AZSITE Advisory Committee

Minutes from Meeting 1/7/2014
Location: State Historic Preservation Office
Committee members present: Allen Dart, Julie Hoff, Barnaby Lewis
A quorum was obtained

Call to order: approximately 10:00 am

- Introduction of Committee Members – Dart
- Approval of previous meeting minutes – Dart
- AZSITE status update - Karl
  - Document hook is up and running
    - AZSITE users now able to download documents through website for a fee of $10/document
    - Non-AZSITE users will still use FTP site and be charged per page
- Discussion on AZ Executive Order 2006-03 and AZSITE's 5-year-plan
  - Should it be maintained as part of the original Exec Order , or should the Order be modified?
  - Discussion:
    - Allows the committee a little more freedom in when to meet and a quorum will not be required
    - GAC may be able to take on some of topics
    - Brief mention of results of user survey (see attached)
    - Discussion will be continued at next meeting
- Discussion of having "In Person" meetings
  - The webinar option is very useful and saves time/money, but we'd like to encourage more people to attend in person to allow for more personal contact/engagement
  - Scanning/photocopy rates changing
- Public Comment:
  - Backlog- Karl
    - Negative – up to date as of 11/2013
    - Projects with site updates only – two year backlog
    - Projects with new sites (or new sites and updates) – three year backlog
  - Any questions/concerns/agenda requests can be sent to Rick Karl and Shannon Twilling
- Next meeting April 2014 in Tucson
- Meeting adjourned approximately 10:45 am

AZSITE User Survey

The AZSITE Consortium wants to develop a 5-year plan to direct the database's growth and development, and expand its user base. Part of the rationale for this plan is that most of the information from the Arizona State Museum, the Museum of Northern Arizona, Arizona State University, and the State Historic Preservation Office has been integrated into AZSITE–one of the main reasons for founding the Consortium. It is likely that not all goals will be completed in that time, so the Consortium wants to develop incremental steps towards those goals. The Consortium also wants to develop performance criteria to enable its members to judge success in meeting these goals.

Please take a few minutes to complete the survey below. We appreciate your input.

1. What do you see are the main deficiencies currently with AZSITE? (Check all that apply.)
   a. Time lag in entering project/site information
   b. Locational/informational errors
   c. Remaining legacy data to be entered.
   d. Difficulty in using AZSITE.
   e. Lack of information
   f. Cost
   g. Other:_____

2. What future goals are most important to you/your organization? (Please rank.)
   a. Expanded research capabilities
   b. Error correction
   c. Development of testing/data recovery/excavation layers
   d. Development of historical data on sites
   e. Report library
   f. Incorporation of federal (e.g., BLM, USFS, NRCS) and state (e.g., AGFD, ASLD) agency data into AZSITE
   g. Improved ease of use
   h. Raw material source and other data layers (specify)
   i. Other:_____

3. Of the above goals, which would you/your organization be willing to pay for in terms of increased access fees? (Please rank.)
   a. Expanded research capabilities
   b. Error correction
   c. Development of testing/data recovery/excavation layers
   d. Development of historical data on sites
   e. Report library
   f. Incorporation of federal (e.g., BLM, USFS, NRCS) and state (e.g., AGFD, ASLD) agency data into AZSITE
   g. Improved ease of use
   h. Raw material source and other data layers (specify)
   i. Other:_____

AZSITE User Survey - 2013

SurveyMonkey

1. 1. How satisfied are you with AZSITE?

	Not at all satisfied1	2	3	4	Extremely satisfied5	Rating Average	Rating Count
	0.0% (0)	6.8% (5)	35.1% (26)	**48.6% (36)**	9.5% (7)	3.61	74
					answered question		74
					skipped question		2

2. 2. How often do you go directly to the following agencies to inspect their databases?

	Never1	2	3	4	Always5	Rating Count
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)	26.4% (19)	**27.8% (20)**	13.9% (10)	16.7% (12)	15.3% (11)	72
United States Forest Service (USFS)	19.4% (14)	**29.2% (21)**	11.1% (8)	12.5% (9)	27.8% (20)	72
State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)	**35.6% (26)**	27.4% (20)	20.5% (15)	9.6% (7)	6.8% (5)	73
Arizona State Museum (ASM)	**32.9% (24)**	27.4% (20)	11.0% (8)	15.1% (11)	13.7% (10)	73
					answered question	74
					skipped question	2

3. 3. What do you like most about AZSITE? (specify)

	Response Count
	59
answered question	59
skipped question	17

4. 4. What do you see are the main deficiencies currently with AZSITE? (Check all that apply.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Time lag in entering project/site information		**61.4%**	**43**
Locational/informational errors		45.7%	32
Remaining legacy data to be entered.		52.9%	37
Difficulty in using AZSITE.		15.7%	11
Lack of information		21.4%	15
Cost		14.3%	10
Other		22.9%	16
	Other (please specify)		34

	answered question	**70**
	skipped question	**6**

5. 5. What future goals are most important to you/your organization? (Please rank.)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Rating Average
Expanded research capabilities	15.5% (11)	9.9% (7)	5.6% (4)	14.1% (10)	16.9% (12)	**22.5% (16)**	14.1% (10)	1.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	4.3
Error correction	**21.1% (15)**	8.5% (6)	15.5% (11)	18.3% (13)	12.7% (9)	15.5% (11)	2.8% (2)	4.2% (3)	1.4% (1)	3.8
Development of testing/data recovery/excavation layers	7.0% (5)	12.7% (9)	11.3% (8)	**25.4% (18)**	21.1% (15)	7.0% (5)	14.1% (10)	1.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	4.2
Development of historical data on sites and districts	1.4% (1)	4.2% (3)	18.3% (13)	11.3% (8)	**28.2% (20)**	22.5% (16)	9.9% (7)	4.2% (3)	0.0% (0)	4.8
Availability of scanned CRM reports (i.e., a report library)	22.5% (16)	**35.2% (25)**	18.3% (13)	12.7% (9)	2.8% (2)	4.2% (3)	2.8% (2)	1.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	2.6
Incorporation of federal (e.g., BLM, USFS, NRCS) and state (e.g., AGFD, ASLD) agency data into AZSITE	**25.4% (18)**	22.5% (16)	21.1% (15)	9.9% (7)	5.6% (4)	7.0% (5)	7.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	1.4% (1)	3.0
Improved ease of use	5.6% (4)	5.6% (4)	8.5% (6)	2.8% (2)	8.5% (6)	9.9% (7)	**32.4% (23)**	25.4% (18)	1.4% (1)	5.9
Raw material source and other data layers (specify)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.4% (1)	5.6% (4)	2.8% (2)	9.9% (7)	16.9% (12)	**57.7% (41)**	5.6% (4)	7.3
Other	1.4% (1)	1.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.4% (1)	1.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (3)	**90.1% (64)**	8.6
									answered question	
									skipped question	

6. 5a. Other (please specify)

	Response Count
	9
answered question	9
skipped question	67

7. 6. Of the above goals, which would you/your organization be willing to pay for in terms of inc access fees? (Please rank.)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Rating Average
Expanded research capabilities	**17.9% (10)**	16.1% (9)	12.5% (7)	16.1% (9)	12.5% (7)	12.5% (7)	8.9% (5)	3.6% (2)	0.0% (0)	3.8
Error correction	10.7% (6)	3.6% (2)	**21.4% (12)**	16.1% (9)	12.5% (7)	14.3% (8)	8.9% (5)	7.1% (4)	5.4% (3)	4.6
Development of testing/data recovery/excavation layers	1.8% (1)	14.3% (8)	14.3% (8)	**30.4% (17)**	23.2% (13)	8.9% (5)	3.6% (2)	1.8% (1)	1.8% (1)	4.2
Development of historical data on sites and districts	7.1% (4)	3.6% (2)	14.3% (8)	17.9% (10)	23.2% (13)	**26.8% (15)**	7.1% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.5
Availability of scanned CRM reports (i.e., a report library)	30.4% (17)	**39.3% (22)**	8.9% (5)	8.9% (5)	1.8% (1)	7.1% (4)	1.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (1)	2.5
Incorporation of federal (e.g., BLM, USFS, NRCS) and state (e.g., AGFD, ASLD) agency data into AZSITE	**21.4% (12)**	16.1% (9)	**21.4% (12)**	3.6% (2)	12.5% (7)	12.5% (7)	8.9% (5)	3.6% (2)	0.0% (0)	3.6
Improved ease of use	5.4% (3)	5.4% (3)	5.4% (3)	3.6% (2)	5.4% (3)	8.9% (5)	**42.9% (24)**	23.2% (13)	0.0% (0)	6.1
Raw material source and other data layers (specify)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (1)	1.8% (1)	7.1% (4)	8.9% (5)	17.9% (10)	**57.1% (32)**	5.4% (3)	7.3
Other	5.4% (3)	1.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (1)	1.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.6% (2)	**85.7% (48)**	8.2
									answered questio	
									skipped questio	

8. 6a. Other (please specify)

	Response Count
	11
answered question	11
skipped question	65

9. 7. Any other comments?

	Response Count
	22
answered question	22
skipped question	54

Page 2, Q3.	**3. What do you like most about AZSITE? (specify)**	
1	I'm still discovering it. I don't work for a cultural resource institution, so I have accessed it only at a friend's house. He likes it.	Sep 27, 2013 2:35 PM
2	The ability to search via the map tool and the new ability to see scanned site cards/forms.	Sep 27, 2013 10:21 AM
3	quick, easy to do basic research	Sep 26, 2013 11:36 AM
4	The ability to do a previous research check without having to necessarily physically travel to an agency's office to manually go through their records. Unfortunately, we still have to do so with too many agencies.	Sep 26, 2013 9:31 AM
5	It's a step in the right direction	Sep 26, 2013 8:58 AM
6	The accessibility of the data. As for Questions 2 - the answer would be we "always" go the those agencies to inspect thier databases if it is necessary. A lot of times, it is not necessary to do so. So in realitety we hardly, or "never", go to those agacnies becasue it is not needed. Hope that makes sense.	Sep 26, 2013 8:28 AM
7	The ability to do a spatial search for projects and sites at one time. The tools for spatial searches are useful, if you know how to properly use them. The accessibility of PRFs and site cards and upon request the FTP is available for quickly downloading digital reports (this doesn't always work though). Lastly, how knowledgeable and helpful the staff is.	Sep 25, 2013 5:15 PM
8	The improved map tool is now good. Not great but it is useful. I really like having the scanned original site cards.	Sep 25, 2013 12:10 PM
9	Ease of access; speed	Sep 25, 2013 10:33 AM
10	ArcGIS integration. Instant access to records.	Sep 25, 2013 10:22 AM
11	The Class I buffering process is convenient and easy to use.	Sep 25, 2013 9:07 AM
12	So many things, but I love being able to show the aerial view on the maps. This option helps me confidently identify the area of my project and what surveys or sites are located in that location.	Sep 24, 2013 4:28 PM
13	It's remote availability.	Sep 24, 2013 4:03 PM
14	The spatial search app. Access to old site cards and PRFs. The AZSITE people especially Christina and Rick!	Sep 24, 2013 2:40 PM
15	Interactive nature, immediate access, retention of older data (site cards and PRFs) along with the new. Still like to use the old hard copy maps (with transparent overlays) in the AZSITE onsite analog room.	Sep 24, 2013 1:53 PM
16	Desktop Access	Sep 24, 2013 11:53 AM
17	Remote access! Stuck in the hinterlands of AZ, it is a must, as getting permission to travel is closely akin to being in league with . . .	Sep 24, 2013 11:29 AM
18	Easy to access, user friendly, lots of search options, and support staff is great.	Sep 24, 2013 11:21 AM

19	Desktop access; no need to travel to collect information. Reliability of the system; it rarely goes off-line for long. Ability to print maps.	Sep 24, 2013 11:15 AM
20	RE: the mapping application - I like that there are improved ways to complete a search (e.g., polyline, rectangle). I also like that aerial imagery layers have been added. RE: the search application - I like that the PRFs and site cards are available. I like that LARC is available.	Sep 24, 2013 11:00 AM
21	The fees are reasonable.	Sep 24, 2013 10:58 AM
22	Its relatively easy to get the info you need about sites prior to fieldwork	Sep 24, 2013 10:53 AM
23	Ease of use, Spatial queries.	Sep 24, 2013 10:51 AM
24	It's fairly easy to navigate and usually has much more complete information than other similar databases I sometimes have to use in the Southwest.	Sep 24, 2013 10:51 AM
25	Relatively user friendly. Good support from ASM staff. Good quality maps. Easy to do records searches once you learn the ropes.	Sep 24, 2013 10:42 AM
26	I like to be able to go to one repository to access all of the information I need.	Sep 24, 2013 10:37 AM
27	Data tables in the GIS are easy to understand (you don't have to guess which field contains the project or site number, you don't need to create a new field for a label that's properly formatted, unlike GIS data we get from some other agencies). Don't need to digitize it ourselves, already in a GIS	Sep 24, 2013 10:31 AM
28	The ability to search for sites and projects without having to come into the office.	Sep 24, 2013 10:22 AM
29	The spatial maps that identify the location of archeological sites and associated info, and list the previous surveys performed at a given location. Essential to being able to perform our own file & records searches.	Sep 24, 2013 10:13 AM
30	I like being able to access the site-wide data in one place.	Sep 24, 2013 10:10 AM
31	It is a comprehensive electronic database for archaeological sites in Arizona.	Sep 24, 2013 10:01 AM
32	I appreciate the speed and utility of AZSITE as an internet-based data source for finding basic information about sites and projects. This is of course with the usual caveat that the more recent projects/sites may not be included on AZSITE yet.	Sep 24, 2013 9:58 AM
33	In reference to the database, it's easy to use, saves money, and provides access to original documentation (ASM site cards, PRFs) which is helpful when checking inconsistencies.	Sep 24, 2013 9:57 AM
34	The spatial search function.	Sep 24, 2013 9:55 AM
35	Being able to look at the plots, as well as the background data, although the connections are still a little clunky navigating from one dataset to another.	Sep 24, 2013 9:55 AM
36	I appreciate the user friendlyness and the amount of data captured.	Sep 24, 2013 9:51 AM
37	computer access at the touch of a button is great.	Sep 24, 2013 9:48 AM

	Page 2, Q3. 3. What do you like most about AZSITE? (specify)	
38	very user friendly (easy to use).	Sep 24, 2013 9:46 AM
39	The database has improved significantly over the last decade. I believe the user interface is intuitive and well designed. I like the option of both spatial and attribute searches. I also appreciate access to scanned originals (site cards and project registration forms). Having multiple lines of evidence available helps us to rectify discrepancies that we identify.	Sep 24, 2013 9:46 AM
40	Basic accessible info - where was it , what was it, when was it found and by whom. Especially like spatial data - map setup	Sep 24, 2013 9:45 AM
41	Ease of use	Sep 24, 2013 9:44 AM
42	The map feature is extremely useful and helpful in compiling information.	Sep 24, 2013 9:44 AM
43	Spatial search interface and the ease of retrieving project information (prfs)	Sep 24, 2013 9:43 AM
44	Having all of the information in a central database is very helpful.	Sep 24, 2013 9:43 AM
45	User friendliness.	Sep 24, 2013 9:43 AM
46	Fairly useful, with greatly increased usage with recent upgrades and better on-screen resources!	Sep 24, 2013 9:43 AM
47	The spatial search is wonderful. I like the layers and the search functions.	Sep 24, 2013 9:42 AM
48	The more info is linked the better so I don't have to look in different places.	Sep 24, 2013 9:42 AM
49	The ability to get original site cards and PRFs.	Sep 11, 2013 10:26 AM
50	The fact that it is improving.	Sep 11, 2013 9:54 AM
51	I really like the ability to download scans of site cards without having to request them or go personally to request them. For the new layout, I really like the tabs in the Attribute search, and that there is a logical progression from left to right when searching scanned site cards and scanned PRFs, so you can see what quad you are in, or what year you are searching easily, and go back to a different quad or year...or start over with an easy click of "New Attribute Search" at the top of the page. I especially like that the AZSITE mapping is now an option to get to within the Attribute Search.	Sep 9, 2013 1:52 PM
52	Online access to site and project information. Spatial searches.	Sep 9, 2013 10:35 AM
53	I like the integration of spatial data and the site information made possible by the GIS platform and the web front end. It is quite helpful to select/find records using the map interface.	Sep 9, 2013 9:16 AM
54	Not really sure. I like being able to use the map service the most.	Sep 9, 2013 8:14 AM
55	The convenience of having data available without having to travel to an agency.	Sep 6, 2013 4:29 PM
56	The concept.	Sep 6, 2013 12:43 PM
57	The mapping application and most recently the addition of satellite imagery.	Sep 6, 2013 12:30 PM

Page 2, Q3. 3. What do you like most about AZSITE? (specify)

58	It is a good, but not comprehensive, compilation of of site and project data for much of the state. It helps to have one source for many projects.	Sep 6, 2013 12:24 PM
59	I love that you are working hard to be THE repository of information for the state. Having all the information at one location is fabulous - keep working towards that goal. I also love that you guys get back to us quickly when we have an issue or problem. That has been extremely helpful many, many times.	Sep 6, 2013 11:46 AM

	Page 3, Q1. 4. What do you see are the main deficiencies currently with AZSITE? (Check all that apply.)	
1	No access unless you work in cultural resources. But what about us nonprofessionals who gather data or protect sites?	Sep 27, 2013 2:37 PM
2	Except for legacy data, most projects and sites on Forest Service-controlled land are not available via AZSITE. Similarly, information for Tribal lands is excluded. In this regard, it is interesting that a substantial amount of data regarding sites and projects on the New Mexico portion of the Navajo Nation are available in New Mexico's archaeological database (NMCRIS), yet Arizona's agreement with the Nation does not allow this.	Sep 26, 2013 9:41 AM
3	1. Excavations data/reports are not included. 2. PDF's of survey reports are not inlucded (it would very useful to be able to clink on a project in the map viewer and have a link to the report pdf come up). 3. It would be usefull to have a measuing tool avilable in the map viewer.	Sep 26, 2013 8:33 AM
4	Lack of a good search tool that allows for keyword searches and brings up maps and other data. The map tool would be much better if it used a range of topo scales instead of one. At present, you cannot see the topo when zoomed out very much.Many sites in the Tucson area are shown as dots or lines instead of with the site boundaries that were turned in. This needs to be fixed. Site boundaries should have 2 different line types: One for originally defined boundaries and one for current. Given that boundaries can change according to whether portions are destroyed, the current AZSITE is misleading.	Sep 25, 2013 12:18 PM
5	We are working with AZSITE to merge records/reconcile data. It is problematic. Whereas our records had up to date information on site boundaries, merging the data has resulted in some setbacks & we are doing extra work to resolve errors. I think it is important that the individuals working on reconciling data have an understanding of fieldwork that will help them to understand which types of reports will contain the most accurate information on site boundaries.	Sep 25, 2013 10:40 AM
6	The clear depiction of long, linear sites and surveys, and surveys that cover incontiguous areas is very lacking. Also, satellite imagery, as an option alongside the 7.5 maps, would be an extreme improvement. Links to research and reference materials (eg, reports pertaining to particular sites and surveys) needs improvement. This is of course partially due to the outdated LARC catalog system, but nevertheless needs to be updated. Finally, although the faunal info provided for many sites is useful, it creates a bias against other equally important materials (in other words, expanded data for lithics, shell, etc is needed).	Sep 25, 2013 9:22 AM
7	Time to receive record search information	Sep 25, 2013 9:01 AM
8	I would like to see an option where you could upload your own project shapefiles for quicker analyses. It would also be beneficial to be able to extract shapefiles directly from AZSITE (cultural sites and surveys).	Sep 24, 2013 3:33 PM
9	I'm always struck by how behind the times AZSITE seems to be, in terms of its user interface. Any business that sells anything on the internet has a better user interface than AZSITE, and I wonder why AZSITE can't be just as seamless and idiot-proof. I don't use AZSITE directly very often (other people at my company use it more often, which means that when I do go to use it I've forgotten how to get around its many little quirks. For example, why are there two separate log-ins for attributes and for maps? I'm sure there's a historical explanation, but as a	Sep 24, 2013 12:18 PM

	user I'm not interested in it. I just want speed and simplicity. Another example: when you use the mapping application, why all those symbols for the different functions? Sure, I know what some of them do, but others are a mystery that I don't have time to explore. All of these functions and how to use them should be obvious even to the occasional user. For example, when you click on the "Query Builder," it is anything but obvious what a "value" is, even with the "Sample Value" that shows up. Maybe none of this is hard to learn, but why should you have to learn anything? It should all be as obvious as buying a book on Amazon.Too high a bar for AZSITE? It shouldn't be.	
10	Specificly the lag in getting new sites entered.	Sep 24, 2013 11:24 AM
11	Need to still search other databases like ADOT, USFS, and BLM. No accessibility to pdf reports and the necessity to send in hard copies.	Sep 24, 2013 11:12 AM
12	Lack of online access to original documentation. This is improving though, which is fantastic. I love having access to original site cards/forms and PRFs.	Sep 24, 2013 10:57 AM
13	Love AZSITE but not able to use it. Too complicated to set up a separate database for each new site. Takes too much time and we don't have that much time to devote to data entry + staff shortages. This is a service that should be included in our yearly use fees, it's what we thought we were getting. The data entry modules don't work for us, and we can't get new sites recorded--we have a 7-yr. backlog of new sites that are not on AZSITE yet (due to inability to get the data entry module to work with our firewalls, not AZSITE's fault, but still cripples us from getting full use out of our user fees).	Sep 24, 2013 10:57 AM
14	Often when using the map to find projects and sites, I'll click on the Identify icon and it doesn't work. When I click on the project/site/whatever I am trying to identify the map will just zoom way in, and then I have to back out of it. Sometimes this will happen several times in a row where the Identify function just doesn't seem to kick in for some reason.	Sep 24, 2013 10:56 AM
15	The main issue is sometimes finding the right location as you zoom into maps.	Sep 24, 2013 10:46 AM
16	There's a fair amount of error in the AZSITE online site cards. Also, it would help to add a scale to the interactive maps for sites in the newer version. And I noticed that there was far more info on the older version of the AZSITE online site cards--hopefully this will be transferred over to the newer version? Finally, will original ASU and GP site cards ever be made available?	Sep 24, 2013 10:26 AM
17	Historic properties informaton includes properties that are not of historic age and is not always accurate.	Sep 24, 2013 10:17 AM
18	I have generally relied on staff to conduct records checks, and I have very little familiarity with the system. When I have had access to it, I have found it to be easy to use. Most of my work is on Indian lands, and most of that is Navajo, so I use tribal records far more than AZSite.	Sep 24, 2013 10:12 AM
19	Based on experience, we use it as a "guide" to site locations, as there are definitely a lot of errors between the hand-plotted and newer gis plotted data. We can usually reconcile these in the field. The largest problem is the lag time in entering data - ideally, there would be a layer that indicates areas for which there	Sep 24, 2013 10:05 AM

	are outstanding project specific permits requested - so that you know who is doing what and don't resurvey an area that was just surveyed or excavated or whatever. Currently we rely on archy gossip and that is very imprecise! And ideally, it would be nice to have a link to the BLM GLO database since they've already shared their arch site data!!	
20	Just a note to clarify the checked boxes. A lot of the older records seem to have discrepancies and erroneous information, which is certainly a product of pre-GPS/GIS paper records. This is certainly not the "fault" of AZSITE, and in fact I believe AZSITE is doing an exceptional job in addressing these issues.	Sep 24, 2013 9:52 AM
21	The system seems to be down a lot.	Sep 24, 2013 9:49 AM
22	Data gaps arising from non participating agencies	Sep 24, 2013 9:48 AM
23	Ability to print maps directly from the application. Also the inability to see site maps.	Sep 24, 2013 9:47 AM
24	AZSITE isn't integrated with other land managment db's as suffers for the lack. Really not AZSITE's fault	Sep 24, 2013 9:47 AM
25	lack of National Register listed properties in the database, lack of National Forest information, incomplete data returns (e.g., SHPO sites)	Sep 24, 2013 9:46 AM
26	When site is updated new changes do not seem to warrant the change.	Sep 24, 2013 9:45 AM
27	ADOT roads do not match topo roads, which makes the accuracy of sites plotted to roads suspect. Also, the mapping service not linking directly to PRFs and original site cards.	Sep 11, 2013 10:30 AM
28	Clicked "other" to expand on time lag & locational errors. Two frustrating elements, which relate mostly to Phoenix metropolitan area, is that AZSITE shapes for many sites are incorrectly mapped (e.g., AZ T:12:62 [ASM] needs to be adjusted eastward), and the AZSITE shapes do not match PGM/City of Phoenix Archaeology Office site shapes. Hoping these problems will be resolved as city of Phoenix data is incorporated in AZSITE. I have also observed location errors in legacy Bureau of Reclamation project shapes, specifically as these relate to the 1970s CAP surveys east of Queen Creek, AZ. Related to above is fact that data recovery results, particularly as they related to refinement of site boundaries are largely not included.	Sep 11, 2013 10:12 AM
29	I'd like to see an option when you conduct a query for partial entries (Site, Project, Reference) to display more results instead of just 10. Option to display 25, 50 or ALL would be great. ALL would allow users to scroll quickly down the list to get to the sites they need faster.	Sep 9, 2013 2:10 PM
30	Lack of site maps.	Sep 9, 2013 10:38 AM
31	It seems that the lag in legacy data is one of the biggest problems. Also the lack of data recovery information. Also It would be nice to be able to specify a scale on the mapping page, and to have some additional background layers, perhaps a simple map page or alternatively scaled topo maps that are easier to comprehend at smaller scales.	Sep 9, 2013 8:19 AM

Page 3, Q1. 4. What do you see are the main deficiencies currently with AZSITE? (Check all that apply.)

32	To me, the biggest problem is that we submit data electronically, and then it sits for a long time. And I may be wrong, but it seems as though site records are manually re-entered as there have been site descriptions that are block copied from a report into the site description field in AZSITE, yet the final description contains spelling and grammatical errors that were not in the final, edited site description. My solution is to allow users to upload data that goes immediately live in AZSITE with a note or something that the data has not yet been verified and also includes the date it was uploaded. Eventually it gets verified and that note would disappear. In the meantime, if errors are found, the AZSITE users would have a responsibility to report this for correction. And if there are repeat offenders submitting incorrect data, they don't use AZSITE anymore or you charge them some amount of money to correct each bad submission.	Sep 6, 2013 12:41 PM
33	The hack of coverage for large areas of the state.	Sep 6, 2013 12:33 PM
34	The BIGGEST thing I'd like to see is agency determinations on sites. That is the one piece of information that we ALWAYS need. If we are working for ADOT, no problem I can download the consultation letters from the portal. Otherwise, it is really hit or miss if we're going to find out the NR status of a site.	Sep 6, 2013 11:51 AM

Page 3, Q3. 5a. Other (please specify)

1	wider access	Sep 27, 2013 2:37 PM
2	Consultation histories	Sep 24, 2013 4:09 PM
3	Use electronic reports not hard copies then no scanning...	Sep 24, 2013 11:12 AM
4	ancient cultures and present-day tribes affiliated with various areas for consultation purposes	Sep 24, 2013 10:57 AM
5	N/A	Sep 24, 2013 10:34 AM
6	Error correction	Sep 24, 2013 9:50 AM
7	Add scans of original Gila Pueblo site records, site card records	Sep 11, 2013 10:12 AM
8	Ability to export spatial data from the Mapping application	Sep 9, 2013 2:10 PM
9	Make site maps available as part of the site card.	Sep 9, 2013 10:38 AM

	Page 3, Q5. 6a. Other (please specify)	
1	Would pay if I had access, but not a lot. I'm an amateur.	Sep 27, 2013 2:37 PM
2	This is public data--why are we paying so much for it? Much less paying MORE???	Sep 26, 2013 9:15 AM
3	None	Sep 24, 2013 4:09 PM
4	Pay more?! Yikes.	Sep 24, 2013 11:24 AM
5	please do not increase fees, they are already high	Sep 24, 2013 10:57 AM
6	N/A	Sep 24, 2013 10:34 AM
7	Ability to download shape files directly	Sep 24, 2013 10:26 AM
8	Error correction	Sep 24, 2013 9:50 AM
9	I think we already pay enough for access.	Sep 24, 2013 9:45 AM
10	Spatial data from Mapping Application	Sep 9, 2013 2:10 PM
11	I can't speak to what the owners would be willing to pay for.	Sep 6, 2013 11:51 AM

Page 3, Q6. 7. Any other comments?

1	Keep up your efforts on AZSITE! It is much appreciated.	Sep 25, 2013 12:18 PM
2	My organization is barely agreeable to paying the fees currently charged; it's like pulling teeth. But I "get" that you guys need $$ to function better. How much do the feds pony up?	Sep 24, 2013 4:09 PM
3	I think you're doing an excellent job at AZSITE. I would support any push to increase funding to support more personnel there.	Sep 24, 2013 1:33 PM
4	The interface to assign rankings in Items 5 and 6 above is a good example of a poorly designed user interface. A task that should take 30 seconds takes about 5 minutes. If I did this survey a few times, I'd get good at it, but in reality I'll never have occasion to use it again. It's a similar thing with AZSITE: people who use it regularly, say a couple times each week, learn its quirks and are comfortable, but how many people actually use it that much? A lot of us use it just occasionally, like at the start of a project to do a records search, then we don't use it again until the start of another project. Meantime, we forget how to navigate the quirks. One more detail I find really frustrating: the size of the site and project labels in the map application: they're so tiny they're hard to read. And when you zoom in, hoping to get a better look, the labels shrink. This is so fundamental a flaw I wonder if the people who designed the application ever tried it out before making it available.	Sep 24, 2013 12:18 PM
5	Archaeologists in other states should only have it so easy. Some here don't appreciate what research would be like without azsite. Keep up the good work.	Sep 24, 2013 11:24 AM
6	Recent improvements to the user interface are great! Overall, I think it would be most useful for AZSITE to become a more central repository for ALL data on sites in the state. I realize not all agencies are on board with this, but moving towards that as much as is possible would be great.	Sep 24, 2013 10:57 AM
7	AZSITE is an excellent tool for researching land parcels and valuable (though expensive) to use. Could you research some other way to fund this valuable tool (state lottery, research grants, etc.)? An increase in fees is not creditable right now, because we are not getting anything out of our >$1200 yearly use fee as it is. We can't get our new sites recorded, our old sites updated, or anything out of our membership except we are able to research older projects and sites recorded years ago--that alone is valuable to us, but we are missing out on being able to record new sites on AZSITE due to complications with the data entry modules. Please keep users restricted to cultural resources personnel only as artifact collectors are becoming more bold and determined to find and collect every artifact they can--they know the artifacts may be worthless right now, but they are hedging on the future, when all Paleo, Archaic, and Late Prehistoric artifacts will increase in value, even ceramic sherds. General public use of AZSITE should not be an option. We have had no luck in getting our ESRI .mdx shape files to copy and be submitted to AZSITE, which is our goal.	Sep 24, 2013 10:57 AM
8	I think it costs enough already, actually, with regard to increased access fees. Since we are out-of-state we don't use AZSITE often enough to be the best source of review.	Sep 24, 2013 10:46 AM
9	I left the "what would we be willing to pay" section blank, because I'm just a peon. I don't want to speak for the company.	Sep 24, 2013 10:29 AM

Page 3, Q6. 7. Any other comments?		
10	The improvements should not be dependent upon an increased access fee.	Sep 24, 2013 10:29 AM
11	I would so love to be able to print what I see on my screen, using one click of a button!! If there is a way to do so, I haven't figured it out!	Sep 24, 2013 10:05 AM
12	Thanks!	Sep 24, 2013 10:01 AM
13	Keep up the great work! I'm not sure if the AZSITE team hears it enough, but we greatly appreciate your effort.	Sep 24, 2013 9:52 AM
14	I do not think that AZSITE should host report libraries. There are several existing services such as tDAR that could host reports. AZSITE should simply provide a link to the file in the other database. There is no need to reinvent the wheel. It would not be fair if AZSITE increases fees to host reports on AZSITE if they could simply link to these files in another service and avoid the time/effort to design a separate AZSITE system. Keep up the great work!	Sep 24, 2013 9:47 AM
15	Maybe I am overlooking it, but the measuring tool no longer seems to be available on the spatial search. That is very helpful, and I'd love to see it return!	Sep 24, 2013 9:45 AM
16	Didn't fill out #6, since I'm not in a position to speak for the organization regarding willingness to pay for increased access fees.	Sep 11, 2013 10:12 AM
17	I think in terms of the availability of scanned CRM reports, it will enable users to check to see if there are any errors within the Mapping application. It would put a bit more responsibility on the users to check to see if the AZSITE plot is correct. Thus, instead of possibily replicating the error found within AZSITE in a new project/report/etc., the error can at least be identified in AZSITE (or any other source it may be incorrect), corrected for that project using the report and scanned site card (if possible), and then AZSITE can be alerted (maybe through an addition to a PRF or whatnot) to the error. I have a feeling that mistakes in the AZSITE mapping application may simply be replicated in subsequent projects because a) no one does (or, let's face it in CRM, no one has the budget) to request the reports to check; b) errors aren't noticed, especially in the 1-mile buffer if not in the PA, as those sites are just on a map and in a table in a report and; c) fixing errors in AZSITE ends up as a sticky note on someone's desk, that may ultimately end up being forgotten because we move on to the next project. If reports, PRFs, and site cards were provided online, and somewhere/somehow perhaps we who use AZSITE and continue to create more backlog were somewhat held responsible for correcting errors (why not if we have what we need to check? If we don't budget for that, it's our fault), it puts less of a responsibility on AZSITE to catch/fix everything. I'm sure there are many who email, alerting to mistakes/errors in site card numbering, scans missing, or whatnot...things that we need ASAP. But other, less "crucial" errors (crucial for our projects to be complete, like sites in the buffer that don't fall in our Project Areas - I'm sure that "crucial" errors inside PAs are brought to AZSITE's attention right away ;)) could also at least be identified by allowing users to access the resources online for that project, as well as perhaps holding us a bit more responsible for identifying them within our own PAs.	Sep 9, 2013 2:10 PM
18	The new AZsite is quite nice and a great tool for research. There are a few ease of use/additions that would help me in my work considerably. I love the inclusion of scanned site records/cards. I would really like the ability to download multiple	Sep 9, 2013 9:21 AM

	site cards simultaneously as well as for the site cards to be accessible through the map interface (which I believe you said was the plan). Further, I would like the ability to be able to search by more fields in the site records lookup including feature type. If CRM reports could be made available digitally, that would be absolutely incredible and save me an amazing amount of time. I really hope that is able to happen.	
19	Please convince the agencies to put all their data into AZSITE. I understand the tribes, but get over yourself Forest Service.	Sep 6, 2013 4:32 PM
20	error correction and ease of use are not goals whose cost should be passed on to the customer	Sep 6, 2013 12:49 PM
21	I realize these improvements and innovations are not cut and dry, but you seem to be making strides in improving AZSITE - it is much more reliable and easier to use than it was even 5 years ago. Make it so we don't have to wait years (days would be acceptable) for data to go live and I'll be one happy camper. Keep up the good work.	Sep 6, 2013 12:41 PM
22	While I understand the tribes want to control their information, the lack of data are a major deficiency in the system. Likewise I understand why various other agencies also are concerned about control an access to their data. There needs to be outreach to these groups to resolve their concerns.	Sep 6, 2013 12:33 PM