

# **AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes**

October 4, 2023

10:00 a.m. to 10:53 a.m.

A quorum was obtained.

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

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

Board members present:

Christopher Caseldine, Chairperson, Arizona State University (ASU)  
Suzanne Eckert, Arizona State Museum (ASM)  
Erin Davis, Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)  
Kelley Hays-Gilpin, Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA)

Members of the public present:

Gabe McGowan (AZSITE Manager)  
Carrie Schmidt (AZSITE GIS Technician)  
Alan Craig (WestLand)  
Brent Kober (Desert Archaeology)  
Tim Goddard (Gulf South Research Corporation)  
Daniel Sorrell (HDR)  
Jenni Rich (Logan Simpson)  
Keith Pajkos (AZ DFFM)  
Emily Fiocoprile (ASM)  
Karen Leone (ASM)  
Scott Courtright (NRCS)  
April Carroll (APS)  
Rachel Fernandez (ASU)  
Nina Rogers (WAPA)  
Sarina Mann (ASM)  
Jean Robinson (ASU Facilities Development Management)

## **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 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2023 Meeting Minutes (Caseldine)
  - a. Motion to approve (Hays-Gilpin)
  - b. Seconded (Eckert)
  - c. Approved – 3 in favor, 1 abstention
2. Finance Report (McGowan)

- a. McGowan presented the finance report. Expenses inflate over the year due to administrative and credit card fees not reflected in encumbrances. In addition, encumbrances have not yet been updated to reflect the server migration costs. These increases will be offset somewhat by a significant portion of the GIS Technician's salary for the next several months being paid by Arizona State Museum (ASM) Mandated Programs for her work on a project. McGowan reviewed past annual AZSITE reports to determine previous annual expenses and income. Total expenses used to be considerably higher in the late 2000s and early 2010s. For example, the total expenses in 2014 were \$353,666. There were also other funding sources from the Ariona Heritage Fund, Federal Historic Preservation Fund (HPF), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and ASM. In early 2022, AZSITE was not allowed to receive a grant of HPF CLG funds from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) via pass-through with Pima County due to a conflict of interest, as SHPO is a member of the AZSITE Consortium. The AZSITE Manager inquired why this was not an issue earlier in AZSITE's history when HPF monies were directed to AZSITE.
  - i. Current Fund Balance: \$98,843
  - ii. Total Income, FY24: \$11,000
  - iii. Toal Expenses, FY24: \$24,017
  - iv. Encumbrances/Pre-encumbrances: \$165,030
  - v. Uncommitted Cash Expenditure: \$66,187
- b. AZSITE staff have been researching other state cultural resource geodatabase systems. California, Utah, and Texas do not have systems comparable to AZSITE. Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington have similar geodatabase systems. AZSITE staff reached out to these states to ask about funding sources, staff sizes, and user fees. Most of these state systems are fully integrated with their state's Section 106 compliance process, which has advantages relating to data latency and completeness. Most also have federal grants/agreements that provide funding and more relationships with state agencies. AZSITE has comparable staffing and functionality to these systems. Action items based on these findings are to rebuild relationships with federal agencies and seek out grant opportunities.
- c. Discussion:
  - i. Caseldine inquired which federal agencies will AZSITE reach out to.
    - 1. McGowan replied that AZSITE is currently in discussions with the BLM, US Forest Service (USFS), and National Park Service (NPS).

- ii. Hays-Gilpin stated that some USFS forests in Arizona contemplated sharing data with AZSITE at one time. NPS would likely share data for research as opposed to management.
- iii. Caseldine suggested reaching out to the Southern Arizona (SOAR) office of NPS, the Arizona National Guard, and the Bureau of Reclamation.
- iv. Davis stated that she will ask Mary-Ellen Walsh about why AZSITE is no longer able to apply for SHPO grants.

**3. Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee Report (McGowan)**

- a. McGowan reported on the activities of the Ad-hoc Advisory Committee in the absence of a current committee chairperson. There was a membership application period in September and there are now several new members: Daniel Sorrell (HDR) representing large archaeological consulting firms; Brent Kober (Desert Archaeology) representing small archaeological consulting firms; and Jodie Brown (City of Tucson) and Zach Lechner (City of Tempe) representing local government CLGs. There was a committee meeting on September 25. An additional meeting will be planned for early November to meet new members and set priorities. The committee will function without a chairperson for the time being. The Data Sensitivity Training is still in progress and requires the tribal perspective.

**4. Data Sensitivity Training Tribal Consultation (McGowan)**

- a. McGowan discussed the draft tribal consultation letter for tribal input for the Data Sensitivity Training. The ASM Repatriation Office reviewed the letter and provided feedback.
- b. Discussion:
  - i. Caseldine stated since the AZSITE board chair is a rotating position, the letter should not be signed by the chairperson. The AZSITE Manager can be the primary signers and include signatures from the four board members.
  - ii. Eckert inquired if McGowan will be the one running the training.
    - 1. McGowan stated it would likely be AZSITE staff running the training, and AZSITE staff and Jim Watson running any meetings with Tribes.
    - 2. Eckert recommended that the letter should be signed by McGowan since he will be running the training and possibly others who will be assisting. It needs to be clear who the tribes need to contact to set up the meeting, which would be McGowan.

3. McGowan stated the committee was unsure who should officially be making the request.
4. Eckert stated that the AZSITE Consortium can sign the letter and clarify McGowan should be contacted for follow-up.
- iii. McGowan inquired about the next steps for sending the letter.
  1. Caseldine replied that the Government-to -Government Consultation website has a list of tribal consultation contacts.

**5. 2024 Board Chair (Caseldine)**

- a. Caseldine discussed who will be the next AZSITE board chair. Since there were two board members not in attendance, Caseldine will remain in the position until a new board chair is selected at the Q1 2024 meeting.

**6. AZSITE Updates (McGowan & Schmidt)**

- a. Backlog:
  - i. Projects: 2,434 projects uploaded (96%)
  - ii. New Sites: 7,431 sites uploaded (97%)
  - iii. Site Updates: 5,992 basic uploaded (84%)
- b. Summaries:
  - i. Overall:

	<b>2004-2009</b>	<b>2010-2014</b>	<b>2015-2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>
Projects	1,061	840	109	452	2,225	172	199
New Sites	1,706	1,287	194	1,084	4,087	1,663	634
Site Updates	-	-	-	752	5,033	299	338
PRFs	-	-	-	335	231	257	359
New/Updated Site Cards	-	-	-	322	511	405	675
Fixes	-	-	-	73	316	48	146
ASM Reports	-	-	-	-	-	4	3951
ASU Site Cards	-	-	-	-	-	117	56

ii. ARO New Fee Structure:

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Projects Uploaded by Accession Year	95	199	146	117	31	0
Projects Uploaded by Calendar Year	0	0	128	368	74	77
Sites Uploaded by Calendar Year	-	-	167	140	177	82

iii. User Applications and Billing

	2021	2022	2023
User Organizations	109	114	117
Users	331	345	373
Mercator Users	218	237	259
\$ Invoiced	\$126,075	\$138,350	\$145,900

iv. Data Clips:

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Requests	48	46	51	200	79

v. Other:

1. Ongoing ASM database migrations have impacted the amount of new fee structure data and documents being uploaded to AZSITE.
2. More ASM reports and Arizona State University (ASU) site cards have recently been uploaded.

c. Other Updates:

i. Server Migration:

1. Migration completed on September 29.
2. Mercator will have the same address.
3. The domain for the web site and web apps has changed to azsiteapp.rc.asu.edu.
4. There are some remaining bugs from the migration.
5. Data update processes to resume October 8.
6. There is an increased performance for all services.
7. There are some networking advantages now that all servers are in one location.

ii. Application Development:

1. There is enhanced application performance due to the server migration.
  2. The User Guide will be continuously updated.
  3. A new application demo and Q&A recording is available.
  4. User-side Credential Management was on hold until completion of the server migration.
- iii. Public Mapping Application
1. Following work on application redevelopment and research of other state systems, AZSITE staff would like to develop and test a cultural resources risk layer based on Wyoming's public cultural resources layer. One metric will be resource risk calculated using a logistic function to calculate a "possible resources" count based on the number of recorded resources and area surveyed. The other metric is the mitigation risk based on the percent of recorded sites listed as National Register of Historic Places eligible. AZSITE staff are investigating if this is a viable option for Arizona.

d. Next Steps:

- i. Continue outreach to federal agencies regarding data sharing agreements.
- ii. Identify grants and grant projects.

iii. Data:

1. Project/site entries missing geometries
2. Rectify ASM site boundaries with ARO maps
3. Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA) and ASU materials
4. Discussing updated to historic structures and possibly districts with SHPO
5. New Archaeological Records Office layers in review at ARO and SHPO

**D. New Business**

a. Annual Report for the Governor's Office:

- i. McGowan stated that an annual report is supposed to be provided to the Governor's Office every fiscal year. Reports for the last three fiscal years have been generated and sent to the board for comment.

ii. Discussion:

1. Caseldine recommended having the next fiscal year report be an agenda item for the Q2 board meeting.

2. Eckert inquired what are the next steps for submitting these reports.
  - a. McGowan replied that the board should review and provide comments, focusing on the FY23 report. Jim Watson submitted the last submitted annual report via email.
  - b. Caseldine stated that submitting the report can be the responsibility of the chair.

**E. Public Comment**

- a. No public comments.

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

- a. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 17, 2024, at 10:00 a.m. The meeting will be on Zoom.

**G. Adjournment**

- a. Meeting adjourned at 10:53 am