

Imagery TWG Meeting Notes
Idaho Water Center
May 5, 2010

Attendees:

Margie Wilkins, IDWR	Keith Weber, ISU	Chris Clay, IDL
Gail Ewart, IGO	Toni Williams, FSA	Jack Clark, Ada Co. Surveyors
Jim Szpara, DEQ	Wilma Robertson, IDWR	Nick Nydegger, IMD*
Eric Rafn, IDWR	Walt Bulawa, Tax	Bruce Godfrey, UofI*
Diane McConnaughey, BLM	Jeff Servatius, Tax	Dawn Leatham, Bonneville Co. *
Jerry Korol, NRCS	Tim Williams, IDFG	Stephen Cox, AGRI*

*via telephone

GIS announcements:

- Wilma Robertson, currently the NHD steward with IDWR, is the new Framework Coordinator in the IGO's office. She starts May 10, 2010.
- The Idaho Geospatial Office captured an ESRI's Special Achievement Award. Gail suggested that you try to attend the ceremony if you are going to the ESRI conference this summer.

Update on future NAIP flights (Toni Williams):

- Idaho is scheduled to be flown in 2011: statewide, 3-band, 1-meter resolution
- FSA is still working on fiscal reporting so specifics are currently undetermined although there appears to be an emphasis on Feds shouldering more of the financial burden:
 - No partnership money would be required although partnerships could purchase upgrades: collect fourth band, or higher resolution
 - The planned 2011 NAIP is based on a State-wide contract. Specific partners cannot buy-up for smaller areas unless the arrangements are made with the contractor directly.
- Plan to reduce 5-year NAIP cycle to three years, or possibly every two years.
- Other Imagery programs being discussed at federal level and elsewhere:
 - Microsoft Digital Globe as a possible alternative to NAIP
 - Microsoft Digital Globe requires a subscription, while NAIP is public domain data
 - Imagery for the Nation as a possible alternative to NAIP
 - Continuation of NAIP imagery allows people to compare NAIP from different years (i.e. you are comparing apples to apples). Historical significance.
 - People are writing white papers to support continuing the NAIP and not switching to a different service.
 - Toni said there would be an opportunity for State agencies and other interested groups to provide feedback and input on the necessity of continuing the NAIP. Toni will update the group after their (anticipated) nationwide NAIP meeting.
- It was suggested that after over two years of working on this partnership, the participants might want a break before the next cycle kicks in.
- APFO web services (<http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/apfoapp?area=apfohome&subject=landing&topic=landing>) available for the 2009 NAIP. There is a separate web service available on this website for the fourth band.
- Absolute vs Relative Control:
 - Toni said they used absolute control for 2009 NAIP
 - Toni said that it is determined that the 2009 NAIP is the most accurately referenced to date.
 - Jack said he is in touch with surveyors and will continue to encourage further cooperation for control information.
 - Bridge decks are surveyed and are easily visible on the NAIP making for excellent control.
 - Idaho is one of the most difficult States to fly because of its terrain.
 - Gail requests that FSA/Toni forward all QC/QA summary reports to the TWG.
- Resolution:

- No plans to collect higher resolution but provide lower resolution due to increased number of flight paths required (four fold).
- Toni said that Oregon was flown at a higher resolution but that the product was disappointing.
- There were some problems flying the NAIP 2009 on the border with Canada because of homeland security issues.

Image Services per Consortium Agreement (Bruce Godfrey and Keith Weber):

- MOU was signed on April 9, 2010
- INSIDE received the data on external hard drive. ISU pulled the data from INSIDE Idaho over Internet 2. Servers have been ordered by ISU and should be delivered in the next two weeks. After that it is expected to take another week to set up the system. It is expected that the ISU services will be operational by the end of May.
- INSIDE anticipates the same sort of schedule.
- Image service:
 - imagery will be in IDTM geotiff format
 - all bands available for download
 - slower but will allow users to access the attributes associated with the imagery
- Map services:
 - caching schema follows BING/Google/ESRI format
 - should be relatively fast
 - largest scale (most zoomed in) is set to 1:2,257
 - tiling is 256
 - WebMercator projection - consistent and more easily shared with other web services
 - will provide both true and false color services

Disposition of Imagery Services Outside Consortium (Gail Ewart):

- Background on Partnership (Gail):
 - Partners act in concert and decide as a group. Even people with a different opinion conform with the majority.
 - This idea of cooperation is essential to the vision of the SDI.
 - The Imagery Partnership and effort is really the first one of its kind, showing a true cooperation and a multi-organizational effort to collect and provide enterprise GIS data
 - a business arrangement documented by signed agreements with each partner.
 - Since this is the first large scale partnership effort, it functions as an example how different agencies can work together as partners.
 - The partners have a fiduciary responsibility to act in good faith with each other and within the agreements of the partnership.
 - This type of effort, working towards a distributed services design, is envisioned and supported by SDI. The design specifically includes INSIDE Idaho.
- In question, are the web services posted by the Tax Commission
 - Gail states this was done outside, and without notification, of the Imagery Services Partnership/ Consortium.
 - Services fall outside of the agreement
- Response from Tax Commission (Walt Bulawa and Jeff Servatius):
 - Walt responded that their intentions to publish web services was brought up at every opportunity
 - formal agreement to not distribute data did not exist
 - 2009 data is vital to the functional operation of the tax commission – 2004 NAIP is too outdated and had to be replaced with the 2009 NAIP.
 - web service created by Tax was provided at no cost to anyone.
- Further Discussion:

- Nick Nydegger expressed that the overriding goal of the partnership is to cooperatively obtain and then distribute imagery data. Data has been obtained, now we must pursue the goal of maximizing data delivery. Nick expressed that the Imagery Partnership should not control how data is used.
- Gail said that she never intended to sound like the partners have any say on how this data should or should not be used. In fact, quite the opposite – the more people that benefit from this data the better. Gail’s concern is that when data is served to the public it should be done in a professional manner. We only have one opportunity for a “first impression” to the public. Gail has heard reports that computers of people trying to use the imagery services have crashed.
- Margie and Gail stressed that the NAIP 2009 data has been available to the partners as soon as it was available – all the partners had to do was call Bob Smith and ask for the data as noted in the March meeting notes. Margie also noted that she has not received any requests for the data. Non-partners have been directed to the APFO website.
- Keith suggested that it might have been a less controversial issue if the Tax Commission had kept the services “in house” (not made it publicly available) and also to have brought their intentions specifically before the group for discussion.
- Walt responded by saying that they did not know how to keep a web service in house. They created the service to meet Tax needs and they never meant to compete with other services. The group responded that the web services could have been password protected, or that the URL was not made publicly available.
- Tax expressed extreme displeasure with the slow pace of delivery services.
- Gail noted that the Tax Commission web services has gis.idaho.gov in the URL which gives the impression that those web services were approved by the IGO. Had the Department of Administration known that the Tax Commission was planning this they could have discussed it internally and planned for the services. There are procedures in place at the Department of Administration to allow such changes. Those procedures were not followed, since the Department of Administration was not asked or notified.
- Jeff Servatius responded that the Department of Administration has no jurisdiction about which public data the Tax Commission serves to the public. The attorney of the Tax Commission may weigh in on this issue as well.
- Gail mentioned that the partners have made a great effort, both in time and money, to get the NAIP 2009 to where it is now and it was understood that partners have preference to the data.
- Stephen Cox agreed that agencies should not need approval from the Imagery Partnership or the Department of Administration to serve public data. Stephen also offered the Tax Commission be assisted with setting up password protections. When INSIDE and ISU are operational, the Tax Commission web service will just be another option. Our job is to create data; therefore more options for delivering the data are preferable.
- There was a question of whether or not the Imagery Partnership really wants to set precedent for setting rules of what can and cannot be done. The TWGs are meant for making recommendations not as regulatory entities. Gail reminded everyone that we are a partnership in this case and we do have authority to make a decision about this matter.
- Margie commented that the meeting notes are informal and that the spirit of the Partnership should be one of communication and collaboration.
- Keith Weber noted that one of the biggest issues leading to this conflict is the lack of communication and that it would have been better if the Tax Commission had brought it more formally to the Imagery Partnership before setting up the service. Also made a plea to let this conflict be “water under the bridge” and focus now on how to go forward.
- Gail said that the Imagery Partnership is a legal entity and that there is a signed agreement that expires on June 30, 2010.
- Walt requested that we take a vote as a group to ask Gail to allow the service to continue until the services on INSIDE Idaho are operational.
- Chris asked what the current agreement is between IGO and Tax.

- There is currently a verbal agreement (initially made between Nathan Bentley, the former GIO-equivalent, and the Tax Commission)
- Agreement is actually between the Department of Administration and the Tax Commission.
- A formal agreement is written up but is still in draft form.
- Gail said the draft MOU between Department of Administration and Tax Commission can be put out for comment.
- Gail also noted, in response to how the Department of Administration relates to, and serves, other State Agencies, that the funding mechanism at Administration is complicated and that Administration has done a favor for the Tax Commission by hosting/serving their data.
- Nick suggested that a solution be worked out between CIO and Tax and that responsibility should not fall on the Imagery Partnership.
- Margie agreed that the Department of Administration and the Tax Commission work this issue out internally and brought forward the following motion:

The Imagery Partnership recommends that a formal agreement be made between the Tax Commission and the Department of Administration. The Imagery Partnership also recommends the continuation of web services until the web services at INSIDE Idaho and ISU are operational.

Yea: Dawn, Nick, Gail, Keith, Jim, Walt, Chris, Jerry, Tim, Margie

Ney: none

Motion passed.

- Wilma Robertson asked if there were plans to document the Partnership process, and provide a “cookbook” for similar processes in the future. Specifically, she was interested on whether there were plans to review some of the pitfalls that occurred and ways that those can be avoided in the future (i.e. “lessons learned”) as well as how the process overall can be improved in the future. Those present responded that this was a good idea and could be a presentation in the future.

NEXT MEETING JUNE 2nd

These notes are provided for general information purposes only and are intended to highlight major points of the shared discussion. Our meetings are not recorded, but every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of information presented; however, errors may be present as well as omissions of pertinent discussion. As Imagery TWG lead, I value the opportunity to participate in the discussion and am not always able to document all verbal exchanges. A special “Thank You” to Wilma Robertson for her assistance with this month’s notes. Thank you – mw

These notes were updated with revisions on May 17, 2010