

AZSITE Board Meeting Minutes

February 5, 2020

10:00 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.

A quorum was obtained.

1. 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)
Melissa Powell, Arizona State University (ASU)
Jim Watson, Arizona State Museum (ASM)
Kelley Hays-Gilpin, Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA)

Members of the public present:

Gabe McGowan (AZSITE)
Christina Rocha (ASM)
Natalie Ortega (Western Area Power Administration [WAPA])
Nina Rogers (WAPA)
Ashley D'Elia (Tierra Right of Way)
Karen Leone (ASM)
Ian Milliken (Pima County)
Sarina Mann (ASM)
Dan Garcia (Salt River Project) (online)
Chris Nicholson (Digital Antiquity) (online)
April Carrol (Arizona Public Service [APS]) (online)
Duane Barclay (ARCADIS) (online)
Michael O'Hara (Arizona State Land Department [ASLD]) (online)
Ron Huettner (ASLD) (online)
Tiffani Graham (ASLD) (online)
Ryan Johnson (ASLD) (online)
Kris Powell (Arizona Department of Transportation) (online)
Alisson MacLean (Logan Simpson) (online)
Caroline Klebacha (PaleoWest) (online)
Teresa Gregory (Statistical Research) (online)

2. Introductions

- a. AZSITE Board members were introduced
- b. AZSITE Manager was introduced
- c. Members of the public attending the meeting were introduced

3. Agenda Items

- a. Discussion and approval of January 8 emergency meeting minutes (Walsh). Hays-Gilpin moves to accept the minutes, seconded by Watson. The minutes were approved with a roll call vote of the Board. There were no comments from members of the public.
 - i. Hays-Gilpin moves to accept, seconded by Watson

- ii. Accepted

- b. Discussion of AZSITE Meeting Postings updates (Walsh). The SHPO website's AZSITE tab has been maintained and updated with this information. McGowan has implemented AZSITE website updates with detailed meeting information.

- c. Updates on the status of the AZSITE Consortium Advisory Committee (Walsh). There have been no updates from the governor's office.
 - i. Garcia, an applicant to the committee, confirms he has also not received any updates.

- d. Discussion of AZSITE Fee Survey Results (Watson). Watson explains that the survey was conducted by the previous AZSITE manager in August 2019 to obtain feedback on the current fee structure as well as for her proposed changes to the fee structure. The proposed changes included adding the option to buy Mercator server access to each tier of access, slightly lowering rates for each tier, and adding an extra-large account size. The results were not previously presented to the board. The results will be added to the AZSITE website after this meeting. There were 10 questions and 74 respondents. The results indicated that:
 - i. most AZSITE users are long-term users;
 - ii. satisfaction with the existing fee structure is mixed, with slightly more dissatisfied users than satisfied users;
 - iii. elements of the present fee structure liked by users are the 30 non-consecutive day account and the tiered pricing by account size;
 - iv. aspects of the present fee structure disliked by users are the expense (especially given the backlog), the lack of Mercator server access for small accounts, and the lack of reduced fees for government/municipal/tribal accounts;
 - v. aspects of the proposed fee structure liked by users were the ability to get Mercator server access at various account sizes;
 - vi. aspects of the proposed fee structure disliked by users were that Mercator access was not free, that the cost per user did not decrease with the number of users in the tiered account system, and the expense;
 - vii. many users who do not currently have Mercator server access would like the option to add it to their account, and that about half of users think all AZSITE accounts should include Mercator server access at no additional cost;
 - viii. changes users would like to see included a one-person yearly account option, free Mercator server access, elimination of the backlog prior to fee increases, a cheaper fee structure for government/municipality/tribal accounts, regular updates on backlog progress, and a per-user fee structure;
 - ix. users were slightly more satisfied with the proposed fee structure than the existing fee structure.

The former AZSITE manager recommended that all AZSITE users be given access to the Mercator server; that fees be reduced for large accounts; that fees be increased for small and medium accounts once Mercator access is granted; that the AZSITE server hardware

be upgraded to accommodate the additional user load; and that an extra-large account option be created for organizations with more than 15 users.

McGowan discusses the server hardware upgrade. The server manager at ASU has indicated that the existing server is nearing capacity, and a significant increase in load would require an upgrade in server hardware. This is something the prior AZSITE manager looked into with ASU and found a cost of \$1,500 to \$2,700. McGowan has discussed with ASU and estimates with labor the total cost will be around \$3,000.

- x. Milliken comments to ask why the board didn't move forward with the proposed fee structure based on the survey results last year, and if they will move forward with them now. Watson responds to say that the board were never presented with the results due to the transition in the AZSITE manager position, and that the new manager should have an opportunity to form an opinion and gather data on this issue.
 - xi. Garcia comments to ask if there will be an additional cost if Mercator access is opened to all subscribers. McGowan responds that the \$3,000 discussed is a one-time server hardware upgrade, not an additional cost to users, but the fee structure proposed in the survey included an additional fee for Mercator access at all account sizes.
 - xii. Milliken comments to ask that if the Board decides not to grant Mercator access at no additional cost to all users, they should consider granting government/municipal/tribal entities access without an additional fee.
- e. Discussion of AZSITE backlog (McGowan). Since the last backlog report (April 2019), about 2,600 PRFs were uploaded to AZSITE and an inventory of shapefiles in the ARO and AZSITE backlog was completed. There are about 2,600 projects in the project backlog. Of these, about 20% do not have shapefiles. There are about 15,000 sites in the backlog. This includes about 44% without shapefiles, about 29% without entry modules, and about 18% with both. Projects with shapefiles and sites with shapefiles/entry modules are a priority for upload. It appears feasible to conduct batch uploads of these data. McGowan will identify other opportunities for scripting upload procedures in the AZSITE upload workflow to improve efficiency. He will also identify those aspects that are more difficult to script and may be more time-consuming. In addition, the Advanced Sites Layer was updated on February 3rd.
- i. Garcia comments to ask for a timeline for updates to be made to AZSITE data. McGowan responds that he anticipates making progress on the backlog by the April Board meeting. Watson comments that McGowan is a new hire and is still learning the existing systems.
 - ii. Watson comments to mention that there has been confusion lately about the ability for stakeholders to submit data from non-state lands directly to AZSITE for upload. He says this service is available free of cost. Leone asks him to confirm that when people send their projects directly to AZSITE, there is no charge. Watson confirms.
 - iii. Leone comments that ARO is developing policy to require shapefiles with submittals, which will streamline future AZSITE uploads. Milliken suggests that

- the AZSITE manager could contact contractors from backlogged projects/sites which lack shapefiles to ask for them, as they likely exist in most cases.
- iv. Milliken comments that he has started building into his contracts a requirement for CRM contractors to include geospatial data with submittals to the ARO and urges other agencies to do the same.
 - v. Walsh comments that this issue could be addressed with use of separate layer
 - vi. Watson comments that one consideration with the geospatial submittal requirement is small companies that may not have GIS software or expertise; Milliken comments that an option for KMZ submittals (e.g. from Google Earth) could address this.
- f. Discussion of AZSITE Finances (Watson). Watson notes that while the state fiscal year begins on July 1, AZSITE accounts operate on the calendar year, creating an offset between income and expenditures for the program. At the beginning of this fiscal year, the AZSITE fund had \$207,876. Through January 2020, fiscal year income was \$61,770 and expenditures were \$38,804, leaving a balance of \$230,841. Encumbrances for the remainder of the fiscal year are \$38,876, mainly for the AZSITE manager's salary. Additional monthly expenditures include monthly billings from ASU for system O&M and troubleshooting, as well as an annual server charge.
- i. Milliken comments to ask why there were salary and benefit expenditures during the interval between AZSITE managers. Watson/Rocha respond these may have been for staff covering some of these duties on an interim basis. There were no such payments in November or December, only October.
- g. Discussion of Access to Mercator server (McGowan). McGowan notes that much of this discussion was had during the fee survey discussion. He notes that some post-processing of fee survey results indicates that satisfaction among those with Mercator access was somewhat lower than those without; this is likely due to the expense of Mercator access under the current system in combination with the backlog. Discussion with the server manager at ASU has indicated the upgrade of the server hardware is a necessary precursor to significant expansion of Mercator access, and that this will cost approximately \$3,000.
- i. Motion to move forward with server upgrades (Watson), seconded by Powell. Approved by roll call vote of the board.
 - ii. Walsh notes that changes to Mercator access that shift the number of user accounts per tier could have a significant impact on AZSITE revenue.
 - iii. Milliken comments to reiterate that most government/municipal agencies will not have a large user group, that they stand to benefit the most from Mercator access, and that we should account for this in our analysis.
 - iv. Suggestion to put discussion of a proposal for expanding Mercator access, including detail cost analyses, on the agenda for the next meeting (Walsh). Walsh also suggests the Board discuss as a separate item Mercator access / policy for municipalities/agencies.
 - v. Garcia comments that the perspective of CRM contractors is not represented, and that they spend a lot of time recreating AZSITE data because Mercator access is

so expensive. He urges the Board to consider opening up Mercator access, and notes that he is dismayed that this has not happened as it was promised by the previous AZSITE manager.

- h. Discussion of AZSITE data clip requests for large areas (McGowan). McGowan has received four requests for extracts of AZSITE data for large areas:
 - i. Pima County - county boundary plus a 20-mile buffer, amounting to about 15,000 square miles. Milliken explains the data is used for compliance in support of County projects.
 - ii. ADOT - road rights of way across the state with a small buffer, totaling about 327 square miles. McGowan reads letter from Powell detailing that the data will be used in ADOT's Section 106 and SHPA compliance process.
 - iii. AECOM – tentative request for an area of approximately 1,200 square miles immediately south of Lake Mead for use in siting client projects and preparing a cultural resources overview report.
 - iv. BLM - the Colorado River District Administrative boundary, an area of about 20,000 square miles along the western border of Arizona. This data will support archaeology efforts across the district.

All requests are approved by unanimous roll call vote of the Board.

- i. User ability to change passwords (McGowan). ASU has given McGowan a not-to-exceed cost of \$3,750 for adding to the AZSITE website the ability for AZSITE users to modify their own account credentials, as is standard for web login systems. This would save McGowan a small amount of time, but the benefit is more in security and professionalism. Currently users must contact McGowan directly to change their credentials. There is agreement that while this feature would be nice, the cost is not currently worth it, as McGowan receives very few requests for credential changes.
- j. Motion to adjourn for five-minute recess (Walsh).

4. Public Comment

- a. Watson comments, in response to Garcia's earlier comment on opening Mercator access to all users, that he wants to ensure such a decision is based on data showing it is financially sustainable.
 - i. Powell comments that she has notes from Malissa in August predicting a \$29,000 decline in revenues from expanding Mercator access. Also notes that the Board previously approved a fee increase to occur over three years, and that only the first year of increases was implemented.
 - ii. Hays-Gilpin notes that the fees make it possible to address the backlog and issues with data currently in the system.
 - iii. Watson notes that a sizeable chunk of revenue was lost when BLM stopped contributing to AZSITE due to the backlog.
 - iv. Board comments that AZSITE should make projections of revenue under potential fee structure changes, incorporating desire for cheaper agency access

and wider Mercator access, and using number of current users for large licenses to predict future licensing levels for these entities.

- v. Garcia comments that he would like to see faster movement on opening Mercator access, but understands that it needs to be considered in detailed financial terms. Suggests that a decision on granting access be on next agenda.
 - vi. Walsh suggests including a separate item on the next agenda, discussion of a draft policy for agencies to have access to Mercator access, to be developed for the next meeting.
 - 1. Action items include developing a budget (Watson) and a policy
 - 2. Milliken suggests that GAAC can help draft an initial policy
 - 3. Walsh notes that there are confidentiality issues given not everything in AZSITE is on state land. This will need to be addressed in the policy, including for properties under the Farm Bill.
- b. Garcia comments that he is glad to hear AZSITE allows sites from non-consortium agencies, and requests that this be advertised to encourage people to contribute when working off state lands. He thinks this would result in an influx of information to AZSITE, particularly for the Phoenix area.
- i. Walsh raises the possibility of hosting data of this type as a separate layer and requests a policy statement.
- c. Garcia comments that since AZSITE is a separate entity from ARO, why not put data that meets the requirements for AZSITE directly into AZSITE as some sort of provisional data in near real time?
- i. Klebacha comments that if the public can submit data, they may be able to associate that information with a previous project.
 - ii. Watson responds that many current issues arise because submitted data is not accurate. A preliminary layer would be a good solution. The web entry module would help with this.
 - 1. Walsh comments that we should follow up with ASU, as she had understood this was complete.
- d. Milliken comments that it would be helpful for AZSITE and ARO to develop a process for users to request a correction to incorrect data that they encounter in the system. Would all such corrections need to go through the ARO or could they go straight to AZSITE?
- i. Walsh suggests AZSITE/ARO consider it for the next meeting, and possibly develop a form.
- e. Garcia comments to request that future meeting agendas include more detail proposed actions for agenda items. Walsh agrees. There is a discussion of holding topic-specific meetings as topics arise. Hays-Gilpin notes that posting Emergency meetings with short notice (two or three days), to respond more quickly to issues that arise, opens the Board to transparency concerns. She says such meetings can be called Special instead of Emergency and asks what the preferred time frame would be to balance advance notice with moving forward more quickly. Garcia notes that three- or four-days' notice to the

public, particularly given recent improvements in web postings, is enough. Milliken notes statute requires only 24 hours.

5. Establish date and time of next meeting

- a. The next Board meeting is scheduled for April 29, 2020 at the SHPO office in Phoenix.
- b. Agenda will include:
 - i. Upgrade to server hardware (McGowan)
 - ii. Fee discussion, including cost analyses, for expanding Mercator access and lowering cost for government/municipal agencies.
 - iii. Discussion of part-time AZSITE employee hire
 - iv. Policy update – president of GAAC
 - v. Garcia and Klebacha to contact the Board if they have any updates from the Arizona Archaeological Council and feel this should be on the agenda.

6. Meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m. (Motion by Walsh)