

2010 NAIP Post-Mortem Contract Review December 7, 2010

Introductions and Program Review

Kent Williams (APFO) started the meeting with introductions. Geoffrey Gabbott (APFO) continued with a [presentation](#) on 2010 NAIP Contract Summary. Thirty states were contracted in 2010 and as of October 12th, 100% of the imagery was acquired. In addition, nearly all of the CCMs (99%) and DOQQs (94%) have been delivered. Nineteen states had season extensions; mostly for adverse weather or flooding in the Midwest. Questions rose during the 2010 NAIP Summary.

- Can you explain what the two mixed sensors requests (slide 10 of 18) were for? Surdex requested approval to mix DMC and UltraCamX imagery as a backup plan (acquisition risk reduction) but was never employed. Sanborn was approved to mixed satellite imagery within California that could not be successfully acquired due to weather and airspace restrictions.
- Does the average price of DOQQs (slide 13 of 18) include 2-meter states? Yes and it also includes 4-band states and other improvements (such as absolute control).

Contractor Lessons Learned

Surdex, Sanborn, Photo Science, North West, Aerial Services, and Northrop Grumman next presented 2010 summary and lessons learned. The following are questions or comments raised during the Contractor's review:

[Click here to view Surdex -PDF:](#)

- A question was asked if the new absolute calibration allows new procedures to improve IR radiometric quality. Currently there are no best practices or requirements for the IR band and an action item was assigned to APFO to initiate a working group to develop the best practices.

[Click here to view Sanborn -PDF:](#)

The planned exposures (slide 6 & 8 of 16) did not include any originally estimated refights.

- Sanborn recommended ending the CCM delivery and when asked what should replace it, Steve answered that a Government web-service might meet the user requirement.
- A question was asked on the results of the satellite be mixed with airborne collection. Currently Sanborn is not seeing any issues and they feel that imagery quality is more affected by imagery with large temporal variation than difference sensors. The main issue with the satellite imagery is large cost increase over airborne collection.

[Click here to view Photo Science-PDF](#)

- PSI was asked if there were any problems flying over the international borders. No major problems as long as the plane does not land in Mexico or Canada – but it does take coordination with FAA.

[Click here to view North West -PDF:](#)

- North West was also asked the same question on flying over the borders and had a similar response.

[Click here to view Aerial Services -PDF:](#)

- A question was asked if they collected all new ground control. ASI answered no, they shared control with Surdex and used the same control for MN.

Northrop Grumman:

- NG was also asked if they shared ground control but they stated that they prefer to collect control internally.

Group Discussions of Selected Topics

The format for this year's post-mortem meeting was changed to allow each prime contractor to pick and host discussions on selected topics.

Mixing direct-digital sensors (hosted by Northrop Grumman): Peter Briere (Northrop Grumman) started by providing a [briefing](#) based on their experiences using multiple sensor types on the border project. He pointed out that there are a lot of considerations when mixing sensor types, such as sensor geometry and processing workflow. APFO was asked why the Government was not allowing multiple sensor types within a DOQQ. The Government responded that the DOQQ metadata is generated on the fly when an order is placed for the imagery and currently there is no way to determine sensor information needed to create the metadata. An action item was created to investigate alternates to allow mixing within a DOQQ. Surdex added that mixing within the DOQQ could reduce the schedule risk.

Web-based product delivery (hosted by North West): The discussion was started with a quick [briefing](#) from John Welter (North West) on the how's, whys, and issues with web delivery. A question regarding image quality/requirements was asked. Was the delivery for APFO's inspection or for an "interim product" for end users? Kent Williams (APFO) stated that the original web delivery discussion from 4-years ago was centered on getting the imagery to APFO faster but new technology will also allow faster delivery to the end customer. Shirley Hall (FSA) added that there would be value added by providing really quick turnaround to FSA users. All six prime contractors stated that they could implement a web based delivery system to provide a quick delivery to APFO or maybe the end user.

1/2-meter imagery (hosted by Aerial Services): Coral Schneberger (ASI) provided a [briefing](#) that contained a comparison table, based on the ADS-40/80 sensor, of flight lines, line miles, and flight time for different GSD resolutions. Craig Molander (Surdex) stated that UltraCam and DMC II would have similar numbers. Coral's briefing also discussed advantages and disadvantages with collecting ½-meter imagery.

Airspace issues (hosted by Sanborn): Jason Caldwell (Sanborn) kicked off the discussion with a [briefing](#) and recommendation to create a “collaborative tool to share information” - such as a shared database of restricted airspace or other areas of interest (AOIs). Sanborn would like to share information, such as contact data, between all of the prime contractors but there was concern that although the database maybe useful, getting access to some airspace requires good communication between the aircrew and the air traffic controllers. Mike Ritchie (Photo Science) stated that there is a MAPPS subcommittee that works with FAA and maybe worthwhile to coordinate with them before creating a database.

Current marketing efforts (hosted by Photo Science): Mike Ritchie (Photo Science) gave the group an update on Agriculture Geospatial Coalition’s (AGC) current marketing effort. However with the current fiscal environment, there is a low probability of a 48 state, annual program being fully funded. A good group discussion followed on the benefits of other non-cost sharing government agencies are receiving from NAIP. An action item was assigned to the six prime contractors asking them to provide an assessment on where the 2010 funding was spend.

Potential partnership improvements (hosted by Surdex): The final group discussion was led by Craig Molander (Surdex) and was centered on improving partnership participation. Geoff Gabbott (APFO) stated that NAIP originally had two incentives: upgrading 2m to 1m and acquiring complete state coverage. One possible solution to improve cost sharing is to license NAIP data to all non-FSA users.

2011 NAIP Forecast

John Mootz (APFO) gave the final [briefing](#) on the 2011 NAIP forecast. There will not be any major contract or specification changes for 2011. Depending on funding, approximate 15-18 one-meter, natural color states will be flown. Several of the states will be upgrading to 4-band imagery, contingent on partnership requirements and funding. One or two small to medium sized states maybe upgraded to a ½-meter pilot; however to date, there has been no serious interest from partners.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Action 1: APFO create a working group to develop specifications or best practices for near-IR processing. (due before 2012 IDIQ RFP)
- Action 2: APFO will investigate the possibility of mixing digital-sensors within a DOQQ. (before 2011 task order RFP)
- Action 3: Prime contractors provide a “broad brush” assessment of where the \$30M from the 2010 season was spent and how it may have translated to jobs. (open)