

To aid the board's review of our responses, we have inserted the questions received along with our response in in blue below.

---

Based on the review by the board and the questions received as a result, the following are questions we would like the task force to follow up on and provide as much detail as possible:

1. Related to Small Business questions and comments:
  - a. Is there an example(s) of a "small business issue" the Task Force wants MAPPS to advocate on Capitol Hill during the Federal Programs Conference? As pointed out by the committee, the small business representation on the LAC is already good (over half of the committee members are small business). Also agree that the majority of MAPPs members are small business, and 6 of the 9 MAPPs board members are small business. The MAPPs Board questions the need to create a subdivision of the LAC since it is already made up by a majority of small businesses. We support and agree small business issues should be part of the federal programs conference, but can't the current LAC small business members generate these issues without needing a subdivision of the LAC?

We agree that the current small business members of the LAC could generate these issues with leadership from John Byrd and John Palatiello. What we are requesting is not a specific issue or business item but rather a dedicated focus within the LAC to focus on issues that impact small businesses. During the course of normal LAC meetings, there is often only time to focus on previously worked issues or things that may be appealing to congress. We are simply suggesting that JB and JP put some time into researching what small business issues may be palatable to congress. Then, those issues can be raised to the small business LAC members who can then work to mature the issue into something that our group may pursue during the spring conference and throughout the year.

One suggestion would be for the small business members of the LAC to be required to participate in the small business forum at the conferences. The small business members need some education about the legislative process and could perhaps bring ideas to the LAC on things that are negatively or positively impacting their ability to grow a small business.

A good first step might be a town-hall type of presentation and topical discussion at the summer conference from MAPPs staff on how small business can better work with the federal government. We have seen an increase in federal set-asides for small business but how do we take the next step of getting funding to those contracts – many of which are hollow or do not use anywhere close to the full capacity of the contract. Also, there are some agencies like the USACE that have done a reasonably good job with set-asides and there are other agencies that seem to have no interest for their geospatial contracts (i.e. NOAA).

Some example issues that could be addressed might include:

- Prompt payment for small businesses.
- Federal licensure of Photogrammetry and LiDAR – too difficult for a small business to obtain licenses to do work outside of a small region.

- b. Small Business Size Increase – How does the committee suggest we go back and revisit this issue if it is a divisive issue?

We agree that it is too late to address this issue. More simply, this is an issue that the small business membership would probably have not supported at the new \$14.0M level. This is where the small business members should have been canvassed and included in the decision about what was being proposed by MAPPS during the request for comments period by SBA. There is a sentiment from many (not all) small businesses in our membership that the play by MAPPS was to work towards more inclusion of its members into the small business category by recommending a higher ceiling (i.e. \$18.0M or whatever the amount was that was pushed out by MAPPS). The primary issue is that the membership was not included in the discussion and direction of MAPPS on this issue.

2. How does the Task Force suggest that MAPPS have some assurance that a candidate under consideration for nomination for election to Board has the "interest, energy and time" to be on the Board if that individual has NOT demonstrated a commitment to MAPPS by contributing to the PAC, being active in or a chair of a committees, attending conferences, speaking at conferences, etc...? What prerequisites or qualifications does Task Force believe should be used by the Nominations Committee to evaluate candidates for the MAPPS Board? Is the task force proposing a new process, or is it suggesting that the current process be better communicated to the members and those considering being candidates for the Board?

The qualifications for someone being on the Board needs to be reviewed and more open to members as a whole. We are simply saying that the current process is broken and perhaps too exclusive. The Board has determined the minimum qualifications (member in good standing) already so why not open up the process for anyone that meets the minimum qualifications to be placed on a ballot and voted on by the membership (instead of a hand selected committee). The vote could be conducted similar to ASPRS and other member-driven organizations where everyone picks a candidate based upon a bio and personal statement by the candidate. Perspective candidates could sign a statement acknowledging the positions require energy, time, and overall commitment.

3. What specifically does the Task Force believe needs to be improved regarding an "external (media and prospective members) marketing/messaging plan"? What is it that the task force finds is effective or not effective? What do members want to hear and how do they want to hear the messages?

We have a wonderful website that has an extensive content management system that can be accessed by a member user name and password. We are simply suggesting that more information needs to be communicated to the members. This is a member organization, not a board organization and not a MAPPS staff organization. The members need to see better transparency from the board and the MAPPS staff to feel more included and to see a higher ROI on the dollars being spent by their firms.

Every set of notes from board meetings should be available to the members. We agree that there are certainly some that will never access the information and simply do not care. However, we feel there are a growing number of firms that want to either be all in or all out. To be included and all in, information about what is going on with the staff and the board is critical.

From an external marketing perspective, we know many firms that are never approached by MAPPS for prospective membership. We need a marketing and sales plan which is active and progressive in

regards to finding and obtaining new members. Firms in the industry should be contacted and given a short presentation on the organization. Invite them to a meeting at a reduced rate.

When a new member comes to a meeting for the first time, we should match them up with a mentor for the conference. The mentor could be a volunteer from the membership or the board that is willing to introduce them around, help make business connections for them and to generally make them feel welcome.

Finally, MAPPS staff should keep a database of prospective firms including the historical interaction with these firms. A tool like Salesforce could be used for this type of interaction. We, the members, need feedback on why firms don't join so we can help change the perception. There is either no information being tracked on these types of interactions or it is simply not made available to the membership – in either case, something needs to change.

4. What does the Task Force specifically have in mind with regard to a monthly or quarterly dues payment plan? How can MAPPS be assured firms will make all its payment and not drop out part way through the year? (MAPPS has had experience in the past with firms paying the member rate (e.g. for the Winter Meeting registration), and then not paying its dues. MAPPS rules and policies unfortunately have to be written for firms that abuse the process, not for those who follow it.

We view these as two separate issues. First, do not let someone attend a conference until they have paid a pre-determined amount of their annual payments. Cash flow is tough for businesses of all sizes. A monthly or quarterly payment plan helps spread that need out throughout the year. Perhaps the only way you can qualify for the monthly payment plan is if you meet some minimum qualifications that could include:

- Member in good standing for at least 2 years consecutively.
- Attended at least one Winter or Summer conference in the last 12 months.
- Etc...

Establishing some minimum criteria would solve the board's concern about firms abusing the process. Allow this option to those firms that have already proven their commitment to MAPPS.

Second, provide discounts for all events if someone is willing to pay up-front at the beginning of the year.

5. With regard to QBS, what does the task force mean by "when do we support it, when does it not become a pillar for our group to stand on"?

We simply mean that we agree that QBS continues to be important to our profession. However, there are times where pushing that agenda is harmful to the members of MAPPS and has caused firms to drop their membership (see USDA and NGA).

Rather than the board directing for JP to make a strong position on behalf of the entire organization when conflict arises, we are simply saying that we must protect our business relationships as a primary goal to defending QBS at all costs. Communication and inviting thoughts from the members is all that we are asking ... not asking to abandon the quest.

I want to thank you for the time to lead this task force and for the task force's comments and feedback. This is high priority for MAPPS and the Board, and I think the task force has made some great recommendations for improvements.