

## LAR-IAC 2 – Technical Advisory Group Meeting #2

7/26/07

Attendees:

Bill A'Hearn (Glendale)  
Roman Arellano (DRP)  
Anthony Calderon (Santa Clarita)  
An Dang (LADPW)  
Joyce Edson (Los Angeles)  
Nick Franchino (DRP)  
Mark Greninger (CIO)  
Jenny Gough (Torrance)  
Hwa-Saup Lee (DRP)  
Brian Sims (Pasadena)  
Todd Zagurski (DRP)  
Marc Zuber (Palmdale)  
Kelly ? (Santa Clarita)

The meeting started with a round of introductions from all attendees and a review of the agenda. Franchino summarized points from the previous TAG meeting.

### LAR-IAC2 PRODUCT DELIVERABLES:

- Delivery Areas same as first LAR-IAC (1. Urban, 4-inch 2. Forest, 1-foot 3. Catalina, 4-inch)
- It was proposed that we could combine Areas 1 and 3...but tentatively agreed to probably leave as is.
- USGS – opportunity to get them onboard
  - \$200,000 potential contribution to LAR-IAC2.
  - 1 foot for all County, resampled from 4 in. where applicable.
  - DEM from LAR-IAC1 at 3 meter posting, not 1.7m.
  - Note that they are on 3 year cycle, Gough suggests giving them 1 yr old data when they are out of synch with LAR-IAC.
  - Greninger – suggests giving LIDAR data to USGS so they can resample DEM to 3m posting (requires trust on our part).
- Vote on allowing USGS into LAR-IAC is unanimous in the affirmative with caveat that they would not be provided with 4-inch images.
- Pictometry 4-inch obliques to be part of the project as well as all software except Change Detection.
- Vote on QA/QC (to be sure to do this again) was an overwhelming YES.
- 4 band imagery will integrate CIR with natural color bands into a single deliverable (RGB+CIR).
  - Mosaic of CIR. Use for ArcIMS. Benefit is smaller overall file size (75 GB vs. 1.5 TB)
  - But theoretically individual tile size goes up in size by 33% .
- Maybe provide building footprints as an option in contract.
  - Issues – firm priced contract, hard to prioritize, some cities already have them, at \$.10/2D bldg footprint that comes to \$200,000-\$400,000. 3D building multipatch at \$1/bldg comes to \$2-\$4 million. Based on rough estimate of number of structures.
  - Bldg footprint costs could be too high. **NO DECISION MADE**
- SDE format is on the table (need to verify cost(s) with Pinnacle).

#### **PICTOMETRY/SANBORN FLIGHT STATUS:**

- Sanborn vs. Infotech – Infotech would like to present to TAG (possibly by the end of August or early September).
- Sanborn is working with Pictometry to finalize steps for pilot. Hopefully to be returned to us or shown to us by the end of August.
- Michigan & Kentucky projects are collaborative tests for Sanborn & Pictometry.
- Flights to occur within 10 days (hopefully).
- Must decide if Pinnacle/Dewberry will reprocess imagery as part of QA/QC contract – We said probably yes, since they did it last time. It might be better since products go through QA/QC and are signed-off as okay; then converted to other resolution (or formats) **NO DECISION MADE**

#### **FINALIZE TILE GRIDS:**

- Complete tiles with no overlap (especially between 4-inch and 1-foot images) and no partial tiles.
- Some suggestions:
  - Greninger suggests using one tile grid for both 4 in and 1 ft images.
  - Gough states concern about Torrance’s CAD data already organized by original grid. A solution may be to just leave Torrance under original grid.
- Use LAR-IAC data to rectify LAR-IAC2; requires sub-licensing agreement signatures.
- Desire to get full tiles where they intersect with 500 ft buffer (forest and county boundary issues). Use of 4 in grid could minimize buffer-tile issues. Might increase costs 5%-10%.

#### **FROM LAST MEETING:**

- We will ask Pinnacle about the best file formats other than jpeg2000 that are compatible with AutoCAD / Autodesk 2007 (.ECW might work with this). – **Still outstanding**
- We will do full tile coverage between 1-foot and 4-inch resolution – need to pick these tiles. – **Updated grid for distribution (hopefully Tues or Wed., 7/31 or 8/1)**
- Decide whether or not to use Pinnacle to convert to SDE format as a deliverable (cost probably marginal, but still need to verify) – **Still outstanding**
- Purchase data conversion tools from MrSID as a group? Need to find out price. - **Mr. SID has compression limits & cartridge costs.**
- Need to decide if we will do 4-way Pictometry shots countywide, and finalize grid. – **Still outstanding (to get pricing before decision is made).**
- Determine cost of “spot updates” for LiDAR collection. – **Need better estimates – Still outstanding**
- Building footprints, possible extra funding for these through the State’s Master Services Agreement. – **Still outstanding, for Greninger**
- Decide on other file formats for deliverables like SDE, MrSID and ECW. – **As we finalize**
- Decide on whether Pictometry’s EcoView (creates polygons for vegetated vs. non-vegetated areas) should be part of next round (an extra \$97,000). – **Not of value at this time.**
- Pictometry contract needs to be clearer on sub-licensing. – **Will do this when working on finalizing contract extension.**

#### **MISCELLANEOUS:**

- An idea to include parts of Ventura and Orange counties (i.e. Seal Beach) may be too much for the LAR-IAC (maybe for SCAG to handle) – **Discussion and some agreement that this was not for our group.**
- New County CEO setup...To help get more County departments on board. Get the heads of the various “clusters” to talk.
- FEMA funds available thru DPW for flood mapping. Could trickle back to LAR-IAC2.
- What about printing as a form of a deliverable...Prints for various cities/agencies. Would probably have to go as an option item. What about radiometry issues and personal preference. Franchino thought this might be hard to narrow down or reach consensus.

- Torrance suggests image capture that starts in the north county and proceeds south for radiometric reasons. We will still look into this. Harder for Pictometry because they have so many planes.

#### **FOR NEXT MEETING:**

##### Homework:

1. Look over simple contract scope documents (3 of them)...to be on LAR-IAC project web site on Tuesday (7/30/07). Submit comments/omissions to Franchino. This is not the official scope of work for the contract documents. This is a guide; a good listing for getting more refined estimates and to continue moving forward.
2. Download grid for 4" and 1' (so we don't have overlap and for complete tiles). -
3. Submit to Franchino your wish list/problems/comments for Pictometry. We will put together and send to Pictometry in some form...similar to "We like your products and we are hopefully valued customers, but you need to continue to work on the following:"
  - More knowledgeable tech support staff and online documents.
  - 8-way obliques for 10 sectors in downtown LA, perhaps other downtowns too.
  - 4-way community shots countywide, could be about \$100,000 extra (waiting for quote).
  - Compressed deliverables.
  - Volume discount on training maybe.

#### **NEXT TAG MEETING:**

Three weeks from previous meeting. Set for **Thursday August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008**. Same time and location (10 am to noon, Hall of Records, Room 1385).