

FINAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORT
ASPRS 2006 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
RENO, NEVADA
“PROSPECTING FOR GEOSPATIAL INFORMATION INTEGRATION”
MAY 1-5, 2006

**FINAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORT
ASPRS 2006 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
RENO, NEVADA
“PROSPECTING FOR GEOSPATIAL INFORMATION INTEGRATION”
MAY 1-5, 2006**

INTRODUCTION

Transmitted herewith is the Final Report of the Planning Committee for the American Society for Photogrammetry (ASPRS) 2006 Annual Conference held in Reno, Nevada, on May 1-5, 2006. The conference was co-hosted by the Intermountain Region (IR) and the Northern California Region (NCR) of ASPRS. George Hepner, University of Utah, and Alan Mikuni, U.S. Geological Survey, served as co-Directors for the conference. “Prospecting for Geospatial Information Integration” was the Conference theme for this meeting which was held at the Reno Hilton Hotel and Casino. Primary Conference Committee members and their assignments were as follows:

George Hepner (IR)	Conference Co-Director
Alan Mikuni (NCR)	Conference Co-Director
Trish Foschi (NCR)	Technical Program Co-Chair
Doug Ramsey (IR)	Technical Program Co-Chair
Charlene Sailer (NCR)	Technical Program Moderators Chair
Lloyd Blackburn (IR)	Poster Session Coordinator
Russ Congalton (ASPRS)	Workshop Chair
Clay Conway (IR)	User Group Coordinator
George Hepner (IR)	Commercial Sessions Coordinator
Lorraine Amenda (NCR)	Keynote Program Co-Chair
George Hepner (IR)	Keynote Program Co-Chair
Cindy Clark (IR)	Student Volunteer Co-Chair
Mike Hearty (NCR)	Student Volunteer Co-Chair
Lorraine Amenda (NCR)	Social Events
Maggi Kelly (NCR)	Social Events
Anna Marie Kinerney (ASPRS)	Social Events
Jeff Sano (NCR)	Logistics/Preliminary Planning
Bob Vitales (NCR)	Logistics/Preliminary Planning

Jim Plasker (ASPRS)

Headquarters support

Kim Tilley (ASPRS)

Headquarters support

Anna Marie Kinerney (ASPRS)

Headquarters support

Rae Kelley (ASPRS)

Headquarters support

This report provides perspectives of the Committee on the planning and execution of those Conference activities for which the Regional components had responsibility. Many Annual Conference activities that not documented in this report, such as contracts, exhibits, and workshops, are solely within the domain of the Headquarters ASPRS conference planning staff. Embedded within each report section are the personal observations, critiques, and suggestions of the Intermountain and Northern California Region Reno 2006 Conference Committee.

**FINAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORT
ASPRS 2006 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
RENO, NEVADA
“PROSPECTING FOR GEOSPATIAL INFORMATION INTEGRATION”
MAY 1-5, 2005**

BACKGROUND

The concept of a newly reinvigorated Northern California Region (NCR) hosting a future National conference was among topics addressed by ASPRS Executive Director Jim Plasker during his keynote address at the June 7, 2002, installation dinner of the NCR in Sacramento, California. Following several months of internal discussion and debate among members of the NCR board of direction, a letter of intent proposing NCR hosting a future National Conference was submitted to then President Terry Keating on October 25, 2002. In the letter, a proposed partnering arrangement with Intermountain Region (IR) was acknowledged, since informal conversations between NCR and IR in the event Reno was selected as a venue has occurred. At the November 10, 2002, meeting of the ASPRS Convention Planning and Policy Committee (CPPC), NCR's proposal was noted as "A letter of intent from the Northern California Region has been submitted with several possible locations including San Jose, Sacramento, or Reno (in cooperation with Inter-Mountain Region)."

With the approval by the Executive Committee and Board of Directors of NCR's/IR's proposal and subsequent approval of Reno as the site for the 2006 Annual Conference, discussions between NCR and IR intensified and became more formal. An immediate need was for both Regions to agree on a conference Director. ASPRS Past Presidents George Hepner from IR and Alan Mikuni from NCR agreed to "place-hold" this position and to temporarily serve as Conference Co-Directors until a permanent Conference Director from NCR or IR stepped forward to assume leadership. As planning meetings between ASPRS Headquarters and the host Regions began in earnest, Hepner and Mikuni found themselves as the Conference Co-Directors.

THE VENUE

In 2003, Anna Marie Kinerney, ASPRS Conference planner, was hosted by the Reno-Tahoe-Sparks Convention and Visitors Bureau. She visited two prospective venues for the 2006 Annual Conference. John Ascuaga's Nugget in Sparks, NV, and the Reno Hilton initially met the basic requirements for a conference of the size of ASPRS'. After visiting, inspecting, and meeting with the staffs of both properties, Anna Marie recommended the Reno Hilton. She conducted numerous meetings and teleconferences with the Hilton event

planning staff and arranged for an on-site meeting of the ASPRS conference planning committee from Northern California and Intermountain Regions.

PLANNING MEETINGS

On May 25, 2004, at the ASPRS' Annual Conference in Denver, Conference Co-Director Hepner convened a planning meeting among those Reno 2006 Planning Committee members in attendance. Initial committees were established, along with chairs and/or members.

On November 13, 2004, a planning meeting among Planning Committee members from IR, NCR, and ASPRS HQ was held at the Reno Hilton Hotel and Casino. Following introductions of committee members from both Northern California and Intermountain Regions, Anna Marie Kinerney guided the Committee through many of the key elements of conducting a National Conference. One element that was introduced, discussed by the group, but that required follow-up and conclusion by phone and email, was the conference theme. A theme and list of topical areas for papers would be needed prior to the design, printing, and distribution of the Call for Papers. A meeting with hotel meeting coordinator and associated staff was held. A tour of the hotel facility and proposed meeting room and exhibition hall was conducted. A convention of gun enthusiasts was in progress, so that provided an interesting backdrop to our deliberations with hotel staff. Following the conclusion of the site visit and planning meeting, Anna Marie continued planning with hotel staff. Anna Marie signed the contract with the Reno Hilton.

CALL FOR PRESENTATION

After much deliberation, a conference theme of "Prospecting for Geospatial Information Integration", linking Nevada's mining history with ASPRS' mission, was selected by the Committee. In addition, an array of conference paper topics was developed. The first Call for Presentation brochures were made available at the ASPRS Annual Conference in Baltimore, MD, in March, 2005. The Call for Presentations flyers were subsequently mailed to the broader audience.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

The Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Bureau provided materials for and staffed a booth at the Baltimore MD ASPRS Annual Conference in March 2005. Presentations at other meetings, conferences, and professional gatherings provided additional venues for promoting Reno 2006. Entries in the calendars-of-events published in many associated journals, publications, and periodicals provided additional exposure for Reno 2006.

TECHNICAL PROGRAM

Patricia (Trish) Foschi (NCR) and Doug Ramsey (IR) served as co-chairs of the Technical Program Committee. Their responsibilities, in collaboration with staff at ASPRS HQ, spanned the design of the technical program, development of the Call for Presentations, review and acceptance of abstracts, preparation of the technical program and input to the Preliminary and Final Programs and preparation for the actual execution of the technical program at the conference. Charlene Sailer (NCR) served as moderator coordinator for the Technical Program. Below submitted is the final report from Technical Program co-chair Trish Foschi.

Final Report on the Technical Program by Trish Foschi

***As Co-Chair of the Program Committee, I participated in many activities, both directly and indirectly related to the Program. My tasks were the following:

1. Attending the Conference Committee meeting in Reno to view available meeting rooms and facilities and participating in Committee teleconferences.
2. Contributing to and editing the wording for the Call for Papers.
3. Helping edit the structure for abstract submission on the Conference Website.
4. Co-writing with Doug Ramsey the abstract review form (*form attached*).
5. Recruiting many of the reviewers and corresponding directly with 22 of them (4 others were handled by 2 of the 22).
6. Organizing/distributing for review the 530+ original oral paper and poster abstracts.
7. FedEx-ing 80+ accepted oral paper abstracts on Photogrammetry and related subjects to Alan Mikuni, who organized them into Regular Sessions and returned them to me.
8. Reading the remaining oral paper abstracts and organizing them into Regular Sessions and into Alan's unfilled sessions to create 91 Regular Sessions (4 papers each) for the Preliminary Program.
9. Creating titles for all Regular Sessions not named by Alan.
10. Redirecting abstracts judged to be too commercial by me and/or another reviewer to George Hepner, who provided the final determination that assigned them to oral papers, posters, or Exhibits and who later organized many of the 'Exhibits' into Commercial Sessions.
11. Assigning oral papers that could not be accommodated in the available Regular Sessions to posters.
12. Creating text for acceptance letters for oral papers and sending them by email to the authors indicating dates and times of their scheduled presentations and other pertinent information (*letter attached*).
13. Sending the lists of accepted posters and rejected papers to Doug, who notified authors of acceptance/rejection.

14. Keeping track of withdrawn oral papers and posters, and reassigning posters (mostly) to oral papers in Regular Sessions and changing session titles as needed (*letter to poster authors attached*).
15. Trouble-shooting as needed (moving oral papers/posters in Program to accommodate authors' schedules, reviewing and integrating papers lost from abstract database, handling the reassignment of Orhan Altan to a Panel Discussion, and numerous other things).
16. Organizing the revised 91 Regular Sessions (80 having 4 papers each, 11 having 3 papers each) for the Final Program.
17. Assigning room numbers to the 108 non-commercial sessions (Panel Discussions, Special Sessions, Regular Sessions).
18. Creating the 3-page Session Categories for the Program including General and Applications Categories (*original 6-page list attached*).
19. Editing the Regular Sessions, Poster Sessions, and other parts of the Program proofs.
20. Editing some letters written by Charlene Sailer, who organized the Moderators.
21. Interacting with Doug on matters needing a Program Committee decision, and redirecting information and questions that I received regarding Special Sessions/Panel Discussions to Doug, who handled this part of the Program.
22. Redirecting other information and questions that I received to other appropriate parties (moderator volunteers to Charlene, student volunteers to Mike Hearty, papers for the Proceedings to Kim Tilley, and numerous other things).
23. Writing most of the Errata Sheet for the Program (30 oral papers withdrawn, 2 oral papers added, 1 poster moved; *other changes after Errata Sheet to be supplied by Charlene*).

The greatest amount of my time was spent organizing/categorizing for review the 530+ original oral paper and poster abstracts, organizing/revising the 91 Regular Sessions for the Program, and corresponding via email with Conference Committee members, ASPRS staff, authors, and others regarding various matters. During some weeks, the majority of my time was spent trouble-shooting. Other time-consuming tasks were editing the Program proofs and creating the 3-page Session Categories list.

Throughout the process of organizing the Program, the number and status of abstracts and Special Sessions/Panel Discussions were in a state of flux. Contrary to my original expectations, the abstract database often increased problems and time needed for various tasks. Some statistics will help explain what I mean. The original download of the abstract database after the submission deadline provided the following breakdown:

By type of submission:

Oral	461
Poster	71

Special Sessions	15
Video	1
-----	-----
Total	548

By subject of submission (without Special Sessions):

3D datasets/DEMs	35
Accuracy	20
Agriculture/Soils	21
Change Detection	18
Data Fusion	24
Data Standards	9
Education	17
Forestry	32
Geology	8
GIS	19
Hyperspectral	21
Image Classification	22
Image Segmentation	41
Land Cover/Weeds	15
Land Use/Land Cover	19
LIDAR	48
Photogrammetry	64
Technical	33
Water Resources	52
Web/Data Transfer	15
-----	-----
Total	533

During the formal abstract reviews and the initial organization of the 91 Regular Sessions, these numbers changed due to a number of factors: finding duplicate abstracts, finding Special Session papers mislabeled as oral papers, rejecting abstracts, moving commercial papers to Exhibits, and determining that some abstracts (oral and Special Sessions) were not in the database. By the first week in November, the breakdown was as follows:

By type of submission:

Oral – Accepted	364
Oral – Moved to Poster	55
Poster – Accepted	71
Special Sessions	19 (<i>Doug may have another count</i>)
Oral/Video – Moved to Exhibits	30
Duplicates	4
Rejects	7
-----	-----

Total 550

In addition, the breakdown of abstracts by subject had to be somewhat revised during the review process and greatly revised during the creation of the 91 Regular Sessions.

From my perspective, much time and energy could be saved and the main problems encountered could be solved by a comprehensive revision of the Conference Website, particularly to make better use of the database capabilities. This key factor would facilitate the work of the Program Committee and would improve communications with authors. The main problems and their potential solutions follow:

Problem encountered	Website solution
Confusion regarding commercial content	Authors to categorize the general content of their papers (commercial, applied, theoretical)
Time-intensive process of organizing abstracts into categories for review and subsequent Program sessions	Authors to categorize the content of their papers using a detailed decision-tree approach (e.g., applied → water resources → water quality, wetlands, etc)
Poor quality of abstracts (more than half)	Structure for abstract submission to provide clear instructions on how to write an abstract and what it should contain
Lack of description in abstract titles	Clear instructions on how to compose a title
Confusion regarding where to send things and/or whom to contact	List of all members of the Conference Committee and all ASPRS staff working on the Conference, their jobs, and their contact information
Confusion in submitting papers to Special Sessions/Panel Discussions	Highlighting these sessions better and having organizers submit all abstracts as a group (more time may be given)
Difficulty in finding duplicate submissions	Writing code that will check all names for duplications and alert author (and Committee if submitted anyway)
Needing permission to move poster to oral paper	Question: "If needed, would you be willing to present an oral paper instead of a poster?"
Conflicts in authors' schedules	Question: "When are you not available to present your paper during the Conference?"
Late start in finding Moderators	Question: "Are you willing to serve as a Moderator?"

Having to reverse late name(s), first name(s) in database for Program	Author to type in first name(s), last name(s) in database
Additional confusion in dealing with Asian (and other?) name order	Clear instructions for these authors
Authors don't read the information they are given	Condensing everywhere possible to bullets, short questions, and focused information

In spite of the overwhelming amount of work, I am glad I volunteered to help. However, I'm not planning to sign up again anytime soon. Perhaps, I should keep my head down...but I would be willing to participate in a comprehensive revision of the Conference Website.***

Technical Program Report: Attachment Session Categories

General Categories:

Accuracy and Performance Metrics

Accuracy Assessment I – Image Classification

Accuracy Assessment II

Accuracy Assessment III – Geometric Correction I

Accuracy Assessment IV – Geometric Correction II

Data Fusion

Data Fusion I

Data Fusion II

Road Network Extraction I

Data Standards, Management, and Policy

Panel Discussion: Characterization/Calibration/Certification Standards for Digital Camera

Systems – The Quality Assurance of Digital Imagery

Panel Discussion: What is the ISO and What Can It Do for You?

Special Session: Re-Engineering the National Geospatial Programs within the USGS and Developing a Better Fit with the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and the Geospatial One-Stop. Part 3 – Metadata: International, Remote, and for the Future

Data Standards

Education/Professional Development

Panel Discussion: AmericaView: A National Resource for Promoting Remote Sensing Technology and Applications

Panel Discussion: Licensure & Certification - Past, Present & Future

Special Session: Geospatial Applications in the Social Sciences and Education

Special Session: **K-12 Education for the Geospatial Sciences**

Educational Programs for Remote Sensing and GIS

National/International Industry Updates

GIS Technologies/Applications

From Remote Sensing and GIS to Management

GAP Analysis

GIS Applications

Infrastructure Management Systems for Urban Applications

Moving and Changing Targets

Remote Sensing/GIS for Habitat Mapping

Remote Sensing/GIS for Hydrologic Monitoring and Modeling

Lidar/3D Technologies/Applications

Panel Discussion: IFSAR Digital Elevation Data Acquisition/Processing
Flow: A User's Perspective

Panel Discussion: Lidar Digital Elevation Data Acquisition/Processing
Flow: A User's Perspective

Forestry IX – Canopy and Tree Characteristics

Geohazard Monitoring

Geomorphology I – Lidar III

Lidar I – Forestry I

Lidar II – Forestry II

Lidar IV – Lidar technology

Lidar/3D I – DTM Generation I

Lidar/3D II – DTM Generation II

Lidar/3D III – DTM Generation III

Lidar/3D IV – Building Extraction

Lidar/3D V – Building Reconstruction I

Lidar/3D VI – Registration/Co-Registration

Lidar/3D VII – Hazards

Lidar/3D VIII – Object Recognition

Lidar/3D IX – SAR

Monitoring Hazardous Waste

Monitoring Natural Hazards

Photogrammetry V – Building Reconstruction II

Wetlands and Forests – Lidar and 3D Studies

**National/International Programs (NSDI/ISDI, NGA, The National Map,
Geospatial One-Stop)**

Panel Discussion: AmericaView: A National Resource for Promoting Remote Sensing Technology and Applications

Panel Discussion: Re-Engineering the National Geospatial Programs within the USGS and Developing a Better Fit with the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and the Geospatial One-Stop. Part 2 – The National Strategy for Acquisition and Maintenance of Base Data Themes that are Part of The National Map

Panel Discussion: What is the ISO and What Can It Do for You?

Special Session: GEOINT 2004 BAA Awardees' Projects

Special Session: Re-Engineering the National Geospatial Programs within the USGS and Developing a Better Fit with the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and the Geospatial One-Stop. Part 1 – How to Drive the NSDI to the Ground

Special Session: Re-Engineering the National Geospatial Programs within the USGS and Developing a Better Fit with the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and the Geospatial One-Stop. Part 3 – Metadata: International, Remote, and for the Future
Future Directions in Imaging Technologies
National/International Industry Updates

Photogrammetry

Accuracy Assessment III – Geometric Correction I

Accuracy Assessment IV – Geometric Correction II

Automated Co-Registration Techniques

Photogrammetry I – Scanners

Photogrammetry II – Camera Calibration I

Photogrammetry III – Camera Calibration II

Photogrammetry IV – Close-Range Photogrammetry

Photogrammetry V – Building Reconstruction II

Photogrammetry VI – Feature Extraction

Photogrammetry VII – Algorithms and Modeling

Photogrammetry VIII – UltraCam

Photogrammetry IX – Georeferencing

Remote Sensing Technologies/Applications

Panel Discussion: Multi-Platform Sensing and Sensor Networks in Support of Natural Disaster Management

Special Session: Remote Sensing for Coastal Ecosystem Health

Agriculture I – Multitemporal Studies

Agriculture II

Agriculture/Soils – Effects on Climate
Cloudless Compositing and Cloud-Detection/Reduction Techniques
Coastal Mapping and Change Detection
Forestry I – Fuel Mapping

Forestry II – Monitoring Disease

Forestry III – Mapping Burn Severity
Forestry IV – Fire and Fuel Mapping
Forestry V – Mapping Habitats and Tree Parameters
Forestry VI – Estimating Biophysical Parameters
Forestry VII – Monitoring Health and Status
Forestry VIII – Ecosystem Monitoring
From Remote Sensing and GIS to Management
GAP Analysis
Genetic Algorithms and Neural Networks
Geohazard Monitoring
Geomorphology II
Hyperspectral Imagery I – Classification
Hyperspectral Imagery II – Classification and Processing
Image Classification – Spectral-Spatial Techniques
Image Segmentation and Classification I
Image Segmentation and Classification II
Infrastructure Management Systems for Urban Applications
Mapping and Predicting Meteorological Change
Mapping Impervious Surfaces
Mapping Invasive Species I – Wetlands
Mapping Invasive Species II and Freshwater Wetlands
Mapping Invasive Species III
Mapping Land Degradation and Faults
Mapping Offshore Environments

Mapping Small and Subpixel Urban Patches

Measuring Soil Moisture from Remotely-Sensed Imagery

Monitoring Hazardous Waste

Monitoring Water Quality

Moving and Changing Targets

Remote Sensing for Climate and Weather Applications
Remote Sensing/GIS for Habitat Mapping
Remote Sensing/GIS for Hydrologic Monitoring and Modeling

Road Network Extraction I

Road Network Extraction II
Support Vector Machines for Image Classification

Techniques for Object Recognition and Placement
Techniques for Studying Urban Growth I
Techniques for Studying Urban Growth II
Vegetation Discrimination in Dry Lands

Water Resources

Watershed Monitoring I
Watershed Monitoring II
Wetlands I – Studying Ecological Change
Wetlands II and Mapping Invasive Species IV

Remote Sensor Systems

Panel Discussion: Airborne Commercial Digital Imaging Systems
Panel Discussion: Multi-Platform Sensing and Sensor Networks in Support of Natural Disaster Management
Panel Discussion: What is the Future for Remote Sensors?

Future Directions in Imaging Technologies

Web/Data Transfer

Web/Data Transfer I

Web/Data Transfer II

Web/Data Transfer III

Applications Categories:

Agriculture and Arid Lands

Agriculture I – Multitemporal Studies

Agriculture II

Agriculture/Soils – Effects on Climate
Vegetation Discrimination in Dry Lands

Climate and Weather

Agriculture/Soils – Effects on Climate
Mapping and Predicting Meteorological Change
Remote Sensing for Climate and Weather Applications

Coastal and Offshore Environments

Special Session: Remote Sensing for Coastal Ecosystem Health

Coastal Mapping and Change Detection
Mapping Offshore Environments

Forestry

Forestry I – Fuel Mapping

Forestry II – Monitoring Disease

Forestry III – Mapping Burn Severity

Forestry IV – Fire and Fuel Mapping

Forestry V – Mapping Habitats and Tree Parameters

Forestry VI – Estimating Biophysical Parameters

Forestry VII – Monitoring Health and Status

Forestry VIII – Ecosystem Monitoring

Forestry IX – Canopy and Tree Characteristics

GAP Analysis

Lidar I – Forestry I

Lidar II – Forestry II

Wetlands and Forests – Lidar and 3D Studies

Geomorphology

Geomorphology I – Lidar III

Geomorphology II

Mapping Land Degradation and Faults

Invasive Species

Mapping Invasive Species I – Wetlands

Mapping Invasive Species II and Freshwater Wetlands

Mapping Invasive Species III

Wetlands II and Mapping Invasive Species IV

Natural and Man-Made Hazards

Panel Discussion: Multi-Platform Sensing and Sensor Networks in
Support of Natural

Disaster Management

Geohazard Monitoring

Lidar/3D VII – Hazards

Monitoring Hazardous Waste

Monitoring Natural Hazards

Water Resources

Measuring Soil Moisture from Remotely-Sensed Imagery
Monitoring Water Quality
Remote Sensing/GIS for Hydrologic Monitoring and Modeling Water
Resources
Watershed Monitoring I
Watershed Monitoring II

Wetlands

Special Session: Remote Sensing for Coastal Ecosystem Health

Mapping Invasive Species I – Wetlands
Mapping Invasive Species II and Freshwater Wetlands
Remote Sensing/GIS for Habitat Mapping
Wetlands I – Studying Ecological Change
Wetlands II and Mapping Invasive Species IV
Wetlands and Forests – Lidar and 3D Studies

Urban Studies

Panel Discussion: Exploring the Business Case for the Deployment of Digital Sensor Technologies for State Departments of Transportation

Special Session: Geospatial Applications in the Social Sciences and Education

Infrastructure Management Systems for Urban Applications
Lidar/3D IV – Building Extraction
Lidar/3D V – Building Reconstruction I
Mapping Impervious Surfaces

Mapping Small and Subpixel Urban Patches

Photogrammetry V – Building Reconstruction II
Photogrammetry VI – Feature Extraction

Road Network Extraction I

Road Network Extraction II
Techniques for Studying Urban Growth I
Techniques for Studying Urban Growth II

**Technical Program Report: Attachment
Guidelines for Reviewers
Abstracts for ASPRS 2006 Conference**

Thank you for agreeing to review these abstracts. For each abstract, please provide a Score and Recommendation and further comments, as appropriate, using the following scheme:

Paper ID number:

Name of first author:

Name of reviewer:

Score: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 () () () () () () () () () ()

(1=lowest, 10=highest)

Work that is *primarily* advertising rather than presentation of new scientific and/or technical information should be housed in the Exhibition Hall. Please consider this criterion carefully; there is often a fine line between advertising and new information.

Recommendation: Oral Paper Poster Exhibition Reject

**Does the abstract appear to be scientifically and technically sound?
If not, why not?**

Other comments?

**Technical Program Report: Attachment
Example Letter of Acceptance for Presentation**

Dear Shawana Johnson,

We are pleased to inform you that your paper ID 101373, entitled “2005 International Remote Sensing Research”, has been accepted for presentation at the ASPRS 2006 Annual Conference and Technology Exhibition to be held May 1-5 at the Reno Hilton Hotel in Reno, Nevada, USA.

At this time, your paper is scheduled for presentation on Wednesday, 3 May 2006, 9:15 – 10:45. Your paper title will appear in the preliminary program, which will be mailed early next year and will also be posted on the conference Website at <http://www.asprs.org/reno2006/>. Please visit this Website to review the most current information regarding your session. Room assignments will appear in the final program. Your presentation should last 15-20 minutes including questions.

We understand that unforeseen circumstances may prevent speakers from attending the conference. If you are unable to attend, please inform us as soon as possible. Insofar as possible, we would like to limit last-minute dropouts. For this reason, we now require that all speakers register in advance of the conference. Please note that in order to confirm your place on the final program, you must register with full payment by 13 February 2006. A registration form will be mailed with the preliminary program. The registration form and payment must be submitted directly to ASPRS National Headquarters in Bethesda, Maryland, USA. Only the person presenting the paper is eligible for the reduced “speaker rate” fees.

ASPRS provides one LCD projector and screen for each oral session room. If you plan to make your presentation electronically, please bring your own computer. We also provide appropriate microphones for rooms where we deem them to be necessary. This means that smaller rooms will not have microphones because all participants should be able to hear the speaker(s) without a problem. If you require projection equipment other than what we provide, you will be able to order such items in advance. A staff person at ASPRS National Headquarters will provide further details shortly.

ASPRS does not provide laptop computers, Internet hook up, or laser pointers. If you require one of these items, ASPRS will only order such equipment for you for an additional charge.

For the ASPRS 2006 Annual Conference, the Proceedings will be organized differently. No abstracts will be published. Only full papers or PowerPoint presentations will be accepted for the Proceedings. The

FINAL REPORT 8/17/2006

deadline for submission of your final paper is 13 February 2006. A staff person at ASPRS National Headquarters will send instructions to you shortly.

When you arrive at the conference site in May, pick up your registration materials and then check in at the speaker ready room in the Reno Hilton Hotel. Your registration packet will tell you where the room is located.

The room will be equipped with a LCD projector and screen so you may do your last-minute preparations.

Foreign participants should apply for travel permissions, passports, entrance visas, etc. as soon as possible since travel to the United States has become more difficult in recent years.

Thank you for your interest in participating in the ASPRS 2006 Annual Conference. We look forward to a fun and informative meeting. We apologize for any inconvenience that this delayed notice may have caused.

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS NOTICE BY RETURN EMAIL to asprs@sfsu.edu with your abstract ID included in the subject line.

Sincerely,
Drs. Trish Foschi and Doug Ramsey
Co-Chairs, Technical Program Committee
ASPRS 2006 Annual Conference

**Technical Program Report: Attachment
Example Letter of Notification for Poster Session**

Dear Chris Wright,

Space for your paper in the oral presentations in a section very appropriate for your subject has become available. We are hoping you will present your poster ID 103592, entitled "Remote Sensing of Palustrine Wetlands in Yellowstone National Park", as an oral presentation at the ASPRS 2006 Annual Conference and Technology Exhibition to be held May 1-5 at the Reno Hilton Hotel in Reno, Nevada, USA. PLEASE ADVISE REGARDING YOUR ACCEPTANCE.

At this time, your paper is scheduled for presentation on Thursday, 4 May 2006, 9:15 - 10:45. Your paper title will appear in the preliminary program, which will be mailed early next year and will also be posted on the conference Website at <http://www.asprs.org/reno2006/>. Please visit this Website to review the most current information regarding your session. Room assignments will appear in the final program. Your presentation should last 15-20 minutes including questions.

We understand that unforeseen circumstances may prevent speakers from attending the conference. If you are unable to attend, please inform us as soon as possible. Insofar as possible, we would like to limit last-minute dropouts. For this reason, we now require that all speakers register in advance of the conference. Please note that in order to confirm your place on the final program, you must register with full payment by 13 February 2006. A registration form will be mailed with the preliminary program. The registration form and payment must be submitted directly to ASPRS National Headquarters in Bethesda, Maryland, USA. Only the person presenting the paper is eligible for the reduced "speaker rate" fees.

ASPRS provides one LCD projector and screen for each oral session room. If you plan to make your presentation electronically, please bring your own computer. We also provide appropriate microphones for rooms where we deem them to be necessary. This means that smaller rooms will not have microphones because all participants should be able to hear the speaker(s) without a problem. If you require projection equipment other than what we provide, you will be able to order such items in advance. A staff person at ASPRS National Headquarters will provide further details shortly.

ASPRS does not provide laptop computers, Internet hook up, or laser pointers. If you require one of these items, ASPRS will only order such equipment for you for an additional charge.

For the ASPRS 2006 Annual Conference, the Proceedings will be organized

differently. No abstracts will be published. Only full papers or PowerPoint presentations will be accepted for the Proceedings. The deadline for submission of your final paper is 13 February 2006. A staff person at ASPRS National Headquarters will send instructions to you.

When you arrive at the conference site in May, pick up your registration materials and then check in at the speaker ready room in the Reno Hilton Hotel. Your registration packet will tell you where the room is located.

The room will be equipped with a LCD projector and screen so you may do your last-minute preparations.

Foreign participants should apply for travel permissions, passports, entrance visas, etc. as soon as possible since travel to the United States has become more difficult in recent years.

Thank you for your interest in participating in the ASPRS 2006 Annual Conference. We look forward to a fun and informative meeting. We apologize for any inconvenience that this delayed notice may have caused.

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS NOTICE BY RETURN EMAIL to asprs@sfsu.edu with your abstract ID included in the subject line.

Sincerely,
Drs. Trish Foschi and Doug Ramsey
Co-Chairs, Technical Program Committee
ASPRS 2006 Annual Conference

Clarification note from Trish Foschi regarding the notification letters

***I forgot that, in using much of the language found in the Baltimore acceptance letters, I included the following paragraphs:

“We understand that unforeseen circumstances may prevent speakers from attending the conference. If you are unable to attend, please inform us as soon as possible. Insofar as possible, we would like to limit last-minute dropouts. For this reason, we now require that all speakers register in advance of the conference. Please note that in order to confirm your place on the final program, you must register with full payment by 13 February 2006. A registration form will be mailed with the preliminary program. The registration form and payment must be submitted directly to ASPRS National Headquarters in Bethesda, Maryland, USA. Only the person presenting the paper is eligible for the reduced "speaker rate" fees.

For the ASPRS 2006 Annual Conference, the Proceedings will be organized differently. No abstracts will be published. Only full papers or PowerPoint presentations will be accepted for the Proceedings. The deadline for submission of your final paper is 13 February 2006. A staff person at ASPRS National Headquarters will send instructions to you shortly.”

I found out (or finally understood?) in January that the February 13 deadline was only for the Proceedings. This point was clarified by subsequent mailings by Kim and Charlene.***

General Comments – Technical Sessions

Included below is an unattributed email exchange that occurred following the conclusion of Reno 2006. It highlights several points about which future Technical Program chairs may wish to pay attention. They are not new issues, but continue to be of concern to conference attenders, and, consequently, of conference planners.

*** I'm not sure what the drop-out rate was in Reno. I understand that the Baltimore Meeting there was about 20%. ASPRS now requires that everyone register by a certain date or else their abstract will be dropped from the agenda. Also, they are talking about keeping a list of repeat offenders - not sure where this is, but I think it's a good idea. There also seems to be a big problem with international submissions and issues with travel funds and visas. Not sure what to do here. It seems that if submitters register by a certain time, there is some commitment there to attend the conference. At the very least, ASPRS has the registration moneys to cover costs associated with expected presenters.

As far as the lead time for the conference, I am not altogether sure why ASPRS - and others, need that much lead time. As the technical co-chair, there is a

significant amount of work to review abstracts and to organize the sessions. This took about 3 months of time (maybe more). This may be one question to bring up to the head office.

The session chairs are instructed to break when presenters do not appear in order to maintain the time line and avoid problems that you had. However, it seems that some did not heed that instruction. When the rubber hits the road, ASPRS has no control over the session chair when the session is in order. They can only issue rules and guidelines and hope that they follow them.

REPLY: I see that ASPRS has instituted a new policy that author of accepted abstract has 60 days to register for meeting or abstract will be dropped. This is due to “alarming dropout rate of speakers.” I’m interested in your experience as technical program co-chair for Reno meeting. What was dropout rate at the Reno meeting? What was your experience like and what problems did you encounter?

I’m wondering if perhaps part of the problem is the long period (nearly a year) between deadline for abstract submission and the meeting. A person could lose interest and be on to something else after a year. In other professional organizations I belong to (e.g. Geological Society of America) the abstract deadlines vary from about 3 months to 6 months prior to the meeting. This seems much more reasonable to me. ASPRS has just extended the deadline to June 26 for the annual meeting a year away – probably because they haven’t received enough submissions. They are asking for them way too early it seems to me.

I have a criticism regarding the technical program at Reno – probably something out of your control. I think each talk should be given a meeting time (e.g. 10:15 am) and session chairs should see that this is strictly adhered to, with breaks for no-shows. Following is a frustrating experience I had at Reno. I wanted to hear talks in two concurrent sessions – the first two talks of one session and the **4th** talk of a different session. After hearing the first two talks I left that room and went to the other session. When I got there the session was completely finished and I missed the single most important talk for me of the entire meeting!

My bad experience is likely due to a combination of the two problems above – dropout of speakers and lack of a strict schedule for the talks.***

COMMERCIAL SESSION

Report on Sessions Track for Commercial Presentations by George Hepner

During the abstract review process, several abstracts were submitted with a singular focus on equipment, software or consultation methodology of private firms. While private firms are entitled to make presentations in the technical sessions, these abstracts were not objective scientific/technical presentations. They contained no description of other products/ approaches or comparative evaluation supporting the conclusions made regarding the value of their product or method. These abstracts were initially declined or placed in poster sessions so as to not undermine the goals of the technical sessions as being objective and not blatantly commercial.

However, given the number of these submissions, a commercial sessions track was created with eight sessions having three to four presentations each. The program clearly identified the sessions as commercial, and actually made it a “showcase” for the firms.

I believe that programs in the future should adopt this commercial session track as a showcase event. It will allow vendors to make presentations on their products without undermining the intent of the technical sessions program.

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

George Hepner (IR) and Lorraine Amenda (NCR) served as members of the Keynote Speaker Committee. Throughout the early planning processes, many potential keynote speakers were discussed as were strategies for inviting them. One possibility, due to the significance of the devastating impacts of the 2005 hurricane season on the United States and the contributions being made by ASPRS sciences and technology, was to seek a keynote speaker from the hurricane response or preparedness community. George Hepner made a number of contacts with university colleagues in the Gulf Coast area, namely Louisiana State University. Alan Mikuni pursued a possible speaker from the Department of Homeland Security.

Another possibility, introduced by Conference Committee member Lorraine Amenda, was Shuttle Astronaut Steve Robinson, son of Bill Robinson, former President of Towill, Inc., a prominent San Francisco Bay Area photogrammetric mapping firm. Robinson was scheduled for a future flight of the Shuttle. Being from a “mapping” family and being associated with a program as highly visible as NASA’s shuttle program, would make Robinson an interesting name recognition “draw” for the 2006 Reno conference. His availability would, of course, depend on the flight schedule, and other NASA commitments prior to and during the week of Reno 2006. During August and September of 2005, and prior to the

conclusion of planning for the preliminary program, NASA's space shuttle Discovery was successfully launched and recovered. As a consequence of the Shuttle Columbia disaster, much attention was paid to the condition of the Shuttle spacecraft and of means to inspect similar structural damage, if any, incurred by the Shuttle Discovery vehicle. Prominent in the televised media was Shuttle Astronaut Robinson, who conducted extra-vehicular activities and collected using remote sensing and photogrammetric data for NASA's inspection of the Discovery.

Alan Mikuni formally invited Robinson to serve as keynote speaker, and Conference Committee member Lorraine Amenda, a Towill employee, worked tirelessly in ensuring that Reno 2006 remained on Robinson's and the NASA Speakers bureau's planning calendar. Donn Liddle, a NASA colleague of Robinson's and a graduate of California State University at Fresno, an NCR student chapter, also agreed to co-present the keynote address, focusing on the photogrammetric aspects of the NASA analysis. Their participation was included in the preliminary program as "invited," and was finally confirmed shortly before the conference. Below submitted is the report from Keynote Speaker co-chair, Lorraine Amenda.

Final Report on the Keynote Speaker by Lorraine Amenda

Stephen Robinson is the son of the former President of Towill, Inc. and a long-time ASPRS member, Bill Robinson. As an employee of Towill for many years, I was well aware that Steve was an Astronaut and had met him on at least one occasion. Steve had also worked in the surveying and mapping arena during school vacations over his years in college, so he was familiar with the fields of photogrammetry and remote sensing. With this knowledge, I suggested we may want to contact him as a possible keynote speaker. I had a co-worker, Warren McKean, make the contact with Steve and follow up until we had him confirmed. Warren has known Steve for years and actually supervised him on his temporary employment with Towill. Warren had also been in touch more recently when Steve wanted to explore close-range photogrammetry as a means of quantifying shuttle damage. It was definitely helpful to have someone who personally knew Steve making the contact. It also helped that we knew his father and, on at least one occasion, had his father speed up a response. Without these close contacts, Steve Robinson would not have been available for the keynote address. Following confirmation of his participation, Steve requested that Donn Liddle co-present with him and final travel plans were arranged by Anna Marie. I did coordinate the acquisition of the bios for both Steve and Donn as well as the description of their presentation. I arrived early at the ballroom on the morning of the keynote address and helped Steve's parents, Bill and Joyce Robinson, find their seats.

PLENARY SESSION SPEAKERS

The planning for the Thursday morning plenary session speakers occurred late in the schedule. The approval by the White House of the Landsat Data Continuity Mission provided the highly relevant theme that would round out this conference session. Two very prominent speakers knowledgeable about this topic were invited by Alan Mikuni. Both R.J.Thompson from the USGS National Center for EROS and Darrel Williams from NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center accepted the invitation.

CLASSIFIED SESSION

Classified sessions, that is, technical sessions on topics related to National Security, or involving tours of facilities requiring security clearances, have been features of several past Annual Conferences. During preliminary planning for the conference, Jeff Sano (NCR) and Robert Vitales (NCR) began the process of investigating topics and/or venues in the Reno area that might be suitable for classified sessions at Reno 2006. The US Geological Survey and National Geospatial Intelligence Agency were principal participants in past classified sessions and were consulted about potential Federal agency or commercial sector hosts for such a session. The only military venue, and potential classified facility for this event, was at a Nevada National Guard compound. However, the military component was a transportation unit, and could not have suitable classified facilities available. Other venues, such as the U.S. Navy Fallon Naval Air Station, which has a classified facility, were too distance to be a reasonable site for the session. After extensive research and consultation, it was concluded that Reno would not be a suitable venue for a classified session, and this particular aspect of Annual Conferences would not be a part of Reno 2006.

TECHNICAL TOURS AND SPOUSE ACTIVITIES

Due to the fact that Reno, the travel destination, and the Reno Hilton, a virtually self-contained entertainment complex, were the city and hotel venues, respectively, for ASPRS 2006, the Reno Conference Committee concluded that it would not be necessary to conduct formal family/spouse activities that have traditionally been part of Annual conferences. In addition, there were few large commercial or government venues available for the traditional Annual conference technical tours, so this feature was not included in the Reno 2006 suite of events.

SOCIAL EVENT

Lorraine Amenda (NCR), Anna Marie Kinerney (ASPRS-HQ), and Maggi Kelly (NCR) served on the Social Events Committee. During Anna Marie's site visit to

the Reno-Sparks area, and her meetings with the Visitors Bureau, an array of possible social events and venues was suggested. Among them was the National Automobile Museum. In addition, the Reno Hilton meeting planning staff suggested a number of on-property events that could be included as the conference social event. Among these were a Western barbeque. After deliberation by the Conference Planning Committee, the Auto Museum was selected, and would occur on the evening of Thursday, May 4, 2006. Included below is committee co-chair Lorraine Amenda's final report.

Final Report of the Social Event Committee by Lorraine Amenda

This committee had few tasks. The location of the car museum was selected from a short list of available options in the Reno area by the full planning committee. Anna Marie worked with the site staff and caterer to arrange the menu and the various food serving locations. The committee was tasked to arrange volunteers to welcome the conference attendees as they arrived at the museum. One important task that was not foreseen was having someone direct the attendees to the buses for transport to the museum. Lloyd Blackburn saw the need and took up that task. During the Conference Planning and Policy Committee meeting it was discussed that the National ASPRS Board members should be more visible during the conference. It was decided that they would greet the attendees as they arrived at both the Exhibitor Reception and the social event. RSI staff were also on site as the event sponsor and took the tickets. Since the duties of the committee volunteers were not clear and these changes (Board member greeting and event sponsors) were not discussed in advance, the committee volunteers did not arrive as expected by National ASPRS staff, causing them to miss much of the event. In the future, it should be clarified as to what duties the volunteer committee members are expected to fulfill and how that dovetails with any other participation by the Board and event sponsors.

STUDENT VOLUNTEERS

Cindy Clark (IR) and Mike Hearty (NCR) served as co-chairs for the Student Volunteers Committee for the conference. Jeff Sano had originally volunteered to represent NCR as its co-chair, but needed to resign that post, as he was being transferred to Denver effective October, 2005. NCR was fortunate to have Mike Hearty immediately step forward to assume the co-chair position for that Region. The task of this Committee was to coordinate the activities of student volunteers prior to and during the conference. Work for the committee began in earnest following the approval to proceed with ASPRS Reno 2006. Conference committee members, and in particular, the Student Volunteers Committee, met with faculty in the two Regions to begin the process of eliciting student interest and, hopefully, volunteers for the conference. The Preliminary Program contained information and a form for students to use to formally volunteer for the

conference. Announcements about Reno 2006 at other professional society gatherings sparked inquiries from interested students, as well. Below included is Cindy Clark's final report for the Student Volunteers Committee.

Final Report of the Student Volunteers Committee by Cindy Clark

***My work as the Volunteer Coordination co-chair was an experience, which for the most part was a valuable lesson learned. There were things I did that could have worked better and things that worked well. My Co-chair Mike Hearty was great to work with.

There are a few things I would like to suggest, to make the next chair's experience a little easier.

- A guide for the Chair of the Volunteers would be great:
 - As a committee member, I was given a Thick book on the conference protocol. This was given to me at least a year before I started working on getting the volunteers together. I have since put it away. I needed something with quick instructions in it to the many different questions I received as students began to register for volunteering.
- First Instruction for all Volunteer Chairs -- READ GUIDELINES FOR VOLUNTEERS
 - I made mistakes in my assignments for volunteers, because I didn't read the guidelines for the volunteers.
- Second Instruction for all Volunteer Chairs – read the GUIDELINES FOR CHAIR OF VOLUNTEERS
 - If there was a short list (such as that for the volunteers) of things the Chair should do, with would help, including the times when the volunteers should be at each event. Yes the chair is supposed to read the volunteers' guideline, and the volunteers' are suppose to read the guidelines, but they didn't. So having these times in the guidelines for the Chair would be great. (Not in the BIG Conference book, that gets lost, or its too hard to use).
 - Also, a template for setting up the schedule, with the amount of minimum amount of volunteers needed for each event would be wonderful. That was a guess for me.
 - Having a list of answers to some of the dumb questions that are asked supplied to the Chairs would be good. Less work for Anna Marie. Below are some of the questions I was asked over and over.
 - If I was a fulltime student last year, but am employed this year and can't afford to come, if I enroll in a class can I volunteer this year.
 - I can only come for these many days, and work for only these many hours, can I still volunteer. (I said yes, because I

- needed all the bodies I could find, but others might not want to accommodate)
- Can I get an official invitation letter from National Headquarters
- I have already registered, but now I'm volunteering, how can I get a refund.
- How do I register, now that I have volunteered? Can I still register on line?
- How do I find the PDF file to fax in my registration form?
- I know this is hard, but on the volunteer registration form, could there be a line that would have the person give an estimation of their ability to speak English, say on a scale of 1-10. This is a way for the chairs to schedule those that are not as fluent in English to places where their language skills might not be as challenged.
- On the registration form, there should be a place to let the chair person know where the volunteer is staying, if it's at the host hotel, or if it is at another hotel. And when exactly is the volunteer arriving in the host city.
- A cell phone number of the volunteer would be nice, to help to keep track of the volunteer, before and during the conference.

I think that should be enough suggestions for making it easier for the next Chair of Volunteers. I would like to commend all my volunteers. They worked hard, and did all that I asked them to do.

Thank you for the experience of coordinating the volunteers. I hope that my suggestions will be of value to others during future conferences. ***

POSTER SESSIONS

Lloyd Blackburn (IR) served as Poster Session Coordinator. His responsibilities included coordination with the Technical Program co-chairs and ASPRS HQ staff to determine the details about venues and about posters to be presented at Reno 2006. Below included is Lloyd Blackburn's final report as Poster Session Coordinator.

Final Report of the Poster Session Coordinator by Lloyd Blackburn

***I participated as the Intermountain Regional Director.

I helped where ever help was needed.

My primary job at the Conference was to take care of the Poster Presentations next to the Exhibitors Hall. The second item I completed was photos for documentation.

I have several comments and some suggestions for the Poster Presentations.

Let me first give you some statistics.

Wednesday, the first official day of the Conference: 11 out of 23 (47.8%)

Thursday, the second official day of the Conference: 10 out of 25 (40%)

Friday, the last official day of the Conference: 2 out of 22 (9%)

or what amounts to a total of 23 submitted posters out of 70 requested showings (32.86%).

WHAT A POOR SHOWING!!!

Even with this few Posters, there was still traffic in the Poster Room at all times that the Exhibitors Hall was open!

Now, I would like to make a suggestion:

First and foremost there is no real incentives to provide a Poster for a presentation. At other Professional Conferences I have attended, there have been prize awards presented at a closing Awards Luncheon.

Here is my proposition for an incentive.

4 categories with 1st place (having a blue ribbon and \$200.00), 2nd place (having a red ribbon and \$150.00) and 3rd place (having a white ribbon and \$100.00). Total expenditure would be about \$2000.00.

The 4 categories would be Government, Private, Upper Education and K-12 Education. In the six Education Awards a one year membership could be awarded by ASPRS.

I think we need to talk about something like this.

Note: There were 2 posters placed on the boards that I could not find as a submitted poster in the Program on Friday and I could not find them anywhere on the previous days' Poster Presentations, and they were removed from the boards.

My second job was completed with the preparation of digital photo documentation of the Conference. I have 110 photos that may be used to help

support the wrap-up Documentation. Please let me know where I can send the photo-CD.

It has been really great working with you-all. Thanks!!!! I would do it again if asked.***

USER GROUPS

Clay Conway (IR) served as chair for the User Group Committee. In preparation for these sessions, exhibitors were contacted regarding their interest in hosting User Group meetings. Following these contacts, twelve vendors agreed to host User Group sessions, which were made available to conference attendees, free of charge. Four such sessions were scheduled for Monday, May 1, 2006, and eight were scheduled for Tuesday, May 2, 2006. One vendor, Definiens, did not appear as scheduled for its Monday session. A packed room was disappointed and Conference planners were made aware of this disappointment. Travel delays for the Definiens staff were the cause. By and large, all User Group sessions were well-attended and user satisfaction was high. Below included is the final report by Clay Conway (IR), Coordinator for the User Groups.

Final Report of the User Group Coordinator by Clay Conway

***First, let me say that it was a pleasure to work with Anna Marie Kinerney on the User Group coordination. She is really on the ball, she got me off on the right track, and we worked well together. I also had some initial very good input from George Hepner. We accomplished the various tasks on schedule. Last fall I contacted all the vendors inviting each to sponsor a User Group meeting. Out of the 40 or so vendors we lined up 13 to do User Groups. It all went fairly well, but was a lot more work than it needed to be because most of the vendors were not very responsive. I had to make repetitive contacts even with those who gave agreed to sponsor meetings. It was especially difficult to get from them the short paragraph about their meeting that was needed for the program.

At the meeting I checked, and so did Anna Marie, to see that things went well for the User Groups. The Hilton did a good job; meeting rooms were set up properly. The vendors were generally satisfied; one company, Eagle Mapping (Nick Dudley) complained that they wanted to start setting up at 7 am for 8 am meeting and were not able to get in until about 7:30. Unfortunately two of the companies (Definiens – Markus Heynen, and Airborne Data Systems – David Fuhr) failed to show for their User Group meetings, and failed to advise us in advance. So we had some pretty unhappy meeting registrants who were sitting around wondering, along with us, what was going on. Several people complained that they came to the meeting one day, and in at least one case, two days, in advance *just to attend* the User Groups that were ‘no-shows.’ That is a

shame. I later met and talked with Markus Heynen – he had to travel from Germany and ran into unavoidable problems he said; he did not seem to be particularly troubled about it however. We had earlier gone out of our way to arrange for Definiens to have a full day instead of the normal half-day allotted. Perhaps these two companies should be denied vendor status next year? What do you think?

Well, it was a good experience overall for me, but I'm not particularly interested in doing it again. I learned a lot about how that aspect of the annual ASPRS meeting works.

Overall, the meeting was great. The social activity at the National Automobile Museum was successful. I thought the Reno Hilton was a very good venue.***

HOT TOPICS

A new type of conference offering, Interactive Networking, or known more colloquially as "Hot Topics," was provided to conference attendees. The one-hour sessions, held concurrently in a large meeting room and in groups of circled chairs to promote the desired interactive networking, were well attended. The Hot Topic sessions were held on Wednesday May 3, 2006, and provided venues for open dialogue with key ASPRS leaders. The topics were: "Certification – What's in it for me?" "State Licensure", Professional Development and Getting a job", "LiDAR – Guidelines, Applications & More", "Data Acquisition in times of disaster", and "The Future of Landsat." A repeat of the sessions occurred the following day, indicating the interest in this session. We would recommend future conferences provide this networking opportunity in the program.

CONCLUSION

Conference Co-Directors Hepner and Mikuni managed the planning of the Reno 2006 by convening only two face-to-face meetings early in the process, i.e., in May 2004, and in November 2004. Subsequent planning meetings were convened remotely. Technology, in the form of email and telephone conference calls facilitated planning among Committee members who were distributed across the geographies represented by the Intermountain and Northern California Regions, and with a meeting venue situated nearly midway between the major population centers of the IR (Salt Lake City) and NCR (San Francisco Bay Area). Throughout 2005 and early into 2006, monthly (roughly) teleconference calls enabled the Conference Co-directors, Committee members, and Anna Marie Kinerney to remain in contact and to ensure that any dialogue that required personal, interactive exchange of information be conducted in that planning environment. Email, by and large, was the predominant means of communications between and among ASPRS HQ and Committee members. In

particular, Technical Program co-chairs Foschi and Ramsey email-transmitted many megabytes of technical program abstract and review materials to that committee's review team. Content and editorial reviews for the Call for Presentation and both the Preliminary and Final Programs were similarly handled by Anna Marie Kinerney and Rae Kelley using the email systems.

In the final analysis, the Conference Co-Directors and Committee members pay tribute to Anna Marie, Rae, and the other members of the ASPRS HQ staff for their leadership, expertise, hard-work, and deft handling of the overall scope of the planning of the Reno 2006 conference. In particular, we acknowledge their extraordinary patience in overseeing the trials and tribulations of two small ASPRS Regions undertaking the massive undertaking of hosting an Annual Conference. From reports we have received about Reno 2006, our combined efforts resulted in a very well conducted and attended conference, with 1,497 badged attendees.