

AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes

July 21, 2021

10:00 a.m. to 11:42 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)
Melissa Powell, Arizona State University (ASU)

Members of the public present:

Gabe McGowan (AZSITE Manager)
Carrie Schmidt (AZSITE Technician)
Karen Leone (Arizona State Museum)
Laura Swantek (AZTEC)
Barbara Montgomery (Tierra Right of Way Services)
Lesley Rodriguez (Archaeological Consulting Services)
Ian Milliken (Pima County)
Christopher Nicholson (ASU)
Scott Courtwright (Natural Resources Conservation Service)
Abraham Arnett (Arizona Game and Fish Department)
Reylynne Williams (Gila River Indian Community)
Dan Garcia (Salt River Project)
Sarina Mann (Arizona State Museum)
Larry Benallie (Gila River Indian Community)

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 2nd Quarter 2021 Meeting Minutes (Watson)
 - a. Motion to approve (Walsh)
 - i. Seconded (Hays-Gilpin)
 - ii. Motion passed unanimously.
2. Finance Report (Watson)
 - a. End of the fiscal year was June 30.
 - i. Beginning Fund Balance: \$278,695.00
 - ii. Total Income: \$142,965.00
 - iii. Total Expense: \$165,094.00

- iv. Current Fund Balance: \$256,566.00
 - v. Uncommitted Cash Expenditure: \$256,566.00
 - b. The income over the past five years was discussed. Year 2020-2021 was above average for the period.
 - c. The current fee structure should be in place for the next few years. Deficits will be covered by existing funds. Continued coordination with ISSR regarding their associated costs will also be required.
- 3. Report on Fee Structure (McGowan)
 - a. McGowan presented a report on the new fee structure outlining use patterns.
 - i. The 2021 fee structure moved to the per-head fee model to reduce costs for organizations. Most organizations indicated that they would purchase about the same number of user accounts in a survey conducted mid-2020. Overall, in 2021 there have been fewer users per organizations.
 - ii. The largest loss in invoicing from 2020 to 2021 is from fewer annual accounts without Mercator access. This appears to be the result of 2020 Small/Medium account users upgrading to Mercator access in 2021, while large organizations are decreasing the total number of users and users with Mercator access.
 - iii. The fee structure is performing at the low end of expectations primarily due to user organizations decreasing their number of accounts. Mercator GIS server use is more prevalent, but larger organizations appear to be reserving this level of access for more GIS-oriented personnel.
 - iv. Discussion:
 - 1. Walsh inquired about the number of municipal level government personnel with AZSITE accounts.
 - a. McGowan replied that the number is low, approximately 8 to 10 accounts.
 - 2. Walsh stated that county and municipal personnel ask SHPO for data and getting them their own AZSITE accounts would be more efficient. This could be applied to non-archaeologists on a limited level.
 - a. McGowan replied that the CLG application developed circa 2016/2017 was put on hold due to concerns about security

- ii. The policy also outlines potential procedures for data clips associated with these data. However, these data are not always in a digital format, due to informal policies against upload of data from Tribal lands.
- iii. Discussion:
 - 1. Watson inquired if these data are completely deleted or securely stored.
 - a. McGowan replied that these data are currently stored separately from the primary AZSITE dataset. If AZSITE data are identified to be on Tribal Lands, the data is extracted and delivered to the associated tribes. A copy of the extracted data is stored.
 - 2. Watson stated that this policy likely requires tribal consultation. The Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resource Working Group would be a great option for a consultation regarding the policy. Their next meeting will be in October 2021.
 - a. Walsh requested that SHPO also be involved in the tribal consultation.
 - 3. Walsh stated that that tribal data was removed from the ARO in the past. During the tribal consultation, the tribes can indicate their preferred storage location.
 - 4. Hays-Gilpin stated that additional situations, such as trust, allotted trust, and fee lands, need to be included in the Tribal Lands definition provided on the draft policy.
 - 5. Williams stated that the draft policy is a good start. Utilizing the Southwest Native Nations Advisory Board at Arizona State University (ASU) would be an ideal next step to involve all 22 tribes. The tribal representatives have questions about AZSITE that can be addressed during the consultation.
 - 6. Watson stated that an invitation for consultation will be sent out to all 22 tribes and will be added to the next Southwest Native Nations Advisory Board meeting agenda.
- iv. Motion to send the policy for tribal consultation (Hays-Gilpin)
 - 1. Seconded (Powell)
 - 2. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee Report (Garcia)

a. Garcia presented the Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee Report.

- i. The committee discussed how to improve land ownership and jurisdiction data in AZSITE. Ian Milliken and Ryan Arp will work with AZSITE staff on how to tailor the layer to reflect which lands are subject to Arizona Antiquities Act (AAA) permitting.
- ii. Adding well known archaeological sites to AZSITE is a major committee goal. Steve Swanson has volunteered to develop a best practice document for obtaining and processing these sites with AZSITE. These sites could possibly be submitted as courtesy submissions if they are on private land or land not subject to AAA permitting.
- iii. Estimated to have revised pre-contact canal information by the end of 2021. There will be a symposium on ancient canals at the Pueblo Grande Museum in September.
- iv. The committee investigated National Register of Historical Places (NRHP) eligibility data in AZSITE after reports of large-scale inaccuracy. The committee investigation found no evidence of this in AZSITE. However, it was determined that the format in AZSITE for presenting NRHP recommendations and determinations is confusing. The level of data integrity is also unclear. The committee would like to request that the board ask the AZSITE Manager to conduct an audit of the NRHP recommendation and determination data currently in AZSITE.
- v. Discussion:
 1. Walsh stated that NRHP evaluations are also an issue for SHPO. The full determination record cannot be transferred. Reasons for conflicting determinations often can only be determined by contacting SHPO. This issue likely cannot be addressed until the new SHPO system with GIS is in place.
 2. Milliken stated that geography is not represented in NRHP eligibility. It is the responsibility of the consultant to determine the geography associated with the determination, whether it be the entire site or only a section of the site.
 3. Watson stated that AZSITE is intended to be a first step. Additional research efforts are always required.

4. Benallie stated that consultants tend to split sites up based on eligibility, but the whole site should either be considered eligible or not. This issue has been previously discussed during tribal consultations. If any NRHP irregularities are discovered, they are typically diligently addressed.
5. Williams stated that the NRHP information provided by AZSITE for consultation with the tribes sets a precedent for all project consultations.
6. Watson stated that AZSITE is a tool with a limited ability to address issues with NRHP eligibilities. These issues should be discussed between organizations and SHPO.
7. McGowan stated that additional fields can be incorporated to better describe the NRHP record in AZSITE.
8. Garcia stated that AZSITE does not reflect the tribal opinion concerning NRHP eligibility.
 - a. Walsh replied that NRHP does not consider the tribal opinion, as it was primarily created for historic buildings. It is unlikely any change can be made at the federal level, but these concerns can be addressed at the state level.
 - b. Milliken offered to provide insights on how local governments use NRHP eligibilities when addressing these concerns.

6. Legislative Updates (Garcia)

- a. No legislative update. Money was added to the Heritage Fund, which could be of interest to ASITE. Legislative sessions will begin in January 2022.

7. AZSITE Updates (McGowan & Schmidt)

a. Backlog:

i. Projects:

1. New upload procedure – projects are uploaded in bulk and checked when uploading their associated new sites.
2. 1,690 Uploaded (66%)
 - a. 634 at Q2 Meeting (25%)

ii. New Sites:

1. 4,337 Uploaded (57%)

- a. 3,052 at Q2 Meeting (40%)
 - 2. 3,301 in Advanced Sites Layer (43%)
- iii. Site Updates:
 - 1. 3,819 Basic Uploaded (53%)
 - a. 1,746 at Q2 Meeting (24%)
- b. Uploads Overall:
 - i. A continued trend for 2 to 3 times more uploads in 2021 when compared to 2020. Additionally, 223 fixes have been completed so far in 2021. A total of 73 fixes were completed in 2020.
- c. Other Updates:
 - i. Data Clips – new container that does not rely on the older legacy entry module. The container summarizes attribute data within the clip boundary in lists while also providing a detail view for each record.
 - ii. New User Forms:
 - 1. Data Request Form – previous Data Request Form updated with new data clip module and secure upload link options.
 - 2. Add/Remove Users Form – allows users to update their AZSITE rosters outside of using the annual application.
 - 3. Data Fix Request Forms – forms for archaeological data and reference data fixes created to standardize the fix request process. Information provided on the forms will be entered into a new data fix database for tracking and analyzing fixes.
 - iii. Web Apps:
 - 1. Changes requested for the website to include the recorded sites, including Advanced Sites, on the project info tab in the Attribute Search.
 - 2. Ongoing efforts to clean and standardize date fields.
 - 3. Requests submitted to re-format the Site NRHP tab in the Attribute Search.
 - 4. Web Entry Module – NPS grant application was declined, but work will continue to have the Web Entry Module available in the near future.
 - iv. Servers:

1. Azsite4 server migration to a different data center at ASU is still ongoing. A new virtualization platform and associated software updates were required for azsite3 and azsitevdb servers, addressing recent stability issues.

D. Public Comment

- a. Williams stated that there is a request from the Four Southern Tribes for a presentation about AZSITE data. This presentation can be combined with one for the Tribal Lands policy. The next Four Southern Tribes meeting is in August.
 - i. Watson and McGowan agreed to the presentation request.
- b. Garcia suggested that the board should discuss increasing the AZSITE fees to meet expenditures and develop the Certified Local Government (CLG) layer. A Tribal Lands buffer would be an excellent way for AZSITE to work more closely with tribes regarding their data.
 - i. Watson replied that the board would like to see the fee structure stay as it is. AZSITE should economize based on priorities, starting with the backlog. Once these goals are accomplished, the fee structure can be addressed for potential changes.
- c. Benallie stated that there is some concern from the Four Southern Tribes on the security of AZSITE data.
- d. Milliken stated that the amount of available funds from SHPO will be known soon, which can potentially be utilized by AZSITE.

E. Date and Time of Next Meeting

- a. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 13, 2021, at 10:00 a.m. The meeting will be on Zoom.

F. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 11:42 am