

AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes

October 28, 2020

10:00 a.m. to 11:23 a.m.

A quorum was obtained.

A. CALL TO ORDER (Walsh)

Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Board members present:

Mary-Ellen Walsh, 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)
Cara Lonardo (Environmental Planning Group)
Sarina Mann (Arizona State Museum)
Mark Reavis (City of Flagstaff)
Jenni Rich (ACS)
Branden Fjerstad (SWCA Environmental Consultants)
Karen Leone (Arizona State Museum)
Margaret Hangan (Forest Service)
Ashley D'Elia (Tierra Right of Way)
Theresa Coleman (City of Bisbee)
Abraham Arnett (Arizona Game and Fish Department)
Tina Thompson (Rancher)
Michael O'Hara (Arizona Land Department)
Sarah Herr (Desert Archaeology)
Scott Courtwright (NRCS)
Ryan Arp (Environmental Planning Group)

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. Discussion and Approval of 3rd Quarter 2020 Meeting Minutes (Walsh)
 - a. **Walsh moved to approve the minutes**
 - b. **Seconded by Watson**
 - c. **Motion passed unanimously**
2. Introduction of the AZSITE GIS Technician (McGowan)

- a. McGowan introduced the new AZSITE GIS Technician, Carrie Schmidt. She is working part-time and focusing on the backlog.
- 3. Discussion and Vote on Large Data Requests (McGowan)**
- a. Arizona State Land Department – request for all project and site data from State Trust Land (9.3 million acres). They want to be able to track cultural resources on state land. Only Cultural Resources staff and GIS admin will have access to the data stored on their server. The goal is to create a separate database for cultural resources on State Trust Land. There is a concern for the time lag between publishing advanced sites and site boundaries on AZSITE.
 - i. McGowan stated that this would be one of the largest requests but would not require unusual effort on his part.
 - ii. Walsh stated that this request would conflict with AZSITE and warrants further discussion.
 - iii. Watson stated that this request is similar to the annual request made by Pima County.
 - iv. Powell stated that similar requests have been denied in the past.
 - v. Watson stated that the main concerns for previous similar requests was security. If the commitment to working with AZSITE continues, then Watson considered this a reasonable request.
 - vi. McGowan reiterated the need for honoring the security agreements.
 - vii. **Motion:**
 - 1. Watson moved to approve the data request**
 - 2. Seconded by Powell**
 - 3. Motion Passed unanimously**
- 4. Update on Servers (McGowan)**
- a. McGowan stated that the Mercator updates were completed in September. Part of the delay was comparison costs between hosting through AWS and ASU. The quote for ASU was for hosting all four servers.
 - b. McGowan explained the different servers and stated that upcoming server changes have prompted the quote for hosting all four servers.
 - i. AZSITE staff interact with the azsite4 server. Changes to made on azsite4 are replicated to the other three (azsitevbd, azsite3, Mercator) which host the web applications and the ArcGIS server datasets.

- ii. Azsite4 is hosted in a program called Server On Demand at ASU, while the other three servers are hosted with ASU's University Technology Office (UTO). Server On Demand is being phased out, and azsite4 will be migrated to UTO by the end of this calendar year.
- iii. A previous agreement has allowed for the three servers hosted at UTO to be hosted without an official fee. AZSITE has only been sporadically billed in the past for Server On Demand hosting for azsite4, but there will possibly be an increase in hosting costs connected to upcoming changes.
- iv. ISSR was concerned that migration of azsite4 to UTO would cause UTO to begin billing for hosting of all four servers, which would increase our annual expenditure on hosting quite a bit. That is why they wanted to provide comparison costs for hosting of all four servers.

5. Financial Report (Watson)

- a. Watson presented the financial report.
 - i. 2021 user applications will begin coming in soon.
 - ii. Most expenses are related to salaries.
 - iii. Current balance, including future encumbrances: \$165,892.00

6. City of Bisbee CLG Access/ CLG Application, Fee Structure & Access (Walsh)

- a. The City of Bisbee made a request for Certified Local Government (CLG) access.
 - i. Walsh initiated discussion if a fee is required for this situation.
 - ii. Watson explained the current fee structure for CLG access. For 2020, no other requests were made for CLG access. The only two accounts are related to testing conducted in 2016. CLG provides detailed access to data just in a specific municipality's jurisdiction.
 - iii. McGowan stated that to his knowledge, this service has never been fully implemented. The framework is present for this service, but additional development is still needed. Fees were discussed but never implemented. These were proposed to be \$200 for a one-time data clip, and \$5 per square mile with a floor of \$300. Discussion of CLG access dropped off after 2017 and no fee schedule was ever implemented. McGowan asked if there is still a need for this service moving forward.
 - iv. Watson stated that the primary purpose was for local governments to provide cultural resources data to their departments (i.e. utilities) in order to minimize

effects to cultural resources in their jurisdiction. It depends on the GIS capabilities of the individual governments.

- v. Coleman stated that the City of Bisbee request concerns exploring the different options available and what data can be useful for the local government.
 - 1. Walsh suggested that the best place to start would be a single use AZSITE subscription.
 - 2. Watson stated that without a GIS staff member, the local government may not qualify for AZSITE access. Therefore, CLG access would be a good resource.
 - 3. Hays-Gilpin stated that the CLG was originally discussed to maintain security while also providing local governments with access to pertinent data.
- vi. Walsh proposed delaying the fee schedule until after AZSITE options are explored concerning the City of Bisbee request. Coleman and McGowan agreed.

7. Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee Report (Garcia)

- a. Garcia presented the report from the Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee.
 - i. New members were elected at the first meeting on August 27, 2020.
 - ii. A second meeting was held October 8, 2020 to discuss ongoing goals and suggested improvements: 1) Tools and capabilities, 2) non-archaeologist access, and 3) incorporating outside data.
 - iii. The Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee will continue to work with McGowan to achieve and develop the ongoing goals.
 - iv. Walsh inquired what kind of outside data would be considered.
 - 1. Garcia described a similar system to AZSITE used by the U.S. Forest Service that could possibly be incorporated in AZSITE.
 - 2. McGowan stated that discussion of data transfer with the Forest Service can be added to the next board meeting agenda.
 - v. Watson requested that all AZSITE Board members review the committee report and discuss the best way to achieve the committee ongoing goals in coordination with AZSITE improvement efforts.

8. Legislative Updates (Garcia & Klebacha)

- a. Klebacha stated that there will be no discussion until after the upcoming election.

- b. HB-2457 – would require board of regents to consult with SHPO concerning matters of the ASM. The bill passed the house and is held in the Senate. The ongoing pandemic has stalled any progress concerning this bill.
- c. SB-1241 – would shift regulatory responsibilities from the director of ASM to SHPO. The bill passed the house and is held in the Senate. The ongoing pandemic has stalled any progress concerning this bill.
- d. There might be less desire to sponsor bills this legislative session due to a large backlog.

9. AZSITE Updates (McGowan)

- a. McGowan presented AZSITE backlog updates.
 - i. The backlogs were defined: ARO Site Card Backlog and AZSITE Backlog; these two are no longer being distinguished by McGowan when discussing the backlog.
 - ii. With the new GIS Technician, more of the backlog has been made available for upload, including ARO Site Card Backlog original site submissions and projects. Basic site updates are uploaded when projects are uploaded. Site cards and site card updates will not be uploaded for these items until ARO curation is complete.
 - iii. Backlog Progress: (see attached presentation)
 - 1. Projects: 326 uploaded; 2,260 remaining
 - 2. New Sites: 950 uploaded; 6,716 remaining
 - 3. Site Updates: 373 basic updates uploaded out of 7,126 total.
 - 4. Advanced Sites Layer: 4,200 backlog site centerpoints added this year. Coverage of backlog original sites in this layer and the sites layer is 99%.
 - iv. Charts tracking backlog progress have been added to the AZSITE blog.
- b. Mercator Server
 - i. There have been some issues with data not replicating to the Mercator Server, meaning this dataset is lagging the primary AZSITE data by several weeks. The issue appears to be related to the firewall. ISSR has stated they are almost done fixing this issue.
 - ii. ISSR is going to change settings so that Mercator layers are turned off by default when loaded in GIS to help with loading time.

- c. Entry Module – currently in the final polishing stage. Remaining edits concern the instruction document.
 - i. McGowan will host Zoom webinars on the new entry module and changes.
 - ii. McGowan gave a demonstration of the new entry module for the AZSITE board.
 - iii. Web Entry Module – McGowan requested the code for the existing web entry module from the ISSR due to their staffing limitations. Sarina Mann, ASM Collections Database Manager, is assisting in creating a development environment to allow AZSITE and ASM staff to work on the web entry module. If this is not possible, AZSITE will instead request desired changes from ISSR. McGowan is targeting mid-2021 as a goal for completion of the web entry module.
- d. SHPO Data Migration
 - i. Recent edits to the Historic Districts dataset will be available online within the next week.
 - ii. Non-historic properties removed from the current Historic Structures layer, reducing the size by approximately 70%. An updated Historic Structures dataset has been requested from SHPO.
 - iii. SHPO and ISSR are still working on a procedure to transfer NRHP decision data from SHPO to AZSITE. As sites are added to AZSITE, McGowan has been updating the AZSITE NRHP data using the last SHPO NRHP transfer obtained several years ago. AZSITE NRHP data has also recently been cleaned of duplicate entries.
- e. ISSR Web Application Change Requests
 - i. Change display of binary fields in attribute search from 0/-1 to yes/no or true/false.
 - ii. Change site attribute search query to avoid apparent redundant results.
 - iii. Add project history tab linking project entry directly to sites, and to a list of advanced sites, to the attribute search. This would facilitate upload of more backlog projects and new projects while sites are under curation.
 - iv. Add link to ASM Library LARC entry to bibliographic entries in AZSITE attribute search.
 - v. Add link to Site Card/PRF to site/project entries in AZSITE attribute search.
 - vi. Sites by agency feature for web mapping application.

- f. Las Capas Site – consolidation complete and uploaded to AZSITE.
- g. Basemap and Feature Services
 - i. Some rasters used in the AZSITE topographic basemap have a projection issue. A possible fix is rebuilding the basemap.
 - ii. ISSR suggested using ESRI Topo Map or National Geographic Historical USGS Topo dataset with a time slider. AZSITE will review test versions of the application incorporating these basemaps.
- h. Server Hosting – looking into using AZGeo Hub services for certain layers (i.e. roads) as opposed to hosting the data. This would decrease the server load while providing more up-to-date data.

D. Public Comment

- 1. Klebacha asked McGowan if it would be possible to populate the entry module, stand-alone or web, from a separate database. McGowan answered that this is possible using Python scripts.

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 on Zoom.

F. Adjournment

- 1. Meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m