

**OrthoFIT Meeting
October 4, 2005
DSL - Salem**

Present: Randy Sounhein, DSL (Chair); Emmor Nile, ODF; Cy Smith, DAS/GEO; Bob Pinotti, Polk County; Corey Plank, BLM; Susan Nelson, BLM; Jim Baker, FSA; Theresa Valentine, USFS; Mack Barrington, Marion County; Chad Brady, ODOT; Bob Harmon, OWRD; Mike Schuft, ODF; Rusty Merritt, GeoSpatial Solutions; Mike McGuire, Ascent GIS; Gail Ewart, DAS/GEO; Nancy Tubbs, USGS; Doug Terra, OWEB; Steve Barnett, Linn County; Eric Brandt, LCOG.

Scribe: Gail Ewart, DAS/GEO

Handouts: Half-meter Contract Status Report; portal email from Toshimi Minoura

Topic	Discussion Summary	Result	Action Req'd Yes/No	Resp. Party
Introductions		Self introductions	No	
Status of 2005 1-meter NAIP delivery	<p>Flying done, scanning almost done. Compressed County Mosaics (CCMs) being delivered now, UTM projection only, SID MG3 format. 15 counties here. Project status available at www.apfo.usda.gov. No data areas will show up if CCM is reprojected.</p> <p>Issue raised about quality of CCMs.</p> <p>Multiple projections will be available for one and half meter products. 1-meter deliveries should begin in November and conclude in December. APFO program management has changed and should be more amenable to meeting customer needs.</p>	<p>GEO has copy of CCMs, will email all partners to see if they want CCMs, copy and send if wanted. Rest of state should be delivered in one or two weeks. CCMs are 25% of total file size for one-meter product.</p> <p>CCMs are an interim product, should only be used as backdrop.</p>	Yes	GEO
Status of half-meter contract	<p>See BLM status report at http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/IRMD/GEO/fit/orthoimagery/OrthoFrame.shtml</p> <p>Deliveries of half meter products will be made to BLM on combination of</p>	GEO will contact all partners to determine if they require delivery on	Yes	GEO

Topic	Discussion Summary	Result	Action Req'd Yes/No	Resp. Party
	<p>hard drives and tapes. Portable hard drives were not part of BLM contract for half meter imagery. Many partners expecting delivery on portable hard drives, but some at meeting willing to send their own hard drives if needed to speed delivery. Issue raised about reliability of portable hard drives. Recent AscentGIS project had failure of 11 of 44 hard drives shipped to customers. They do better if sitting still, but not so well when moved a lot.</p> <p>Issue raised about quads that fall on projection zone boundaries; request made for those quads to be delivered in both projections.</p>	<p>portable hard drives. If so, GEO will purchase and transfer data.</p> <p>BLM agreed to make that request of Surdex and didn't think it would be a problem. ODF will provide list of affected quads.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>ODF</p>
<p>Data Distribution/Provisioning via a Portal</p>	<p>Issue raised as to whether the consortium funding was intended or needed for portal development. Point made that Google Earth could meet viewing needs. Need for more than just viewing was expressed by many. Need for access to multiple vintages and multiple types of imagery also expressed by many. Need for provision of compressed and uncompressed imagery was expressed. Some locals get lots of such requests for imagery they develop, other locals get few such requests. Need for ability to use local tools with imagery.</p>	<p>GEO will provide half meter imagery to Terraserver (via USGS agreement with MicroSoft) for use in Virtual Earth, which will provide secure backup of imagery offsite. Will also provide to Google Earth.</p> <p>Portal Functionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clip, zip, ship, unzip • Select projection • Multiple vintages • Select output format • Web imagery service available to other apps • Metadata provided • 24/7 accessibility • Backups/Archival • Admin. Privileges – mgmt structure of host • Scalability 	<p>Yes</p>	<p>GEO</p>

Topic	Discussion Summary	Result	Action Req'd Yes/No	Resp. Party
	<p>APFO will launch portal for NAIP imagery, Oregon could participate, might be able to add other data to portal; will have ability to select area and ftp download.</p> <p>Discussion to define need for portal functionality to guide development.</p>	<p>Next steps to have OSU help with procurement, may use sole source. Some customization will be needed to integrate imagery portal tools with Oregon Explorer portal.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Randy, develop SOW for portal to include functions</p>
<p>Implementation Plan</p>	<p>Draft plan is more of a white paper. Need to finalize to provide replicable, sustainable, institutional approach for updated imagery that everyone can budget for. Opportunistic approaches in past are not replicable and require too much effort.</p> <p>Aerial Imagery for the Nation proposal by NSGIC is valid model with lots of support from many organizations, including NACo, MAPPS, URISA but no federal owner or steward identified yet. Caution from feds at mtg about reliance on this initiative when some fed agencies facing cuts.</p> <p>IR and LIDAR are products that are needed and should be pursued. LIDAR is being done for a few areas in OR, including Portland and the Columbia River from Bonneville Dam to the mouth. Startup costs for a project would be \$21K, then \$500/sq mi fixed.</p>	<p>Elements from Aerial Imagery for the Nation proposal will be incorporated in to OrthoFIT implementation plan to produce final draft, which will then be posted for review before finalizing.</p> <p>http://www.nsgic.org/committees/documents/ortho_initiative_handout.pdf</p> <p>DOGAMI will do a white paper on LIDAR and post to GEO website.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Randy</p> <p>Paul Staub</p>