

FHP Aerial Detection Survey Ground Checks Internet Survey Results – Fall 2007

Question 1

Indicate your field of expertise.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Forester	11.5%	3
Aerial Observer	38.5%	10
Entomologist	23.1%	6
Pathologist	7.7%	2
Botanist	0.0%	0
Biologist	7.7%	2
Fire & Fuels	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)	11.5%	3
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)
1	11/13/2007 17:19:00	Biological tech ex-aerial observer
2	11/15/2007 21:08:00	aerial observer and pathologist
3	11/16/2007 18:42:00	a

Question 2

For General Overview ADS, how would you characterize the type of on-the-ground site visit you typically conduct?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Ground Check	57.7%	15
Ground Truth	15.4%	4
Accuracy Assessment	7.7%	2
Other (please specify)	19.2%	5
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)
1	11/13/2007 15:02:00	You need to define these terms. To me ground checking, ground truthing, and accuracy assessment are all the same
2	11/13/2007 17:22:00	All of the above. I check for position, type and density of host/agent
3	11/15/2007 21:09:00	check of pest and accuracy of mortality estimate
4	11/16/2007 18:30:00	all of the above
5	11/16/2007 18:43:00	Combination of Ground Check and Ground Truth

Question 3

What is/or should be the purpose for visiting areas mapped during ADS? (check all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Improve ADS Observer skills	88.5%	23
Adjust attributes for final map based on site visit	76.9%	20
Adjust area for final map based on site visit	50.0%	13
Early detection of native/non-native pests	34.6%	9
Develop accuracy statistics for ADS (assumption being to assist other analysis)	11.5%	3
Determine viability for inclusion in salvage timber sale	3.8%	1
Make available to analysts stand level data associated with ADS	3.8%	1
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 4

What proportion of the points or polygons mapped are visited on the ground?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0 - 1%	80.8%	21
>1 - 10%	19.2%	5
>10%	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 5

Are site visits well-distributed throughout the ADS region?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Well distributed to visit a range of host and damage agents	19.2%	5
Narrowly focused on areas of specific concern or question	46.2%	12
More or less random, just trying to check something given time constraints	34.6%	9
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 6

Would you visit more of the ADS area if you could?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	96.2%	25
No	3.8%	1
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 7

You answered that you would visit more ADS areas if you could. What would help you do this? (Check all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Additional ADS Observers	52.0%	13
Additional assistance from other forest health personnel (e.g. entomologists, pathologists, foresters)	40.0%	10
Would benefit by transient crew to help do field work	20.0%	5
Transient crew, in lieu of observer checks, would detract from purpose of improving observer's skills	36.0%	9
Other (please specify)	20.0%	5

<i>answered question</i>	25
<i>skipped question</i>	1

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)
1	11/09/2007 18:31:00	More time at the end of survey season. Other field work needs to be completed before weather changes.
2	11/10/2007 18:36:00	More time for ground checks
3	11/13/2007 15:08:00	Approval of comp time. Because ADS workweeks tend to be 50 plus hours, I am constantly maxing out on credit hours. As we are not allowed to accrue comp time, let alone overtime, in my down weeks I am forced to take time off so I can use up my credit hours so I have them available for my next flying week. If I could accrue comp time I could do more ground truthing in my non flying weeks. As it stands now I have no time to ground truth and once flying season ends it's the big rush to get the maps finalized, so there's no time for ground truthing then either. I don't know if this is an issue nationwide but it certainly is in region one and four where we are absolutely forbade from accruing comp or overtime.
4	11/13/2007 17:29:00	Funding, and longer summers, liason to private land observation, better access to remote wilderness areas
5	11/26/2007 19:45:00	more time avaailable to conduct checks.

Question 8

What characteristics do you record when conducting site visit? (check all that may apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
GPS coordinate	53.8%	14
Trees per acre	50.0%	13
Tree species	88.5%	23
Damage type (mortality, defoliation, flagging, etc...)	92.3%	24
Damage causing agent	92.3%	24
Polygon acreage (implies examining/adjusting area mapped during ADS)	30.8%	8
Other (snags, forest type, salvage viability)	23.1%	6
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 9

Reporting site visit details, such as stand level data and GPS coordinates would encourage inappropriate use of ADS data.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
TRUE	34.6%	9
FALSE	65.4%	17
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 10

Who is involved in ADS ground checks? (check all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
ADS Observers	100.0%	26
Other Forest Health personnel	53.8%	14
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 11

The current "Ground Check Guidelines" as developed out of ASWG 2007 help meet the intent of "A Guide to Conducting Aerial Sketchmapping Surveys", the "Aerial Survey GIS Handbook", and QA/QC as outlined in "Aerial Survey Standards" documents.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Fully	3.8%	1
Partially	46.2%	12
Not at all	0.0%	0
Don't know	50.0%	13
<i>answered question</i>		26
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 12

Thank you for participating. Please write additional comments below.	
Answer Options	Response Count
	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	14

Number	Response Date	Response Text
1	11/09/2007 02:34:00	I beleive purpose is first to aid ADS observers, that stand-level data collected would be useful in other analyses but additional uses MUST be monitored closely to gaurd against inappropriate use, accuracy assessments not feasible
2	11/09/2007 18:38:00	The primary purpose for conducting ground checks of ASD is to refine the observers skill in determining what is happening on the ground that they have surveyed. Most of the checks that I have performed indicate that things are more complex than we can detect. With this knowledge it has helped me hone my skills as an observer and to better relay conditions to others that use the ADS information. To attempt to apply statistics to this information, or apply across the board corrections to information collected would be a mistake.
3	11/09/2007 18:43:00	More and more work is required of less and less people, more and more travel is needed as travel budgets are being cut.
4	11/10/2007 18:38:00	I ground check primarily to identify unusual signatures or to verify presence of certain defoliators which cannot be reliable diagnosed from the air (eg aspen defoliation by frost vs insects vs wind). Bill Ciesla
5	11/12/2007 16:19:00	The ground checks I did were very informal. I just picked a few points that were relatively easy to get to, navigated in using a GPS unit, and looked around. Results were mixed: out of the 8 points I checked, 5 were pretty much "right on", 2 were "pretty close", and 1 was "what the hell did we put a point here for?".
6	11/13/2007 17:50:00	Ground checks should be as accurate as given time for in terms of stand composition, host and disturbing agent types. This exacting information should be used for the aerial observer for the betterment of there survey techniques. I use ArcMAP to upload GPS points in ADS ploygons of accessable areas and hyperlink photos of those points along with my description of my on the ground observations to give the observers as best a description of what was on the ground as possible.

7	11/14/2007 14:58:00	Ground checking protocols are too narrowly defined to a certain kind of ground check. When fully implemented, they take too much time and detract from the purpose of improving observer skill, which benefits more from seeing a wide variety of signatures in different stand types. They are, however, useful to some degree.
8	11/14/2007 23:13:00	I think the GT protocol as currently described is too detailed, at least for the type of checking we currently conduct in our area. While I can understand having it available for those areas needing or requiring such level of detail, it would seem a simpler protocol/standard should be included as well. For example, a point GIS file of visits with a simple set of attributes (verified tree species, agent, damage type, note field) might be a start.
9	11/19/2007 19:22:00	Not all ADS done using DASMMapping, and the form is set up for DASM polygon info, etc. Make the form universal for DASM or paper maps.
10	11/21/2007 15:44:00	Ground check area too small a sample at 1% to be a viable statistic, and not enough time and money to back to so. It is useful to the observer to tweak his eye/hand style, and so improve accuracy.
11	11/21/2007 20:55:00	More emphasis on ground checking is needed at training events.
12	11/26/2007 19:48:00	Note - I am from British Columbia, Canada.