

Subject: Elevation Framework Implementation Team Meeting  
Date: Tuesday February 18, 2014  
Time: 10:00am to 1:00pm  
Location: DAS West Conference Room B  
Attendees:

(at location )

1. Brandt Melick, Elevation FIT Lead, City of Springfield
2. Bob DenOuden, Oregon FIT Coordinator, DAS/CIO/GEO
3. Sheri Schneider, USGS Geospatial Liaison for Oregon
4. Emmor Nile, GIS Coordinator, Oregon Department of Forestry
5. Corey Plank, Lead Cartographer - Remote Sensing, BLM
6. Cy Smith, Statewide GIS Coordinator, DAS/CIO/GEO
7. Ian Madin, Chief Scientist, DOGAMI
8. Jake Edwards, LiDAR Database Coordinator, DOGAMI
9. Doug Smith, Principle, David Smith and Associates
10. Brady Callahan, GIS Program Leader, Oregon Parks & Recreation

(via ilink)

11. Ian J. Reid, GIS Specialist, USDA-NRCS Oregon State Office

#### Agenda:

1. Introductions and general business (20 min)
2. Discuss 3DEP program (Sheri Schneider - 20 min)
3. Lidar data collection needs – needs for filling the data holes (20 min)
4. Discuss opportunities, strategies and develop next steps (90 min)

#### Meeting Notes:

1. Introductions and general business (20 min)
  - a. House cleaning on state web site E-FIT pages (add links)
    - i. Add examples of local consortia IGA's, e.g., Cooperative Project Agreement (SPFLD, EUG, LC, EWEB, etc.), 3-5 year acquisition plans, etc. – items that provide examples of needs, terms and collaborative methodologies.
    - ii. Add standards for other elevation products such as DEM's, Contours, TIN's, Bathymetry, etc. – standards developed by previous elevation FIT's, by ASPRS, FGDC, etc. [added terrestrial raster and vector elevation standard links]
    - iii. Add new DOGAMI docs (need simple meaningful titles):
      1. Amendment 5, Contract 8865, Watershed Sciences, circulation\_draft\_2-13-14.pdf
      2. V2\_OPA\_8865\_Amendment\_5\_9-5-13.docx
    - iv. Add new USGS docs:
      1. NEEA study [done – added a link]

2. Sheri's draft 3DEP Summary - Data Acquisition State Role  
3DEP.docx[done]
  3. Sheri's 3DEP slide show [done]
  4. Draft 3DEP - 3DEP Plan Ver 1.0.pdf and as available comments from Oregon
  - v. Add status map similar to DOGAMI Lidar status map (collaborative efforts between DOGAMI, BLM and USGS)
  - b. Status of E-FIT Charter
    - i. Charter has been approved by the E-FIT, approved by PAC and now goes to OGIC for approval.
    - ii. Brandt offered to go and defend Charter before OGIC – others are welcome to join
  - c. Delivery dates for current projects (Lane county, etc.) and projects in development
    - i. Lane County Project: metro area will be sent within a month; rest of county dependent upon weather conditions could extend to July 2014
    - ii. Deschutes Project: in development; state parks interested in potentially expanding areas
    - iii. Douglas County Project: BLM and NRCS developing project (??)
    - iv. Pilot Work occurring in eastern Oregon to evaluate various resolutions of Lidar to map sage grouse habitat (8 pnts/m<sup>2</sup>, 11 pnts/m<sup>2</sup>, etc.) (??)
  - d. Group began to discuss need for better method of identifying and prioritizing project needs across the state
    - i. Need large regular shaped project areas to lower cost
    - ii. Need find ways to acquire data where local funding is not present to provide state wide coverage
    - iii. Need to pragmatically move across the state to save project development time
  - e. New Lidar distribution program
    - i. Working well – participating agencies appreciate and see value in program
    - ii. Need better communication – email all participants when receiving and when sending the hard drive
    - iii. A more logical and efficient routing scheme for Salem state offices was requested
    - iv. Maybe include a paper log in the nice “pink” case, i.e., list of recipients with several columns for received date, sent date, contact name, etc.
2. Discuss 3DEP program (Sheri Schneider - 20 min)
    - a. See Slide show for details . . .
    - b. Highlights from my notes:
      - i. Shared interests:
        1. Nation Program (3DEP) needs nationwide coverage Oregon E-FIT needs Lidar for the entire state
        2. 3DEP needs success and Oregon has been highly successful

3. 3DEP needs at least QL2 lidar and Oregon can buy up to QL1
  4. 3DEP needs to engage with mature programs that have fostered strong Federal, State, regional, tribal and local partnerships – we have been doing this - need to get our native American representatives back at the E-FIT table (Mell Volker, GIS Coordinator, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde)
  5. 3DEP needs cost local sharing partners, we need national cost sharing partners and we have cost sharing mechanisms in place and good track record
  6. 3DEP needs a reliable lead agency within each state with whom to coordinate – we have that with DOGAMI and DAS/Geo
  7. Opportunity to comment on plan extended until Feb 21 Ian was the only one to comment so far
- ii. Recommended improvements:
    1. Units of measure (arc seconds, etc.) appear to be relics – maybe refer to newer methods and provide an appendix with the cross reference
    2. Highest hit/intensity product not included even though these are fundamental derived products for nearly all users
    3. Not everyone wants hydro flattening (e.g. USACE on Columbia found that this removed islands rather than rapids...) – maybe have this as an option rather than a requirement
    4. Not everyone wants hydro flattening (e.g., local governments prefer to model flow thru culverts rather than artificial “street cuts” . . .) – maybe have this as an option rather than a requirement
  - iii. Recommendations to share results with others:
    1. Should this be presented at 2014 GIS in action?
    2. Should there be a round table to initiate discussion and collect more feedback?
    3. Even though deadline will have passed E-FIT recognized value, recognized that 3DEP program development will still be occurring and recognized value in sharing information with broader base of elevations users across the state
  - iv. E-FIT discussed value in aligning local programs with national programs transitioned into the next agenda item . . .
3. Lidar data collection needs – needs for filling the data holes (20 min)
    - a. Group discussed merits of filling the “white space” (areas within the state that are not currently covered with QL1 Lidar) with QL2 lidar
      - i. Pro ‘s
        1. more affordable – QL2 is \$20.62 million less than QL1
        2. of more value than current elevation (or lack of elevation) information
        3. could provide statewide coverage in fewer years

4. groups on the east coast argue that QL1 is over kill
  - ii. Con's
    1. State partners that participated in August 4, 2010 Elevation FIT Meeting with Larry Sugarbaker at PSU all agreed that QL1 was needed to support their operational needs and made the case for a strong ROI
    2. QL2 is inadequate to support . . . endangered species habitat mapping
      - a. Sage-Grouse which inhabit areas across southeastern Oregon
      - b. Juniper tree control . . other endangered/threatened species (pygmy rabbit) . . .
    3. QL1 is preferred by local agencies for Public Works, environmental services, operations, etc.; its needed and federal agencies such as DOGAMI, BLM, ODF, NRC, etc. to support agricultural activities, hazard mitigation, forestry, environmental monitoring, preservation and restoration and , etc.
    4. Groups in Oregon are evaluating 15 points per meter for some applications (state archeologist??)
  - iii. Group agreed that clear and concise messaging was needed to secure funding and advance acquisition across the state, similar that that which DOGAMI provided around hazard mitigation for landslides, riparian flooding and tsunami inundation
  - b. Group agreed that costs associated with QL1 warranted a review of needs across the state, evaluation of QL2 vs QL1 –especially where both quality levels exist for the same area
  - c. Discussion of needs transitioned into the next agenda item . . .
4. Discuss opportunities, strategies and develop next steps (90 min)
  - a. Group discussed new Watershed Sciences/Quantum Spatial Lidar pricing plan
    - i. Pricing was identified as very consistent with pricing in 3DEP
    - ii. Questions about vertical overlap were left unanswered
  - b. Group identified major components of the Stewardship Plan . . . and the advantages of breaking these out into tracks, perhaps with smaller task force groups for each
    - i. Data Sharing Plan
    - ii. Data Acquisition Prioritization Plan
    - iii. Data Stewardship Plan (partnership strategies, MOU's, IGA's, etc.)
  - c. Group agreed that immediate action is required for data sharing and acquisition prioritization, i.e., people across the state are still unable to access current Lidar and acquisition plan is needed to get in the 3DEP and State legislative queue
  - d. Data Stewardship Plan (partnership strategies, MOU's, IGA's, etc.)
    - i. This is take the longest to complete
    - ii. This will be informed by the other plans, i.e., depend on the other plans
    - iii. Will be developed over a longer time frame as other plans take form
  - e. Data Sharing Plan

- i. Need task force to advance
  - ii. May require multiple nodes (and apposed singular repositories)
  - iii. Need to make sure that distribution remains and key of the program – and that public accessibility is perpetual
- f. Data Acquisition Prioritization Plan
  - i. DOGAMI presented a straw-person proposal
    - 1. Proposed a grid size (100K tiles??)
    - 2. Proposed example methodology
    - 3. Explained needs driving the plan (3DEP, efficiency, state wide coverage)
  - ii. E-FIT identified need for task force (advisory committee) to advance data acquisition plan and do the following . . .
    - 1. Establish prioritization criteria (hazards, engendered species, ROI, etc.)
    - 2. Establish parameters (weight of each criteria, grid size, etc.)
    - 3. Design prioritization analysis methodology
    - 4. Perform Analysis
    - 5. Review preliminary results
    - 6. Refine prioritization criteria, parameters and methodology
- g. DAS laid out key time frames:
  - i. OGIC adopt Oregon lidar plan – June 2014
  - ii. Full FIT review - May 2014
  - iii. task force report - April 2014
  - iv. Create Task force - Now

**Decision Items:**

---

- ✓ E-FIT decided to create a sub group called either the “Acquisition Prioritization Task Force” or “Acquisition Prioritization Advisory Committee” to develop evaluative criteria, develop methodology, perform analysis and develop the Data Acquisition Prioritization Plan as described above under 4.f.
  - ✓ E-FIT decided to coordinate presentations at the next Oregon and Washington URISA, GIS in Action Conference, April 16 & 17, 2014 (session have been incorporated in 2014 GIS In Action Conference, Wednesday April 16, 1:30- 5:00PM)
    - 1.5 hour session – panel session - Applications of OLC Lidar - Brandt and Bob discussed this and can find three presentations on how current statewide Lidar is being used. This would precede the roundtable.
    - 1.5 hour - roundtable / panel session - Elevation Framework for Statewide Lidar Roundtable Discussion - Brief presentation on USGS 3DEP program, OLC plans, new ASPRS accuracy standards and other key factors in current framework planning, followed by an open discussion and feedback from participants on proposed activities.
-