Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Arizona Geographic Information Council and to the public that the Arizona Geographic Information Council will hold a meeting open to the public.

Meeting Time:

Wednesday, January 9th, 2023 · 10:00am – 11:30am

Meeting Location: Google Meet

Video call link: https://meet.google.com/amc-rygb-rjb

Or dial: (US) +1 304-402-6281 PIN: 765 576 788#

Meeting Attendance	
Name	Agency/Company
Eric Shreve	ADOA
James Meyer	ADOT
Becky Reid	ADOT
Veronica Nixon	ADWR
David Waltz	ADWR
Daniel Fielder	ADWR
Adam Razqynski	ADWR
JC Kliner	Apache Junction
Conor Cousins	AppGeo
Maurice Khollman	AppGeo
Jenna Leveille	ASLD
Ayan Mitra	ASLD/ASU
Ryan McClain	AZDPS
Cat Moody	City of Prescott
Terry Couchenour	Cochise County
David Minton	Maricopa County

Name	Agency/Company
Kevin LaVallee	Maricopa County
Jim Johansen	Maricopa County Sheriffs Office
Josh Pope	Pima County
Jessica Abrahams	Pima County
Aaronn Mattingly	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Peter Marckmann	Salt River Project
Keith Larson	USDA NRCS
Mark Christanio	USFS Kaibab National Forest
Chris Chalmers	WGI Geospatial
Kevin Blake	Yavapai County

Note: This will be an informational meeting only; per Arizona Open Meeting Law a quorum of the AGIC Council is not required.

AGENDA

I. <u>Welcome & Introductions (Kevin Blake, AGIC Vice-Chair and Yavapai County GIS Director)</u>

II. Recap of Dec Meeting

- A. Review of NAIP buy-up options, costs & timing
 - 1. The timeline will be tough given that most agencies will be working on FY24 budgets, and the NAIP Program would need the funding by June 1, 2023. Possibility of working with the governor's office for a cost share and given the change of leadership with the governor's office, that will be delayed. Another resource for funding would come from the Arizona Commerce Authority and its broadband office. The June 1, 2023, timeline will constrain all possible funding sources. The timeline that NAIP has is unrealistic, and the group will have to look at another option.
- B. Review of other vendor options and cost-sharing possibilities

- This group will evaluate proposals/quotes from potential vendors to see how they can supplement the state. AppGeo and Sandborn will present on 1/12/23 at the AGIC data committee about their offering.
- 2. ASLD will research purchasing mechanisms and report to the group on what potential constraints there may be.

C. Review of funding mechanisms

1. The NAIP program can only exchange funding from one point of contact. The assumption would be that ASLD would be the fiduciary agent because their funding is not swept every fiscal year. The end product for the imagery product is that it would be in the public domain and can be shared with anyone. If stakeholders went through a private group, the subscription would be different, and an agreement would be made to ensure the data is shared with public/private partners. The group would need to agree on an SOW, and the procurement process would need to be coordinated. The SOW should not require an RFP, but there is a threshold if the price goes beyond a certain price (threshold currently unknown).

III. Definition of requirements for statewide imagery program

- A. Minimum resolution (30 centimeters)
 - 1. Veronica Nixon asked the group if anyone has a process of defining their resolution requirements because some agencies have different requirements. Mark Christiano provided an overview of the different resolutions; he says 60 cm is ok to see basic features. 30 cm makes a big difference in identifying high-resolution features such as stock tanks. In a rural environment, 30-15 cm doesn't provide much difference. 15 cm would be more for urban area requirements. Having 30 cm would make a big impact on our natural resource SDI. SRP said they utilize higher resolution imagery (30 cm) to ground truth projects in rural areas but would like (15 cm). SRP is currently using UAS to fly smaller areas but would like to expand the coverage. Josh Pope said urban settings, 15 cm is the minimum requirement for asset mapping and utility definition. Maurice Khollman (AppGeo) said users should sample the data because

requirements differ depending on the business need. Based on the discussion, we will need another survey to capture requirements.

- Potential Survey Questions for gathering additional requirements from end-users
 - a) Rural vs. Urban
 - b) Minimum Resolution
 - c) Funding Availability that is more specific
 - d) Imagery needs to be in the public domain (federal funding)
 - e) Frequency of acquisitions (urban area every year, rural area every other year)
 - f) What to prioritize our efforts with. NAIP 2025 vs. private vendors.
- 3. Jenna mentioned when working with the consortiums, we do not want competing purchases and need to define that clearly.
- B. Urban vs. rural coverage
- C. Frequency of acquisition (e.g., once every two years)
- D. Acquisition season (June 1 August 30)
- E. Other specific requirements as needed

IV. Cost-sharing options for statewide imagery program

- A. Review of cost-sharing models used by other states
 - Texas has a cost-sharing model in place with AppGeo that has a possibility. Utah has a process in place as well that utilizes AppGeo's GIZA platform.
 - 2. Every state has different resolution requirements, and AppGeo plans to provide a briefing at the AGIC Data Committee on 1/12.
 - 3. Jenna & Kevin will reach out to Michigan and Oregon for their input and requirements on what they did for their state.
- B. Discussion of options for funding the program through a combination of state and local resources.
 - This group will need to explore what options are available. It is possible to utilize AGIC/ALSD as the central POC and payee; with agreements from participants to provide funding for cost-sharing.

2. Counties on the call would have to present to the board of supervisors to get their feedback which will also be difficult.

V. Next steps for implementing statewide imagery program

- A. Discussion of timeline for deciding program options and securing funding
- B. Review of the process for procuring imagery and ensuring quality control
- C. Outline of responsibilities for participating agencies | **ACTION ITEMS**
 - 1. Create a survey based on the questions that were defined
 - 2. Possibility of creating a workgroup under the data committee to capture results and strategize the best option for moving forward. This will help us prioritize our resources as we move forward.
 - Outreach to the other states to hear their feedback and what works.(Michigan and Oregon).

VI. Other business

A. Open discussion for any other items or questions related to the statewide imagery program or AGIC initiatives.

The Arizona Geographic Information Council does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the provision of its programs, services, and activities. Persons with disabilities who require accommodations for effective communication and participation in the meeting may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the ADA Coordinator at (602) 542-2629. Requests should be made as early as possible to arrange the accommodation

This agenda will be posted at Arizona State Land Department, 1110 W Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007 by Jenna Leveille on the AGIC <u>website calendar</u> 24 hours prior to meeting.