

AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes

**November 17, 2020
9:00 a.m. to 9:49 a.m.**

A quorum was obtained.

A. CALL TO ORDER (Walsh)

Meeting called to order at 9:00 a.m.

Board members present:

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

Members of the public present:

Gabe McGowan (AZSITE Manager)
Carrie Schmidt (AZSITE Technician)
Dan Garcia (Salt River Project)
Caroline Klebacha (PaleoWest Archaeology)
Jenni Rich (ACS)
Karen Leone (Arizona State Museum)
Abraham Arnett (Arizona Game and Fish Department)
Sarah Herr (Desert Archaeology)
Scott Courtright (NRCS)
Ian Milliken (Pima County)
Christopher Nicholson (Arizona State University)

B. Introductions

1. Members of the AZSITE Board were introduced
2. The AZSITE Manager was introduced

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

1. Promote AZSITE GIS Technician to 1.0 FTE (Walsh)
 - a. Walsh inquired how long, in years, will it take to complete the backlog and if additional funding is required.
 - i. McGowan responded that as of this week there are approximately 2,241 projects (1803 or 80% with shapefiles) remaining in the backlog, and approximately 6,396 new sites (5,078 or 80% with shapefiles).
 - ii. A goal is to get 500 new sites and 150 projects processed a month, which would be a combination of work by the GIS Technician and AZSITE Manager. If meeting these goals, then it is estimated the backlog will be cleared in a calendar year. If effort levels increase on the backlog, this

timeline could be moved up. This is also with the assumption that AZSITE is vetting the data to maintain a level of consistency and checking data against reports.

- iii. Walsh inquired if the Archaeological Records Office (ARO) is the main office checking the site boundaries against reports.
 - 1. McGowan replied that the ARO does do this, but AZSITE has been allowed to upload sites prior to ARO curation on the condition that AZSITE is checking the boundaries and attributes.
- iv. Walsh inquired about the ARO timeline for new projects.
 - 1. Leone stated that currently the plan is for projects to be processed weekly and stay up to date. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the office is currently behind schedule.
- v. Walsh inquired if the board should start looking for temporary funding to work down the backlog, which would be used to move the part-time GIS Technician position to a full-time position.
 - 1. Watson said the current AZSITE budget is enough to cover moving the position to full-time. The University is still under a hiring freeze, but there should not be an issue because it does not involve university funding. The likely implementation date would be after January 1, 2021. It is also an option to hire another part-time position.
- vi. Powell asked if the board could vote on changing the position to full-time or should just be discussing at this time.
 - 1. Walsh replied that a vote could take place during this meeting.
- vii. Leone stated that it would be good to start with two full time AZSITE positions and then determine if additional positions are needed.
- viii. **Motion:**
 - 1. **Watson moved for the GIS Technician position to be moved to full-time.**
 - 2. **Seconded by Hays-Gilpin.**
 - 3. **Motion passed unanimously.**

2. Data Clip Policy (McGowan)

- a. McGowan stated that there was a discussion in late 2019 concerning the need for a data clip policy for 2020. Since this did not occur, McGowan has drafted a Data Clip Policy to use moving forward.
- b. McGowan reviewed the policy draft. The policy outlines data standards, security, and volume procedures. The main change is that data clips exceeding 1,000 sites and/or projects are not available for 30-day users. The draft policy states a turnaround time of not more than 10 business days.
 - i. Powell stated that there is concern that the policy will create extra work for the AZSITE Manager.
 - ii. Walsh stated that a 30-day turnaround time would be more realistic for large clips.
 - iii. McGowan stated that the effort is relatively minor concerning data clips but agreed to an increased turnaround for large clips.
 - 1. McGowan inquired about the fee structure for data requests.
 - 2. Watson replied that the idea was that users are paying enough already to use AZSITE, so the data requests should remain part of the regular AZSITE services included with existing fees.
 - iv. **Motion:**
 - 1. **Hays-Gilpin moved to approve the data clip policy, as revised.**
 - 2. **Seconded by Watson.**
 - 3. **Motion passed unanimously.**

3. CLG Access Policy (McGowan)

- a. McGowan reviewed the CLG (Certified Local Government) application developed and tested in 2016 and 2017, which allows CLGs to see AZSITE data within their jurisdiction boundaries and up to a mile buffer from said boundary. McGowan reviewed the CLG requirements listed in the Access Policy: *“Cultural Preservation Office staff working under the direction of City or County Cultural Preservation Officer who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Standards or CLG Commissioners who meet Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Standards.”* It was noted that most Arizona CLGs do not have staff meeting these qualifications.

- b. It was suggested that the CLG category could be expanded to CLGs lacking personnel meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards if changes to the application were made so that site boundaries are not shown.
- c. McGowan gave a demonstration of a proposed new structure for the CLG application. Based on selection geometry, users can determine if cultural resources are present or absent in their work area.
 - i. Hays-Gilpin inquired if the CLG application requires GIS personnel on staff to access, like AZSITE.
 - 1. McGowan replied that the CLG application does not.
 - ii. Walsh inquired if municipalities that only have a NEPA position would be able to use the CLG application.
 - 1. Watson replied that they would have access.
 - iii. Milliken stated that Pima County ran into issues with misinterpretation of the result “No Cultural Resources Present in Your Work Area” with their similar application. Non-professionals may think that this is confirmation of no cultural resources in their work area, as opposed to no cultural resources currently inventoried.
 - iv. Walsh stated that the interpretation of “No Cultural Resources Present in Your Work Area” can be worked into the policy, and the specific language implemented in the application could be adjusted.
 - v. Milliken recommended non-professional users should be required to read the policy before using the application.
 - vi. Powell inquired how often CLG requests have been made to AZSITE.
 - 1. McGowan replied that the only request this calendar year was from the City of Bisbee.
 - vii. Leone stated that the Permit Office currently offers a report for non-archaeologists, such as developers. The report states if there are sites within their work area and whether they need to contact a professional archaeologist. Leone restated the need for the process to be thought through carefully and for the associated documentation to provide clear interpretations.

- viii. Walsh recommended creating a working group comprised of members of the public and the AZSITE manager to work through the CLG application. Non-professionals may only be able to access this data through the ARO.
- ix. Garcia inquired if the ad-hoc committee could help with the CLG application. Garcia also discussed the current AZSITE public mapping application, which also provides some information on past surveys. Information of this nature could be integrated in the CLG application.
 - 1. Walsh agreed and requested the involvement of SHPO and ARO.
 - 2. Garcia will add as an item to the next ad-hoc committee meeting agenda.
- x. Walsh stated that the CLG application will be tabled until more information is presented to the board.
 - 1. McGowan inquired about a desired timeline for rolling out the CLG application.
 - 2. Watson replied that there does not seem to be a pressing need from CLGs at this time.

D. Public Comment

- 1. Milliken stated that with the new fee structure and Mercator access, there will likely be a decline in the number of data requests. Pima County is seeing less of a need for data clips due to Mercator Access.

E. Date and Time of Next Meeting

- 1. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 20, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. The meeting will be held via Zoom.

F. Adjournment

- 1. Meeting adjourned at 9:49 a.m.