AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes

April 14th, 2025
10:03 a.m. to 10:59 a.m.

A quorum was obtained.

A. CALL TO ORDER (Jim Watson)

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

Board members present:

Jim Watson, Chair (2025), Arizona State Museum (ASM)

Christopher Caseldine, Arizona State University (ASU)

Jeff Burns, Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA)

Erin Davis, sitting in for Mary-Ellen Walsh, Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, (SHPO)

Members of the public present:

Gabe McGowan (AZSITE Manager)

Ellie Maria Renteria (AZSITE GIS Technician)

Lesley Rodriguez (Logan Simpson)

Cristina Rocha (UA RII)

Stephanie Bosch (AZTEC)

Tim Goddard (ASM ARO)

Dan Garcia (Salt River Project)

Scott Courtright (NRCS)

Abraham Arnett, City of Mesa Archaeologist

B. Introductions

1. Members of the AZSITE Board were introduced.

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

1. **Discussion and Approval of 1st Quarter 2025 Meeting Minutes** (Watson)

   a. *Motion to approve (Caseldine)*

   b. *Seconded (Burns)*

   c. *Approved (Unanimous)*

2. **Finance Report and FY 2026 Draft Budget** (McGowan)

   a. McGowan presents finance report:

      1. University of Arizona Financials FY25 fund summary dated 4/5/25

         a. Beginning balance: $133,719

         b. Total income: $403,838

            1. McGowan notes there was an interdepartmental transfer from UITS for approx. $165,000 in February. ASM's representative at the RII business center (Rocha) may be able to speak to why this occurred.

2. The Board recognized Rocha to speak (Watson)
   1. Rocha notes that the $165,000 is reimbursement for AZSITE staff salaries, as the AZSITE team came back from the UITS centralization that occurred as part of the response to the UA financial crisis in late 2023. The salary base was calculated based on the previous AZSITE Database Technician, as well as the portion from the ASM Database Manager at the time. These funds are not going to be divided elsewhere.
   2. Watson notes that we can treat that $165,000 as AZSITE's money.
   3. Rocha notes that FY24 carryforward funds were frozen by the UA as part of the financial action plan. All sales accounts did not carry forward funds, and even though the funds still show up in AZSITE's account they are not actually there - the analytics have not caught up with the UA's actions. ASM has requested to get the full amount back, but we are unsure if that will happen.
   4. Watson notes that the UA responded to the financial crisis two years ago with two steps, 1) they centralized IT job categories and 2) they froze all carry forward and all units had to justify why they needed the funds and why it wasn't spent in FY23. It wasn't a fund sweep; it was a funds freeze or temporary stay. AZSITE was subject to that, and Watson argued that those were not UA funds.
   5. McGowan notes that the freeze on carryforward funds will bear on everything else forthcoming, as he was unaware that the $133K carryforward balance had been frozen.
   6. McGowan inquires if the upshot of this discussion is that AZSITE lost $133K and gained $165K. Rocha replies that this is accurate.
   c. Total expense + encumbrances: $126,865 + $65,017 = ($191,882)
   d. Current balance: $410,691
   e. Uncommitted cash: $344,774
2. Updated financial numbers from 4/14/2025
   a. Beginning balance: $133,719 (should be considered gone)
   b. Total income: $406,938 [$241,780 not including $165K transfer]
   c. Total expense + encumbrances: ($200,388)
   d. Financial year balance: $41,392

     e. Uncommitted cash: $340,269 [$175,111 not including $165K transfer]

     a. Outstanding invoices: $35,870

3. User Applications and Billing (Table 1)

     a. McGowan notes that we are seeing slightly fewer users than last year. The amount invoiced has increased with the fee increase and exceeds the amount invoiced for the entirety of calendar year 2024.

4. Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Projected vs Actuals

     a. Personnel costs: $162,969 projected; $154,137 actual/remaining projected.

          1. McGowan notes these are lower than expected due to the Database Manager departure and the new Database Technician starting the FY at half time

     b. Operations costs: $38,727 projected; $33,818 actual/remaining projected.

          1. McGowan notes that these costs are lower than anticipated, despite the additional cost of a new workstation for the Database technician.

          2. McGowan notes AZSITE has not yet used all our conference and training allocation. AZSITE may be sending one person to the Historic Preservation conference next month.

          3. McGowan notes these numbers exclude UA fees on income and expenditures, which are not being collected this fiscal year.

5. Fiscal Year 2026 Draft Budget

     a. *Without* UA fees (assumes fees on income and expenditures are not collected in FY26)

          1. Projected personnel costs: $179,976

               1. McGowan notes this number includes some effort from a new ASM Database Manager in anticipation of that position being hired, as that position historically supervises AZSITE staff; a potential San Miguel student worker ($7,500); and 2.75% salary increase the new UA President has committed to instate in October.

          2. Projected operations costs: $47,815

               1. McGowan notes additional line item for an ArcGIS Enterprise migration, to be discussed in detail later.

               2. McGowan notes a higher cost for conference and training as Renteria and McGowan hope to take an instructor-led course on ArcGIS Enterprise, to be discussed in detail later.

          3. Total projected spending: $227,791

    b. *With* UA fees (assumes UA reinstates fees on income and expenditures)

       1. Projected personnel costs: $179,976

       2. Projected operations costs: $47,775

       3. Total projected spending adjusted for UA IDC 2% on expenditures and UA 11% on income: $261,018

       4. McGowan notes this is the same budget as above but accounts for the fees

    c. Watson notes that San Miguel High School offers training to its students, where they send a student to work one day per week at ASM. ASM has been part of this program for years, and the ARO typically has a few students working with them. They tend to be pretty good employees and are cheaper than University student employes.

    d. Caseldine asks if the carry forward $133k frozen by UA were funds the users specifically paid to keep AZSITE functional, and whether the university is therefore violating the agreement the users made when they paid for AZSITE access.

    e. Watson answers that this was the argument ASM made to UA to justify keeping the carryforward funds, but that the argument was not successful. Watson notes that UA froze carry forward funds across campus.

    f. McGowan notes that, for the current fiscal year, AZSITE's income is about $240k and AZSITE's spending is about $200K. He inquires if AZSITE should assume that $40k not encumbered should not be thought of as belonging to AZSITE, either immediately or as of July 1.

    g. Rocha notes that John Arnold (Senior Vice President, Chief Operating Officer and Chief Financial Officer U of A), has stated FY25 carryforward balance will not be frozen. Based on that we can anticipate those funds being available in FY26 but she cannot state that with absolute certainty.

3. **Funds for ArcGIS Enterprise Migration Project** (McGowan)

    a. McGowan notes that the updated fiscal information, which he was previously unaware of, should inform discussion the following items.

    b. Estimated cost: $11,725 for ASU labor, hardware, and software. McGowan notes this cost does not include AZSITE personnel labor.

       1. McGowan notes that the retirement of ArcGIS Desktop in March 2026 and WebAppBuilder Developer Edition in July 2024. This means Esri does not provide help with issues, and we have to troubleshoot as best we can. Over time this will

present pressing issues. ASU GRS recommends migrating to our own ArcGIS Enterprise instance with Experience Builder Developer Edition from the current standalone ArcGIS Server with WebAppBuilder Developer Edition. This will create an internal ArcGIS Portal to manage our data, while our data store will still be SQL Server and SQL Server SDE databases. The main reason for moving to Enterprise is to support Web Experience Builder Developer Edition.

2. McGowan notes that, besides keeping within Esri support, the advantages of this project include:

a. Making it easier to develop new web apps.

b. While AZSITE would not be able to credential all users directly on the Portal due to costs, we could credential a limited number of non-AZSITE users, for example from SHPO or ARO or other partner agencies, to manage data provided by their agencies that is hosted on our Enterprise. For the bulk of our users, we would still proxy their access with application tokens, the way it is currently done.

c. Experience Builder offers more capabilities, including a much-requested ability to run a select/spatial query with data added to the web mapping app at runtime. In addition, the support for one-to-many data relationships is more advanced, making it possible to run more advanced queries like those currently available in the Attribute Search app within the Web Mapping app.

c. Project Funding

1. McGowan notes that AZSITE has applied for grant funds from the NPS Preservation Technology and Training grants program but recommends pursuing the project even if grant funding is not received.

d. Watson notes that this migration has to happen as they are phasing out the existing platform. Additionally, Renteria and McGowan should participate in the training so they can better facilitate the new system.

e. McGowan asks if there is a need for a Board vote to approve allocation of these funds.

f. Watson answers that no, this is to improve AZSITE and the expenditures are within the proposed budget, so this doesn't need to be voted on separate from the budget

4. **Funds for ArcGIS Enterprise Training** (McGowan)

a. Esri offers an instructor-led online training called *Sharing Content in ArcGIS Enterprise*

b. Personnel costs: $2,020 per attendee, total $4,040. Offered once or twice per month.

c. McGowan notes that key training content for our use case includes sharing content with different access roles, user-managed data, basemap and operational layer optimization.

d. McGowan recommends that at least one AZSITE staff complete this training.

5. **Funds for San Miguel Intern** (McGowan)

   a. Cost: $7,500 per year; students work 1-2 days per week

   b. McGowan notes that a student worker could assist with review of documents for tribal land, data entry, and, potentially, digitization of GIS data from documents and that the ARO has had good outcomes from this program

6. **Approval of FY26 Budget as proposed** (Watson)

   a. Caseldine inquires if it would be best to try to spend the FY surplus rather than carrying over.

   b. Watson notes that the CFO has said it will <u>not</u> be frozen in the coming year.

      a. *Motion to approve (Caseldine)*

      b. *Seconded (Davis)*

      c. *Approved (Unanimous)*

7. **Access Policy Update** (McGowan) ([Attachment A](#))

   a. McGowan notes that at our last meeting, Walsh suggested amending the AZSITE Access Policy with an additional requirement for organizations without qualified archaeology staff, the completion of the SRPMIC Cultural Sensitivity training. This would be in addition to the currently required AZSITE Data Sensitivity Training.

   b. McGowan notes that this training is recorded and available online and thus directing AZSITE users to it would not cause a burden to SRPMIC personnel.

   c. Proposed change ([Link to current policy (revised 2022)](#):

      1. New subpoint *b* to *V:1* stating "individual users agree to complete the online Cultural Sensitivity Training provided by the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community"

      2. McGowan notes this would go into effect calendar year 2026.

8. **Approval of Change to Data Access policy** (Watson)

   a. *Motion to approve (Caseldine)*

   b. *Seconded (Burns)*

   c. *Approved (Unanimous)*

9. **AZSITE Updates** (McGowan)

   a. Data Uploads overall ([Table 3](#))

b. AZSITE Interface

    1. McGowan notes the ARO updated their workflows (Attachment B) for the transfer of data to AZSITE, and AZSITE is updating our workflows in response. The big change is the decoupling of Sites Cards from Projects with Sites, which means many more new site recordings and site updates (including boundary updates) are available to upload to AZSITE.

c. Updated Metrics (Table 2)

d. Date Clip/Fix requests (Table 4)

e. Advisory Framework

    1. McGowan notes that all "current" members of the AZSITE Advisory Committee are no longer eligible or wish to resign their positions. We have had applicants for the State Agency and Federal Agency representative positions and will be seeking applicants for the Tribal Preservation Office and CRM representatives.

    2. McGowan notes that AZSITE has developed a detailed user feedback survey, to collect data to help prioritize and guide future improvements to AZSITE.

f. Data

    1. McGowan notes that the ASM Library and Archives catalog has migrated and AZSITE has crosswalked the links from AZSITE's reference data to the new system.

    2. McGowan notes that the NPS Data Sharing agreement was approved for funding by NPS leadership and the project will move forward once the payment is received.

g. Development

    1. McGowan notes that work has begun on a new AZSITE user management application in the UA Cooperative Extension Quickbase environment, which was used by the ASM Mandated Programs for their new Quotes and Invoicing application.

    2. McGowan notes AZSITE is working on new GIS feature services that will consolidate several existing feature services, provide additional attributes for core layers, and update reference data layers. These will serve as a bridge update to AZSITE heading into the ArcGIS Enterprise migration project.

h. Grants

    1. NPS Preservation Technology and Training Grant

        a. Grant application submitted 3/3/2025; notifications typically go out in May or June.

2. South 32/AACD funds for tribal government accounts
    a. 12/16 accounts requested; will inquire with AACD about potential future funds for this purpose.

D. Public Comment
    a. No public comments

E. Date and Time of Next Meeting

Proposed Next Open Meeting: Wednesday, July 9th, 2025, time: 10:00am

Location: Zoom (https://arizona.zoom.us/j/84892911228)

F. Adjournment
    a. Motion to adjourn (Watson)
    b. Seconded (Caseldine)
    c. Approved (Unanimous)
    d. Meeting adjourned at 10:59am

Table 1: AZSITE User Applications and Billing

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
User Organizations	109	114	117	132	119
Users	331	356	373	431	395
Mercator Users	218	237	259	281	354
$ Invoiced	$126,075	$138,350	$145,900	$233,555	$ 243,395
$ Not Yet Paid	-	-	-	-	$ 35,870

Table 2: Updated Summary of Data Uploads by Year

Mean Annual (past) Total Annual (current)	2004-2014	2015-2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Projects	951	109	452	2,225	172	220	421	221
New Sites	1,497	194	1,084	4,087	1,663	696	387	77
Site Updates	-	-	752	5,033	299	360	578	259
ASM PRFs	-	-	335	231	257	361	400	98
New/Updated ASM Site Cards	-	-	322	511	405	743	169	635
ASM Reports	-	-	-	-	4	3,975	2,401	279
ASU Site Cards	-	-	-	-	117	56	810	194
MNA Reports	-	-	-	-	-	-	53	1
USFWS Site Forms	-	-	-	-	-	-	171	22
USFWS Survey Reports	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	8
SHPO Site Info Entries	-	-	-	-	-	872	982	71
SHPO Project Info Entries	-	-	-	-	-	1,266	1,456	366
SHPO NRHP Eligibility Dets.	-	-	-	-	-	806	812	72

Document Type	Total Available to AZSITE	Document Uploaded	On Tribal Land (not uploaded)	AZSITE has GIS data?
ASU Site Forms	1,182	1,177 (99%)	2 (0.2%)	699 (59%)
MNA Project Reports	970	54 (6%)	-	54 (6%)

Data Type	Total Available to AZSITE	Data Uploaded	Document Uploaded
USFWS Sites	421	214 (51%)	191 (45%)
USFWS Projects	25	20 (80%)	18 (72%)

Table 3: Summary of Upload Progress, ASM New Fee Structure

Type	Total Available to AZSITE	Uploaded	Outstanding
ARO/PO/Repo PRFs	1,626	1,626 (100%)	0 (0%)
ARO/PO Reports	1,564	1,216 (78%)	348 (22%)
REPO Reports	60	1 (2%)	59 (98%)
ARO/PO Negative Surveys	903	800 (89%)	103 (11%)
ARO/PO Projects w/ Sites	290	127 (44%)	163 (56%)
Original Site Recordings	409	16 (4%)	393 (96%)
Site Updates	627	255 (41%)	372 (59%)
Site Cards	544	544 (100%)	0 (0%)

Table 4: Data Clip and Fix Requests

Clips	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Requests	48	46	51	200	102	176	45

Fixes	2023	2024	2025
Requests	3	62	17
Closed	3	61	17

Attachment A: Access Policy Proposed Change

V. Requirements for Organizations Without Qualified Archaeology Staff

1. State and federal agencies, National Park Service-certified CLGs, other local governments, and public utilities without staff meeting the applicable qualifications described in item **IV** above may be granted access to AZSITE if the following conditions are met:
   a. All individual users agree to complete data sensitivity training provided by AZSITE and partner organizations.
   b. All individual users agree to complete the online Cultural Sensitivity Training provided by the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community.
   c. All individual users are approved for access following a review by the SHPO. Factors influencing the decision to grant access include:
      i. Cultural resources management responsibilities.
      ii. Need for access to archaeological information in AZSITE.
      iii. The existence of a cultural resources management program at the organization.

Attachment B: Updates ARO Workflows; Data to AZSITE

ARO TRANSFER TO AZSITE

Project Registration Forms (PRF)

All PRFs for projects submitted to the Archaeological Records Office for curation that have been reviewed and approved are available to AZSITE.

All PRFs for projects submitted to the Permits Office for curation because they are under a AAA Project-Specific Permit and artifacts are not curated at ASM, which have been reviewed and approved and are available to AZSITE.

The ASM Repository is still working on making PRFs for projects curated at ASM under ASM Repository Agreements systematically available to AZSITE, as these were never historically uploaded to AZSITE.

Archaeological Reports

All scanned reports for projects submitted to the Archaeological Records Office for curation that have been reviewed and approved are available to AZSITE. AZSITE staff will need to review them for Tribal Land.

All scanned reports for projects submitted to the Permits Office for curation because they are under a AAA Project-Specific Permit, and artifacts are not curated at ASM, which have been reviewed and approved and are available to AZSITE. AZSITE staff will need to review them for Tribal Land.

The ASM Repository is still working on making scanned reports for projects curated at ASM under ASM Repository Agreements systematically available to AZSITE, as these were never historically uploaded to AZSITE.

Negative Non-Collection Survey Projects

All information provided to the Archaeological Records Office (ARO), including project shapefiles, is available to AZSITE as soon as the ARO staff reviews and accepts the project.

Projects with ASM Site Numbers

These projects in the past were not made available to AZSITE until the ASM Site Card was created or updated.

The ARO has now made the AZSITE Entry Modules, shapefiles as submitted by the clients, and the site boundaries as shown on the ARO maps (not as shapefiles) available to AZSITE as of 4/2/2025 for projects under the new ASM fee structure (registered after July 1, 2018) that have gone through review by ARO staff and been accepted. Site Cards are now being provided to AZSITE separately.

The ARO is still waiting to provide AZSITE Entry Modules, shapefiles as submitted by the clients, and the site boundaries as shown on the ARO maps (not as shapefiles) to AZSITE for projects registered

before July 1, 2018, until ARO Staff have reviewed the ASM Site Cards. However, ARO is making these projects available as staff time permits.

ASM Site Cards and Site Card Updates for projects paid for after July 1, 2018

ARO is providing all new ASM Site Cards as we process them for curation. As of 4/2/2025, the ARO has made 459 New Site Cards and 41 Site Card Update components available to AZSITE.

ASM Site Cards and Site Card Updates for projects (ARO Site Card Processing Backlog)

The ARO is processing ASM Site Cards, creating Site Card Update components for existing ASM Site Cards for sites in the ARO Site Card processing backlog, and making these available to AZSITE. This process does not include reviewing the site boundary and only updates the hardcopy/PDF version of the site card. As of 4/2/2025, the ARO has made 741 New Site Cards available to AZSITE.

All project components from this backlog were already made available to AZSITE previously, including AZSITE Entry Modules, shapefiles as submitted by the clients, and the site boundaries as shown on the ARO maps (not as shapefiles) available to AZSITE.

Though these project components were made available, AZSITE did not process information about site updates at that time. As of 4/2/2025, AZSITE can now update any site update in the ARO Site Card Processing Backlog using the site boundaries found on the ARO maps, and any information included in the mandated program's database with the understanding that more details about an update will be added to the database as site cards updates are created by ARO staff. Due to this, AZSITE may need to add notes to the site history saying that more information is forthcoming and to contact the ARO for further information until the site card update is uploaded or a data fix is provided to AZSITE for the site.