AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes
January 20, 2021
10:00 a.m. to 11:23 a.m.

A quorum was obtained.

A. CALL TO ORDER (Watson)
>**Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.**
>Board members present:
>>Jim Watson, Chairperson, Arizona State Museum (ASM)
>>Mary-Ellen Walsh, Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
>>Kelley Hays-Gilpin, Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA)
>>Melissa Powell, Arizona State University (ASU)

>Members of the public present:

>>Gabe McGowan (AZSITE Manager)
>>Carrie Schmidt (AZSITE Technician)
>>Karen Leone (Arizona State Museum)
>>Dan Garcia (Salt River Project)
>>Caroline Klebacha (PaleoWest Archaeology)
>>Jenni Rich (ACS)
>>Abraham Arnett (Arizona Game and Fish Department)
>>Christina Rocha (University of Arizona – RII)
>>Sarina Mann (Arizona State Museum)
>>Scott Courtwright (NRCS)
>>Ian Milliken (Pima County)

B. Introductions

1. Members of the AZSITE Board were introduced. Watson is the 2021 chair of the AZSITE Consortium Board.
2. The AZSITE Manager was introduced.

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

1. Discussion and Approval of 4th Quarter 2020 and November 17, 2020 Special Meeting
   Minutes (Watson)
   a. **Motion to approve (Watson)**
   b. **Seconded (Hays-Gilpin)**
   c. **Motion passed.**
2. Digital Data Submissions (McGowan)
   a. McGowan stated that AZSITE would like to encourage courtesy submissions, which do not go through the Archaeological Records Office, and make data submissions in

general easier through the website. Currently, submissions are saved to a CD or flash drive and mailed in. There is a secure server that can be configured to allow one-time uploading credentials. This might take a few months to be put in place. Another option would be to use a cloud-service (i.e. The Box), also using a one-time upload link. Data would then be deleted from the cloud after being secured by AZSITE.

  b. Discussion:

      i. Watson stated that this should be an acceptable situation compared to storing data on a cloud server.

      ii. Walsh inquired about the status of the web entry module.

          1. McGowan replied that the goal is to have it available by mid-2021.

      iii. Board Members agreed that submitting data needs to be as easy as possible. Since it does not change the structure of AZSITE no vote was required. The data submission method was left to the discretion of the AZSITE Manager.

3. **Financial Report (Watson)**

  a. Watson presented the current financial report. Due to the previous fee structure change, extra attention should be paid to how this is affecting the AZSITE balance.

      i. Current Balance: $166,673.00

      ii. On track to meet 2020 member subscriptions for 2021, with $130,000 to $140,000 in subscription fees.

4. **Hosting Costs (McGowan)**

  a. McGowan stated that ASU previously communicated upcoming migrations concerning the AZSITE servers. Three of the four servers are hosted at ASU University Technology Office (UTO) free of charge per an old, informal agreement.

  b. The fourth, the azsite4 server, has been hosted in a different hosting program (Server on Demand) at ASU that is being phased out. Azsite4 will be migrated to UTO with the other servers.

  c. Server migration will begin in the next two to four weeks. A rough quote for the costs associated with these changes was presented by ASU to AZSITE. The estimated cost of hosting the azsite4 server will be $3,500 a year.

  d. This cost is similar to the purported cost of hosting with Server on Demand, but billing was intermittent from this program. It appears billing will become more regular moving forward, and it is possible UTO may wish to end the informal agreement and begin charging for all four servers. The cost per server per year is estimated to be $3,500.

e. Discussion:

    i. Walsh requested that the billing arrangement be more formalized.

    ii. Powell inquired if a contract was ever signed.

        1. Board members agreed that no contract was ever signed associated with server storage.

    iii. McGowan will follow up with ASU and request an official contract.

    iv. Rocha stated that if the contract is over $10,000 there needs to be a quote and other additional information.

        1. McGowan will coordinate with Rocha concerning this contract moving forward.

5. Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee Report (Garcia)

a. Garcia presented the Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee Report. The committee met in early December and drafted a proposal that would give access of non-confidential information to Certified Local Governments (CLG) that is more detailed than the current public mapping application. The proposal outlined an updated mapping application that will include cultural resource sensitivity levels and will guide users to the appropriate offices/departments for their survey areas. The application could have different access for individuals that work for government agencies. The application would group surveys by age and have an improved land ownership layer. The following concerns for this application were discussed by the committee:

    1. Tribes should be consulted before this application is developed.

    2. Care should also be taken not to inadvertently provide site locations to users.

    3. It should be stressed that users should coordinate with the appropriate entities regarding cultural resources in their survey areas.

b. Discussion:

    i. Watson stated there is a concern that the scale and density will not be of much use to CLGs.

        1. Garcia replied that a quarter section grid size would be of more use for planning, which is currently done by the City of Phoenix. That system is designed to let users know when they need to coordinate with archaeologists.

    ii. Walsh inquired if the City of Phoenix is satisfied with their system.

       1. Garcia replied that there is a general approval. The only drawback is that they do not have dedicated GIS staff to keep the application updated.

  iii. Milliken stated that the most important aspect of this application would be to steer users to the correct avenue of information and get their requirement questions answered. The main purpose should be education.

  iv. Watson asked how realistic it would be for AZSITE to develop this application.

       1. McGowan replied that the public mapping application already exists. The effort to update it would involve changing the projection, calculating updated site density and survey history data, and improving the land ownership layer, which is already in development for all AZSITE applications. The largest effort would be creating the different tiers of access and would need a quote for the associated costs.

  v. Milliken said the goal was to keep the maintenance as minimal as possible.

  vi. Walsh stated that people currently do not use SHPO data correctly and this application could add more confusion.

       1. Courtwright stated that NCRS is also dealing with the same issue. There is concern that users may misunderstand the level of access and assume they are getting full AZSITE access.

  vii. Walsh inquired if the proposal was for one or two applications.

       1. Garcia replied that to keep maintenance at a reasonable level, the committee decided on one application.

  viii. Powell inquired about the security of the public mapping application and if there is an application process.

       1. Garcia replied that an application process was not considered in committee discussions.

       2. McGowan stated that currently anyone can create a public account and access the public mapping application. He has requested traffic data for the public mapping application from ASU. CLG-specific access would need an application process.

  ix. McGowan gave a demonstration of the public mapping application that is currently available on the AZSITE website.

    x. Watson requested that McGowan research the costs and time associated with the proposal to report to the board.

6. Legislative Updates (Garcia & Klebacha)

  a. Klebacha reported on legislative updates. There is currently no legislation concerning archaeology or AZSITE.

7. AZSITE Updates (McGowan & Schmidt)

  a. McGowan reviewed the updates for the following (see attached presentation for more information):

    i. Backlog:

      1. Projects – 424 uploaded (16%); goal 50/week

      2. New Sites – 1.650 uploaded (21.5%); goal 125/week

        a. 5,950 in Advanced Sites Layer (77%)

      3. Site Updates – 773 uploaded (11%)

    ii. Overall Uploads:

      1. 2020 Summary:

        a. Projects - 452

        b. New Sites - 1,084

        c. Site Updates - 752

        d. PRFs - 335

        e. Site Cards/ Site Care Updates - 322

        f. Fixes - 73

      2. January 2021 Summary:

        a. Projects - 69

        b. New Sites - 156

        c. PRFs - 6

    iii. Other Updates:

      1. New password delivery via expiring link.

      2. Credit Card transaction key updated.

      3. Mercator server now up to date.

      4. Website – working on making the website more intuitive and organized; will potentially develop a data submission page to streamline electronic submissions.

5. Standalone Entry Module – sent out to users earlier this month with training webinars taking January 13 and 15. A recording of the training will be published on the website.
6. Web Entry Module – now a main priority for AZSITE.
7. Tribal Lands data – removed data based on updated tribal boundaries.
8. Land ownership layer update – beginning to research improving or creating a more specific land ownership layer.
9. Topo Basemap update is in process.

b. Watson inquired if AZSITE has been reaching out to companies to see if they have shapefiles for old projects.
   i. McGowan stated this has not been successful thus far, but increased efforts may yield more results.

D. Public Comment
a. Garcia commented on the quality of work and the great level of communication by the AZSITE team. If there is a change to the fee structure for the Archaeological Records Office, then there might be more people wanting access to AZSITE. There should be more vocalization on improvements. Legislative funding could be also be requested for special projects.

b. Walsh suggested publishing information about surveys and that there is not an expectation to keep re-surveying the same areas.

c. Watson stated there is a need to have an annual AZSITE report summarizing the progress made during the previous year.

E. Date and Time of Next Meeting
a. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 21, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. The meeting will be on Zoom.

F. Adjournment
a. Meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.