

Imagery TWG Meeting Notes
Idaho Water Center
June 4, 2008

Attendees

Nathan Bentley, Ada County
Keith Weber, ISU
Mike McGuire, Ascent GIS
Bill Kramber, IDWR
Jim Szpara, DEQ
Scott Van Hoff, USGS
Margie Wilkins, IDWR

Donna Pitzer, BOR
Nancy Glenn, ISU
Gail Ewart, DoA/IGO
Jim Hill, ITD
Nick Nydegger, IMD
Jerry Korol, NRCS
Ross Dodge, COMPASS

Tom von Alten, Idaho One Plan
Toni Williams, FSA
Brian Liberty, Idaho Power
*Don Patterson, USFS Region1
*Paul Gessler, U of I

*via telephone

Nathan Bentley (Ada Co.) volunteered at the last Imagery TWG meeting to research various Image Service Providers as an alternative to the NAIP program. He presented his findings via a PowerPoint presentation. (see the "Review of Imagery Service Providers" link on the [IGO Framework website](#)) I have included the presentation below in outline form.

Review of Imagery Services by Nathan Bentley

• [America View](http://www.americaview.org/) (<http://www.americaview.org/>)

• AmericaView (AV) is a nationwide program that focuses on satellite remote sensing data and technologies in support of applied research, K-16 education, workforce development, and technology transfer.

• [America View](#)

• USGS AmericaView Program is an AV data infrastructure, data processing, and data delivery initiative administered by the USGS under the Land Remote Sensing (LRS) Program and carried out at USGS facilities. Primary activities for this effort are undertaken by the USGS Earth Resources Observation System (EROS) Data Center (Sioux Falls, South Dakota) in conjunction with other LRS priorities such as the Landsat Data Continuity Mission (LDCM).

• [America View](#)

• AmericaView Consortium is comprised of university-led, state-based consortia working together to build a nationwide network of state and local users. AmericaView supports the goals of the AV Program by further expanding communications networks, facilities, and capabilities for acquiring and sharing remotely sensed data among AmericaView members. The Consortium is actively working with the USGS and universities across the country to expand participation in the AV Program to all 50 states.

• [America View](#)

• Sensors

- Landsat 1 -7 MSS, TM, ETM
- MRLC 1992 and 2001 (in 2001 TC or RA)
- Ortho ETM+ (SPOT)
- Pansharpen ETM+ (SPOT)
- Ortho TM (SPOT)
- ASTER VNIR
- ASTER TIR

- MODIS MOD09A1
- MODIS MYD09A1

- [America View](#)

- Overview

- Satellite based program Higher Education and Research focused
 - Resolution range from 1.5 meter to > 30 km
 - SPOT license does not allow for use outside an education or training setting. (Best resolution sensors)

- Input from UI or ISU

- Google Earth

- Free API to develop with
 - \$10,000 a year for subscription fees for the Premier Level
 - Limited customer input on imagery dates
 - Variable sensors and imagery resolutions all copyrighted
 - Google has entered into statewide agreements to use state derived data (Indiana, New York) but the state had an imagery program independent of Feds
 - Imagery cannot be imported into your GIS

- Microsoft Virtual Earth

- Free API to develop with
 - ~ 1meter Resolution
 - Subscription based service ~ \$7,000 a year per license up to 100000 views.
 - Ability to license better imagery
 - Interfaces with SQL database for GIS display
 - Imagery cannot be imported into your GIS

- Private Sector

- Willing to enter into a statewide contract to fly the state
 - Willing to fly at resolution requested
 - A few would consider Lease versus Buy
 - Most preferred Buy
 - Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) was encouraged over lowest cost selection
 - Must follow purchasing rules (RFP, RFQ)
 - Potentially the highest cost option
 - Creative Licensing available

The conclusion drawn from the research indicates that America View is primarily an educational and research aimed approach for Satellite imagery. The commercial options (Google Earth and Microsoft Virtual Earth) have limited use in GIS and allow for little customer input or control. Clients use the data that is provided. Private sector options allow for the most client input, but at a higher cost than other options.

Nancy Glenn (ISU) said that America View has a contract with the USDA to provide alternative satellite imagery (IRS) since the Landsat 7 ETM+ Scan Line Corrector problem that began in 2003 and subsequent data collection problems of Landsat5. IRS collects throughout the growing season.

Summary of Nation Digital Orthophoto (NDOP) Meeting held May 5-9, 2008 by Scott van Hoff

- Imagery For The Nation ([IFTN](#))
 - FGDC has completed their study on IFTN

- \$80-85 million is spent annually on imagery data collection
- FGDC has taken on IFTN which is in its planning and design stages. NAIP has been around longer and is ahead in the federal support. Although it is expected that there will be a convergence of the two programs as time goes on in order to leverage dollars.

●NAIP

- slides highlighting the changes to USDA's NAIP program (first handout)
 - estimated as a \$14M annual program with about \$10M coming from FSA
 - FSA to focus their funding on Agricultural Program Lands
 - minimal commitment in some western states
 - varying information on funding scenarios needs quick resolution for '09 program
 - some people are being told that '09 projects will require significant state partnership participation
 - APFO is vague
 - discussions at NDOP about the potential for funding the base program with Federal dollars with state participation focused on buy-ups for improved accuracy and 4-band.
- Therefore, a new funding model has been proposed (see USDA-FSA Notice AP-9 on the [IGO Framework website](#))
 - As long as 3 top federal agencies (NRCS, USFS, USGS) contribute \$1.3M to \$1.5M annually, minimum cost share for partners in individual states is 10% of FSA costs for CLU coverage in that State.
 - converting to a 3-year refresh cycle
 - product will be 1 meter, statewide, true color
 - buy-ups possible for Infrared, absolute control, and higher resolution
 - time is short – funding agreements need to be in to FSA by Dec. 31, 2008
 - partial payment is made at time of first delivery

DISCUSSION

Gail (IGO) - Dept of Admin has made first contribution to new funding model with \$5000 contribution

Nick (IDM) - NAIP has become standard nationwide; Federal agencies have seen the importance and are willing to fund it; continuous talk of upgrades makes 2009 NAIP collection messier than it needs to be; suggests going with the basic product until we get the ball rolling for future collections; inertia is there!

Scott - improvements have been made in QC/QA

Mike (Ascent GIS) - WA and OR moved in steps; first securing funding for basic package, then moving on toward buy-ups

Ross (COMPASS) - need to know costs for buy-ups for budgeting and justification

Toni (FSA) - suggests that those partners that need to know the numbers contact Kent Williams (APFO, NAIP). He can provide costs of past projects.

Mike – estimates that fuel costs account for 5-7% of the cost of flying. Usually this is covered by surcharges.

Toni –Surcharges must be dealt with through the buy-ups and individual contracts. FSA must approve all buy-ups (secondary contracts between NAIP cost-share partners and NAIP vendors). “Secondary contracts must not impact the FSA flying season or delivery requirements, or result in cost amounts that are higher than established estimates.” (USDA-FSA Notice AP-9 --)

Nathan – grants and private monies may help with distribution efforts.

Margie – asked Ross to summarize the findings at the county consortium meeting they held on May 21st
Ross – a cost allocation model is currently being worked out by the consortium. They plan on going ahead with their 2010 flight. They are proceeding with an RFP.

Keith Weber (ISU) – reminded the group that the first 6 months has been spent dealing with needs assessments, surveys, and possible funding commitments. What does it take to make things actually happen? What should the next step be?

Nathan – when 2004 NAIP was collected, the Imagery TWG worked through MOUs.

Donna Pitzer (BOR) – had questions on absolute control - what is it, what does it require, how much does it cost, and what is the return on the investment

Mike – will research this for the next meeting. He estimated that it would add approximately \$150, 000 to the cost and reminded us that it would be a one-time expense.

Jim Szpara (DEQ) – commented that absolute control would likely vary across the state because of wilderness areas.

Mike – process to move forward would require that members of the Imagery TWG volunteer their time for certain responsibilities until the state administration position is funded.

Gail – suggested the following action item: Imagery TWG forward a recommendation to the IGC to purchase NAIP imagery in 2009

Keith - made the following “Motion”

Motion: That the Imagery TWG recommend to IGC that the State and its partners pursue the acquisition of the 2009 NAIP data.

Nathan and others seconded the motion.

A vote was taken:

Yeas – 18

Nays – 0

Abstained – 0

The next IGC meeting is scheduled for June 19th. Nick Nydegger will put this item on the agenda.

The next Imagery TWG meeting will be scheduled for Wednesday, July 2nd at 10:00.