

February 23, 2009

Charles Mondello

Pictometry International Corp.

via e-mail: charles.mondello@pictometry.com

cc: David Nale, Mark Baker, Doug Leibbrandt, Garth Lawrence
Donald Carswell, John Copple, Bill Derrenbacher

Dear Charles:

I would like to thank you and the other members of the group that participated in developing the comments you submitted regarding the draft for review ASPRS Procurement Guidelines document. The drafting committee has carefully considered these comments and suggestions, as well as those submitted by other groups. We have paraphrased all key comments from the different responders and have prepared a single response with a detailed explanation of our conclusions as well as specific proposed action items. That response is attached and will be posted on the committee's web page and forwarded on to the ASPRS Board for their consideration.

In summary, the committee has proposed the following specific revisions and actions to address issues that were raised:

- 1) Add an additional section (or sections) to provide guidance on the specific technical implementation of procuring professional photogrammetric mapping services.
- 2) Finalize a glossary
- 3) Expand the existing section discussing products and technical services to further explain the role / value of mapping products.
- 4) Coordinate with your "participating firms" group to facilitate development of a companion guidelines document for the procurement of geospatial mapping products.
- 5) Develop an additional attachment of detailed justifications for the QBS process to address key concerns that were raised.

The committee wants to emphasize that while the Guidelines *recommend* QBS methods be used for the procurement of professional services, the intent was not to state or in any way imply that licensing and Brooks Act procurement should be required for all professional mapping services. Nowhere does the document suggest expanding the Brooks Act and this is not the intent.

In fact, the Guidelines specifically state that Brooks Act procurement is not required for all mapping services and guidance is provided for an alternative approach. Language to this affect is included in bullets 5, 6, 14 and 17 of the Executive Summary and related sections of the full text. Further, the Guidelines in no way encourage licensing of all survey tasks. The Guidelines adopt the NCEES Model Rules approach to distinguish between surveying and non-surveying tasks, and include a detailed matrix breakdown clarifying this distinction.

To clarify, the intent of the Guidelines is to state that: 1) Qualifications based selection processes are *recommended* (not necessarily required) for procurement of professional services; 2) The NCEES Model Law/Model Rules and State Law should be used to distinguish between survey and non-survey tasks when determining whether or not FAR or State QBS procurement requirements apply; 3) QBS is not always required by law and QBS laws do not apply to all mapping services; and 4) If cost based methods are to be used by an organization, ASPRS *recommends* that cost be considered secondary to qualifications according an alternative process outlined in the document.

It is important to us that the Guidelines be well understood. Therefore, if your group does not feel the document clearly represents these viewpoints, we hope that you will identify any specific language in the Guidelines that you believe is confusing or misleading.

The committee plans to make the changes stated above and submit a final document to the ASPRS Board for their consideration at their meeting March 13. In the absence of any specific recommendation with regards to language on licensing and the Brooks Act, no substantial changes to those parts of the document are as of yet proposed. Any further written comment or recommendations for specific revisions or suggestions for further work that are received prior to March 3 will be forwarded on to the Board for their consideration.

I understand that you are planning a meeting in Baltimore to discuss development of a companion document. I can be available to attend that meeting. If you would like to meet separately to provide further input on the services document prior to the Board Meeting, I will schedule time to be available for that also. Kass Green has expressed an interest in participating in that meeting.

Again, thank you very much for your detailed consideration of this effort. The Guidelines committee is committed to considering all viewpoints on this complex subject and we very much appreciate your input. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or wish to schedule a meeting in Baltimore.

Sincerely,



Douglas L. Smith
Procurement Guidelines Committee Chair
Professional Practices Division Director