AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes
February 2, 2022
10:00 a.m. to 11:24 a.m.

A quorum was obtained.

A. CALL TO ORDER (Watson)

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

Board members present:

Jim Watson, Chairperson, Arizona State Museum (ASM)

Mary-Ellen Walsh, Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)

Kelley Hays-Gilpin, Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA)

Christopher Caseldine, Arizona State University (ASU)

Members of the public present:

Gabe McGowan (AZSITE Manager)

Carrie Schmidt (AZSITE GIS Technician)

Abraham Arnett (AZGFD)

Michael Brack (Tierra Right-of-Way)

Jenni Rich (ACS)

Ian Milliken (Pima County)

Dan Garcia (Salt River Project)

Branden Fjerstad (PaleoWest/Codify)

Karen Leone (ASM)

Kathryn Turney (Yavapai Public Works)

April Carroll (Arizona Public Service Company)

Sarina Mann (ASM)

Teresa Gregory (SRI)

Scott Courtright (NRCS)

Zachery Rothewell (North Wind)

Mary Swearinger (Transcon)

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 4th Quarter 2021 Meeting Minutes (Watson)

   a. Motion to approve (Hays-Gilpin)

   b. Seconded (Walsh)

   c. Approved unanimously.

2. Finance Report (Watson)

   a. Finance Report:

   i. Current Fund Balance: $239,666.00

   ii. Income: $66,075.00

   iii. Expenses: $83,975.00

 b. Annual Applications:

   i. Applicant Organizations: 78

   ii. Users: 285

   iii. Invoiced: $114,400.00

   iv. Annual applications are running ahead of this time last year. Some organizations have submitted multiple applications due to recent hiring. More applications are expected to be submitted over the next month, as well as throughout the calendar year.

   v. Discussion:

    1. Caseldine inquired the trajectory for revenue and how this compares to previous years.

    2. Watson stated that due to the fee structure change in 2020, it is difficult to compare to previous years.

    3. McGowan explained the previous fee-structure and how the new fee-structure has lower fees. The number of user organizations has increased. The number of users has decreased from 2020 to 2021 due to the fee structure change.

3. Data Clip Delivery (McGowan)

 a. McGowan discussed different options for delivering data clip request material. Currently, AZSITE is using Box to deliver clip material to users. Material is zipped, uploaded to Box, and a link to the Box files are emailed to users. The link is set to expire after seven days. McGowan inquired about the board's opinion on continuing this process or if another secure method should be explored. There is a framework in the Attribute Search to make files available to users associated with a given organization that was previously used to deliver reports. The cost of adding this functionality for data clips would be approximately $2,000 - $3,000. ASU-GRS could be asked for a more precise estimate. There are only about five or less data clip requests per month.

   i. Watson asked if users could request clips themselves using the Mercator server.

> 1. McGowan replied that they could, but not with the more detailed attributes provided in a data clip.
>
> ii. Watson stated that is does not seem necessary to invest in a special application for data clips.
>
> iii. Hays-Gilpin stated that Sharepoint is currently being used for Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) data.
>
> iv. Walsh stated that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) consultations also use Sharepoint.

4. Access Policy & Database Use Agreement (McGowan & Schmidt)

   a. Schmidt presented a draft of the AZSITE Access Policy. Major changes include the increased criteria for Certified Local Government (CLG) and County/Municipal government applicants that do not meet the Department of Interior standards, have an Arizona Antiques Act (AAA) permit, or have an Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) permit. These applicants must complete biannual sensitivity training and be reviewed by the SHPO. Updates to the Access Policy also include addition of any Tribal cultural resource officers and staff, clarification that Cultural Resource Management firms must have a staff archaeologist as the organization contact, and that state and Federal agencies must have a SHPO approved responsible entity if the contact is not a cultural resource manager.

      i. Discussion:

         1. Walsh stated that recent updated to the signatory criteria for Cultural Resource firms and state and federal agencies will require a final review by the board.

         2. Schmidt stated that there is a question about Public Utilities vs. Private Utilities in the policy.

            a. Walsh replied that since private utilities still have to go through the Arizona Corporation Commission for their projects, they can also be included in the Public Utilities section.

   b. Schmidt and McGowan presented a draft of the AZSITE Database Use Agreement. The drafted divides the statements into the following sections: General Terms of Use, Access Management, Data Management, Data Distribution, and Other Considerations. Clarifications have been made regarding individuals within an organization without AZSITE Access (Field, IT, or editing personnel) having access

to AZSITE data, web application vs. Mercator server access, data storage on cloud servers, and prohibiting the sharing AZSITE data with outside cultural resource databases.

  i. Discussion:
      1. Schmidt stated that there was a question from the Ad Hoc Committee about if outside cultural resource databases included internal databases used by approved AZSITE organizations.
          a. McGowan stated that the associated section in the agreement can be rewritten to allow for internal database use.
      2. Walsh inquired about differences in data between AZSITE, land managers, and the Archaeological Records Office (ARO).
          a. Watson replied that the ARO curates the official record and it is the responsibility of AZSITE staff to publish data transferred from the ARO.
      3. McGowan stated that the outside cultural resource database statement in the draft was meant to prohibit AZSITE users from transferring data to organizations that do not have AZSITE access and serve a similar purpose to AZSITE.

c. Motion to approve the AZSITE User Agreement draft pending discussed edits to the outside cultural resource databases statement. (Hays-Gilpin)
  i. Seconded (Walsh)
  ii. Approved unanimously.

d. Motion to approve AZSITE Access Policy pending review of edits to organization signatory criteria for cultural resource firms and state and federal agencies. (Walsh)
  i. Seconded (Caseldine)
  ii. Approved unanimously.

5. Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee Report (Garcia)
  a. Garcia discussed the January Ad Hoc Advisory Committee report. There are several new members due to resignations and employment changes. Scott Courtright (NRCS) has filled the federal position and Branden Fjerstad (PaleoWest/Codify) has filled the small cultural resource firm position. The committee is still soliciting applications for the state, large cultural resource firm, and academic positions. Theresa Coleman (City of Bisbee) has resigned her CLG position. The committee would like guidance from the board on how the open CLG position should be filled.

   i. Watson stated that the committee is adequately diverse without filling the open CLG position.

   ii. Walsh stated that Coleman not only represented a CLG, but the ranching community in the surrounding area.

   iii. Garcia stated that there is a ranching representative currently on the committee. Scott Courtright also works closely with producers. Based on board comments, the position will not be filled.

 b. No updates for the committee initiatives concerning land ownership data and prehistoric canals. The initiative to add well-known sites to AZSITE will be reassigned to another committee member.

 c. Reylynne Williams (GRIC) drafted an outline for biannual training. The committee will review before presenting to the board.

 d. The committee would like to discuss having survey reports available through AZSITE, similar to the way site cards and Project Registration Forms (PRF) are made available as PDFs.

   i. Hays-Gilpin explained that the Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA) had a contract with AZSITE to scan MNA site cards and plot site points. The next phase was to scan reports, but the budget and data capacity prevented this from moving forward.

   ii. Watson inquired if adding reports would increase server costs or slow down the applications.

     1. McGowan replied that reports would require more storage. The new AZSITE servers have affordable storage at $50 a year for a terabyte. Additional storage is already planned to be added for 2022.

     2. Milliken clarified that the committee is not asking for non-digitized reports to be digitized.

   iii. Walsh inquired about the costs associated with obtaining reports from the Archaeological Records Office (ARO).

     1. Leone stated that anyone can come into the office to look at physical or PDF copies of reports. If they want a digital copy, they need to request the document for a fee.

   iv. Watson stated that according to the AZSITE Executive Order as a cultural resource repository, reports could be included and subjected to the Database Use Agreement.

v. Caseldine stated that adding reports to AZSITE could be redundant with tDAR. Files can easily be corrupted, so a digital archivist would be required to maintain the records. It could be possible to provide a link to the location of the document as opposed to hosting the data on AZSITE.

vi. Walsh stated that there are also issues of confidentiality. SHPO has investigated storing reports with tDAR. It is better that users go directly to the agency storing the reports.

vii. Watson inquired about the level of effort this would require from the AZSITE staff. Adding reports to AZSITE could be investigated after major projects, such as the backlog, are complete.

1. McGowan replied that previously, when ARO and AZSITE were one entity, ASM reports were temporarily made available to AZSITE user organizations via AZSITE as part of records research deliverables. The organizations would have to make specific requests. Reactivating this system would require a fair amount of ongoing effort by AZSITE staff due to the likely high volume of requests. There would need to be a framework to ingest and manage the requests. However, startup effort would be minimal as the report sharing functionality already exists. Another option would be maintaining a library of report PDFs that users can browse, as is currently done with site cards and PRFs. This would likely incur several thousands of dollars in upfront development costs to add this library to the Attribute Search, but less ongoing effort in managing individual report requests.

viii. Milliken stated that the reports should come from the ARO to ensure the correct and final iteration of the report is provided. Other sources may not provide the final version maintained in the ARO.

ix. Caseldine suggested having another tier of AZSITE accounts that would have access to reports.

x. McGowan stated that additional discussion with the ARO and ASM would need to take place before moving forward.

xi. Garcia stated that the committee will look into possible funding opportunities for this project at a later date.

xii. Watson stated that due to the time and effort demands on AZSITE staff, investigation of adding reports to AZSITE is not recommended to move forward at this time.

e. The AZSITE presentation at the Four Southern Tribes meeting was well received and it was asked if this presentation could be replicated for other tribal meetings.

   i. Watson stated that ASM has a tribal advisory board. This would be a great opportunity to present information about AZSITE.

f. Discussion:

   i. Walsh stated that PaleoWest was recently purchased by Codify.

      1. Garcia replied that PaleoWest and Codify remain two separate entities. The committee will look into if PaleoWest is still considered an independent cultural resource business.

      2. Fjerstad stated that Codify is a separate company with its own governance.

   ii. Walsh stated that the biannual training could be in a PowerPoint format.

      1. Garcia replied that more tribal input could be solicited for the trainings.

6. Legislative Updates (Garcia)

a. Senate Bill 1671 – has not been formally introduced. This would appropriate funds every year to support ASM and the Arizona Antiquities Act.

7. AZSITE Updates (Schmidt)

a. Backlog:

   i. **Projects:** 2,229 uploaded (87%)
   ii. **New Sites:** 5,467 uploaded (72%)
   iii. **Site Updates:** 5,201 (73%)

b. Uploads Overall: 2021

   i. **Projects:** 2,225
   ii. **New Sites:** 4,087
   iii. **Site Updates:** 5,033
   iv. **PRFs:** 231
   v. **New/Updated Site Cards:** 511
   vi. **Fixes:** 316

c. Updates:

   i. Web Forms:

1. New web forms now available for data clip requests and annual applications. The form and underlying database have made the 2022 application period more efficient.

2. A web form and database for user-submitted data fixes is currently in development.

ii. Pima County Pass-Through Grant:

1. Grant for approximately $20,000 to be used for the following updates and improvements to AZSITE's web mapping application:

   a. Updated web map interface
   b. Esri Basemaps
   c. Map print function
   d. Ability to add shapefiles/KMZ to the map
   e. User-managed credentials

iii. Development:

1. AZSITE staff gaining access to a development server for work on the Attribute Search application.

2. Continued work on the Web Entry Module.

iv. McGowan Family Leave:

1. Part-time leave beginning February 9, 2022.

D. Public Comment

a. Garcia stated that executive order for AZSITE should be reviewed and used for future planning purposes. Thank you to the AZSITE staff for the work on the backlog and the applications in general.

b. Milliken inquired if AZSITE is eligible for Heritage Fund funding.

   i. The board agreed this should be looked into. If AZSITE is not eligible, an eligible agency could apply on behalf of AZSITE.

   ii. Garcia stated that the Heritage Fund was only funded for one year, so it is likely that those funds are already assigned.

E. Date and Time of Next Meeting

a. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 13, 2022 at 10:00 a.m. The meeting will be on Zoom.

F. Adjournment

a. Meeting adjourned at 11:24 am