

Missouri Aerial Imagery Meeting Notes, Meeting of August 26, 2013

Attendees:

In Person		Phone		
Ray Fox	USGS		Keith Owens	Fugro
Brad Fugate	Woolpert		Steve Reed	SC Ozarks COG
Drew Lane	MO National Guard		Cliff Mefford	AeroMetric
Tim Donze	Surdex		Greg Tilley	AeroMetric
Scott Zeller	SEMA		Paul Wright	OA
Joe Carter	DOT		Arnold Williams	OA
Jason Warzinik	Boone County		John Gover	Henry County
Matt Gerike	Columbia		Steve Marsh	MARC
Melissa Johnson	Cole County		Terry Stone	Cuivre River Electric Coop
Greg Retz	Jefferson City			
Earl Petit	OA			

Action Items:

The contract can be downloaded at: www.oa.mo.gov/purch. Contract number C213036001(-4).

Earl and Paul to determine what contract deliverables become public domain when a state agency joins in a local/regional consortium using the State Photogrammetric Services contract

Earl to determine whether non-governmental entities, coops, not for profit, quasi-public, and commercial can join consortiums

Take a look at the website: <http://www.flymoimagery.com/>. Thanks to Jason for creating this

Meeting Notes:

Earl Petit, Contracting Officer for the contract kindly took time to explain the contract and answer questions. All four of the contractors, Woolpert, Surdex, Aerometric and Fugro were represented. Brad Fugate had provided questions in advance which are below. Note that I have interpreted the answer as best I can, corrections or modifications are expected and will be posted.

My understanding is if the State receives a request from a financial contributing program partner, the State will send a Project Assessment Quotation (PAQ) to each of the four vendors requesting a technical scope and price. What if a vendor brings a project to the State who is not a financial contributing partner to the State and request to use the contract?

The State agency will use their contracting process to issue PAQ's. The contract was written for use by State agencies with a provision for other government entities (2.8.1). The other government entities will issue their own PAQ's to the four vendors using their contracting process. The State will not be directly involved in that process.

Would the State contract be used or the Local government contract?

The local government entity is able to use this contract only for the products and services included in the contract. Note that oblique imagery is not included, that product would have to be contracted separate from the State contract.

Would that opportunity be sole sourced to that vendor since they are prequalified or will a PAQ be sent to all four vendors?

Unsure as to this answer, believe if the State contract is used a PAQ is sent to all four vendors.

Whether the work is contracted locally or with the State, Do all invoices run through Earl Pettit's office?

No, in fact OA would not be involved in any of the contracts. These will be either by the State agency or local entity.

Does the State take any % for administering the contract?

No

During the evaluation of the PAQs, are there any additional (bonus) points awarded for using WBE, MBE, or veteran owned small businesses during the evaluation of the PAQ or was that criteria only for the initial RFP?

No, although the contracting entity may include this as part of their subjective evaluation.

Will the State be sending out a PAQ to select a vendor to prepare and/or perform the marketing of the program?

No, the Missouri GIS Advisory Council (MGISAC) will be doing the marketing of the program

Will the State be setting up a website about the program and will a PAQ be issued?

No, MGISAC has set up a website <http://www.flymoimagery.com/>

Who will be establishing the acceptance criteria and perform the QA/QC of project data - the State, the program partner, or a third party vendor?

The acceptance criteria and QA/QC will be the responsibility of the contracting entity. Note that USGS will perform QA to USGS specifications for any project that includes one of the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA) contracted urban areas of Kansas City, Jefferson City, or St Louis. USGS will not perform this service for any project that does not include these areas, and only for those deliverables that are made public domain.

Will the state in the very near future provide documented guidelines to establish protocols?

Earl Pettit and Paul Wright are working on clarifications that were discussed during the meeting.

General Discussion:

Ray informed the meeting that as of this time DNR does not have a requirement for state-wide imagery. As a result MGISAC will be concentrating on developing local consortiums and not a state-wide effort. Note the CIO office requires a business case before any planning can occur.

Much of the discussion centered on data ownership. Does use of the State contract entitle State agencies access to the deliverables, or if they contribute some money for a two foot product can the local entity only deliver that? Earl and Paul are investigating this.

Can non-governmental entities contribute to a local or regional government that uses the State contract? Earl is investigating this issue.

The need for marketing materials starts with price estimates. MGISAC has the Wisconsin pricing, the Indiana and Minnesota programs are also available. These can be used for estimates. Another suggestion is to informally ask the vendors for estimates with the understanding that these are not binding and changes in the project will impact the estimates.

Following the meeting Steve Marsh sent out the following email (note two minor edits made):

Hi all,

I am copying all (I think) of the people that were focused on this section.

I am attaching that portion of the document with track changes enabled. You will see my edits there.

On its face, I see no issue at all with the state receiving the product for which it helped fund, which is the way that it should be. That is the way we have operated with the USGS for years. But the language itself appears to open ended. The products the state is entitled to should be those that it was willing to help fund. If Boone County invested in LiDAR or 3 inch imagery, but, the state kicked in for what it wanted (2 foot aerials) it should not be entitled to all products, but be limited to the 2 foot imagery.

Then there is the "realized" cost savings portion. I struck those portions entirely for a few reasons.

- As an area, we (MARC) are large enough to create our own economy of scale.
- If there is no overall state project, there is not economy of scale at all, so any entity seeking to use the contract is getting the same economy of scale they would have achieved doing their own thing.
- While we might save some time by using the contract, we are also likely not getting to see some potential lower costs by having more vendors available. So it would likely be a wash.
- "Realized" cost savings are too nebulous to define. You would have to make a lot of assumptions, all up to argument, to determine a benefit.
- You will have people using the agreements that never let the state know, so in reality they are not subject to the same provisions that others would be if they were working the system in conjunction with the state.

Just to start the discussion.

Steve

Other news to report: Camden County held a meeting on August 1 and as a result will not be pursuing imagery this year.

