

# **AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes**

**April 29, 2020**

**10:03 a.m. to 11:51 a.m.**

A quorum was obtained.

## **A. CALL TO ORDER (Walsh)**

**Meeting called to order at 10:03 a.m.**

Board members present:

Mary-Ellen Walsh, Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)  
Melissa Powell, Arizona State University (ASU)  
Jim Watson, Arizona State Museum (ASM)  
Kelley Hays-Gilpin, Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA)

Members of the public present:

Gabe McGowan (AZSITE Manager)  
Christina Rocha (ASM)  
Margaret Hangan (US Forest Service)  
Megan Fuller (Applied Cultural Ecology)  
Gene Rogge (AECOM)  
Ian Milliken (Pima County)  
Teresa Gregory (Statistical Research, Inc./Arizona Army National Guard)  
Ryan Johnson (Arizona State Land Department)  
Brendan Fjerstad (SWCA)  
Jenni Rich (Archaeological Consulting Services)  
Stewart Deats (EnviroSystems Management)  
Caroline Klebacha (PaleoWest Archaeology)  
Ashley D'Elia (Tierra Right of Way)  
Barb Montgomery (Tierra Right of Way)  
Karen Leone (ASM)  
Sarah Herr (Desert Archaeology)  
Steve Swanson (Environmental Planning Group)  
Dan Garcia (Salt River Project)  
Cara Lonardo (Environmental Planning Group)  
Chris Rayle (North Wind Resources Consulting)  
Ryan Arp (Environmental Planning Group)  
Chris Papalas (ASU)  
John D Hall (Terracon)  
Kathryn Turney (Yavapai County)  
Michael O'Hara (Arizona State Land Department)  
Lynn Neal (LA Neal Consulting)  
Lauren Jelinek (Bureau of Reclamation)

## **B. Introductions**

1. Members of the AZSITE Board were introduced
2. The AZSITE Manager was introduced
3. Members of the public attending the meeting were introduced

**C. Agenda Items** – The Board may consider or take action on any of the following:

1. Discussion and Approval of 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2020 Meeting Minutes (Walsh)
  - a. Motion to approve by Watson
  - b. Seconded by Hays-Gilpin
  - c. Minutes approved with a roll call vote of the board.
2. AZSITE Updates (McGowan)
  - a. Large data requests
    - i. Salt River Project – requesting data for approximately 27,000 square miles within their water and power service territories, transmission system, generation facilities, habitat conservation areas, proposed renewable generation and storage areas. SRP asks for this to be a standing request that can be updated in the future by the AZSITE manager without additional board approval.
      1. Watson asks if this request would be necessary in the future if Mercator server access is expanded. McGowan says no, but data clips would still be available as a service to these users.
      2. Motion to approve by Watson. Seconded by Powell. Approved by roll call vote of the board.
    - ii. AECOM – requesting data for approximately 400 square miles in a one-mile-wide path spanning the east-west extent of the state. This data is for a confidential client and would be used for a critical issues analysis.
      1. Walsh asks that the data are protected in the NEPA and public participation process when the project gets to that point. Rogge says they will comply.
      2. Hays-Gilpin moves to approve. Seconded by Powell. Approved by roll call vote of the board.
  - b. Server upgrades
    - i. ASU ISSR has been working on migration of AZSITE from Windows Server 2012, SQL Server 2012 and ArcGIS Online 10.2 to Windows Server 2019, SQL Server 2019 and ArcGIS Online 10.7. This migration is scheduled to take place the weekend of May 9. The migration is necessary because the older software packages are out of support and will improve stability and performance.
    - ii. The server hardware upgrades approved at the February meeting will be conducted after the software upgrades are complete, in May and June. The goal is for completion by the end of June.
  - c. SHPO-AZSITE data flows
    - i. McGowan has been in discussion with Vince Schiavitti (SHPO), Ayan Mitra (ASU) about reestablishing flows of SHPO data into AZSITE. McGowan and Mitra have found and are planning to consolidate scripts that comprised the old workflow for attributes received from SHPO; Schiavitti is working on a script to share the data. The issues to be dealt with are Oracle (SHPO) – SQL Server (AZSITE) compatibility and working within both programs’ security constraints. There is a coordinated approach to deal with attribute

data; additional work is required to determine what has been done in the past for transfer of GIS data.

1. Walsh notes that the GIS data, except the historic structures data, are legacy data that have not been updated, so this will not be necessary.
- d. Filter-by-agency feature for sites layer
  - i. McGowan has been cleaning up thousands of errors and inconsistencies in the AZSITE sites data agency field so that this field provides a useful way to filter the data by agency. He will be working to implement a filter-by-agency feature in the web applications. This is a short-term answer to the goal of breaking the sites layer into sub-layers by agency. Those with Mercator access can now run their own definition queries on that layer.
- e. USGS Quads layer update
  - i. McGowan corrected several errors and gaps in this dataset and the corrected data will be uploaded at some point this week,
- f. Entry module
  - i. McGowan has been working on an update to the Microsoft Access standalone entry module, which ideally is completed and included with ARO submissions, and is typically used by the ARO as the basis for a site card. The ARO had requested the addition of several fields, and changes to the site summary report output, so that the output is closer to a complete site card and requires less work by them, thus improving the rate of curation.
  - ii. That work will feed into work on the web entry module. McGowan is focusing on the web entry module as the modern version of the standalone entry module. The ARO's feedback on the web entry module was similar to that for the standalone entry module (additional fields, more complete from the site card perspective). McGowan is working with ASU and hopes to begin making progress over the summer; the beta version works. Progress will depend on ASU availability.
- g. Courtesy submissions & Correction requests
  - i. McGowan has not had time to think about these items in detail. Ideally, courtesy submissions should include a completed entry module along with project/site shapefiles. This will minimize McGowan's effort for uploading. He notes that project shapefiles should represent the actual area surveyed; e.g., rather than a line representing a right-of-way or points representing boring locations, submissions should include polygons representing the actual survey coverage.
  - ii. McGowan hopes to develop a form for correction requests, possibly a spreadsheet, in which users can indicate which attributes need changes and what should be changed. This will allow him to pick up the information with a script. Boundary changes will require consultation with the ARO, unless they are obvious errors, misprojections, etc. Shapefiles representing the desired boundary should be submitted for these.
- h. La Plaza site consolidation
  - i. In March, 15 sites were consolidated into AZ U:9:165(ASM) by ARO decision. The new boundary, updated attributes and updated site cards are available on AZSITE.
- i. Large addition of backlog sites to advanced sites layer
  - i. In early April, McGowan and Christina Jenkins (ARO) compiled as many UTM center points for backlog original site submissions as possible and added them to the Advanced Sites Layer. About 3,500 points were added, bringing the total of backlog original submission site center points in this

layer to about 6,200. The effort is ongoing, and the goal is 100% coverage of these sites in AZSITE.

- j. Backlog update and discussion
  - i. McGowan provides a PowerPoint presentation providing an update on the backlog from his perspective as the AZSITE Manager. He notes that some of the numbers in the presentation relating to counts of already uploaded data are approximate, due to typos and incompleteness in the data.
  - ii. There are three primary pools of data available to AZSITE:
    - 1. ARO site card backlog, consisting of old fee structure projects submitted before July 1, 2018. These items are awaiting ARO curation. ARO has been short-staffed for a long period but were recently able to make a new hire with an exemption from UA hiring freeze. This will allow them to begin devoting more person-hours to curation within the next several months.
    - 2. AZSITE backlog, a small pool of older projects passed on to AZSITE by the ARO prior to the new fee structure. There are fewer of these items (32 projects vs. 2,586 in site card backlog; 183 new sites vs. 7,864; 7,125 updates vs. 303). There were also 229 new site cards and 85 new PRFs in this backlog which were uploaded.
    - 3. Newer submittals, which have been prioritized in an organized workflow by ARO under the new fee structure with the goal of preventing and backlog growth. Negative submissions from this pool are available for AZSITE upload.
  - iii. ARO Site Card backlog – Projects
    - 1. 2,586 projects, most (2,072) with shapefiles, a key factor for upload readiness. McGowan has a script for batch upload of projects with shapefiles.
    - 2. 2,444 of these have sites associated, which require curation. Most of these projects have shapefiles. 131 of these projects have already been uploaded.
    - 3. 142 of these projects are negative surveys, again mostly with shapefiles, about half of which have already been uploaded.
  - iv. ARO Site Card backlog – Sites
    - 1. 14,989 sites, 151 of which are known to be on tribal land
    - 2. 7,713 original submissions (new sites) not known to be on tribal land. Of these:
      - a. 6,171 are in the AZSITE Advanced Sites Layer (80%)
      - b. ~500 are in AZSITE Sites (6%)
      - c. ~1000 are not in AZSITE at all (14%). ARO and McGowan will continue pursuing center points for these sites; about half have shapefiles but these data are problematic.
    - 3. 7,119 updates to sites not known to be on tribal land. Of these:
      - a. Up to ~600 are already in AZSITE (based on accession number)
      - b. At least ~6,500 are not in AZSITE.
    - 4. Of the original submissions, ~6000 have shapefiles and ~2600 are known to have entry modules (up to as many as ~5300 may have entry modules). These are the two key components for upload readiness from the AZSITE perspective; however, these data require vetting by ARO. McGowan has scripts for batch uploads of sites that have entry modules and shapefiles. Entry modules are often but

not always the starting point for site cards; if a site is passed to AZSITE without an entry module, McGowan will need to make one (or tabulate the data in a similar fashion) prior to upload.

5. McGowan & ARO have discussed the possibility of conducting batch project uploads, while associated sites await curation. In the case of updates to sites already in AZSITE, history entries and remarks addendums could be uploaded. In the case of new sites, project boundaries could be uploaded with remarks indicating the presence of sites, allowing users to consult the Advanced Sites Layer and PRFs for their background research.
- v. Newer Submissions
    1. 161 projects have been reviewed and approved by ARO since July 1, 2018 and are queued for curation. These include 114 new sites and 79 site updates.
    2. Many additional projects and sites have been received and are in review/revisions.
    3. PRFs from this pool are uploaded as they become available (128 so far this year).
    4. 120 negative projects are available for upload
  - vi. Conclusions:
    1. Upload priorities:
      - a. Remaining AZSITE backlog
      - b. Remaining Site Card backlog negatives
      - c. Negative projects from newer submissions
      - d. Remaining Site Card backlog center points (Advanced Sites)
    2. Secondary priorities:
      - a. Site Card Backlog update projects and site links
      - b. Site Card Backlog projects with new sites partial uploads
    3. ARO hire will increase rate of curation, allowing additional backlog uploads.
  - vii. Discussion:
    1. Walsh asks if AZSITE is ready to hire assistant to McGowan and if the timing is appropriate.
      - a. McGowan says a part-time hire would be helpful in final checks of geometries, generating/correcting geometries and entry modules. Currently, there is the UA hiring freeze. With the ARO making a hire, there will be a ramp-up period as they train that person before they begin contributing in late summer. At that point we could expect ARO to begin turning data over to me, and it would be a logical time for AZSITE to bring in an assistant, if the hiring freeze does not present an issue.
      - b. Walsh says that the hire and AZSITE's progress is a priority for the governor's office.
      - c. Powell asks if McGowan is furloughed. Watson and Rocha note that this has not been decided yet, as ASM has requested he be exempt, despite being fee-funded rather than grant-funded. Rocha recommends assuming AZSITE is affected by the furlough. Watson notes the situation evolves daily, and that ASM is arguing AZSITE is an essential

service. He does not see any reason we would not be able to get an exemption from the furlough or the hiring freeze.

- d. Walsh recommends moving forward with the hire, as people will be looking for work. Hays-Gilpin agrees.
2. Public comment in the Zoom chat.
    - a. Teresa Gregory (SRI/AANG) – last SHPO update to AZSITE was four years ago.
    - b. Dan Garcia (SRP) – Asks that with SHPO data added to AZSITE that the NRS tab in the search application be fixed to address several issues that make the data hard to interpret.
    - c. Steve Swanson (EPG) – Concerned that qualified archaeologists that have worked at La Plaza were not consulted on the consolidation.
      - i. Karen Leone (ASM-ARO) says ARO can be contacted with questions, and that the consolidation considered reports on work done in the area.
    - d. Teresa Gregory (SRI/AANG) – When she worked at ASM there was a large quantity of hard-copy data that were ready for upload, done in ARO, other than checking/digitization by GIS technicians. McGowan responds that he is the only staff currently, and that he is not certain about these data she is talking about. He can say that most of the new sites in the backlog already have shapefiles. McGowan suggests they may be talking about different things; Watson indicates the data she is talking about is old and has been dealt with.
    - e. Dan Garcia (SRP) – Concerned that the backlog sites were not listed in McGowan’s upload priorities. Walsh raises possibility of a provisional sites layer. McGowan discusses the possibility of adding these data with ‘placeholder’ sites, and that it would be feasible to create an interim layer, but it is a question of resources available to work with ASU to make it happen, as he does not have the access to do it himself. On the issue of priority, McGowan says he is meant to wait for the ARO to curate the site cards before uploading sites. He has discussed with ARO the potential for uploading projects associated with these sites but does not want to create confusion for users if the data are incomplete.
    - f. Ian Milliken (Pima County) – For data missing shapefiles, can AZSITE generate lists of projects by organization and request the data. McGowan responds that he did generate those lists but did not make it to the point of sending the data requests due to the quantity of available data.
    - g. Brendan Fjerstad (SWCA) – CRM consultants need site locations for clients; ARO visits are burdensome, especially considering the pandemic.

### 3. Financial Report (Watson)

- a. Starting balance of nearly \$208,000
- b. Income over past couple months, beginning in December: about \$163,000
- c. Expenses so far: \$78,000

- d. Encumbrances: Additional funds through end of the fiscal year, at which point new encumbrances will come onto the books. These are primarily McGowan's salary.
- e. AZSITE fund is currently flush, and a good time to make structural changes using those monies. Monthly billing from ASU may increase as we make these changes. Nonetheless, a two-month billing for February-March was recently received and the total was similar to, but slightly higher, than the average of around \$3,000 per month.
- f. Watson will wait to discuss budget forecast at next meeting.

**4. Mercator server access (Watson)**

- a. This is a separate item from the fee proposal for a specific reason. The fee proposal is for next year (2021); many are concerned about Mercator access sooner.
- b. Watson proposes opening Mercator access following server upgrades to those who want it for the remainder of the calendar year, based on user feedback including via the 2019 fee survey. The target date would be beginning of the next fiscal year (July 1, 2020).
- c. Watson notes this may upset those who have already paid for Mercator access.
- d. Watson opens the floor for questions/feedback on this proposal.
  - i. Teresa Gregory (AANG) – AANG, a large user, is fine with this proposal.
  - ii. EPG approves of the proposal.
  - iii. Dan Garcia (SRP) approves of the proposal.
- e. Watson asks McGowan to comment on the utility of Mercator server access. McGowan says this allows users to directly add the feature services to their own mapping applications for figure production and research, rather than requesting a data clip.
- f. Hays-Gilpin motion to approve.
- g. Watson seconds.
- h. Approved by unanimous roll call vote.

**5. 2021 AZSITE Fee Proposal (Watson)**

- a. This is available on the AZSITE website for people to review on their own.
- b. A switch to a per-user pricing model, rather than by organization provides companies and individual users with more flexibility.
- c. If a company needs a lot of accounts, they can still get them at a comparable or better rate. Allows companies to only purchase Mercator access for those (e.g. GIS staff) that need them, while more field-focused staff can have regular level access at a lower cost.
- d. Single Calendar Month and 30 Non-consecutive Days accounts collapsed into a single 30 day account pricing.
- e. Educational pricing is also per head and will end up being cheaper for most organizations due to the number of users.
- f. If we maintain a similar number of users, we will maintain a similar income level.
- g. Comments:
  - i. Many firms like the structure
  - ii. Lynn Neal (LA Neal Consulting) - Why no Mercator access for 30 day account?
    - 1. Watson says this could be up for discussion, but that the concern was users getting a cheap account, short-term, and downloading data that they will use beyond the 30 day period. The structure attempts to strike a balance on this issue.



2. Lynn Neal – says these prices are much better but are still significant for small firms, even if Mercator access was available for the short-term account.
  3. Powell asks about projected revenue under this structure, with the concern about long-term financial sustainability.
    - a. Watson discusses budget modeling. He says the base requirement is around \$130,000 annually, which includes ASU maintenance but not major improvements. McGowan has tried to map current user base into the new fee structure. The result indicated income between \$120,000 and \$140,000 in nearly all cases.
    - b. Walsh notes that improvements in AZSITE will bring in more investment.
  4. Milliken – why doesn't the fee structure include a discount for public agencies as discussed at the February 2020 meeting?
    - a. Watson – The goal was simplicity and flexibility in pricing, with multiple categories of user allowed within organizations.
  - h. Walsh proposes waiting to vote on this until the next meeting after further discussion. McGowan will send the fee proposal to the users and take feedback.
  - i. Will send this out to users for feedback, will vote at future meeting
6. Update on the AZSITE Advisory Board (Walsh)
- a. No update from the governor's office and don't expect one in the foreseeable future due to the pandemic.
  - b. Walsh suggests creating an ad-hoc board in the interim, which Dan Garcia (SRP) has suggested.
  - c. Walsh motion to create ad-hoc board.
    - i. Individuals can contact the AZSITE board if they wish to be part of the board.
  - d. Seconded by Watson. Approved by unanimous roll-call vote
  - e. Walsh will work with McGowan to produce a form for people to apply to be on the ad-hoc advisory board.

#### **D. Public Comment**

- a. Teresa Gregory (AANG) – Asks about courtesy submissions, if there is a cost. AANG has a large quantity of data they would like to submit. McGowan says there is no cost, and he would like to develop a process/form. For now, users should contact him directly. In this case it is a large quantity of data, so would need to work out a specific transfer protocol.
  - i. Walsh asks how such submissions would be prioritized versus the backlog. McGowan says the submissions would be held to a high degree of completeness (shapefiles and entry module). Complete submissions require little additional effort on his part to upload.
  - ii. Gregory – projects on AANG land, some with ASM numbers, some only AANG numbers. Will email McGowan directly regarding the submission.
  - iii. Milliken – asks if the data are in the format required, can the source of the data be indicated, to prevent confusion. McGowan says the agency field of the sites





**F. Establish Date and Time of Next Meeting –**

- a. The next Board meeting is scheduled for July 29, 2020, 10:00 a.m.
- b. Tentative in-person meeting at MNA

**G. Meeting adjourned at 11:51 a.m. (Motion by Walsh)**