A. Fall 2026/Winter 2027

- Question 19: Is there a maximum file size for the submission document?

  A. A document must be no more than 25GB to be uploaded and the site holds up to 25GB.

- Question 20: It's clear that the font size needs to be either 11 or 12, but are there specific font styles that documents need to be in?

  A. There is not a specific font style that must be used, but it must be in English, easily readable, and in its basic format (no narrow or wide version of the font).

- Question 27: Is the NPS planning to issue a list of the groups that participated in the site visit?

  A. Yes, the list is available upon request by emailing SERCommercial_Services@nps.gov and putting "Requesting Caneel Bay Site Visit List" in the subject line.

- Question 37: Please confirm whether cover pages, table of contents, section dividers, the required forms (Exhibits D, E, F, and H), résumés, certificates of analysis, and reference lists count toward the per-criterion page limits, or are excluded.

  A. Where page limits are set forth in the RFP, unless otherwise specifically stated, all printed pages, other than section dividers with section title only, count toward the page limits.

- Question 38: For Criterion 1, please confirm which materials qualify as "drawings or renderings" exempt from the 20-page narrative limit (site plans, floor plans, elevations, perspectives, landscape plans), and whether explanatory text on those sheets is permitted.

  A. There is no page limit to the drawings and renderings submitted under Crition 1 and the text that would normally be associated to interpret and describe the drawings or renderings to include legends, scales, etc.

- Question 39: Are headers, footers, captions, and image annotations subject to the 11–12-point font requirement, or only body text?

  A. Only the body text is required to be 11 or 12 point font, but font sizes chosen for other categories must be in English and easily readable.

- Question 40: How should ARCH D (24"×36") drawings be submitted electronically — as scaled PDFs? Are native CAD or other formats required or accepted?

  A. ARCH D drawings should be submitted in PDF format and the resolution should be adequate for the reader to clearly read any text and all the relevant details and dimensions.

- Question 41: Is there a file-size limit, file-count limit, or file-naming convention for uploads to the Microsoft Teams site, and may offerors create subfolders?

  A. Each Offeror will be provided a Teams site that has a maximum capacity of 25GB. The Offeror may upload as many files to this site as long as they do not exceed 25GB of storage. If more storage is needed, the Offeror may contact the NPS at SERCommercial_Services@nps.gov for assistance. There is no specific naming convention. Offerors may create subfolders within the Teams site if desired.

- Question 42: Beyond Microsoft Office and Adobe PDF, are any other formats acceptable (for example, video fly-throughs)? Will the evaluation panel open embedded hyperlinks or external links?

  A. Internal hyperlinks to navigate within a document, such as a table of contents, may be used. Hyperlinks to external websites will not be considered as part of the proposal. Any information an Offeror wants to include in its proposal must be provided electronically as part of their submitted proposal.

- Question 43: Will the NPS confirm receipt of each uploaded submission, and within what timeframe?

  A. Yes, within a reasonable timeframe once the submission is uploaded.

- Question 44: For the hard-copy Offeror's Transmittal Letter, must it be physically received by 2:00 p.m. ET on July 8, or postmarked by that date? Is tracked delivery via a specific carrier recommended?

  A. The hard copy of the Offeror's Transmittal Letter must be postmarked by Proposal Submission Deadline (as may be amended at the discretion of the NPS). The electronic version of the Offeror's transmittal Letter must be submitted electronically in accordance with the RFP by the Proposal Submission Deadline (as may be amended at the discretion of the NPS).

- Question 45: May an offeror submit more than one distinct concept (for example, a base proposal and an alternative), or a proposal with clearly delineated optional variations?

  A. Offerors should submit one distinct concept that does not include optional variations. Responses will be evaluated on firm redevelopment commitments; any optional variations that are at the discretion of the offeror will not be evaluated.

- Question 46: Will the process include interviews, oral presentations, additional site visits, or a best-and-final-offer round after submission, or is selection based solely on the written July 8 submission?

  A. The NPS will determine the offeror whose proposal best met, on an overall basis, the Proposal Evaluation Criteria outlined in the RFP based on the material that is timely submitted, and any additional information that may be requested in accordance with the laws, regulations, and policies applicable to NPS leasing.

- Question 47: Will the NPS provide scores or a debrief to offerors who are not selected?

  A. The NPS will not be providing debriefs to unsuccessful offerors.

- Question 48: Please confirm the deadline for submitting questions, and whether questions received after that time will be answered.
  A. **The deadline was June 11. 2026 at 2:00 P.M. (ET) and questions received after this deadline will not be considered.**
- Question 49: When will the consolidated Q&A be issued, and will all answers be released far enough before July 8 for offerors to incorporate them? Will there be more than one Q&A round?
  A. **The NPS does not intend to accept additional questions and responses to the questions received will be released in a timely manner prior to submission deadlines.**
- Question 50: Will the NPS hold a pre-proposal conference or any additional site visits beyond June 4–5?
  A. **The NPS is not planning to hold a pre-proposal conference or any additional site visits beyond June 4-5 at this time.**
- Question 52: May the offeror be a newly formed special-purpose entity, and may the lessee entity be formed after selection rather than before submission?
  A. **Proposals may be submitted under a "to-be-formed" entity where the anticipated ownership, control, and governance structure is clearly defined and the required information is submitted for each of the controlling members/owners regardless of the percentage of ownership or control. Any changes to the controlling members/owners after submission of the proposal will not be considered since evaluation of the proposal will be based on the experience and financial capability of the offerors collectively.**
- Question 57: Are there any restrictions on participation by an offeror or team member that previously provided studies, assessments, or services related to the property?
  A. **No.**
- Question 69: Beyond the June 4–5 site visits, will offerors be granted additional access for interior inspection or independent (including limited destructive) testing before July 8, or is such testing available only to the selected offeror post-award under the LDDA?
  A. **There will be no additional access granted to offerors for additional interior inspections or testing before the submission deadline or prior to the execution of the LDDA.**
- Question 124: Will the NPS apply numerical scoring against the stated criterion weightings, and will it publish or share the evaluation results?

A. **Qualitative ratings will be given a numerical value that will then be weighted in accordance with the percentages provided for in the RFP. The NPS will not publish or share the evaluation results other than to identify the selected offeror with whom the NPS will enter negotiations.**

- Question 166: For the electronic submission, NPS will accept ARCH D drawings submitted as PDF files formatted at the 24" × 36" dimension. Does NPS require a specific file resolution?

  A. **Yes. The NPS will accept ARCH D drawing in PDF format and the resolution should be adequate for the reader to clearly read any text and all the relevant details and dimensions.**

- Question 189: Is a detailed and reliable topographical file available, with coordinates and the location of each structure and relevant point, in an editable digital format?

  A. **The NPS will not be providing additional information regarding this RFP beyond what has already been provided or may be publicly available.**

- Question 268: Which optional elements would generate the highest evaluation scores?

  A. **The NPS will evaluate proposals in accordance with the information and criteria identified in the RFP. Offerors are not required to incorporate optional elements into their redevelopment concept. However, Offerors who wish to include optional elements must include it as part of their overall redevelopment concept submitted under this RFP.**

- Question 283: Are there any CFIUS, foreign ownership, or domestic preference restrictions that would disadvantage a non-US bidder?

  A. **The NPS is not aware of any restrictions that would disadvantage a non-US bidder.**

- Question 284: Does the NPS expect to provide responses to Q&A prior to date by when interested parties need to indicate their intention to submit a response to the RFP (June 17)?

  A. **No**

- Question 286: Will NPS accept unsolicited clarifications or supplementary questions after the June 11 deadline if ambiguities arise during proposal preparation?

  A. **The NPS will not accept unsolicited clarifications or supplementary questions after the June 11 deadline.**

- Question 287: Are Virgin Islands-based businesses required as equity partners, or only as sub-contractors and suppliers? Would a joint venture with a local VI entity be viewed more favorably in the evaluation?

  A. **The NPS does not require Virgin Island based businesses to be equity partners, sub-contractors, or suppliers, and no preference will be afforded to an offeror based solely on their business address.**

- Question 324: If the Offeror entity has not yet been legally formed at the time of proposal submission, is it acceptable to submit under a "to-be-formed" entity, provided that the anticipated ownership, control, and governance structure are clearly described? Additionally, to what extent may the Offeror describe anticipated ownership and governance arrangements (e.g., joint venture structure) where final terms remain under negotiation at the time of submission?

  A. **Proposals may be submitted under a "to-be-formed" entity where the anticipated ownership, control, and governance structure is clearly defined and the required information is submitted for each of the controlling members/owners regardless of the percentage of ownership or control. Any changes to the controlling members/owners after submission of the proposal will not be considered since evaluation of the proposal will be based on the experience and financial capability of the offerors collectively.**

- Question 346: Will Park officials be serving on the evaluation panel?

  A. **The evaluation panel will comply with the guidance provided by NPS Director's Order #38: Real Property Leasing.**

- Question 347: Who is the "NPS deciding official" who will determine the best responsive proposal?

  A. **In accordance with NPS Director's Order #38 the role of "Deciding Official" for Part 18 lease has been delegated to the Department of the Interior Region 2, NPS Regional Director.**

Workforce, Housing & Local Participation

- Question 30: The earlier RFQ asked respondents to describe their plans for utilizing, hiring, and training the Virgin Islands workforce. How will those commitments be evaluated during the selection process?

  A. **The earlier RFQ is not part of the current RFP process. Only the elements in the RFP will be used to evaluate offerors proposals.**

- Question 32: Will bidders be required to disclose how they intend to house employees, and how will Caneel's potential impact on the St. John housing market be evaluated during the selection process?

  A. The NPS will evaluate proposals based on the responsiveness of the proposal to the evaluative criteria outlined in the "RFP Evaluation Criteria" section of the RFP.

- Question 62: May employee housing be located off the Leasehold Premises (including at Red Hook), and are there density, height, or location constraints on on-premises employee housing?

  A. No housing is permitted at Red Hook, and the lessee may decide to provide employee housing off the Leasehold Premises. There are no specific density, height, or location restrictions on employee housing.

- Question 232: Is there a set target of management positions expected to be locally filled?

  A. No.

- Question 233: Will local hiring targets be contractually required?

  A. The NPS reserves the right to include certain commitments made by the selected offeror in the terms and conditions of the final lease.

Transportation, Access & Dock

- Question 271: Do any flight paths cross over the Red Hook Bay area and are any anticipated?

  A. The NPS does not have this data.

- Question 275: Denotion of all boat jetties, moorings or other fixings on beaches for the purpose of arriving into the site by boat.

  A. Virgin Islands National Park limits access to beaches through designated channels. The following beaches within the Premise have boat channels: Honeymoon, Caneel, Scott, Little Hawksnest/Caneel Hawksnest. Refer to Superintendent's Compendium for use.

- Question 296: Please provide any existing rules and regulations regarding ingress, egress, safety, sanitation and security in relation to the site.

  A. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and

take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.

Safety, Security & Emergency Preparedness

- Question 229: The RFP explicitly identifies "Excusable Delay" provisions covering Force Majeure events including hurricanes — but expressly excludes inability to secure financing as an excusable delay. Will NPS consider any modifications to this provision given the extraordinary capital requirements of rebuilding a hurricane-devastated resort?

  A. **As this term is defined in the LDDA and the LDDA is intended to facilitate the eventual execution of a final lease, including all financing provisions, the NPS does not intend to consider modifications to this section of the LDDA.**

- Question 289: Could the NPS clarify the legal jurisdiction and operational boundaries for security enforcement between the U.S. Park Rangers, the Police Department, and resort's private security? Are there any restrictions regarding the installation of perimeter security technologies?

  A. **Laws can be enforced by both Federal and U.S. Virgin Islands police officers. However, only Park law enforcement officers can enforce the Superintendent's Compendium. Security installation is dependent on the selected offeror's proposal and will be negotiated with the selected offeror. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.**

- Question 290: Are the US Park Rangers and/or Police Department armed? Are their restrictions on the use of fire arms by private security personnel?

  A. **Park law enforcement officers and the U.S. Virgin Islands police officers are trained and armed. As part of the offeror's due diligence, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will determine its obligations under applicable laws, statutes, and regulations, including but not limited to 36 CFR 2.4(b), and take appropriate steps to ensure compliance. Further, the NPS anticipates that each offeror will seek and obtain any required approvals under those authorities.**

- Question 291: Are there any restrictions on use of boat jetties for emergency medical evacuation?

A. Emergency medical evacuation is dependent on the selected offeror's proposal and will be negotiated with the selected offeror.

- Question 293: Does the NPS have a dedicated Safety, Security and Resilience representative that would work with lessee to align assessments and procedures?

  A. Not as described. The Park has a Chief Ranger who would serve as the POC for safety and security matters within the Park and the Leasehold Premises.

- Question 295: Is there a prohibition on making any type of fire (open fire, gas stove, etc.) throughout the entire park territory?

  A. 36 CFR Section 2.13 Fires. Fires may only be built in NPS provided grills or in portable grills designed to contain combustible material. Ground fires are prohibited.

- Question 297: Should the emergency plan (communication, alarm, evacuation, emergency supply, fire protection and fighting, etc.) for common areas used for resort operations and by external visitors, be developed by the lessee, by the NPS, or jointly by both entities? If so, what are the NPS requirements for this type of emergency plan?

  A. Developed by the lessee, reviewed by NPS for adequacy and conformance with federal laws, regulations and policies.

- Question 298: What is the fire response protocol for the facility or its immediate vicinity? What firefighting resources are available on the island, and what is their response capability? Is the resort expected to be autonomous in terms of fire suppression, or can external support be relied upon? In the latter case, what are the estimated response times?

  A. Leaseholder will need to comply with NPS Reference Manual #58: Structural Fire Management. The VI Fire & Emergency Medical Services Robert O'Connor, Sr. Fire Station (Zulu Fire Station) is located in Cruz Bay at #100 Remainder Enighed, St. John, V.I. 00830. A second station is located in Coral Bay, Coral Bay Fire Station (Romeo Company), #9 Emmaus, St. John, V.I. 00830. The NPS is not able to provide information on FEMS's resources or response times.

- Question 300: Provide hurricane resilience requirements and required certification standards for buildings

  A. These requirements and standards are contained within the applicable building codes and local building requirements.

- Question 301: What is the responsibility of the lessee versus public authorities for activation of emergency evacuation procedures on the island?

A. **Virgin Islands Territorial Emergency Management Agency (VITEMA) is responsible for emergency services and preparedness on the US Virgin Islands. The Virgin Islands National Park has a Severe Weather Emergency Action Plan (SWEAP) that we implement during tropical storm or hurricane events. Our team shelters in place and does not evacuate. The lessee would be responsible for evacuation of their customers and employees should they choose that option.**

- Question 302: Will selected lessee be required to contribute to cost / provision of facilities for immigration and customs services, personnel, etc.?

  A. **The NPS is not aware of any requirement that the lessee contribute the cost / provision of facilities for immigration and customs services, personnel.**

- Question 312: Is there any hurricane-related damage that remains hidden underground?

  A. **The NPS has not performed any excavation and is unable to determine what is underground that might have been damaged from previous hurricanes. Hurricane debris is still on the landscape.**