The following are questions received about this combined synopsis/solicitation and their respective answers. This q & a document is current through Jan. 9, 2009.

1.   For previous NRI/WRP projects we have used an automated e-mail progress report system. The result is a fast more efficient reporting system. Can we send e-mail progress Reports?   A PDF version of the FAX report is acceptable but we cannot accept an e-mail using the same methodology used in the previous NRI/WRP projects. The pilot project requires multiple resolutions for each site, and with the potential of having more then one contractor acquire imagery in each pilot area, we needed a different solution that can handle the multiple reports and not interfere with the established NRI/WRI program reporting process.

2.   Section C-6.4 mentions the delivery of "Differentially corrected GPS ground data". The rover data or "Airborne GPS positional data" is what becomes differentially corrected during post processing; the GPS ground data is used to make the differential corrections. With a project of this scope it would make the most sense to utilize the large network of CORS ground stations instead of a temporary ground station. This CORS data is downloaded from the CORS network in an extracted format at the time of post-processing. This data is used to aid in processing but is not processed to another file format itself. Will the raw data as downloaded from the CORS network satisfy the requirements of Section C-6.4? Included with these questions is sample CORS data (please see attachment SampleCors.zip) This requirement is only if your proposed approach requires base stations. If you are using direct georeferencing (such as the new Applanix systems) or relying on CORS stations, then there is no deliverable. The intent is to have all data from any "unique" ground station delivered, along with the unprocessed airborne GPS/IMU data (required in para C-6.3), to allow recreating the reverse solution.

3.   Type error Page 6 section 2.2 (Program 2: WRP Locations) Sub Section (a) shouldn't it read All WRP sites instead of "All NRI sites"?   Correct, should read WRP.

4.   Is the deliverable ortho 4 band and is it 8 or 16 bit (see chart section 3.2 and Section 6.2 below)? There are "two" image deliverables: 8-bit orthos and 16-bit, unprocessed, single point, georeferenced (both are 4-band images). The 8-bit requirement for the ortho is defined in paragraph 3.3(a) of Attachment B (para C-6.2 of the contracts calls Attachment B for "file format").

Also Section 6.2 (b) is vague (please clarify any required specifications)
(b) File Format. The digital image shall be a georeferenced tagged image file format (GeoTIFF) created in accordance with Attachment B. Attachment B has very detailed requirements for the GeoTIFF, such as required TIFF/GeoTIFF tags, band registration, etc. (We don't believe the specifications in "B" are vague.)

5.   If the size of the ortho for the WRP is large, can it be broken into multiple tiles? If so, do you have a specification? This may not apply specifically to this test project, but going forward it could be an issue.   The estimated file size of a 500 acre site (assuming it is square) will be 1.4 gb if it is a 4-Band 8 bit image at 8cm GSD.   Usually an area this

big would be broken into tiles so that areas of interest can be worked quickly and since many image viewer cannot open files this large.   A 5,000 by 5,000 pixel tile would generate a 200 mb image size and is a standard used by some in the industry. Consider the hardware requirements of an approximately 7 times larger 500 acre site.   The file sizes are of concern and we are reviewing possible methods of possibly "breaking up" the images into small files. One approach under consideration is using the National Grid (1,000 meter grid, see www.fgdc.org/usng) for the tiles and naming convention. Unfortunately we will not have a methodology finalized until after the pilot project is completed.

6.   Also, why are the industry standard tiled tiffs not allowed? Again the memory requirements to open the larger files will be enormous. Tiled tiffs are a means to work with larger files in a more efficient manner without sacrificing any spatial accuracy? Some USDA applications have problems reading tiled TIFFs (which is considered an extension to the 6.0 Specification and, therefore, does not require a valid reader to properly "read"). Until we know all legacy application have been updated, we require non-tiled imagery. This is a requirement has been under review by APFO and may be eliminated for this program and other (specific NAIP) in the future.

7.   The RFQ mentions FGDC compliant metadata to be delivered with Section C items 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5 and Section C-8.1. The RFQ states that metadata samples will not be provided. Can you provide us with any information that may help us deliver data in a format that you are expecting? The Government will be providing a template for the required metadata in C-6.1 and C-6.2 which could be used as a guide; however, if awarded a contract, we would be willing to work with you on the details. The FGDC specification states which elements are required and there are several metadata editors (such as Tkme from USGS) that may help in the creation process. Also, the USGS metadata parser will alert you if an element is missing.

8.   Exhibit 1 Project Area Map for Oregon only depicts 22 NRI Sites while the RFQ and the .dbf file referenced 23 sites. Can you confirm the number of sites in Marion County in Oregon? The published map was cropped too tight and did not show a site in the eastern side of the county. The correct count is 23.

9.   We have created a shape file representing what we believe to be the test NRI sites based on the 2008 NRI data and the RFQ Project Area Maps; can you confirm this shape file (please see attached nri09select_kasselected_region.zip)? A quick visual check in ArcMap confirms your locations but I was unable to check the actual size/shape of each site.

10.   Section C-6.3 specifies that we are to deliver both raw and processed IMU/GPS data to be compatible with LPS. Section C-6.5 goes on to specify the delivery of a Photo – Center File which is made up of post-processed IMU/GPS data. In what way does Section C-6.3 differ from Section C-6.5? These two deliverables appear to be redundant other than the raw data mentioned in Section C-6.3.   The Photo-Center file is detailed in the exact columns, column order, and field size. The processed GPS/IMU may be in any

format and can contain data not listed in C-6.5 (and could, in theory, be the same data delivered under two file names).

11.   The shapefile that has been provided – shapefile.zip – only has a .dbf file with the name "nri_pilot_09_ply-nolatlong.dbf." Where are the rest of the files associated with it? The NRI site locations are confidential in nature and therefore no specific lat-longs are being provided until time of award. Acreage and elevation have been provided in the .dbf file to allow flight planning. Essentially all of the NRI sites are square in shape but of varying acreages. A map provided in the RFQ shows their approximate locations in each state. There are no restrictions with the WRP data and a full set of shapefiles have been provided.

12.   The RFQ makes reference in Section B-4.2 to "Two (2) ASCII text files [that] will be provided to be used as templates when creating the metadata for the georeferenced image tiles and the orthorectified image tiles." Is it possible for us as prospective bidders to review these templates or have them made otherwise available to assess our ability to provide an adequate solution?   The templates have not been finalized at this time. Other similar templates may be available, but will differ in many ways from the type of imagery that is part of this RFQ. It is planned that the templates will be provided at time of award.

13.   In Section C-6 the RFQ says, "The metadata must parse cleanly through the USGS metadata parser "mp" version 2.8.10 without any errors." Is this software likewise available to review the compatibility of the prospective solution? Yes, it is. The following URL is a link to the parser: http://geology.usgs.gov/tools/metadata/ , you can find a history of the revisions -- the 2.8.10 version was January of 2004. The current version of the parser – mp 2.9.8 – may be substituted for 2.8.10.