

# STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Natural Resources  
Division of Support Services



## RFP 2024-1000-0176 AS NEEDED LIDAR DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTROL SERVICES

### ADDENDUM 1

ISSUED JANUARY 16, 2024

This addendum is being issued to answer questions from vendors.

**Important Note to Offerors:** You are required to sign and return this page of the addendum document with your proposal. Failure to do so may result in the rejection of your proposal. Only the RFP terms and conditions referenced in this addendum are being changed. All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain the same. This Addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and is a total of four pages.

**SHAWN M. OLSEN**

Procurement Specialist 4

Phone: 1 (907) 269-8687

Email: [shawn.olsen@alaska.gov](mailto:shawn.olsen@alaska.gov)

---

COMPANY SUBMITTING PROPOSAL

---

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

---

DATE

## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY OFFERORS AND ANSWER FROM THE STATE

**Question 1:** *In reference to experience outlined in SEC. 1.04, would the State be open to reconsidering the requirements for any LiDAR projects of comparable scope and size? This suggestion is based on the idea that this is a quality control project, the data is already collected and classified.*

**Answer 1:** Offerors must submit examples for a minimum of 10 prior projects providing quality assurance, control, and validation services to federal, state, or local, government agencies and/or consortiums, ensuring provided LIDAR data meets U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) QL1 Base Specifications (any version). Example projects must include detailed reports for control and validation processes.

**Question 2:** *In reference to RSME accuracy within 3.01.1.1 will we be comparing the LiDAR data solely to GCP provided by the State? Or will the contractor be required to survey new check points for comparison?*

**Answer 2:** The contractor will not be required to survey new check points. Checkpoints will be provided by the State.

**Question 3:** *As stated in 3.01.1.3, "If available, regional LiDAR collections and DEMS are compared.". If no data exists for comparison as described, are we to ignore and move to the next dataset? Or should external comparable data be sought out or created?*

**Answer 3:** If no data exists the submitted LAS points should be used to create a derived DEM and compare to the submitted DEM to look for classification errors or other anomalies.

**Question 4:** *If the QA Consultant identifies errors anomalies with the provided datasets and returns the data for corrections, is the QA Consultant required to re-evaluate each subsequent resubmission for all SOW requirements, or only perform validations for the identified errors from the previous review?*

**Answer 4:** Only perform validations for the identified errors from the previous review.

**Question 5:** *The State has performed, at a minimum, a cursory review of the submitted data to determine a sufficient number of errors exist to warrant an independent QA/QC contract. Based on the State's review of the Skagway data, or previously submitted data of a representative size, how many errors/anomalies have been identified, or how much effort has the State imparted to identify and/or correct identified errors?*

**Answer 5:** The State will not perform any cursory review of the submitted data.

**Question 6:** *Can the State please provide the Skagway data or a sample of the data to aid in formulating the cost proposal.*

**Answer 6:** No. Offeror that meets minimum requirements should have access to example data needed to formulate cost proposal.

**Question 7:** *On page 4 of the RFP, Section 1.04 Prior Experience notes to provide 10 prior projects providing quality assurance, control and validation and include detailed reports for control and validation processes. Would the State like a report for each project example submitted? Additionally, are the reports able to be submitted in an Appendix?*

**Answer 7:** Yes. The State would like 10 reports submitted and each to be included as an Appendix.

**Question 8:** *On page 50, Attachment 5, Cost Proposal Form, please clarify the State's intended use of hourly rate sheets for Years 1-5. How will the Offeror's average hourly rate be used to evaluate their proposal and costs?*

**Answer 8:** The Average Hourly Rate shown on Attachment 5 Cost Proposal Form, in table "7. Total – For Evaluation Purposes Only" is the cost that will be used for evaluation and award of up to three contracts and the Skagway Area of Interest.

Future Task Orders will be paid at the Hourly Rate shown on the offeror's Cost Proposal Form.

**Question 9:** *On page 50, Attachment 5, Cost Proposal Form, will future task orders be awarded as Time-and-Materials or Lump Sum?*

**Answer 9:** When the State requires services under an MA, the DNR Procurement Officer or Project Manager will issue a Task Order solicitation to the contractors. The solicitation will be a written document sent by email; will outline the required services to be provided; will inform the contractors how the proposal responses will be evaluated and will set a deadline for receipt of proposals. Responses may be evaluated solely on cost, cost and technical response, or other criteria (i.e., timeliness of needed collection).

Contractors may provide a cost estimate (depending on solicitation response requirements) within the designated timeframe for receipt of proposals. Evaluation of the Task Order solicitation will be in accordance with the State Procurement Code. Task Order Solicitations may require Contractors to return a Task Order solicitation Response Form.

The State may negotiate the services or costs in the offered proposal. Once an agreement is reached, the State will issue a written Delivery Order to the Contractor authorizing the work.

**END OF ADDENDUM 1**