

Below are the questions that were received regarding this RFP, listed in the order received. C/CAGs answers have been provided in blue.

1. Data Ownership and Licensing (Re: Appendix D, Sample Agreement, Section 7 "Contract Materials"; Appendix A, Task 5)

Section 7 of the Sample Agreement and Task 5 of the Scope of Work specify that all data and contract materials become the property of C/CAG upon delivery. Would C/CAG consider an alternative structure in which the Consultant retains ownership of the underlying data and instead grants C/CAG a perpetual, royalty-free license to use, share, and publicly display the data delivered in shapefile and geodatabase formats? Under this structure, data could be shared freely within C/CAG and member agencies, provided to engineering firms working on the government's behalf, and made publicly viewable, but would not be made available for public bulk download in native geospatial formats. Please advise whether this licensing approach would be acceptable in lieu of a full ownership transfer.

No, C/CAG would need a full ownership transfer.

2. Re-survey Methodology (Re: Appendix A, Task 4.1)

Task 4.1 requires re-surveying a minimum of 10% of total mapped point features for QA purposes. Could C/CAG clarify whether this re-survey must be conducted via traditional field verification, or whether an independent desk-based re-check (for example, a second analyst re-extracting features from the same or newly acquired imagery or LiDAR data) would satisfy this requirement, provided the proposed tolerance and validation procedure is detailed and approved under Task 2?

Provided the proposed tolerance and validation procedure is detailed and approved under Task 2, re-surveying can be completed through an independent desk-based re-check. It is not expected that a field verification would be required at this time.

3. Base Imagery/Data Availability

Does C/CAG or San Mateo County have existing high-resolution aerial imagery, oblique imagery, or LiDAR datasets that would be made available to the selected Consultant for use on this project, or should Proposers assume full responsibility for sourcing and budgeting for any required base imagery or LiDAR data independently?

C/CAG does not have this data available. Proposers should assume full responsibility for sourcing and budgeting for any required base imagery or LiDAR data independently.

4. Supplemental Pricing Beyond Defined Scope

Beyond the required Tasks 1-5 and optional Tasks 6A/6B, would C/CAG be open to receiving supplemental, for-information-only pricing on additional transportation asset data types not currently included in the Scope of Work, such as pavement markings, pavement striping, and lane geometry/centerline data, for potential future planning use? If so, should this be submitted as a separate appendix outside the official Cost Proposal Template (Appendix C) so it does not affect evaluation of the required scope?

Yes, and yes. Please include any additional transportation asset data types not included in the Scope of Work as a separate appendix. Additional transportation asset data types included will not be subject to scoring.

5. Slope and Cross Slope Scope Flexibility (Re: Appendix A, Task 3.1)

Given the scale of the Countywide network (approximately 2,098 miles of public roads, evaluated independently by roadway side) and the budget available for this contract, collecting slope and cross slope data to a reliable degree of accuracy across the full network may require a level of technical investment beyond what the indicated budget can support. Would C/CAG consider proposals that deliver sidewalk and crosswalk presence, width, and curb ramp location data within the base scope and budget, while presenting slope and cross slope collection as a separately scoped, optionally priced task or future phase?

Yes. C/CAG understands that proposers' scopes may exceed the amount of budget available and encourages vendors to propose phased or tiered data collection approaches. If you opt to do this, please clearly describe the scope, sequencing, cost implications, and deliverables associated with each phase.

6. Sidewalk Obstruction/Encroachment Granularity (Re: Appendix A, Task 3.1)

Task 3.1 requires identification of sidewalk obstructions and encroachments, including utility poles, traffic signal equipment, signage, street furniture, and private frontage encroachments. Given the scale of the network and the budget available, systematically and comprehensively identifying every obstruction type across the

full network may require investment beyond the base budget. Could C/CAG clarify whether identifying significant obstructions only, such as street trees and other major encroachments that meaningfully impede sidewalk passage, would satisfy the intent of this task within the base scope, with comprehensive identification of all obstruction types (utility poles, signage, street furniture, etc.) offered as a separately scoped, optionally priced task?

C/CAG can confirm that the intent of this portion of the work is to identify significant obstructions that impede sidewalk passage.

C/CAG also understands that proposers' scopes may exceed the amount of budget available and encourages vendors to propose phased or tiered data collection approaches. If you opt to do this, please clearly describe the scope, sequencing, cost implications, and deliverables associated with each phase.

7. Cost Proposal Template

Are respondents required to use the provided Cost Proposal Template? Or may we use our own template, provided that it includes all of the same information required by C/CAG?

Respondents are required to use the provided template, but respondents may also submit additional cost proposal information as separate attachments.

8. Monthly Progress Reports (Re: Appendix A Task 1.4)

Does C/CAG envision progress reports described in Task 1.4 as more detailed narrative documents? Or shorter, more general bullet lists for the purposes of invoicing?

The progress reports described in Task 1.4 are envisioned to be brief documents, including bulleted lists, for the purpose of invoicing. At a minimum there should be a short description of project progress (1 – 2 paragraphs) and bullet pointed information about milestones and deliverables achieved, but these should not exceed 1 – 2 pages.

9. Most of the datasets C/CAG has requested in RFP can be achieved through AI-based tools, processing aerial imagery, LIDAR collection, etc. while others (specifically cross slope) typically require manual field collection. Countywide manual field collection is likely be beyond the budget allocated for this project. Is C/CAG open to

omitting cross-slope from the base scope of work, if the level of effort required to collect that data is prohibitive?

Yes. C/CAG understands that proposers' scopes may exceed the amount of budget available and encourages vendors to propose phased or tiered data collection approaches. If you opt to do this, please clearly describe the scope, sequencing, cost implications, and deliverables associated with each phase.

10. Please confirm whether proposers should submit pricing for Tasks 1–5 only, as the base proposal, with separate additional pricing for Optional Task 6A and Optional Task 6B, or whether C/CAG prefers a different pricing structure.

Correct. At a minimum, C/CAG is interested in proposers submitting pricing for Tasks 1–5 only, as the base proposal. Additionally, proposers can choose to submit separate additional pricing for Optional Task 6A and Optional Task 6B. Any proposer must fill out Appendix C: Cost Proposal Template page 1 for Tasks 1 – 5. Any proposer interested in completing either of Tasks 6A or 6B must fill out Appendix C: Cost Proposal Template page 2. If a proposer can complete the work of 6A or 6B, they should fill out both sections on page 2. C/CAG will proceed with either the work of Task 1 – 5, or Tasks 1 – 5 and 6A, or Tasks 1 – 5 and 6B.

11. Please clarify whether any bike facility or bike intersection treatment work is expected within the base scope of Tasks 1–5, or only if Optional Task 6A or 6B is selected.

Correct, there is no Bicycle Facilities or Bicycle Intersection work included in the base scope Tasks 1 – 5. Bicycle related work will only be included if Optional Task 6A or 6B is selected.

12. Please define C/CAG's expected planning-level accuracy standard for sidewalk, curb ramp, crosswalk, and bicycle facility attributes, including any target tolerances for width, slope, cross slope, and feature location accuracy.

C/CAG is seeking planning-level data suitable for network analysis, prioritization, and capital planning purposes, rather than survey-grade or engineering design-level measurements. Specific numerical tolerances have not yet been established. Proposers

should identify the expected accuracy of their methodology and recommend appropriate planning-level tolerances for consideration during contract negotiations

13. For Task 4, does C/CAG expect a consultant-hosted web application, a GIS web viewer, or another type of review platform? Are login credentials, comment moderation, exports, or post-project archiving required?

The web-based map viewing platform can be either a web application, a GIS viewer, or any other type of review platform, given that the described capabilities are supported. Comment exporting, moderation, and post-project archiving are required. Login credentials are not required. Distribution of this deliverable is expected to be limited.

14. Does C/CAG have preferred GIS schema conventions, basemap sources, projection/coordinate system requirements, metadata standards, or naming conventions for final deliverables?

Not at this time.

15. Are there any regional collaborative data initiatives C/CAG would like the deliverables of this project to align with, or be informed by?

None at this time, though C/CAG is open to suggestions.

16. For Task 6A, what level of field verification or conflict resolution is expected where existing bicycle datasets disagree?

None. Discrepancies should be flagged only. If C/CAG is able to provide field verification prior to the start of Task 5, discrepancies should be corrected in any final reporting.

17. Please clarify how C/CAG intends proposers to align the requested schedule with the reference to an approximate eight-month outreach delivery timeline and a maximum four-month program evaluation period.

We have revised the schedule listed in the RFP. Please refer to Addendum Number 1 here: <https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/AT-mapping-Addendum-1.pdf>

18. Will C/CAG provide existing jurisdictional GIS layers, base street centerlines, or other source data in advance of kickoff, and if so, in what format and under what terms of use?

For Tasks 1 – 5 and Task 6B, the selected vendor is expected to utilize the GIS data publicly available at <https://www.smcgov.org/tsd/gisdata-download>. Should Task 6A be selected, C/CAG will provide the up to 22 existing bicycle facilities map data layers at project kick-off.