MAPPS-USGS Liaison Committee Meeting
11 October 2005
Washington, D.C.

Present:
Stan Ponce USGS
Pat Olsen Aero-Metric
Jim Page James W. Sewall
Gary Florence Photo Science
Joe Gawlik 3001
Bob Mark Air Land
Tom Cecere USGS
Phil Thiel Dewberry
Tom Bowes SAIC
Ken Stiller HAS Images
Greg Snyder USGS
Tim Stagg BAE Systems
Kari Craun USGS
Bryan McFadden VARGIS
Jim Schriever Sanborn
Tina Cary Cary and Associates
Anne Miglarese Earthdata
Ken Fleming LandAir Mapping
Bill Earnshaw ESRI
Susan Marlow Smart Data Strategies
John Copple Sanborn
Terry Keating Intergraph
Roger Crystal Aero-metric
Tim Lowe Lowe Engineers
Dawn Sienicke DigitalGlobe
David Nale DigitalGlobe
Bob Pierce USGS

The meeting was co-chaired by Pat Olsen and Stan Ponce. Attendees introduced themselves. The agenda was reviewed and accepted.

AGENDA
1:30 Introduction (Pat Olson and Stan Ponce)
1:35 Q and A re Karen Siderelis’ morning presentation - Stan Ponce facilitated discussion
(Stan Ponce)
1:45 Forecast for contracting under the CSC 2 in FY 2006 (Kari Craun)
2:00 Update on the new Geospatial Products and Services Contract (Kari Craun)
2:15 Discussion on “Standardized Scope of Emergency Response Kari Craun and Pat Olson
(Pat Olson and Kari Craun)
2:30 Update on Commercial Remote Sensing Policy and Implementation (Greg Snyder and Tom Cecere)
3:00 USGS Policies in Obtaining Imagery and DOQs (Dave Roberts)
3:15 Update on National Licensing of Photogrammetrists and other Geospatial Professionals and Federal Land Inventory: USGS Role (Stan Ponce)
3:25 NGPO Activities of Interest: GIS for the Gulf; Project Bluebook; and the GOS Market Place (Bob Pierce)
4:00 Adjourn

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS
Q and A re Karen Siderelis’ morning presentation - Stan Ponce facilitated discussion
The point was repeated that, although the A76 review will be in progress, USGS will make every effort to ensure CSC review will be orderly and timely. The management of these contracts, which has been handled in Rolla, is expected to become a function in the NGTOC. One of USGS’ actions is to capture the experience of the Rolla people. The CSC re-compete will be known as GPSC (Geospatial Products & Services Contract). The proposals will be sent to Rolla. Staffers there are dedicated to making the process go smoothly; the situation is difficult because their positions are being eliminated and they have to make appropriate plans. MAPPS explicitly commended the professionalism of the people in Rolla.

Following on the information about the schedule, that the PWS is being developed this week, MAPPS explicitly requested that USGS/Stan advise MAPPS of any changes to the plan that may result from this week’s meeting.

To the question whether A76 and Brooks Act are inherently incompatible, John Palatiello said he would have to review the revised Circular A-76 to determine whether the revision applies only to DoD or also to DoI.

MAPPS conveyed its desire that all map production be outside the A-76.

John Palatiello shared that he and Karen Siderelis had talked after her presentation about the possible advantages of a firewall between a management contractor and production contractors.

Action item to MAPPS members: any input a company may wish to provide about roles and responsibilities for A-76 management, should be provided to John P as soon as possible and definitely within 10 days.

Forecast for contracting under the CSC 2 in FY 2006 – Kari Craun (see presentation)
Kari summarized FY05 budget items in terms of USGS appropriations and reimbursable dollars, and then looked at FY06, which will be down. One factor in the decrease is the necessity to support the Landsat program.
USGS has pledged $500,000 to help get the NSGIC 50-States Initiative effort off the ground. MAPPS asked where that money will come from, and indicated that we would have heartburn if any of it were to come from the CSC budget.

**Action for Stan:** advise MAPPS where the money will come from.

**Response 20 October:** The answer is it is coming from the FGDC budget; not from the Cooperative Topographic Mapping Program.

To the question re FY06 of whether more granularity is available about the $1.5 M for CSC, the answer is mainly to continue activities already underway, examples include Alaska, with the Park Service, Maine DOQ.

To the question in FY06 of how secure the projection for $5 M reimbursable is, the answer is $2 M is secure.

**Update on the new Geospatial Products and Services Contract** - Kari Craun

GPSC will have two parts, architecture and engineering under FAR Part 36 and Best Value under FAR Part 15. DPA is envisioned as $35 M for each or a total of $70 M over five years.

Official responses to questions will be posted, including responses to FOIA requests, on the web at [http://geodatacontracts.er.usgs.gov](http://geodatacontracts.er.usgs.gov).

The question was asked whether the RFP could be reviewed and the point was raised that a review period would delay the process. The determination of which tasks will be QBS and which will be Best Value will be made on a task-by-task basis. Guidelines are being developed, and possibly those could be reviewed. The MAPPS position is that all should be QBS, and having some Best Value is fraught with peril.

**Action for Stan:** Communicate that MAPPS requested that the Ombudsman that will arbitrate any appeals of whether a task is Part 36 or Part 15 be a PE, LS or CP.

The number of awards is not known; given that the DPA is smaller, either the number of awards or size of awards can be expected to be smaller.

**Standardized Scope of Emergency Response** Kari Craun and Pat Olson

USGS requirements come from FEMA. USGS and FEMA have an MOU in place. After Katrina, FEMA went to the Corps of Engineers rather than using the USGS-FEMA MOU.

The issue is not what will be requested. The issue that needs to be clarified is pre-coordination: who will call whom when. USGS, FEMA and CoE are having this discussion.

The role of state and local government is relevant here. Their specifications are generally more rigorous than FEMA’s and therefore beyond what FEMA’s budget is intended to cover.

MAPPS can take a strong advocacy role in getting IDIQ contracts in place by region **in advance** of disasters. John P. reported that he and Anne Miglarese and Herb Satterlee have made a presentation to the National Academy of Science panel and will be developing a legislative proposal.
Matters of licensing and security also arise, organizations are not always clear on their freedom to provide data both in compliance with their licenses and in consideration of security issues. The Global Disaster Information Network, GDIN, is used effectively in other parts of the world, though not in the US.

**Update on Commercial Remote Sensing Policy** - Greg Snyder and Tom Cecere
The policy: collect requirements, communicate them to industry, budget for requirements, manage fulfillment.
The Senior Management Oversight Committee includes USGS, NGA, NOAA, NASA, DHS, USDA.
22 agencies are participating and growing the CRSSP Imagery-Derived Requirements, CIDR. Go to [http://cidr.cr.usgs.gov](http://cidr.cr.usgs.gov) to request an account, which provides access to all validated requirements. Long-view had FY info, short-view has funded/unfunded.
A complication is getting people to enter and update CIDR.
The vision is CIDR feeds GOS Marketplace. The next steps include improving the tool to make populating the database easy, and educating agencies about the uses of CIDR.
To the question of how to get funding for unfunded requirements, the answer is that by making the information readily accessible, interested parties will be able to create partnerships.

**USGS Policies in Obtaining Imagery and DOQs** - Dave Roberts was unable to attend, his topic was presented by Stan.
MAPPS has drafted a letter which USGS folks are comfortable with in principle; it is being reviewed by staff and will make its way to the policy folks for approval. The letter is for USGS to send to DFPP. It makes a distinction between NAIP and NAPP.

**Update on National Licensing of Photogrammetrists and other Geospatial Professionals** - Stan
John P drafted a white paper to take to the Solicitor.
USGS role is governed by 1) statutory authority and 2) authorized appropriations. In the case of camera calibration, USGS has no statutory authority, but the USGS role is OK because it involves reimbursable funds. The Solicitor may ask why the Model Law doesn’t take care of this, to which the answer is that it’s a model and every state’s implementation is different. Photogrammetry differs from surveying in that the rules do not change with political boundaries.

**Federal Land Inventory** – Stan Ponce
FGDC is interested in a lead role in this.

**NGPO Activities of Interest** - Bob Pierce
Three topics: Bluebook, GIS for the Gulf, GOS Market Place
Bluebook - GIS for the Nation - in development for about five months
Consistent with NGPO strategic directions and NSDI vision, this GIS for the Nation integrates two types of systems, national and distributed. The Geospatial Bluebook provides a template/guidance for sharing.
Local business needs are met by products that include geospatial data.
The design approach is application-driven, involves looking at successes- NC, WTC.
Initial specifications involved development of common themes, some thematic content is like NSDI. The first public presentation was at the ESRI Conference at the end of July. The system-of-systems is built from local sources.
The Bluebook is currently about 800 pages; to get to it see http://www.geodata.gov, and perform the following actions: (1) click on “Try geodata.gov Version 2” in the red bar above Lady Liberty; (2) click on :ENTER geodata.gov Now!”; (3) click on the “Communities” tab on the top of the page; (4) click on “GIS for the Nation” under Special Interest in the column on the left side of the page; and (5) click on the “Geospatial Bluebook Documents” folder on the top of the page and follow the instructions to locate the files of interest.

GIS for the Gulf, aka GFG
In ten days, all available data were pulled together for three states - Louisiana, Alabama and Mississippi.
Lessons:
1) Importance of data sharing agreements
2) Archive/hosting need to be off-site
3) State:county structure

Now geodata.gov has some public info. There is a first-responders’ page. The GFG viewer requires and ID and password. The GFG data were shipped two weeks ago.

Users include JFOs and the FEMA people on the ground. They were drowning in data, this lets them cross boundaries. There is a lot we’d like to add, it is everything we could do in ten days.

The intent is that NGA and DHS $ in FY06 will continue GFG.
This is really the third pilot in a series. First was a city pilot, San Francisco, then a state pilot, Colorado; GFG is a multi-state pilot

GOS MarketPlace
Question was asked, what are incentives to local government to participate? The benefits include data access, availability of a liaison person, access to ideas (not money).

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS
Any change arising in the PWS, let MAPPS know - Stan
Provide comments on “the fireplace” to John P - MAPPS members
Where is 500K coming from - Stan - done
Convey MAPPS’ request that the ombudsman be technical - Stan