

Imagery TWG Meeting Notes
Idaho Water Center
January 7, 2009

Attendees:

Margie Wilkins, IDWR	Toni Williams, FSA	Anne Hillyer, BPA *
Gail Ewart, DoA/IGO	Jack Clark, Ada Co. / Surveyors	Roberta Quigley, USFS R4 *
Jerry Korol, NRCS	Tom von Alten, IDI	Don Patterson, USFS R1 *
Bill Kramber, IDWR	Ross Dodge, COMPASS	Bruce Godfrey, InsideIdaho *
Eric Rafn, IDWR	Ross Dodge, COMPASS	Paul Schneider, Bingham Co. *
Chris Clay, IDL	David Clopton, IDI	Mike McGuire, AscentGIS *

*via telephone

Gail started the meeting with an update on the status of the partnership

- have met funding goal for data (\$268,794)
- more agreements to come
- 31 partners
- agreement with FSA is in 3rd draft, very close to signature ready
- substantial interest by federal agencies in high resolution buy-up (to 0.5 meter)
- Cindy Sessions (APFO contracting officer) has ideas on gaining the additional funding for 0.5 meter buy-up
- BPA and USFS announced they are interested in stereo pairs – would like a cost estimate from NAIP vendors

Margie apologized for not following through on the request/inquiry to NAIP vendors for cost estimates. Will do so and report back next month. Will include request for stereo pair cost estimate.

Discussion on best method of distributing interim dataset (compressed county mosaics, CCMs)

another survey should be sent to partners to determine how:

- DIY stations located in 3 areas (ISU, INSIDEIdaho, and Boise) – partner provide external drive or DVDs and make the copies themselves
- Download CCMs from INSIDIdaho or ISU
- mail out DVD
- direct partner contact with NAIP vendor for download on external drive provided by partner (typical for Feds due to virus risk,etc.)

There was discussion on the various file sizes for CCMs and who would be responsible for making the copies to be sent via mail.

Discussion on pros and cons of JPEG2000 – slow display

The option of a 100k tiling scheme was put on the table – there was a lot of support for this since many won't be using the CCMs or QQs

Margie proposed a priority list for consortium dollars (funding available above and beyond data costs)

1. tiling structure was more important than
2. projection (because ArcGIS products can reproject on the fly)

Gail suggested general access thru INSIDEIdaho might solve the projection issues. Bruce supported this saying that many export options (for various projections) were available; however hardware, storage, and web development upgrades would be needed.

Imagery TWG needs to send out another poll/survey to determine:

- best delivery method for CCMs (see above for options) and should also include
- geographic area of interest
- interest in 100k tiles instead of QQs
- Chris, Eric, Gail, and Anne will review survey that Margie writes

Ross suggested that, as a cooperative, it might be better to have each individual partner work thru the vendor for custom products rather than try to meet all the needs of all partners as a group – there was much agreement on that approach

Custom packages may be possible for low cost through University (ISU)

Gail asked if partners are willing to contribute funds collected over \$300, 000 goal toward hi resolution buy-up? most responded “yes”

Next Meeting February 4, 2009