



Questions and Answers #1
Digital High-Resolution Aerial Photography TORFP #060B8400047
Geographic Information Systems
May 17, 2018

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This list of questions and responses is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above referenced TORFP. The State's responses are italicized. The statements and interpretations contained in responses to any questions, whether responded to verbally or in writing, are not binding on the Department unless the TORFP is expressly amended. Nothing in any response to any questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the Department of any statement or interpretation on the part of the entity asking the question.

1. Can an Offeror to FA2 proposal also be a subcontractor to FA1 contractor for purposes of Q/A for optional non-imagery products such as LiDAR and planimetrics?

ANSWER: *No. Offerors are permitted to submit proposals for both FA1 and FA2, but will not be awarded, or perform work for, both Functional Areas. For example, if Contractor A is awarded FA1, whether the prime contractor or subcontractor, it cannot be awarded for FA2.*

2. On Attachment B-1, for FA1, the Mobile LiDAR Option Tab, the pricing table asks that respondents provide pricing for USGS Quality 1 and Quality Level 2 compliant data. Mobile LiDAR is generally associated with much higher point densities and accuracies that this, as well as specialized processing requirements that go beyond USGS requirements for airborne LiDAR. Can we please get a confirmation that this is indeed the requirement the State wants us to meet, or better clarification with regards to the technical requirements for a typical project?

ANSWER: *The State has revised the price sheet. Please refer to Amendment 1.*

3. In TORFP Section 2.3.17 Ground Control (pg. 17), you mention that 2016 and 2017 control will be made available. Is that information available for download or can be provided during this proposal response period?

ANSWER: *The 2016 is available for download. Currently, the 2014 control points are available for download, but the 2017 points will be added soon. Link to the feature service is*



http://geodata.md.gov/imap/rest/services/Imagery/MD_ImageryAcquisitionFlightInformation/FeatureServer. Data can be extracted from the Feature Service using GIS software.

4. Can the State confirm the aerial digital sensor used for the 2016 and 2017 6in 4 band imagery and 3in buy-up 4 band imagery?

ANSWER: *A CCD sensor was used for the acquisition for both the 2016 and 2017 6 inch and 3-inch imagery.*

5. Will the state provide the new targeted and photo ID control from the 2016 and 2017 project?

ANSWER: *The State will provide the control points. However, there is no distinction between existing and new control points. The link to the feature service for the control points is*

http://geodata.md.gov/imap/rest/services/Imagery/MD_ImageryAcquisitionFlightInformation/FeatureServer. Data can be extracted from the Feature Service using GIS software.

6. Per your Data Ownership Clause, section 2.3.23 page 22, will all the optional products in this RFP be owned by the State or is there the ability for vendors to license one or more of the options outlined?

ANSWER: *The State won't accept licensed options. All products produced under this contract will be owned by the State.*

7. Please provide a list of Counties/Cities that have selected the buy-up to 3in orthos for both 2016 and 2017. Please also provide those Counties/Cities intention for continuing this buy-up.

ANSWER: *Annapolis, Easton, Gaithersburg, and Westminster all received 3-inch Orthos. No county or municipality has committed to 3-inch imagery for the 2019 and 2020 acquisition.*

8. Section 3.7.5 Data Productions and Controls subsection B (p.63) states the intention to not allow for any part of this data, including options, to be done offshore. Please confirm what documentation needs to be provided to ensure that this work stays within the US? As a follow-up please provide understanding that all MD agencies and local municipalities are aware of this new clause within MD IT Security standards and that these agencies are not allowed to use this data for any offshore production under this contracted dataset.

ANSWER: *Any production work performed for the deliverables under this TORFP must be done in the U.S. Master Contractors do not need to provide any special documentation to verify their adherence to this TORFP requirement (a statement in the proposal will suffice).*



The requirements for data production and controls are outlined in TORFP Section 3.7.5. If State or local government partners create products from the deliverables of this TORFP, the location for the creation of those products are not subject to the terms of this TORFP.

9. Regarding the FA2 quality assurance task, it was stated in the pre-proposal meeting that the QA portion of the RFP may not be pursued. Re-reviewing the RFP it states that the State anticipates to issue work orders in one or more of the functional areas, and later states it intends to select two CATS+ Master Contractors, one to support the FA1 activities and one to support the FA2 activities. Can the State quantify the probability it will select an FA2 TO Contractor?

ANSWER: *The State does plan to award for FA2. However, there is no guarantee that FA2 will be utilized. The FA1 contractor is responsible for performing its own QA of the orthoimagery. The FA2 contractor may be utilized as additional level of QA.*

10. Given the FA1 vendor will provide an online QA tool for shareholders to review the orthoimagery and collect calls, what entity will be responsible to coordinate quality reviews, scrub these calls, and how, or will, these calls be incorporated into the FA2 TO Contractor's review process? Is training or feedback back to the shareholder required?

ANSWER: *FA1 will be responsible to coordinate QA calls. A formalized training session is not required. However: 1) the QA tool must be intuitive; and 2) the TO Contractor shall provide documentation that will allow the user to easily navigate the tool.*

11. Should the FA2 TO Contractor consider efforts associated with reviewing/scrubbing shareholder calls and incorporating shareholder calls in the larger FA2 review process? The RFP does not address this scenario.

ANSWER: *Yes, the FA2 TO Contractor shall consider efforts associated with reviewing/scrubbing shareholder calls and incorporating shareholder calls in the larger FA2 review process.*

12. Please confirm the FA2 TO Contractor would not be expected to utilize the FA1 TO Contractor web QA tool.

ANSWER: *The FA2 TO Contractor is not expected to utilize the FA1 TO Contractor's web-based QA tool.*

13. What level of FA2 review is required for the micro review of the orthoimagery and DEM products? 100%, 50%, 25%, other?

ANSWER: *100%.*



14. For the checks outlined in TORFP Section 2.4.5.37-.38 (Aero Triangulation Acceptance Criteria), the FA2 TO Contractor would need to view the data in stereo and have blind independent checkpoints. Is it the State's intent to provide the FA2 TO Contractor with a copy of the raw imagery as well as the blind checkpoints in order for this check to be performed?

ANSWER: *The State intends to provide a copy of the raw imagery to the FA2 TO Contractor. However, we will not supply the blind checkpoints to perform the QA.*

15. In Section 2.3.25 Item A, it appears that a raw imagery review by the FA2 TO Contractor would be an optional item that the State may task? Can you confirm that such a review should not be a part of the FA2 TO cost estimate? If it should be included, what level of review is anticipated? Should it be assumed it would be limited to assessing image radiometry?

ANSWER: *The State may elect to utilize FA2 for imagery review. All FA2 TO Offerors must supply a cost for imagery review in their financial proposals. Please note that imagery review is not limited to assessing imagery radiometry. See Section 2.7.2 for the level of review that will be required by the FA2 TO Contractor.*

16. Will the State provide the necessary blind independent check points to the FA2 TO Contractor? If so, how current are these points, do they all meet the required level of accuracy, and are each of these targeted or photo-identifiable points? Or is the QA vendor required to collect blind checkpoints? If the latter, does the State have a predefined method?

ANSWER: *No, the State will not provide blind independent check points to the FA2 TO Contractor. The QA vendor will be required to collect their own blind checkpoints. The State does not have a predefined method.*

17. Please confirm the project management line item in the FA2 cost sheet refers to the project management tasks associated with orthoimagery QA activities and not project management tasks associated with aerial data acquisition and data production.

ANSWER: *The project management line item in the FA2 cost sheet does refer to the project management tasks associated with orthoimagery QA activities.*

18. The State has required an independent QA be performed of some of the FA1 non-ortho related optional deliverable products (i.e. LiDAR, planimetrics, etc.). Given that there is no overlap in the production processes, is it permissible for the State selected FA2 vendor be a QA subcontractor to the FA1 TO Contractor vendor for the optional products?

ANSWER: *No. If the subcontractor of the selected FA 1 TO Contractor proposes for FA 2, the State will not consider that vendor's FA2 proposal and, therefore, will not award that vendor the FA2 contract.*



19. How will the data be delivered, by County?

ANSWER: *The TO Contractor shall deliver data by County. The State will establish deliverables when it issues the Work Order.*

20. Will the TO Contractor issue a QA report for each deliverable block (i.e., by County)? Is a final comprehensive QA report required at the end of the project?

ANSWER: *QA report shall be delivered by-weekly for each deliverable block with a comprehensive report due at the end of the project.*

21. How will the State deliver data to the FA2 TO Contractor for quality review (hard drive, cloud download, other)?

ANSWER: *The method used to delivery imagery to FA2 Contractors will be the method used for the FA1 Contractor. Therefore, the State cannot provide a definitive answer at this time.*

22. Is there a page limit to the proposal?

ANSWER: *No.*

23. What was the delivery schedule for the base products in the last Task Order?

ANSWER: *Acquisition began the end of February 2017 and the products were delivered by December 31, 2017.*

24. Is there a delivery schedule that the state would like to recommend?

ANSWER: *The TO Contractor shall provide their recommended delivery schedule. Historically, deliverables have been received within ten months of collection. We anticipate at a minimum meeting this schedule.*

25. What is the exact area size/tiles/boundary for eastern shore and for western shore? Can you provide the boundary file that shall be used for the Eastern and Western shore collections?

ANSWER: *Please refer to the Note in Section 2.3.1 and also refer to Land Area by County in Section 2.3.3.*



26. Does the TO Contractor have to correct color balance or tonal problems in the water?

ANSWER: *No.*

27. Will the state provide the ground control survey reports, accuracies, and photos for the existing control?

ANSWER: *The State will provide the AT report containing the ground control accuracies. The State does not have photos of existing control. This report can be emailed upon request.*

28. Is existing control photo-identifiable?

ANSWER: *No.*

29. How do we communicate cost for cloud hosting? \$/GB?

ANSWER: *Please refer to the updated Financial Proposal Form FAI pricing sheet.*

30. Are we able to add a tab to the pricing sheet for the Cloud pricing?

ANSWER: *Please refer to the updated Financial Proposal Form FAI pricing sheet.*

31. Is the state looking for a Pilot area QC or a full raw data QC?

ANSWER: *Both.*

32. Is the state asking the TO Contractor to provide stereo pairs as a delivery item to the AT Solution?

ANSWER: *Yes.*

33. Based on Section 2.4.5.A, acceptance criteria #23, #34, and #38 (for the base imagery), are we expected to perform checkpoint survey in order to perform these tests?

ANSWER: *Yes.*

34. Based on Section 2.5.1.C, acceptance criteria #3, #8, and #9 (for the higher resolution imagery), are we expected to perform checkpoint survey in order to perform these tests?

ANSWER: *Yes.*

35. Deliverables show no building lean. In our interpretation of Near True ortho it is reduced building lean. Can the state clarify further on what the needs of the state are?

ANSWER: *The State is not interested in Near True orthophotos, just True orthophotos. The State has revised the TORFP to reflect this. Please see Amendment 1.*



36. TORFP Section 2.5.4, dealing with Mobile Lidar does not mention including Independent QA/QC in price; however, the financial proposal form has an entry for Independent QA/QC price. Please confirm if we need to price Independent QA/QC for mobile lidar.

ANSWER: *See Amended Pricing Sheet*

37. The financial proposal form requires pricing for deliverables not usually associated with an oblique product (for example, orthophotos). Please provide more detail on the deliverables listed in the financial proposal form; there is no detail regarding the expected deliverables in section 2.5.5 of the RFP.

ANSWER: *See Amended Pricing Sheet and Amendment 1 which provides high level deliverables for the oblique products.*

38. Please clarify if we are required to price updating data over 6 years old.

ANSWER: *Pricing is required for newly created planimetrics over 6 years old.*

39. Can we add columns to the financial proposal indicating “city-wide” or “county-wide”? Or are we limited one-unit price regardless of the area size tasked?

ANSWER: *No. You are limited to one-unit price regardless of area size. Size of the requested collection will be determined at the Work Order level.*

40. The RFP lists the age of the existing planimetric datasets, by County. Can the state provide guidance on pricing based on the following example-

Allegheny county planimetric data is over 6 years old. In this example, can we assume that we would leave columns C and E blank in the financial proposal form (“Update Planimetric Mapping (Existing Data newer than 6 years old..”)? And we should only enter pricing for Allegheny County in columns B & D (assuming “New Planimetric Mapping” only)?

ANSWER: *The State asks Offerors/Master Contractors to provide a price for all listed options (i.e., enter a price in each column for each County).*

41. Is there a place on the CATS+ page to find existing or future addendums from the Q&A?

ANSWER: *CATS+ TORFP Status Webpage.*
<http://doit.maryland.gov/contracts/Pages/CATSPlusTORFPStatus.aspx>. *In the “Select Requesting Agency” drop down box, please use the last option- F50- Dept of Information Technology. This TORFP should be the first result.*

42. Attachment B1. Will it be possible to clarify on what is quality level 1 and quality level 2 in Mobile LiDAR?



ANSWER: *See Amended Price Sheet and TORFP Amendment 1.*

43. In Section 2.5.4, dealing with Mobile LiDAR, is imagery be required as part of the LiDAR collection?

ANSWER: *No*

44. In Section 2.5.1, High Resolution Orthophotography, what is the minimum area to be considered for price calculations?

ANSWER: *There is no minimum area. See the price sheet for price per unit (square mile).*

45. In section 2.4.4, number of bands change between 3, 4 and 5 in deliverables (2.4.4.17, 2.4.4.18). Can this be clarified?

ANSWER: *The bands are based on the format of the deliverable.*

46. Would there be any possibility for date extension considering the Q&A period, number of options etc.?

ANSWER: *Yes, please see Amendment 1.*

47. In TORFP Section 5.3.5, is the State seeking 3 deliveries of each submission? A Microsoft Word document, a searchable Adobe PDF and a searchable Adobe PDF that is redacted?

ANSWER: *No, the State is not requesting 3 deliveries. The State requires vendors to submit proposals in two parts- one Technical and one Financial. Each part requires the proposals to be submitted in 3 different formats (Word, searchable Adobe, and searchable Adobe with confidential/proprietary information redacted).*

48. 2.2.4. During the Conference it was stated by one of the State's panel members that "there's no guarantee that FA2 will get awarded; only guarantee is that FA1 will be awarded." If a FA2 contractor is not selected, who will be performing the FA2 services?

ANSWER: *The State does plan to award for FA2. However, there is no guarantee that FA2 will be utilized. The FA1 contractor is responsible for performing its own QA of the orthoimagery. The FA2 contractor may be utilized as additional level of QA.*

49. Regarding TORFP Section 2.3.1.A, 2.3.1.D and Attachment B1 Financial (6" Resolution Tab)- Is the Offeror to include in their pricing for both the western shore cycle and eastern shore cycle the fees associated for flying the entire Chesapeake Bay with each cycle?

ANSWER: *Yes.*



50. Does 2.3.1.D mean the State will request a fee from the selected FA1 Contractor for the Chesapeake Bay “Water-Only” tiles post-award?

ANSWER: *No, the water-only tiles are inclusive of the Eastern Shore and Western Shore. The pricing for this shall be included in the financial proposal.*

51. Will the State add another line-item to the 6” Resolution Tab of Attachment B1 for “Chesapeake Bay Water-Only Tiles”?

ANSWER: *No, it is included in the Eastern Shore and Western Shore pricing.*

52. With regards to TORFP Sections 2.3.29 & 3.7.5.B.14, please confirm the State’s desire to keep this language as part of the TORFP and contract as well as the State’s intentions on enforcing this requirement for all geospatial data produced under this contract. The data restrictions placed on the geospatial data produced under this contract conflict with Maryland’s “open-data” policy, web-services, i-Map, etc., as well as section 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 of the TORFP. Much of the existing data produced under the State’s current geospatial contract is freely available for review and use under this TORFP.

ANSWER: *Sections 2.3.29 and 3.7.5.B.14 refer to the need for all storage and processing of the deliverables to be completed within the U.S. These sections in no way refer to or conflict with Maryland’s Open Data Policy, web services, or the MD iMAP Program.*

53. If the data produced under this contract is to adhere to all restrictions in TORFP Section 3.7.5, does the State plan to impose and enforce these requirements on all source data and deliverables for any future entity desiring to use the data for any purpose, including service contracts of state or local governmental agencies?

ANSWER: *The handling, storage, and processing of State data (which would include deliverables produced under this TORFP) must take place in the U.S. State partners who use the data, after it’s delivered to the State, are not bound by the restrictions in TORFP Section 3.7.5. Any data produced under this contract will adhere to all restrictions outlined in the TORFP (such as those in Section 3.7.5). Any data produced outside of this TORFP, including service contracts, are not required to adhere to the TORFP’s restrictions.*

54. Will future users of the data produced under this contract be required to enter into a State of Maryland User-agreement subject to the same terms and conditions of use?

ANSWER: *No. Please refer to the answers to Questions 52 and 53.*

55. Will the State consider and weigh the Offerors’ technical approach, methodologies, team members, equipment, experience, etc., for the Optional Products as part of technical evaluation as defined under section 6.2 of the TORFP?

ANSWER: *No.*



56. Will the State consider and weigh the pricing in the Offerors' Financial Proposal for each and all of the "Optional Products" as part of the evaluation as defined under section 6.3 and 6.4 of the TORFP?

ANSWER: *No.*

57. With regards to TORFP Section 2.5.6., are FA1 offerors required to have on their team a subcontractor to perform independent QA/QC services for the airborne LiDAR and planimetric data and such services must be factored into the pricing?

ANSWER: *The State does not have a preference whether the prime contractor or a subcontractor performs QA/QC. However, The QA/QC must be done in an objective and thorough way. Please see Amendment 1. The QA/QC service for the airborne LiDAR and planimetric data should be factored into the offerors pricing for these services.*

58. Regarding TORFP Section 2.5.3., will the State use its selected FA2 contractor to perform these independent QA services for the airborne LiDAR and planimetric data?

ANSWER: *No, the State has removed the requirement for the independent QA/QC from Sections 2.5.3 and 2.5.6 (see Amendment 1). The FA2 Contractor will only perform independent QA on the imagery.*

59. Regarding TORFP Section 3.5.2. Data Import/Export – As written, it appears as though the selected FA1 contractor is to provide data requests via hard drive, FTP, web-service, etc., indefinitely, without minimum requirements, and with a charge for time and/or materials such as hard drives if required. Raster image files and/or LiDAR data files are extremely large data datasets requiring several hours to copy, hard drives for delivery and shipping charges. Can the State elaborate on this section?

ANSWER: *The pricing proposed for the 6" Resolution shall be reflective of the Offeror's entire process for providing the deliverables (i.e., factor in the vendor's cost of adhering to Section 3.5.2).*

60. Regarding TORFP Section 5.4. "NOTE- No pricing information..." Does this statement restrict an Offeror from referencing pricing information of other example contracts on which they are currently working or have worked?

ANSWER: *The State will only accept the total dollar value of the example contracts. The State does not want specific pricing structures or unit prices used/charged to the example contracts. Additionally, the State does not want any price information related to this contract (such as the vendor's proposed price, pricing structure(s), etc.).*

61. Attachment B1 Financial. To avoid confliction between the "Instructions" tab, General Instructions, Section "F" (row 8), of the Financial Proposal Form and section 5.5.2 of the



TORFP, can the State modify Attachment B1 to include a blank “Assumptions” tab or may the Offeror add a tab for this purpose?

ANSWER: *If Offerors, after reviewing the revised price sheet, want to include assumptions, those assumptions shall be included in a cover letter that is submitted with the financial proposal.*

62. Attachment B1 Financial. In order to comply with the requests on the “Instructions” tab, rows 19, 24 and 37: Can the State grant the Offeror the permission to modify/repeat the pricing sections within the relevant pricing tabs with each proposed resolution noted for each pricing scenario proposed? If not, can the State modify Attachment B1 to include pricing areas for two or three additional pixel resolutions options on each, relevant, tab?

ANSWER: *No. TO Offerors cannot modify the price sheet, see the updated price sheet provided by DoIT.*

63. Can the State modify the pricing section for the following Optional Products: Near True Orthos, Higher Resolution Option, LiDAR Option, Mobile LiDAR Option, and Oblique Imagery Option, to include ranges of minimum square mile or linear mile areas; or provide a sample AOI (area of interest) for each Option, for Offeror to Price as part of their Financial Proposal?

ANSWER: *No. The size of the collection for an optional product is defined at the Work Order level.*

64. Attachment B1 Financial – Mobile LiDAR Tab – The state is requesting a line item price for Independent QAQC Services. However, in RFP Section 2.5.4, independent QAQC Services is not stated as a requirement. Does the State want to have independent QAQC services proposed?

ANSWER: *Please see Amendment 1. QA/QC is required and may be done by the prime or sub. However, the QA/QC must be done in an objective and thorough way.*

65. Please confirm that an ADOBE digital signature of an authorized principal or employee of the Offeror is acceptable on all relevant electronic document submittals as part of the Offeror’s response to the TORFP.

ANSWER: *Yes, an electronic signature of an authorized designee is acceptable for submittals.*

66. Appendix 3: Labor Classification Personnel Resume Summary Form - is it possible to get this in word format so that we can edit and add the education, general experience, etc.

ANSWER: *The State will provide Appendix 3 in Microsoft Word, as requested. However, Offerors are not permitted to make changes of any kind to the structure or format of the form.*



Amendment #2
Task Order Request for Proposals (TORFP) 060B8400047
Digital High-Resolution Aerial Photography
July 30, 2018

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This Amendment #2 is being issued to amend and clarify certain information contained in the above referenced Task Order Request for Proposals (TORFP). All information contained herein is binding on all Offerors who respond to this TORFP. For the following changes/additions, any new language has been double underlined and marked in bold (i.e., **new**) and any deleted language has been marked with a strikethrough (i.e., ~~delete~~).

1. Revised Key Information Summary Sheet as follows:

TO Procurement Officer: e-mail: Office Phone:	Memory Jackson <u>Scharrence Richardson</u> 100 Community Place, Room 2.321 <u>Room 2.325</u> Crownsville, MD 21032 Memory.Jackson@maryland.gov <u>Scharrence.Richardson@maryland.gov</u> 410-697-9678 <u>410-697-9688</u>
TO Proposals are to be sent to:	Memory.Jackson@maryland.gov <u>Scharrence.Richardson@maryland.gov</u>

Issued by:

Memory Jackson
Procurement Officer