

1. NAIP Review/Discussion – Williams, Uhlhorn, Davis, Gabbott, Mootz, Simpson, Wheeler
  - a. Kent W. - Discussed 2010 plans, challenges, changes, etc. We never know until the day the contract is let how many states we will be acquiring. NAIP is about getting imagery quickly, at a low cost; that meets the requirements of FSA and other Agencies. Discussed funding for 2010, states not flown last year “guaranteed” funding (tier 1). Shirley – budget discussion and administrator commitment. Map displays funding commitment but funds aren’t there yet...these are tier 2. Budget is still pending. Kent W. – full state coverage, no holes. Administrator supports this. It is a national standard base. Not enough funds, but the goal is annual coverage of lower 48...so we move that direction (tier 3 states exemplify this on the graphic). Slides of Tier 1, 2, and 3 states. Cost share numbers based on cost estimates. Cost share is one heck of a deal. Discussed with state partners, etc., such as NISGIC. Candice B. – When do you have to know about partnership? Geoff G.– Agreement must be signed by end of January. Bill B. – why so soon? Geoff – due to need to know for planning for 4-band states for RFP. So partnerships must beat the RFP out the door. Kent discussed specifications changes (absolute, full coverage lakes, QQs available to partners sooner this year, jp2). Whole strategy is to maximize coverage. Showed timeline for NAIP acquisition and delivery. Sensible fast delivery of QQs because of low remake rate. Discussed the unlicensed nature of NAIP. NAIP is everywhere; Google earth, NASA WorldWind, ArcGIS Online, etc. But now MOUs credit in place of the data. Working on agreements to help collect stats on usage which should intern help with partnership with other federal and state agencies. Ron N. – you know the FSA Administrator really does understand the value of sharing the data widely like this. Melinda M. – joined state partnership of WY for CIR upgrade. DVDs to Randy Wiggins. I have counties I cannot load because of DVD copy...I don’t even have the 2008 NAIP data. How do I get it? Kent – web services are part of the answer. But infrastructure is part of the problem, and we are trying to correct. Bill B. – get the data from Mike Hadly. Conversation between Mike and Melinda. McGowan described the process of getting NAIP to USFS Regions via GSTC process. Kent displayed the 2009 NAIP status website. Geoff – described difference in inspection process now for receipt and delivery of QQs and CCMs, before full inspection.
  - b. Issues with deliverables – David D. – 4-band discussion. 4-band both CCM and DOQQ would be our preference, but CCM issues. Review of compression formats and positives and negatives. McGowan - image server seems to like JP2 more than SID. Bill – forest service business, if tiles are delivered same time as CCM, then do we need CCM spinning on the ImageServer. Kind of a consensus no, but still big reason to receive the CCMs in the field. David – discussed a new proposal; the CCM pro and con discussion. Is there a better way? Discussion on higher compression, a (compressed DOQQ) CDQ with raster catalog, premade areas, or single compressed DOQQs. May also help with server space. These are just ideas, would these meet requirements of users? Lots of discussion of formats ensued. **ACTION ITEM – Review Deliver Formats of NAIP Deliverables, and the Delivery System. Formulate Team, David Davis/Kent Williams**

- c. Feasibility studies – David - New slide – high res feasibility study. Discussed results from costs to delivery schedules to formats, etc. Pilot projects and impact studies. David – does this meet user needs? Well of course, but match infrastructure versus higher resolution. Bill – there is absolutely a need/requirement. Need to do the feasibility study. Pilot ok, but making a move is a risk...Shirley H. – base imagery, thin client comments. Jim Heald. – the storage issue doesn't go away, still will have larger files, just central. Shirley H. – how does this change the entire cost of the program? And how does this affect partnering and commitment of the primary partnership. Ron N. – GDW is a USDA asset, so costs will go up for USDA just based on increased storage...