AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes

October 24, 2024
10:03 a.m. to 11:01 a.m.

A quorum was obtained.

A. <u>**CALL TO ORDER**</u> (Caseldine)

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

    Board members present:

        Christopher Caseldine, Acting Chair, Arizona State University (ASU)

        Jim Watson, Arizona State Museum (ASM)

        Jeff Burns (MNA), sitting in for Kelley Hays-Gilpin, 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)

        Erin Davis (SHPO)

        Jeff Burns (MNA)

        Gabriel Gomes (AZ Parks and Trails)

        Jenni Rich (Logan Simpson)

        Katie MacFarland (ASM)

        Mattie Tigges (Tierra)

        KaVoka (Hualapai Tribe)

        Danny Sorrell (HDR)

        Dan Garcia (SRP)

        Matt. Guebard (NPS)

        Alison Talbot (Chronicle)

B. <u>**Introductions**</u>

    1. Members of the AZSITE Board were introduced.

    2. The AZSITE Manager was introduced.

    3. GIS Database Technician was introduced.

C. <u>**Agenda Items**</u> – The Board may consider or take action on any of the following:

    1. **Discussion and Approval of 3ʳᵈ Quarter 2024 Meeting Minutes** (Caseldine)

        a. *Motion to approve (Burns)*

        b. *Seconded (Watson)*

        c. *Approved (Unanimous)*

    2. **Finance Report** (McGowan)

        a. McGowan provided the most recent University of Arizona Financials (UA Financials) Fund Summary, dated 10/5/2024. (Table 1)

b. McGowan provided an updated account summary using information pulled on 10/24/2024 as well as the remaining outstanding invoices for 2024 (Table 2). McGowan noted that fiscal year encumbrances significantly larger than fiscal year income is typical for this time of year, just prior to the annual application season.

c. McGowan: We have the second year of our fee increase slated for 2025. The number of participants is going up (Table 3), when we expected a decrease in participation after the first year of the fee increase. Instead, we have seen more participation, even with the fee increase.

d. Caseldine: Notes this is a positive and reflects the improvements made to AZSITE.

3. **Policy on Data from Tribal Lands** (McGowan)

a. McGowan: There has been a longstanding internal set of procedures AZSITE has followed with respect to data from federally recognized Tribal lands. AZSITE initially included data from those lands until that data was extracted in the early 2000s and delivered to each tribe, if requested. ASM still maintains a hard drive with copies of the data that was extracted. Additionally, AZSITE has procedures used on an ongoing basis concerning data we receive for upload. AZSITE does not include data if it is fully on federally recognized Tribal lands and redacts information if partially on Tribal land. In 2020/21, AZSITE drafted a policy to formalize those procedures, and in 2021 sent out consultation letters to the 22 federally recognized Tribes. Throughout 2021/22 AZSITE met with the Four Southern Tribes, the Pascua Yaqui Nation, the Navajo Nation, the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, and the Hopi Tribe to discuss AZSITE in general as well as the draft Policy on Data from Tribal Lands.

b. McGowan showed a few key definitions from the draft policy:

1. "Tribal lands" […] refer to reservations, Tribal trust lands, allotted trust lands, or fee lands as depicted in the most recent Arizona Surface Management Agencies feature service published by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

2. AZSITE acknowledges that these boundaries do not adequately represent the ancestral lands inhabited by Indigenous peoples for thousands of years.

c. McGowan detailed the draft policy and the procedures for implementing the policy (see Appendix B):

1. AZSITE does not show project and site information from tribal lands in the Attribute Search Application, in the Map Application, or on the Mercator GIS Server.

2. Project and site information from tribal lands are not provided in Data Clips unless 1) the requestor is a tribal government entity, or 2) a tribal government entity's formal endorsement is provided with the request.

d. Caseldine: Implementation of this policy comes to mind. From personal experience there is still some belief that if an area of AZSITE is blank, then nothing is there. It could be useful for the buffering tool to perhaps say, if a search falls into a Tribal Government's land, then it could link to the G2G website.

e. Approval of Draft Policy on Project and Site Information from Tribal Lands
   1. *Motion to approve (Watson)*
   2. *Seconded (Burns)*
   3. *Approved (Unanimous)*

4. **NPS Data Sharing Agreement** (McGowan and Guebard)

a. McGowan: AZSITE has met with the National Park Service several times in recent years to discuss their interest in participating in Arizona's state cultural resource geodatabase program (AZSITE). NPS proposed to provide data from Montezuma Castle and Tuzigoot National Monuments as a pilot project to see how things work for both parties. A Draft Data Sharing Agreement was developed and distributed to the Board prior to this meeting. The draft agreement as written has a two-year lifespan, after which it must be renewed by both parties. Under the draft agreement:

   1. NPS would provide AZSITE with:
      i. Cultural resource site and survey data from Montezuma Castle and Tuzigoot National Monuments
      ii. $1,000 for GIS infrastructure dev in year 1
      iii. $500 for hosting and maintenance for year 2 (and beyond if renewed under same terms)
   2. AZSITE we would provide NPS with:
      i. Two complimentary AZSITE user accounts per year (1 per participating park unit)
      ii. New NPS GIS data service(s) with view-only access (no export), to be excluded from data clip deliverables unless approved by NPS cultural resources personnel from the relevant units.

b. Guebard: This is a discussion we have had for a while, about 10 plus years. We have varied opinions within NPS units, but we view this as a pilot and a way to push out information on this agreement to other units. This is a good starting point for us to see how it works.

c. Caseldine inquired if this is just informational for the Board.

    1. McGowan: Because the agreement as written needs to be signed by the board chair, and because an exchange of money for professional services is involved, we are seeking a Board vote on this.

d. Approval of NPS Data Sharing Agreement

    1. *Motion to approve (Watson)*

    2. *Seconded (Davis)*

    3. *Approved (Unanimous)*

5. **AZSITE Updates** (McGowan and Renteria)

a. McGowan: (Table 5) This spring AZSITE worked with the ARO to get more of the new fee structure project boundaries available for upload into AZSITE. Renteria's focus has been on uploading these projects into AZSITE, and nearly 300 of these recent projects have been uploaded thus far.

b. McGowan: Renteria has also been working on the remaining new ASM sites backlog. USFWS has also been providing site and project information. Quite a few ASM PRFs, ASM reports, and ASU site cards have also been uploaded. ASM report upload is now included as part of the ASM project upload process. The ARO has student workers scanning older reports, and a large batch of project reports from 1980s and 1990s has been uploaded (Table 4).

c. McGowan: MNA recently approved AZSITE to make MNA survey reports available in AZSITE, 58 of which are now online. Upcoming updates to the web applications will make the MNA documents available and linked throughout.

d. McGowan: The ARO is restructuring their workflows, and AZSITE is working with them to make data available to AZSITE earlier in their processes. A goal for the next Board meeting will be to provide a detailed inventory of ASM new fee structure sites and project materials, those available for upload, and those that have already been uploaded.

e. McGowan: Data Clip requests (Table 6) have been increasing this year. The data clip workflow has been improved recently allowing for easier tracking, processing, and delivery. Upcoming updates to the web apps will include a new data clip claim page. The Data Fix request workflow (Table 7) put into place late in 2023 is being utilized more and more by users to improve AZSITE's dataset.

    f.   McGowan: AZSITE provided draft objectives for ASM's 2025-2030 strategic planning effort. The current draft objectives, subject to change and generalized for this audience:

1. Assess and improve ASM data completeness/contemporaneity
2. Continue to work with ARO to streamline data sharing and improve the ASM-AZSITE Interface
3. Improve Historic Districts and Historic Structures Datasets
4. Expand AZSITE's non-ASM datasets
5. Modernization and Migration Planning and Prioritization
6. Admin framework update
   i. Update the current Interagency Services Agreement
   ii. Revive the AZSITE Standing Advisory Committee as created by Governor's Executive Order 2006-03 or pursue an alternative advisory framework.
   iii. McGowan stated that the previous Governor's Administration was not making appointments to the Committee, and it has not met since 2014 or 2015. McGowan noted that the current administration's Office of Board and Commissions has stated that they would review and potentially approve new applicants. However, they also noted that their records indicate four current members of the Committee. Since the executive order states Committee members serve at the pleasure of the Governor, they would need to step down or be removed. They also noted that the listed Governor's Office representative no longer meets that description and would need to be replaced.
   iv. *See a question from Garcia concerning current Committee membership in the* [Public Comment](#) *section*

6. **Other Updates** (McGowan)
   a. McGowan briefly reviews other AZSITE updates:
   1. USFWS has been providing site and survey data
   2. AZSITE continues outreach to Federal agencies regarding data sharing
   3. New data sources also include ASU site cards and MNA reports. These are also potentially sources of new GIS data and we are developing workflows and priorities for digitizing information from these.
   4. ASM LARC migration: AZSITE links references to ASM LARC entries. The links to the old LARC database still work, but we need to migrate over to the new ones. We are waiting on keys from the new system that we can use to update the links.
   5. The data clip ticketing and delivery system has been updated.

6. The USFWS document library will go into production soon and was designed to be reusable for other agencies. It is already being used to deliver data clips.

7. Integration of MNA reports and a few bug fixes will also be incorporated into an upcoming round of web app updates.

8. The AZSITE updates blog on our public website has been improved with a weekly summary (and detailed list) of data that is new online each week.

b. Caseldine: What is the timeframe for the data fixes?

1. McGowan: We work on a database each week that is synced to the production database on Sunday; our working database runs ahead of the production database. We try to get them done within the week they are received, so that the updated data is online the next week. Some are more involved than others; most will be closed within two weeks.

c. Caseldine: Do you have a sense of how long it takes for things to go through ARO?

1. McGowan: Unsure. We recently had many newer projects made available to us for upload, ranging from 2018 to 2023. I hope to be able to speak to this at the next Board meeting along with the data inventory.

2. Watson: Note the ARO is down three staff members, and we just got a manager position posted and approved to hire. We will start reviewing applications soon for the ARO Manager and get that hired as soon as possible. We have significant issues with our ability to keep up without adequate staffing, but this is out of our control due to the University of Arizona financial crisis and current budgetary controls.

d. Caseldine: We should discuss clip requests, what are we doing, and what are the nature of those requests?

1. McGowan: In terms of volume or time to process them?

2. Caseldine: How many individuals make the request, a better sense of who is using the service or not.

3. McGowan: We have some folks who do a lot of data clip requests, but they tend to be annual users, a couple who are thirty-day users, but their volume of requests is not exceeding [30] in a year. For one reason or another, it is a subset of AZSITE users who use it. Renteria and I have discussed it and wonder if it is because of awareness of the data clip service is lacking.

4. Renteria: Anecdotally, users have told me they use the service to comply with "checking AZSITE" requirements

     5. Caseldine: Please look into it. If it is for requirements, then look at how AZSITE fits into compliance.

7. **Next Board Chair (Caseldine)**

     a. The 2025 AZSITE Executive Management Board chair will be Jim Watson.

D. Public Comment

1. Garcia: Who are the government appointed individuals listed by the Governor's office to be on the committee?

     a. McGowan: They listed Alan Dart (federal agency representative), Kevin Kinsall (governor's office representative), Barnaby Lewis (tribal representative), and Christine Joy Markussen (CRM representative). The Office of Boards and Commissions stated "all were appointed at the pleasure of the Governor, which has no end date unless we replace them, they become ineligible or they resign. If any have resigned or become ineligible, we were not notified."

     b. Davis: I don't believe Al Dart works for the feds anymore, and Barnaby has retired.

     c. Garcia: Christine Markussen is with EnviroSystems in Flagstaff

     d. McGowan: So that would leave one person

     e. Caseldine: [McGowan], can you explain what that group is in relation to the consortium versus the Ad Hoc committee?

     b. McGowan: *reads out an excerpt of the executive order* (see appendix a). In 2020, because there were issues with the Governor's administration at that time not being responsive or reviewing applicants for that body, the board convened an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, which consisted of representatives from a wider cross section of agencies and institutions; it was a larger group. That group was instrumental in improving AZSITE from 2020 to the beginning of this year. At that point the group had experienced a loss of leadership and direction and was retired in April. We have been considering our options for a similar framework moving forward that would be less of a burden on people who are interested, but that would still provide AZSITE with valuable insights and advisement. As part of that process, I was trying to find out more information on what happened to the official Standing Advisory Committee. We can work to reinstate the Committee but is it vulnerable to political changes.

      c. Caseldine: For the vacancies that we know of, can we reach out to those individuals to clarify if they are working in those capacities? And if not, can you reach out to the Government's Office to see what the steps are to get new people nominated?

      d. McGowan: Yes. We received the info on Monday, which is why we haven't acted on it yet.

E. Date and Time of Next Meeting

Proposed Next Open Meeting: Thursday, January 23, 2025, 10:00 am Arizona time

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

F. Adjournment

      a. *Motion to adjourn (Caseldine)*

      b. *Seconded (Watson)*

      c. *Approved (Unanimous)*

      d. *Meeting adjourned at 11:01 am*

Table 1: AZSITE Fund Summary, 10/5/2024

Arizona State Museum: AZSITE Balance Summary
Run by: RII Business Center
Date run: 10/5/2024

Fiscal Year	Period Number	Account Number	Account Name	Sub Account Number	Accounting Category Group	Beginning Fund Balance	Total Income and Transfers In	Total Expense and Transfers Out	Encumbrances and Pre-Encumbrances	Current Fund Balance	Uncommitted Cash Expenditure
2025	04	2488860	ASM - AZSITE	-	01 - Balances	133,719	0	0	0	133,719	133,719
					02 - Income	0	12,475	0	0	12,475	12,475
					03 - Expenses	0	0	35,558	123,370	(35,558)	(158,928)
				- Total		133,719	12,475	35,558	123,370	110,636	(12,734)
		2488860 Total				133,719	12,475	35,558	123,370	110,636	(12,734)

Table 2: Unofficial AZSITE Fund Summary, 10/24/2024

Beginning Balance	Total Income	Total Expense + Encumbrances	Annual Balance	Current Fund Balance	Outstanding Invoices
$133,719	$15,825	($183,908)	$(168,083)	$108,864	$19,070

Table 3: AZSITE User Applications and Billing, 10/23/2024

	2021	2022	2023	2024
User Organizations	109	114	117	132
Users	331	356	373	431
Mercator Users	218	237	259	281
$ Invoiced	$126,075	$138,350	$145,900	$233,555
$ Not Yet Paid	-	-	-	$19,070

Table 4: Summary of AZSITE Uploads

Mean Annual (past) Total Annual (current)	2004-2009	2010-2014	2015-2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Projects	1,061	840	109	452	2,225	172	220	322
New Sites	1,706	1,287	194	1,084	4,087	1,663	696	258
Site Updates	-	-	-	752	5,033	299	360	375
ASM PRFs	-	-	-	335	231	257	361	373
New/Updated ASM Site Cards	-	-	-	322	511	405	743	78
Fixes	-	-	-	73	316	48	221	65
ASM Reports	-	-	-	-	-	4	3,975	2,311
ASU Site Cards	-	-	-	-	-	117	56	759

Table 5: Summary of ASM New Fee Structure Uploads, 10/23/2024

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Projects Uploaded by Accession Year	114	200	147	120	44	3	0
Projects Uploaded by Upload Year	0	0	128	368	74	77	294
Sites Uploaded by Upload Year	-	-	167	140	177	82	27

Table 6: Summary of Data Clip Requests, 10/23/2024

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Requests	48	46	51	200	102	136

Table 7: Summary of Data Fix Requests, 10/23/2024

Fixes	2023	2024
Requests	3	50
Closed	3	47

Appendix A: Excerpt from Executive Order 2006-03

"The AZSITE Consortium shall be composed of an Executive Management Board ("Board") and a standing advisory committee ("Committee") that shall assist the Board in issues related to the management, access, security, content and delivery of information in AZSITE… Members of the committee shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Governor. The Committee may include representatives from each of the following: the Governor's Office, a state agency, a federal agency with an Arizona presence, a tribal preservation office, and a private cultural resource consulting firm."

Appendix B: Excerpt from Draft Policy on Project and Site Information from Tribal Lands

Policy
AZSITE does not show project and site information from tribal lands in the Attribute Search Application, in the Map Application, or on the Mercator GIS Server. Project and site information from tribal lands are not provided in Data Clips unless 1) the requestor is a tribal government entity, or 2) a tribal government entity's formal endorsement is provided with the request.

Procedures
AZSITE follows the following procedures in implementing the *Policy on Project and Site Information from Tribal Lands*.
A. If the GIS boundary is located entirely within tribal lands:
    a. The GIS boundary is not shown.
    b. The related attributes are not shown.
    c. Any related documents are not posted in AZSITE.
B. If the GIS boundary is located partially on tribal lands, i.e., the GIS boundary spans a tribal land GIS boundary:
    a. The portion of the GIS boundary on tribal lands is not shown.
    b. The related attributes are shown, except where these indicate locations of cultural resources on tribal lands.
    c. Any related documents are redacted prior to posting in AZSITE. Redactions may include:
        i.   Locations of sites and projects on tribal lands on document maps.
        ii. Narrative site descriptions or photographs of sites located on tribal lands.
C. If the GIS boundary is not located on tribal lands:
    a. The GIS boundary is shown.
    b. The related attributes are shown.
    c. Related documents are posted.

        i.   If the document includes maps of other project or site locations on tribal lands, these data will be redacted.

       ii.   If the document includes narrative site descriptions or photographs of other sites on tribal lands, these will also be redacted.

D. Data Clips

    a.   Data Clip deliverables will be developed using the primary AZSITE dataset, which does not include project and site information from tribal lands as described above.

    b.   If the area of interest for the Data Clip request includes tribal lands, and the requestor is a tribal government entity, or a tribal government entity provides a formal endorsement of the request (e.g., the requestor is a contractor of a tribal government entity):

        i.   Data Clip deliverables will be augmented with project and site information available to AZSITE for the portion of the area of interest located on tribal lands.