Conference Chair Final Report

ASPRS 2003 Annual Conference

Technology: Converging at the Top of The World Anchorage, Alaska

The 2003 ASPRS Annual Conference was held in Anchorage, Alaska at the Egan Convention Center on 5-9 MAY 2003. The planning started in 1998 at the Annual Conference in Tampa. There was a lot of concern from vendors about the attendance and cost of flying to Anchorage. The Anchorage Convention and Visitors Bureau (ACVB) was helpful in convincing the vendors and ASPRS National that the costs were equivalent to other destinations. ACVB attended the initial proposal presentation to National in Portland, set up information booths at the FIG in DC, and the Denver Pecora Conference to help advertise the Alaska Conference. The main contribution from ACVB was their influence to waive the rental fee for the Egan Center if we planned the conference in the first week of May. This was a **savings** to the conference of about **17,000.00 dollars,** a substantial savings!!

I also had to poll the Alaska Region to see if they would support my intentions of bringing the ASPRS annual conference to Anchorage. I then had to present my idea to the Alaska Society of Professional Land Surveyors (ASPLS), Alaska Chapter of ACSM, the Alaska Chapter of URISA, and the Alaska Arc Users Group (AAUG) and convince them to forgo the annual Alaska Surveying and Mapping Conference (ASMC) and combine our resources for the annual ASPRS conference that would be held in May 2003. There were some reservations, but I received support from all societies to cancel the ASMC and proceed with the 2003 ASPRS Annual Conference. I also contacted Kurt Summner, the Executive Officer for ACSM, and invited ACSM to joint venture the conference. He told me that ACSM was probably not ready for another joint conference.

I had to be certain that the Anchorage hotels would have available space during that week. Paul Brooks, John Koltun, Howard Earl, and myself had several meetings with the Hilton and Captain Cook hotels to tour their property and plan for about 1200 people. The hotels assured us there would be rooms for the conference attendees. After consulting with National, the decision was made to make the Hilton hotel the conference headquarters hotel. Paul Brooks contacted Alaska Airlines and they were designated as the official airlines of the 2003 ASPRS Annual Conference.

A Business Plan was put together by the Alaska Region and members of the associate societies that had volunteered to help plan the conference and that will share in the profits. Once the Business Plan was approved in 1999, I selected the members of the Planning and Steering Committee (PSC). Our first tack was to develop a preliminary budget. I was provided a preliminary budget from the Portland Conference. It was an EXCEL spreadsheet with 7 sheets and included some nice programming. I expanded on the programming to make the task easier

and the PSC provided estimates for the budget. There were no initial guidelines from National concerning costs and profits, thus we proceeded with the detailed budgeting.

After the preliminary budget was approved by National, the main tasks of the PSC were providing text for the Preliminary and Final Program, planning the social events and welcome reception, scheduling and logistics for the 500 technical papers, setting up the User Groups, and planning local technical tours.

Starting in 2001 we held our monthly planning PSC meetings at Noon on Friday and then later on in 2002 we started having a tele-conferences with National the following Monday. All of the meetings we held an AeroMap US. I want to thank them for allowing us to us their facilities for the past two years. This commitment by AeroMap made the planning process less confusing, since we all knew exactly where we would meet every time.

We all knew there was very little conference planning documentation available and the planning process was a joint venture between National and us, thus we scheduled periodic tele-conferences with National early in the process.   These tele-conferences should be mandatory for all future PSCs. The Conference Planning and Policy Committee (CPPC) have now started to develop a document that details the respective responsibilities of the PSC and National. This is a document that all Conference Chairs should study. It will save a lot of time and headache regarding who does what and when. I was at the CPPC in Anchorage and added about two dozen items to the list. The CPPC is a great idea and should continue to be an active committee with input every year by the PSC. I am confident in a few more years there will be less confusion and mystery about planning another great ASPRS Annual Conference. I regret that I am unable to participate in Chairing this committee in the future.

Please find attached the following appendices:
- The most time consuming task was the technical papers – see the report in Appendix A.
- The student volunteer chair required a great deal of time – see the in Appendix B and C.
- The memorial address, technical tours, and welcome reception reports are in Appendix D.
- The social event took the next biggest block of time – see the report in Appendix E.
- The keynote address involved some overseas communications – see the report in Appendix F.

- The exhibitors summary is in Appendix G.

- The User Group Report is in Appendix H.

Overall I was pleased with the planning process and did not encounter anything that I considered a fatal crisis – although there was some measure of crisis, I expected this as standard operating procedure.

I think the Conference was a financial success, although I have not been informed yet of the final profits.

In closing, I enjoyed the conference, the social events especially, and would like to thank the staff at National for all of their support and hard work that helped make this conference a success.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Don Davis Jr., PLS, CP
2003 ASPRS Annual Conference Chair
Professor
Chair – Department of Geomatics
School of Engineering
University of Alaska Anchorage
Tel. 907-786-6433 Fax. 907-786-1079
Email. afdd@uaa.alaska.edu

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

APPENDIX A
Technical Program Final Report, ASPRS 2003 Annual Conference
Thomas Eidel and Greg Durocher Co-Chairs

Overview
The Technical Program for the ASPRS 2003 Annual Conference took place on May 7 – 9, 2003. It consisted of 105 technical sessions, of two to four oral presentations each. This was complemented by 65 poster presentations in three poster sessions:
- Wednesday, 32 posters out of 46 scheduled.
- Thursday, 17 posters out of 32 scheduled
- Friday, 16 posters out of 30 scheduled

The Technical Program Committee originally received 502 abstracts for poster, video and oral presentations. Of these, approximately 30 abstracts were rejected. Most were rejected because they exhibited a very poor command of English. Of the remaining abstracts about 100 had requested poster or video presentations, and about 370 requested oral presentations. Of the oral presentations, a further 50 were moved to posters either: because there weren't enough submissions on the topic to form a session, or because the speaker was from a third world country and stood a high likelihood of encountering visa or other travel problems. Of the 470 posters, video and oral presentations that formed the technical program approximately 50 cancelled in the months prior to the conference.

Special Request
At the meeting of the ASPRS Convention Planning and Policy Committee, held on May 5, 2003, the Anchorage conference was asked to provide a head-count for the technical sessions. It was felt that these data would be very useful in determining which topics held the interest of the attendees and which didn't. It was felt that this information would be invaluable to future conference planners (determining what sessions to offer, determining room size, etc.) and ASPRS headquarters staff (determining interest trends of the membership). Steve Buchanan, in charge of the student volunteers, was asked to have his volunteers collect attendance figures where possible. In all, they were able to collect attendance figures for 98 of 105 sessions. Steve and his staff should be commended for their effort in taking on this last minute, additional duty.

Some Statistics
The following are some statistics gleaned from the figures the volunteers collected. The largest session was 'Today's Airborne Digital Camera Technology' (Thursday, May 8th, 1:30 – 3:00 pm) with 125 people in attendance. The smallest session was 'Implementing GIS Systems' (Wednesday, May 7th, 2:15 – 3:45 pm) with 7 people in attendance. The volunteer, assigned to this session, noted that only one speaker out of the three scheduled showed up. The average attendance per session for the conference was 32 people:
- Wednesday (30 sessions) averaged 34 people per session, with 6 sessions of 50 people or more, and 7 sessions of 20 people or less.
- Thursday (41 sessions) averaged 37 people per session, with 7 sessions of 50 people or more, and 7 sessions with 20 people or less.

- Friday (34 sessions) averaged 25 people per session, with only 1 session of 50 or more people, and 12 sessions of 20 or less people.

These figures bear out an opinion expressed at the Convention Planning and Policy Committee Meeting that the last day of a conference is always poorly attended.

Successes

For the first time, all communications between the Technical Program staff and speakers and moderators, was done completely by e-mail instead of the U.S. Postal Service. This included two complete mailings and three partial mailings. On a whole this was successful and probably saved the conference $400 to $500 in postage. If this approach is used in the future, we suggest that all messages request confirmation, and that follow-up messages be sent if confirmation isn't received in a reasonable time. We found that not everyone reads his or her e-mail.

We would also recommend that copies be kept of all e-mail sent to or received from speakers and moderators. This became an invaluable resource that we referred to time and again in the course of organizing this year's conference.

As an illustration, about a month before the conference ASPRS Headquarters received an e-mail from a non-profit corporation stating that they had submitted 5 abstracts for consideration, but had never heard anything back about whether they had been accepted or not. We were able to check our e-mail records, find the original e-mails and the date they were sent, and provided that information to the corporation in question. They checked their records and found the unopened e-mails that contained their acceptance notices. Our mistake was in not sending follow-up messages when we didn't receive confirmation.

Another innovation initiated by us this year, was the addition of a switch to the on-line abstract form by which speakers could indicate their willingness to be session moderators. This was a big asset when it came time to select moderators because we basically had a list of volunteers (many more than we needed) who only needed to be matched to sessions. Of the people we contacted from this list only two said 'No'.

Our other major success was in moving speakers who we thought might not make it to the conference, from papers to posters. It turned out that many of these people couldn't come, and their absence was less of a disruption in the poster sessions than it would have been in the technical sessions.

Problems

One of the major problems that the Technical Program Committee experienced was with the on-line abstract form. During the final days of abstract submissions as many as 75 – 80 abstracts per day were submitted and the ASPRS computer system was overloaded. We were contacted by a number of prospective speakers who couldn't submit their abstract due either to errors that occurred when they submitted the form, or an inability to even access the website. As a result over 60 abstracts had to be entered into the ASPRS database by the Committee. This problem has been discussed at length with James Hipple, Website Editor, and Martin Wills, Website Assistant (Electronic Communications Committee). No satisfactory solution has been found.

A related problem was caused by the University of Missouri's e-mail system; the University of Missouri being where the ASPRS system is physically located. At the conclusion of a successful submission, an automated confirmation e-mail should be sent back to the speaker displaying all the data they had just submitted. The final days that the submission form was available coincided with the beginning of the fall semester at U. of M. As a result, tens of thousands of students were suddenly sending and receiving e-mails, and the e-mail system became swamped and many of the confirmation e-mails were 'lost'. The Committee spent a lot of time searching the database and confirming reception of abstracts for people. In the future, this university's schedule should be taken into consideration when planning conference due dates.

We have recommended to James Hipple and Martin Wills that a form similar to the abstract form be developed for on-line proposal of Special Sessions. This year over half the people proposing Special Sessions attempted to use the abstract form for such submissions. In most cases this didn't work. We ended up receiving angry e-mails or phone calls from people complaining that the abstract form didn't work, only to have to tell them that they were misusing the form. To us this points up a need for an on-line Special Session form. We would be willing to work with the Electronic Communications Committee over the coming year to develop such a form if ASPRS sees the need.

Several people ran into trouble when attempting to use the speakers and moderators on-line registration form. We're not referring to the people who couldn't follow and master simple directions, but to people who ran into trouble trying to use the web-link or manipulating the form once the web page was accessed. This may be a part of a larger, ongoing problem of compatibility with older web browsers.

Many posters (43) were no-shows (14 to 15 each day) and provided no advance warning that they weren't coming. This was more than what was expected. We had anticipated that more would have sent cancellation notices. Better planning on our part would have made this problem less noticeable.

One thing we could have done better involves the placement of posters. The Committee used a first-come-first-served policy, allowing the presenters to select the location for their poster. The thinking was that people would choose the most advantageous locations first with the result that the most visible spots would fill and any unused space would be in secondary locations. This proved not to be the case. Left to their own devices, many people chose the most obscure location they could find for their poster, leaving blank space in the most visible areas.

Local Stand-Outs

Of special note was Shari George's Landsat session. Shari was the only member from the Alaska Region to organize and host a Special Session. It was very successful, with an attendance of 68, making it one of the better attended sessions. It should also be noted that a number of members moderated one or more general sessions including: Emily Binnian, Greg Durocher, Carl Markon, Mark Shasby (two sessions), and Ken Winterberger.

APPENDIX B
Society for Photogrammetry & Remote Sensing (ASPRS)
2003 Annual Conference May 5-9, 2003 Anchorage, Alaska

Student Volunteer Coordinator Report

Thanks to the efforts of those that have held this position prior to myself, Anna Marie Kinerney's ready guidance, and Russ Congalton's workshop experience, I found myself able to accomplish most tasks required of the position without too much stress. Not that it was easy. I spent many late nights answering emails and sending out announcements when I should have been preparing for lectures or grading. I estimate that I received about 200 email messages and sent out at least that many responses and updates. All of that combined with maintaining the volunteer schedule proved to be very time consuming.

The report and preliminary guidelines provided by Kristin Eickhorst were very helpful in formulating my own ideas on how to handle the volunteers. Even she didn't seem too clear on some things though and I was left to figure them out myself. The technical program spreadsheet prepared by Tom Eidel was invaluable in my planning efforts. I adapted it slightly and added additional worksheets for other general and specific tasks unique to this conference. The volunteer registration form in PDF format (prepared by ASPRS) was very useful and appropriate, but surprisingly confusing to many student volunteers. They were confused about which form to send in, when to send it, and with how much money. I don't suppose there is much to be done about that.

Once I had my planning spreadsheet and the ASPRS website was set up with contact information my primary duties were responding to student inquiries and scheduling their requests. I also spent some time publicizing the event statewide in an effort to secure more volunteers. Most of the volunteers ended up coming from the University of Alaska Anchorage (8) with three or four from the Fairbanks campus. The rest were from out of state schools and were comprised primarily of graduate students. I had one student from China who had planned on attending but his visa was not approved in time. Overall I had twenty-three student volunteers that ended up participating at some level and at least fifteen others that had expressed interest but never followed through. One student showed up on Monday to check in and then left a note on Wednesday saying she would be unable to volunteer in her time slots on Thursday and Friday. A few students had problems with tardiness for their slots and inappropriate dress.

The week of the conference kept us all very busy. Sunday night we conducted an orientation meeting that was very poorly attended. Kim (National) and Russ Congalton were very well prepared with guideline handouts and rules for all volunteers. I think those that missed the meeting found themselves at a disadvantage on Monday. One student (unfamiliar with professional conferences) showed up at a workshop in jeans and a white t-shirt. I kept busy during the week adjusting the schedule to meet the demands of the conference and the expected problems with volunteers. Having my "rovers" worked perfectly as they were able to fill in during the "holes" that invariably occur. Ramona (National) and Dominic filled in for me on Wednesday when I was unable to attend due to another obligation. And I must say that the UAA volunteers did a tremendous job proving that I could count on them when others seemed to

disappear. One note to future volunteer coordinators: forget about trying to attend the conference workshops or technical sessions or even some of the other activities. This is a full time job.

The main problem was communication between myself, National, and the committee regarding decisions that affected the volunteers and scheduling. I had scheduled volunteers for the train and was told late in the game that they were not allowed. I had not been aware of this. Some questions, I forgot to follow up on but they proved to not be much of an issue, such as arm-bands or t-shirts for volunteers (either would have helped identify them in my opinion), parking, and lunches. National took care of these things as I found out at the conference. There were some scheduling changes that I had to make rather late when I was told that volunteers would not be needed for registration duties. Also there were a number of students that ended up dropping out due to inability to attend, causing me to reschedule once again. I do not consider any of these to be major problems, just part of the process. Perhaps the next coordinator will do a better job of staying on top of things.

With regard to the Student Volunteer Coordinator guidelines, as outlined in the ASPRS Meeting Guidelines dated 5/5/03, it should be noted that the proposed guidelines represent a significant time commitment and any potential candidates should be well aware of this. In particular, bulleted items 2, 5, 6 will entail a great deal of diligence to successfully complete. Even with repeated requests, I had trouble getting volunteers to follow protocol, let alone keep track of everything. I believe I originally estimated a need of approximately 35 volunteers for the conference, with the assumption that they would all complete the required 15 hours. We were able to make do with less thanks to the ASPRS staff on-site. Based on the guidelines, I estimate future conferences will require upwards of 60 volunteers or more. That could be a difficult number to recruit if only students are eligible. I would also recommend that the relevant portions of these guidelines be distributed to potential volunteers and regularly discussed prior to and during the conference. This way everyone can be familiar with ASPRS' expectations and their required duties. Volunteers must understand that this is an intense one week job and professional level behavior is expected.

Finally, it may make more sense for ASPRS to handle the volunteer coordination duties. They have a clear sense of how they want to handle everything and much experience in the matter. Cutting out the middle-man so to speak may eliminate some miscommunication. Also, I would like to encourage ASPRS to find ways to make student attendance and volunteering more enticing. The students are the future of ASPRS and should be encouraged to join and participate. They might also look at allowing non-students to participate under certain guidelines.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Steve Buchanan, PLS
Student Volunteer Coordinator
Instructor -- Department of Geomatics
School of Engineering
University of Alaska Anchorage
Tel. 907-786-1104 Fax. 907-786-1079
Email. afsb1@uaa.alaska.edu

APPENDIX C

Dominic Bernardo: ASPRS 2003 Conference Diary.

Special Note: I had contact with a number of "non-profit" groups. Although a few expressed interest, they did not participate. Other contacts for sponsorship were referred to the appropriate chairs.

Friday May 2: Danielle Allen of BLM Public Affairs sent out the conference press release to their state-wide media list. ASPRS National committee members **DID NOT** want a copy of the recipients.

Sunday May 4: I went to a volunteer meeting at 5:30 p.m. Attendance was sparse.

Monday May 5: I took two short courses. Photogrammetry 101 (Course 5) was very good. Assessing the Accuracy of GIS (Course 6) was outstanding. My only problem was with the extra $100 price for two workshops vs. an all day workshop.

Tuesday May 6: I worked the whole day in the volunteer room for Steve Buchanan, who had other obligations, only taking time for walking with a BLM tour group to the Federal Building. The tour, coordinated by Gust Panos of BLM Geomatics, was comprehensive and well done. The reaction of the group was favorable. I attended the evening "welcome" reception--an excellent event. Afterwards, I picked up two student volunteers at the airport.

Wednesday May 7: I attended, and thanks to Charles Ludington of BLM, was able to videotape the Memorial Address. This was one of the highlights of the conference.
I suggest having a tripod for videotaping. I again worked in the volunteer room for the afternoon. The 2004 Technical Sessions Chair requested that a "head count" be taken at the sessions. We complied. Kathleen Jamison (ASPRS) and Karl Spohn (UAA) updated our room numbers on our assignment list. We had some anxiety about an overhead projector a speaker forgot to request. This was resolved. June Finkbiner (UAA) took the lead in checking each "tech session" room to make sure it was covered. There were no provisions for a space for the UAA shirt sale fund-raiser.

Friday May 9: We were short on student volunteers, so Steve and I had to fill in. This was not onerous, because it gave us a chance to attend some "tech sessions". But, there was a problem registering two local high school student volunteers. ASPRS needs to review its policies to expedite such registration. We may even have more members eventually if we make it easier for them to participate in the conference. ASPRS did allow us to take surplus journals for our local "recruiting". Thanks to all, especially Anna Marie Kinerney, for a memorable conference.

Dominic Bernardo
Dominic_Bernardo@ak.blm.gov

APPENDIX D

COMMITTEE REPORTS
Memorial Address
Technical Tours
Welcome Reception

PAUL D. BROOKS

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
In the early planning for the Conference, I talked with Bill Hemple, Chair, Memorial Address Committee, about honoring two Alaskans during the Memorial Address at the 2003 ASPRS Annual Conference. Bill proposed this suggestion to his Committee, and they agreed with the concept. I proposed this idea to the Conference Planning Committee and asked for nominations for consideration.

Over the course of several months, five candidates were considered for memorialization, with the final selection being Calvin Fifield and Thomas Hazard. These two names were submitted to Bill Hemple for consideration by his Committee. Bill informed me that the Committee accepted our recommendation of honorees, but wanted us to select the presenters and do the research and prepare the presentations for Cal and Tom. Bob Schweitzer agreed to prepare the presentation for Calvin Fifield and Bill Mendenhall agreed to give the presentation for Thomas Hazard if someone(s) would help in preparing the background information. Steve St.Peter and Paul Brooks agreed to research and prepare the background information on Tom Hazard for Bill Mendenhall.

It was a very time-consuming research task to find information on Cal and Tom, as both Families were no longer in the area. We relied heavily on ASPRS Region records, which go back to the formation of the Alaska Region. The presentations were prepared, forwarded to the Memorial Address Committee, published in the Final Program, and presented at the Memorial Address Ceremony on May 7, 2003 from 11:15 am to 12:30 pm.

ASPRS President, Terry Keating, made opening remarks and recognition of guests. Moderator Bill Hemple introduced the Presenters, Robert Schweitzer and William Mendenhall. Bob chronicled the life of honoree Calvin Fifield and Bill presented memories of honoree Thomas Hazard. The two presentations were recorded by Dominic Bernardo using a video recorder, and will be available for interested parties and for the ASPRS Region files. The ceremony concluded with a reception of light refreshments, which allowed time for attendees to reminisce.

TECHNICAL TOURS
Five Technical Tours were originally planned for the Conference. These were DAT/EM Systems International, University of Alaska Anchorage, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Fish &

Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management. These tours were advertised in the Preliminary Program and a price of $25.00 was quoted to cover transportation costs. The cost for the BLM tour was set at $10.00, as this was within walking distance of the Convention Center.

Two tours, DAT/EM and UAA were canceled due to lack of interest. Bus transportation to the USGS and USFWS were provided from the Hilton Hotel and the BLM tour departed from the Egan Convention Center. Greg Durocher hosted the USGS tour, Jerry Minick hosted the USFWS tour, and Dominic Bernardo hosted the BLM tour.

WELCOME RECEPTION AND AIRBORNE TECHNOLOGY EXHIBITS
The ASPRS Alaska Region, AeroMap U.S., Z/I Imaging, Airborne 1, Applanix, and Optech sponsored this event. The event was held at the University of Alaska Anchorage, Aviation Technology Center (AVT) on Merrill Field, Anchorage. The event was originally scheduled to be held at the Evergreen Helicopters Hangar on Merrill Field, but at the last minute, Evergreen Helicopters decided they could not make their facility available for the event. Fortunately, the AVT was available and the venue was moved to their facility.

Continuous bus service (4 buses) was provided from the Hilton Hotel to the AVT starting at 5:30 pm and ending around 9:00 pm. No tickets were required to attend this event. Attendees were able view the new Z/I Imaging's Digital Mapping Camera mounted in AeroMap's Piper Navajo Aircraft, and Optech's new ALTM LiDAR system and Applanix systems mounted in AeroMap's Cessna aircraft. Other airborne sensors were also available for viewing in aircraft.

Good Alaskan food and beverages were provided by the sponsors. This was an excellent opportunity for attendees to make new friends, renew old acquaintances, view the new airborne technology in a working environment, and enjoy Alaskan hospitality at its finest. Many folks were also treated to live Tower Simulator demonstrations by the AVT staff. The UAA Conference Catering Service was contracted to be the caterers for the event.

APPENDIX E

ASPRS 2003 Conference Entertainment Committee Final Report

John Koltun, Entertainment Committee Co-Chair
Howard Earl, Entertainment Committee Co-Chair

The following are our thoughts and impressions of the overall process as well as our responsibilities as the Entertainment Committee Co-Chairs.

Conference Organization Process
In our opinion, the Alaska region did an admirable job in organizing and coordinating our presentation of the 2003 Conference. The Alaska Region Planning and Steering Committee (PSC) worked diligently to maintain schedules, as provided, delegate responsibilities amongst the committee, and perform tasks as assigned. Any difficulties in the initial organization and planning could be tracked directly to lack of definitive direction from ASPRS regarding exact responsibilities of the Region and a comprehensive schedule. Most of these issues were resolved through regularly scheduled meetings between ASPRS National and the PSC.

The overall process of conference planning would be greatly facilitated by the comprehensive documentation of the conference process. The ASPRS National office indicated that a document addressing these issues was to be delivered to the Alaska region well before the conference date. Despite the necessity of this documentation, it was not available and therefore not provided to the Alaska Region for use in this conference. It is our understanding that a draft conference-planning document has been produced and reviewed at the 2003 meeting. We recommend that this document contain, at a minimum the following topics:

- Complete conference task list
- Comprehensive conference deadline schedule
- Identify the party responsible (Region/National) for each conference task item
- Identify, **in detail**, the roles and responsibilities of each conference sub-committee

These organizational topics should not be documented in general terms, but should have sufficient detail and clarity as to leave no room for misinterpretation regarding the roles, tasks, and schedules involved in the conference planning process.

National should integrate the local event sponsorships with the sponsorships presented as part of the exhibitor prospectus. The opportunities presented to potential sponsors should be a seamless package including the various options such as lunches, coffee breaks, and entertainment events.

National should consider a review of the accounting practices used to record and document the income associated with the conferences. During the budgeting phase of the 2003 Conference planning, the Alaska Region requested the actual budgets for prior conferences. The only data that were available for budget planning were the planning budgets for prior conferences. The actual income and expenses by budget category were not available. In order to properly plan and

organize future conference budgets, detailed accounting of actual costs and income is a necessity and should be an inherent responsibility of the National Office.

Entertainment Committee
The 2003 Conference Entertainment Committee (EC) was tasked with investigating and organizing the entertainment events for the conference.

The EC requested proposals for entertainment events from the 4-major Destination Management Companies (DMC) in the Anchorage area. Three of the four firms returned bid packages outlining the entertainment options for a conference of the anticipated size. The EC reviewed the options presented and selected Logistics as the DMC to assist with the entertainment options as well as the organization of the pre and post conference tours.

The EC then reviewed the entertainment options with the Conference Committee. Through a series of meetings and investigations, the Committee agreed on a preliminary event schedule. The selected events included an Ice Breaker reception at the 4th Avenue Theatre and an attendee-supported Conference "Wrap-Up" barbeque at Kincaid Park and Recreation Center. A dinner and entertainment trip on the scenic Alaska Railroad was selected as the Main Event. In addition to these events, the traditional exhibitors reception, Awards Luncheon, and Memorial were also planned as part of the events.

The EC continued to investigate the costs and options for these events from the various facility owners and catering companies. The costs and options for each of the events were considered and an entertainment budget was presented as part of the overall conference budget.

The PSC had difficulty developing the initial budget due to the lack of budget planning documentation and the lack of detailed "actual" budget values from prior conferences. The initial budget proposed by the PSC met with considerable resistance from the National office, and it was suggested by National that the Train event was not really an option due to the anticipated cost ($90 per person).
National suggested that the PSC could solicit sponsors for the entertainment events. The Alaska Region Committee was uncertain how to pursue the sponsorship since we were not aware that this was an option until well into the planning process. By this time, the exhibitor packages had already been sent out including an outline of standard sponsorship levels as determined by National. This created the odd situation whereby the Alaska Region was somewhat competing with the sponsorships presented by National. Regardless, the PSC developed a sponsorship package and solicited potential sponsors.

A series of meetings followed regarding the conference events and overall budget. The ASPRS Executive Committee (ExCom) agreed that the Railroad event was unique and worthwhile. ExCom determined that it would be feasible to hold the railroad event if the Ice-Breaker event was eliminated.

The PSC determined that it was unlikely that there would be enough participants to justify the organizational time required for the Wrap-Up event, so it was canceled.

The EC met with Alaska Railroad sales department and negotiated the initial specifications and requirements for the railroad event. On December 3rd, 2002, the final contract negotiation and finalization was turned over to National by the EC as requested by National.

The EC continued to investigate catering options. In meetings with National, it was determined that the Egan had some experience in catering train events and that National may be able to negotiate a favorable package with the Egan in conjunction with the other events. As a result, the EC turned the negotiation and planning for the catering of the train event over to the National office.

The EC also organized three entertainment events for the train ride; a bluegrass/folk band, karaoke, and a traditional polka band. These musicians would be performing concurrently to offer attendees a choice of entertainment genre. In addition, the EC negotiated to have AKRR tour guides on board to provide narration during the trip.

Approximately two weeks prior to the conference, the EC was notified that contract negotiations had broken down between ASPRS National and the Alaska Railroad. At issue was a clause-requiring adherence to applicable State, Federal, and Local laws. In response, the EC began to evaluate alternate event options given the short notice. EC Co-Chair Mr. Earl was able to negotiate facilities and catering for an event at the Native Heritage Center – all contingent on the final negotiations with the railroad. Once it became clear that the situation had deteriorated, an PSC member, who is also an Alaska Railroad employee, facilitated contract changes and approval by the railroad.

On May 7, 2003 over 800 conference attendees boarded an Alaska Railroad train consisting of 22 passenger and entertainment cars. Food and drink stations were distributed throughout the train. At one end of the train, the Alaskan Glockenspiel band performed in the Tiki-bar car while at the other, Muskeg Sally performed bluegrass and folk music in the 50's diner car. Members of Muskeg Sally welcomed talented ASPRS attendees to play along on spare instruments. Attendees also displayed their vocal prowess in Karaoke situated in a first-class car near the center of the train. Attendees dined on Alaska Scallops, Salmon Lox, Grilled Chicken, pasta, assorted cheeses, and fresh vegetables.

The few complaints that were heard regarded the placement and quantity of food provided by the catering. Many attendees were unaware that they had to serve themselves during the trip and therefore did not get food. Once it became clear that it was self-serve, the food stations were not distributed to allow attendees to obtain food without waiting in significant lines (although this is common at most conference events). In addition it was noticed that there was considerable food waste. Although the food quality was excellent, the plates were larger than standard cocktail plates and many served more food than they could consume. This may have affected the availability of food during the event. The caterer should have anticipated these issues and mitigated the problems by provided roving servers, to distribute and allocate food appropriately.

It was also noted that a number of people were not aware that they could freely rove along the train and that the entire train was accessible. Given the different national, and international traditions, it would have been helpful to have a printed guide that explained the nature and

location of the event service and entertainment areas. This may have alleviated some of the service issues as well.

There were also complaints regarding the allocation of a single drink ticket for such a significant event. Although Digital Globe sponsored a single ticket, another ticket had been included in the conference budget but was not provided by National.

Overall, the train event was a tremendous success. For some it was a trip of a lifetime: a chance to view the majesty of Alaska while enjoying local food and entertainment in the companionship of friends and associates.

A group of local and national photogrammetric companies proposed to hold a privately sponsored icebreaker event. The event would showcase aircraft and photogrammetric equipment at facilities in nearby Merrill Field airport. The EC, PSC, and National approved the event. (The details of this event are covered in a report by Paul Brooks.)

The selected DMC provided some assistance in the beginning of the conference planning, but their efforts were not adequate. The EC determined that the role of the DMC was minimal at this point: the EC was negotiating and organizing the train event and National was now organizing all catering for the conference. The selected DMC was notified that their services were not going to be necessary. A second DMC, Alaska Destination Specialists (ADS), offered to organize and provide a selection of post-conference tours. It was agreed that this could be a benefit to the attendees at no cost, so ADS information was included in the conference package. The EC does not know if any of these tours actually occurred.

Overall, through careful planning by the EC (and Anna Marie), the entertainment events at the conference were a huge success. The process would have been much, much easier and gone much smoother if more information (e.g. past actual budgets, a completed conference-planning document etc.) had been available to the EC. In particular it was very disconcerting to be informed about the contract issue with AKRR at virtually the last moment. Improved communication in the future would make everyone's life much easier.

Furthermore, it was also extremely disconcerting that committee members did not receive any feedback from staff at National regarding their efforts. Although, in coming President Don Lauer did send a note of congratulations to committee members and this was greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX F

Final Report from the Keynote Committee
2003 ASPRS Annual Conference, Anchorage, Alaska

We began with the assumption that we would need to reach an agreement with the keynote speaker one year prior to the conference. With that in mind we began our search approximately 18 months prior, and received the acceptance from our Speaker on May 10, 2002.

We initiated our search by identifying a number of categories of speakers we thought might be of interest to our constituency. These included academics, industry leaders, government dignitaries, celebrities, and other authorities. We used this list to open discussions with the executive committee to solicit specific suggestions. We also enlisted the input of ASPRS officials and others. Approximately a dozen persons were named and seriously considered as potential speakers. Don Lauer suggested Prof. Yang Kai, Deputy Director General of the State Bureau of Surveying and Mapping for the People's Republic of China, who was finally agreed upon by the committee. We formally approached him in late winter and concluded our negotiations in May.

Because of the uncertainties of dealing with foreign nationals as well as programming considerations, the planning committee agreed to also invite a plenary speaker, with the ulterior motive of having backup in case of issues with the Keynote. This turned out to be a fortunate decision, as the Keynote was forced to cancel due to illness and travel restrictions. Our plenary speaker, Dr. Craig Dorman, Vice President for Research for the University of Alaska Statewide System, became our Keynote Speaker with approximately one week notice.

Altogether the Keynote Committee functioned well, with few crises of note. The only major crisis was dealt with by good planning. The energetic and thoughtful input by the planning committee was gratefully received.

We offered both our speakers full conference registration and "reasonable travel expenses". These included airfare and hotel, meals and taxis. We did not offer a rental car since we deemed it an unnecessary expense. Dr. Dorman did not take us up on the airfare offer.

We corresponded primarily via email, which seemed to be sufficient for all concerned. We were prepared to also correspond via regular mail, should that have been requested. We followed up with Thank-you letters and a request for expense reports…

Sincerely

Stan Moll
Keynote Committee Co-Chair

APPENDIX G

Exhibitors

JEFFREY F. YATES – Exhibitor Co-Chair

The following exhibitor list was submitted by Truby Chiaviello of Potomic Publishing. The last update for the list was June 16, 2003. As with all ASPRS conferences, Truby is the primary point of contact for conference exhibitors.

The general consensus from exhibitors was the conference was a success. Many exhibitors knew attendance would not be the same as other conferences and planned their booth space accordingly. One vendor decided not to attend (after reserving their booth) due to perceived competition and cost of shipping their equipment to Anchorage.

Otherwise, no major complaints were received by me while on the exhibit floor or during the exhibitor breakfast on Friday morning.

Exhibitor	Booth Size	Booth #	Cost
Accupoint	8x20	212/214	$6,000.00
Accupoint	8x10	209	$3,000.00
AeroMap	8x10	305	$5,000.00
AGFA	8x30	504,506,508	$7,500.00
Airborne 1 Corporation	8x10	505	$2,500.00
Ampex Data Systems	8x10	602	$2,500.00
Applanix Corporation	8x20	203,205	$5,000.00
Airborne Data Systems	8x10	201	$2,500.00
ASPRS	16x20	712/714/811/813	$-
BAE Systems	16x20	208	$10,000.00
Boeing/Autometric	8x20	601,600	$5,000.00
Cardinal Systems	8x10	702	$2,500.00
Career Fair	8x10	715	$-
*Center for Geospatial Workforce Development, University of MS	8x10	700	$2,500.00
DAT/EM	8x20	500,502	$5,000.00
Deifiniens Imaging	8x10	206	$3,000.00
DeLorme	8x10	Cancel	$2,500.00
Digital Globe*	8x10	301	$5,000.00
Dynamic Aviation	8x10	102	$2,500.00

DVP	8x10	202	$2,500.00
E. Coyote Enterprises, Inc.	8x20	404, 406	$5,000.00
Earth Resourse Mapping	8x10	317	$2,500.00
Earth Satellite Corporation	8x10	515	$2,500.00
Eastman Kodak	8x20	511,513	$5,000.00
Emerge	8x10	407	$2,500.00
ESRI	16x20	310	$10,000.00
Federal Geographic Data Committee	8x10	604	$1,200.00
Geographic Resource Solutions	8x10	703	$3,500.00
Geo North	8x10	409	$3,000.00
GeoSpatial Solutions	8x10	100	$-
GITC/Prof Surv/EOM	8x30	211/213/215	$-
HAS Images	8x10	303	$2,500.00
INPHO	8x20	603,605	$5,000.00
Intermap Technologies*	8x10	307	$-
ISM	8x20	313,315	$5,000.00
ITRES Research Limited	8x10	617	$2,500.00
KLT Associates/Wehrli & Associates	8x10	Cancel	$2,500.00
Leica Geosystems	20x20	300	$12,500.00
Lounge	8x10	812	$-
MacDonald, Detwiler and Associates Ltd	8x10	Cancel	$3,000.00
NASA Earth Science Enterprise	8x20	613/615	$2,400.00
NASA/EOSDIS	8x20	609/611	$2,400.00
NASA GSFC/DAAC	8x10	607	$1,200.00
NGS/NOS/ Remote Sensing Div.	8x10	717	$1,200.00
NIMA	8x10	414	$1,200.00
North West Group	8x20	612/614	$5,000.00
Optech Inc.	8x20	507,509	$5,000.00
PCI Geomatics	8x20	510,512	$5,000.00
Radarsat International	8x10	200	$-
RedLake Masd, Inc	8x10	204	$3,000.00
Research Systems, Inc.	8x10	Cancel	$1,250.00
Rolta International	8x10	701	$2,500.00
Space Imaging	8x20	314,415	$5,000.00
Surveyors Exchange	8x10	308	$2,500.00
Take One	8x10	713	$-
The Alaska SAR Facility	8x10	616	$1,200.00
Topographic Engineering Center	8x10	606	$1,200.00
Uneek Expo	8x10	810	$-
USGS Land Processing DAAC	8x10	608	$1,200.00
USGS Western Geographic Science Center	8x10	610	$1,200.00
Vexcel Austria	8x10	408	$2,500.00
Vexcel Corporation	8x10	410	$2,500.00
Visual Learning Systems	8x10	412	$3,000.00
VX Services	8x10	306	$2,500.00
Z/I Imaging	16x30	400	$15,000.00
TOTAL			**$210,650.00**

Total Square Footage	**10240**
Total Square Footage Sold	**8160**
Total Square Footage Remaining	**2080**
Total Booths	**128**
Total Booths Sold	**102**
Total Booths Remaining	**26**
Total Percent Sold/Occupied	**80%**

APPENDIX H

User Groups Final Report

Gerry Bering - User Group Chairman

The 2003 ASPRS User Groups ended up having 5 sessions. These were by:

> Alaska ARC User Group
> PCI
> Z/I Imaging Corporation
> DAT/EM Systems International
> Research Systems, Inc.

The sessions were well attended and appeared to be well received. Anna Marie Kinerney did most of the work. I acquired the names and she did the organization.

To acquire the names of companies that might be interested in having a User Group meeting at the 2003 ASPRS Conference I went to the previous years program and acquired the names of all the companies that exhibited at that conference and the companies that had User Groups meetings. I sent multiple emails to each of these companies and telephone calls to certain ones of these. The response was immediate for a few companies but there seemed to be a hesitation by others that seem to think that the attendance would not justify them having a user group session. I believe that proved to be wrong.

The major problem I encountered was that most people were very slow to respond and indecisive. Many did not respond at all.