

## **Ortho-FIT Meeting**

Division of State Lands

Randall Sounhein - Chairman

1/31/08

9:30 – 12:00

- Chair opened with Welcome/introductions and call for any additional agenda items.
- Emmor Nile, ODF, suggested the addition of “Objectives” as a discussion items under new business adding that there were problems with the process we recently went thru and that the group should back up and look at it’s objectives.
- Cy Smith, GEO, added that we should ID requirements and needs then move forward. Cy added that in the past we have jumped on available opportunities prior to fully identifying needs
- It was decided to add “Objectives” under new business

### **Old and New Business**

#### Chairs comments:

- State of WA like our approach/model; used a similar approach.
- It would have been nice to have added an IR product
- Timeline for deliverables was a factor
- We should re-consideration establishing a formal strategy of creating an Implementation Plan; such a plan could delineate “goals and objectives.”

#### Group comments:

- ODF asks group if .5M was necessary for their business needs?
- Metro requires 6” primarily based on Local Government requirements
- USFS identifies .5M as desirable by internal users but was unable to ID business need
- Several suggest that two products may be needed, perhaps one for urban and one for resource
- Alan Holsted, Metro, says users are already used to split resolution/ two product scenario in Metro area.

#### ▪ **Timeline and OA/OC:**

- Timeline was problematic causing credibility problems.
- ODF business needs requires “fresh” imagery
- By the time product was received it was of little/no use to ODF resulting in some ODF Districts acquiring their own imagery.
- Process needs to be examined, was bottleneck in QA/QC? Yes
- BLM asks, “Would trading QA/OC for quicker delivery help?” Yes ...
- Group suggests having user community provide QA/QC.
- USGS asks, “What did QA/QC process uncover?” BLM responds smudges, color balance and dust. Smudges and color balance were fixed dust was not.

#### ▪ **Accuracy:**

- ODF and ODOT use imagery to measure although recognize as not a good idea
- Imagery is inaccurate due to inaccuracies in DEM used for processing
- LIDAR was discussed relative to its use for imagery processing as well as it’s quantitative use for analysis

- **Funding:**
  - GEO states that moving dollars between entities is a lot of work, the “pass the hat” or telethon approach required agreements with each contributing entity. This was not a bottleneck this time but if other parts of the process are streamlined then this may become the bottleneck. No known solution but needs to be explored.
  - Metro asks group how WA coordinates it's funding. Someone answers that it's handled by WA DNR.
- **Image resolutions:** ODF queried the group for resolution and repeat cycles:

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Repeat</u>	<u>Resolution</u>	<u>Comments</u>
USFS	2-3 yrs	1M	
ODF	2 yr	2M	
BLM	5 yr	>= 1/2	ID trees (explore lidar)
NRCS	< 5 yr	1M	
USGS	5 yr max	1M	

### General discussion

- **BLM:** Susan Nelson pointed out that Oregon was the first state in the nation to acquire .5M statewide, and so we had no hard and fast rules to follow.
- **GEO:** Cy Smith suggests looking at colorized IR as lower cost alternative to traditional IR. Imagery for the Nation *IFTN* timeline would have first deliverable ~2010. Oregon needs process/products for interim period
- **USGS:** Sheri Schneider asked if there are plans to add older imagery to the Oregon Imagery Explorer. Both OSU and GEO say yes.
- **DLCD:** Tanya Haddad asked if alternative formats might resolve the issues of areas of nodata.
- **Group:** There is a need to establish a stronger more formalize process as and timeline. Better communication amongst players is advised.

### Pictometry Presentation

Pictometry Corporation provide a hour and a half presentation on their georeferenced oblique products. Product resolutions are approximately 6 inch and one foot with the capability to product 3 D building modeling. Product is very useful in urban regions. Emergency response (911) folks in Oregon are interested in utilizing such a product. With the use of oblique imagery site information traditionally obtained in the field is no longer necessary, thus reducing the time and the hazards associated with working in the field.

Metro folks had asked the question of licensing and how it compare to Pictometry' competitors MultiVision.

Pictometry's product it is an accurate second order visualization tool, integrated with multi-functional tools, i.e. area and measurement calculations etc. While it is not designed as survey-grade precision, the product does uses LiDAR data and DEMs to produce a pixel-level ground sample distance in the order of 15 centimeter.

Attendees:

Milt Hill  
Paul Coney

[milton.e.hill@state.or.us](mailto:milton.e.hill@state.or.us)  
[coney@metro.dst.or.us](mailto:coney@metro.dst.or.us)

Alan Holsted [holsteda@metro.dst.or.us](mailto:holsteda@metro.dst.or.us)  
Sheri Schnedier [sschneder@usgs.gov](mailto:sschneder@usgs.gov)  
Mike Schuft [mschult@odf.state.or.us](mailto:mschult@odf.state.or.us)  
Emmor Nile [enile@odf.state.or.us](mailto:enile@odf.state.or.us)  
Orrin Frederick [orrin\\_Frederick@blm.gov](mailto:orrin_Frederick@blm.gov)  
Kuuipo Walsh [kuuipo.walsh@oregonstate.edu](mailto:kuuipo.walsh@oregonstate.edu)  
Cy Smith [cy.smith@state.or.us](mailto:cy.smith@state.or.us)  
Corey Plank [Corey\\_Plank@or.blm.gov](mailto:Corey_Plank@or.blm.gov)  
Tom Adams [adamst@co.yamhill.or.us](mailto:adamst@co.yamhill.or.us)  
Ian Reid [ian.reid@or.usda.gov](mailto:ian.reid@or.usda.gov)  
Michael Golden [mdgolden@fs.fed.us](mailto:mdgolden@fs.fed.us)  
Susan Nelson [snelson@or.blm.gov](mailto:snelson@or.blm.gov)  
Jeanette Holman [jeannette.Holman@dsl.state.or.us](mailto:jeannette.Holman@dsl.state.or.us)  
Kent Willett [Kent.Willett@or.usds.gov](mailto:Kent.Willett@or.usds.gov)  
Randall Sounhein [randy.Sounhein@dsl.state.or.us](mailto:randy.Sounhein@dsl.state.or.us)