

AZSITE Consortium Board Meeting Minutes

July 16th, 2026

10:01 a.m. to 10:56 am

A quorum was obtained.

A. CALL TO ORDER (WALSH)

Meeting called to order at 10:01 am.

Board members present:

1. Mary-Ellen Walsh, Chair (2026), Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, (SHPO)
2. Suzanne Eckert, on behalf of Jim Watson, Arizona State Museum (ASM)
3. Christopher Caseldine, Arizona State University (ASU)
4. Jeff Burns, Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA)

Members of the public present:

1. Gabe McGowan (AZSITE Manager)
2. Christina Rocha (UA ORP Business Center)
3. Kathryn Turney (Tetra Tech)
4. Tim Goddard (ASM ARO)
5. Lauren Tennison (North Wind Resource Consulting)
6. Abraham Arnett (Dudek)
7. Sara Cullen (AZ DFFM)
8. Tim Watkins (BLM)
9. Amber Redger (WAPA)
10. Christopher Schwartz (City of Phoenix)
11. Bella Comstock (North Wind Resource Consulting)

B. INTRODUCTIONS

- 1. Members of the AZSITE Board were introduced**
- 2. 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 2026 Meeting Minutes (Walsh)**
 - a. Motion to approve (Caseldine)*
 - b. Seconded (Walsh)*
 - c. Approved (Unanimous)*

2. Finance Report (McGowan)

1. McGowan notes that CY 2026 participation (433 users) is similar to that seen in 2024 (431) and 2025 (439). The total invoiced for CY 2026 (\$252,395) is slightly lower than in CY 2025 (\$266,485), mainly because we are mid-year ([Table 1](#)).
2. Provisional FY 2026 fund summary numbers ([Table 2](#)):
 - a. \$389,462 beginning balance (unfrozen by UA per 4/6/2026 letter from John Arnold, UA CFO)
 - b. \$244,190 income
 - c. \$230,141 expense
 - d. FY 2026 carryforward of \$14,049
3. Projected vs. Actual FY 2026 Spending ([Table 3](#))
 - a. Personnel: \$179,975 projected; \$178,115 actual
 - b. Operations: \$47,300 projected; \$52,026 actual
 - c. Total expense: \$227,285 projected; \$230,141 actual
 - d. Income: \$261,000 projected; \$244,190 actual
 - i. McGowan notes this discrepancy is mainly due to income projections based on CY participation, while income runs on the FY
4. Walsh inquires if AZSITE's frozen funds have been moved to account as was supposed to be the case per 4/6/2026 letter from John Arnold, UA CFO. Rocha is asked to comment.
5. Rocha notes the money never left the account and will not be swept. AZSITE will be able to use the funds as needed.

3. Data Clip Widget Proposal (McGowan)

1. McGowan notes that AZSITE currently offers a "Data Clip" service to users. Users fill out a web form and submit an area of interest (AOI). AZSITE provides a data package for that area of interest. AZSITE uses a custom-built ticketing system to manage the requests, with most parts of the workflow scripted. Some supervision and button clicks are required by AZSITE personnel.
2. The proposal is to implement a self-serve version of this service within the AZSITE ArcGIS Enterprise Portal to reduce the workload of AZSITE personnel in managing these requests.
3. The scope of work includes the following features:
 - a. User defines AOI in-app, via file upload or sketch/buffer
 - b. User selects layers of interest and output type (file geodatabase or shapefiles with text files for flat tables)

- c. Data is delivered in app session by download, or as content shared with the user on the AGE portal
 - d. Per-request data volume is limited to 2,000 features from core feature classes
 - e. Usage is tracked per user
- 4. McGowan states that AZSITE has requested a cost estimate from ASU Geospatial Research Solutions (ASU GRS) for development of this solution. For budgeting purposes, a \$12,000 placeholder cost has been used. Depending on the ASU GRS cost estimate, comparison costs from other contractors may be sought.
- 5. Walsh inquires how this one-time cost compares to the effort expended by AZSITE personnel on data clip requests. McGowan notes that AZSITE GIS Technician Ellie Renteria has previously reported to the Board on her effort level on data clips, but that he does not have that information at hand. Walsh states that information should be given to the Board ahead of any vote.
- 6. Caseldine inquires if there is a reason why such a tool has not been built before, such as concerns about allowing users to do their own data clips. McGowan states this has primarily been a framework capability issue, including the ability to track usage. He notes that as AZSITE has standardized and automated the data clip process, the volume of requests has slowly ticked up, which shows people are getting value from the service beyond what they get from the web app.
- 7. Burns inquires if there were plans to build in some sort of oversight for this system, to allow AZSITE personnel to identify suspicious clip requests or clip requests that seem automated.
- 8. McGowan notes that the tool would include a user-side data volume check, preventing the clip from running if the data volume is too large. On the back end, AZSITE will be tracking requests and data volume at the user level, which will allow this to be tracked at the organization level as well. Collecting this information would then allow AZSITE to decide how to regulate requests. A revision to the AZSITE Data Clip Policy would likely be required.

4. CY 2027 Fee Proposal (McGowan)

- 1. McGowan discusses the FY 2027 budget, which has been updated to reflect actual compensation increases for AZSITE personnel, instead of estimates, a \$12,000 placeholder cost for the data clip widget, and costs for a UA student worker at 0.375 FTE ([Table 4](#)).
 - a. Personnel costs total around \$225,000
 - b. Operations costs total around \$57,000
 - c. Total costs total around \$283,000
- 2. McGowan summarizes the AZSITE fee structure from 2023 to 2026, including performance in terms of total users and total amount invoiced ([Table 5](#)).

3. Given that the previously frozen AZSITE account balance, totaling around \$400,000, is now available, and that additional funds may arrive via the proposed amendment to the Florence Copper Programmatic Agreement, McGowan recommends that AZSITE aim to cover personnel costs (~\$225,000) with user fees and rely on the standing account balance for operations and development.
4. McGowan states that this approach will allow AZSITE to reduce fees while still covering personnel costs with fee revenue. He compared a per-account fee decrease across all account types with a volume discount model.
 - a. A per-account fee decrease to a fee structure similar to the CY 2024 fee structure would save ~10-20% for every user organization, with projected income of around \$232,000. McGowan notes this would still cover personnel costs ([Table 6](#)).
 - b. A volume discount model, under which a 20% discount is applied to accounts 5-9, a 30% discount is applied to accounts 10-19, and a 40% discount is applied to accounts 20 and beyond, would see 14% of organizations save from 4-25%. Modeled revenue would be around \$235,000 ([Table 7](#)).
5. Based on this comparison, McGowan recommends a modest decrease in fees, bringing them down to be similar to the CY 2024 fees ([Table 8](#)).
6. Walsh states that she wants to clarify that Florence Copper mitigation funds cannot be used for personnel costs. McGowan states that is understood, and that this is part of the rationale of adjusting user fees to cover personnel costs.
7. Walsh states that she thinks the fee structure should be kept the same to increase the balance for additional future projects, rather than creating a yo-yo effect of having to increase the fees in the future. She also states that a flat discount of 10% for federal and state agencies would be beneficial, as their budgets have shrunk, while private companies generally can recoup their costs from clients.
8. Caseldine states that he agrees with Walsh on changing the fee structure. He notes that the user survey results from the spring indicated that users did not feel decreasing fees was a priority, but rather wanted new functionality and more work on data uploads. He also states that avoiding a readjustment to the fees in several years is preferable to reducing them now.
9. Burns states that he is not opposed to a modest rate decrease, but he agrees that stability in fees is desirable. He also notes that keeping fees the same amounts to a rate decrease.
10. Eckert states she is sympathetic to the argument of keeping fees the same, but also that there is something to be said for reducing fees for large numbers of users.

11. Walsh notes that a vote on this issue will be tabled due to Watson's absence. She inquires if the AZSITE Advisory Committee had recommendations on this. Advisory Committee Chair Sara Cullen is called to speak.
12. Cullen states that the Committee discussed this at their May meeting, and came to a consensus that utilization of funds, including adding an additional student worker, was preferable to reducing fees.
13. Walsh requests that McGowan prepare materials for a vote on keeping fees the same or reducing them at the next Board meeting. She requests that this include an additional discount for government agencies.
14. Walsh inquires if there is a way to grow the money in the AZSITE account. Eckert notes that this has not been possible in the past.

5. Advisory Committee Report (McGowan & Cullen)

1. McGowan states that the Committee met on May 5th. Discussion at that meeting centered on the AZSITE fee structure, project priorities, and hiring student workers. He notes that the Committee also discussed in detail data submission systems in other states, and cultural resources GIS data management practices within federal agencies.
2. McGowan notes that the Tribal Preservation Office representative is still in review by the Governor's Office.
3. McGowan states that the Committee's next meeting will be in two weeks on July 30th.
4. Cullen states that she does not have anything to add, beyond the previous discussion.
5. Walsh notes that the Board appreciates having the Advisory Committee together again and looks forward to hearing more about potential projects that could streamline AZSITE services. Walsh also requests McGowan follow up with the Governor's Office regarding the Tribal Preservation Office representative applicants.

6. UPDATE on Mitigation Funds (Walsh)

1. Walsh notes that the amendment to the programmatic agreement was signed, that the funds are to be used first for tribal access to AZSITE, and that SHPO will be promoting that to the tribes to assist in their work on cultural resources outside reservation boundaries.
2. Walsh states that SHPO is concerned that the funds be restricted to use for Tribal-first projects, and cannot be used for personnel costs.
3. Walsh notes that the funds should be arriving soon.

7. AZSITE Updates (McGowan)

1. McGowan provides an update on AZSITE's migration to ArcGIS Enterprise.
 - a. AZSITE personnel have completed two instructor-led training courses to support the migration
 - b. AZSITE GIS Technician Ellie Renteria is currently attending the Esri User Conference to learn more about Enterprise implementations and network with other cultural resources data managers and tribal GIS personnel
 - c. AZSITE's Enterprise GIS portal went online in January 2026; new enterprise geodatabase (eGDB) serving as the portal data store went online in April 2026
 - d. Migration updates, data and applications:
 - i. February 2026: NPS Montezuma Castle/Montezuma Well/Tuzigoot data published on portal for NPS review
 - ii. March-April 2026:
 1. Reference data updated and migrated
 2. ASM data updated/restructured and migrated, published on portal for ASM review
 - iii. May-June 2026:
 1. SHPO/NRHP layers and data updated/restructured and migrated
 2. eGDB relationships/domains built out
 3. AZSITE document library migrated to portal server
 - iv. July-August 2026:
 1. AZSITE conducting cleanup on migrated data
 2. AZSITE to publish new, consolidated feature services
 3. ASU GRS migrating AZSITE user store to portal
 4. Experience Builder application development underway
2. Uploads Summary ([Table 8](#))
 - a. McGowan notes large volume of site cards coming from ASM
3. ASM New Fee Structure Items ([Table 9](#))
 - a. McGowan notes AZSITE has been keeping up with or exceeding rate of data transfer from ASM
 - b. Recent batch of negative surveys will be a priority for San Miguel student associate
 - c. Walsh inquires about the time lag between the ARO and AZSITE

- d. McGowan notes that AZSITE can see items in a workflow database when they are ready for AZSITE upload. He also notes that the bracketed numbers in this table show the change in each value since the last AZSITE Board meeting, implying the throughput.
4. Upload Metrics for ASU, MNA, USFWS ([Tables 10 & 11](#))
5. Data Clips and Fixes ([Tables 12 & 13](#))
 - a. 140 data clips processed in 2026 so far
 - b. We have had 53 data fix requests in 2026

D. PUBLIC COMMENT

E. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Proposed Next Open Meeting: October 15, 2026, time: 10:00:am

Location: Zoom (<https://arizona.zoom.us/j/88630572942>)

F. ADJOURNMENT

1. Walsh entertains a motion to adjourn
2. Caseldine makes a motion to adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:56 am

G. APPENDICES

Table 1: AZSITE User Applications and Billing

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
User Organizations	109	114	117	132	142	134
Users	331	356	373	431	439	433
Mercator Users	218	237	259	281	272	278
\$ Invoiced	\$126,075	\$138,350	\$145,900	\$233,555	\$266,485	\$252,395
\$ Requested, not yet invoiced	-	-	-	-	-	\$8,875

Table 2: AZSITE Fund Summary 7/15/2026

	Beginning Balance	Income	Expense	Encumbrances	Open Invoices	Other Anticipated Expenses
FY 2026	\$389,462	\$244,190	(\$230,141)	--	--	--
FY 2027	\$403,511	\$4,500	(\$2,639)	(\$215,037)	\$23,150	~(\$65,000)

Table 3: FY26 Budget Projected vs Actual

Section	Description	Projected Amount	Actual Amount
Personnel			
Salaries	AZSITE Manager & GIS Tech, ASM Database Manager Support	\$130,360	\$129,254
ERE	AZSITE Manager & GIS Tech, ASM Database Manager Support	\$42,115	\$41,361
Interns	San Miguel High School Intern	\$7,500	\$7,500
Projected / Actual Personnel Total		\$179,975	\$178,115
Operations			
General	Software/Subscriptions	\$510	\$535
	Supplies	\$4,000	\$6,025
	GRS Hosting & Maintenance	\$20,000	\$24,575
	ArcGIS Enterprise Migration	\$11,250	\$9,388
	CC Fees	\$6,000	\$5,181
Travel/PD	Conferences, training	\$5,540	\$5,987
Projected / Actual Operations Total		\$47,300	\$52,026
Projected / Actual Total, Personnel + Operations		\$227,285	\$230,141
Projected / Actual Income		\$261,000	\$244,190

Table 4: FY 2027 Budget Update

Section	Description	Budget Amount Requested
Personnel		
Salaries	McGowan	\$ 86,520
	Renteria	\$ 60,897
	ASM DB Mgr	\$ 5,000
	UA Student Worker	\$ 15,600
Subtotal		\$ 168,017
ERE	McGowan	\$ 27,704
	Renteria	\$ 19,499
	ASM DB Mgr	\$ 1,601
	UA Student Worker	\$ 312
Subtotal		\$ 49,116
	San Miguel Intern	\$ 8,170
Subtotal		\$ 8,170
Personnel Total		\$ 225,303
Operations		
General	Software/Subscriptions	\$ 510
	Supplies	\$ 5,500
	GRS Hosting	\$ 12,000
	GRS Support	\$ 10,000
	GRS Dev - 30 Day Widget	\$ 6,250
	GRS Dev - Data Clip Widget	\$ 12,000
	CC Fees	\$ 6,000
Subtotal		\$ 52,260
Travel/PD	Conferences, training	\$ 5,000
Subtotal		\$ 5,000
Operations Total		\$ 57,260
Budget Total		\$ 282,563

Table 5: Fee Structure Performance, 2023-2026

CY Fees	2023	2024	2025	2026
Std I	\$550	\$750	\$825	
Std II	\$450	\$650	\$725	
Govt Std I	\$450	\$650	\$725	
Tribal Govt Std I	NA	\$625	\$625	
Educational	\$100	\$120	\$120	
30 Day	\$250	\$400	\$450	
CY Performance	2023	2024	2025	2026
Invoiced	\$146,775	\$233,555	\$266,485	\$252,395
# Users	373	431	435	433

Table 6: Analysis of Fee Reduction for All Account Types

Fee Decrease						
Account Types	Current Rate	2026 #	2026 \$	Proposed Rate	Projected \$	Savings %
Consortium	\$0	63	\$0	\$0	\$0	NA
30 Day	\$450	23	\$10,350	\$350	\$8,050	22%
Educational	\$120	16	\$1,920	\$100	\$1,600	17%
Mid-Year	\$80	0	\$0	\$60	\$0	25%
Standard II	\$725	127	\$92,075	\$650	\$82,550	10%
Mid-Year	\$525	3	\$1,575	\$450	\$1,350	14%
Tribal Government Standard I	\$625	10	\$6,250	\$550	\$5,500	12%
Mid-Year	\$475	0	\$0	\$375	\$0	21%
Government Standard I	\$725	59	\$42,775	\$650	\$38,350	10%
Mid-Year	\$525	6	\$3,150	\$450	\$2,700	14%
Standard I	\$825	120	\$99,000	\$750	\$90,000	9%
Mid-Year	\$600	4	\$2,400	\$525	\$2,100	13%
projected income			\$ 259,495		\$ 232,200	
Δ			-		\$ (27,295)	
personnel costs deficit					\$ 7,567	

Table 7: Analysis of User Volume Discount

Volume Discount	Discount Rate	Count Private Orgs Affected	Avg Savings	% Savings	Count Govt Orgs Affected	Avg Savings	% Savings	Count Edu Orgs Affected	Avg Savings	% Savings
Users 5-9	20%	14	\$ 355.00	4-10%	3	\$ 325.00	4-10%	0	NA	NA
Users 10 - 19	30%	7	\$1,602.50	13-20%	0	NA	NA	0	NA	NA
Users 20+	40%	4	\$3,866.25	23-25%	0	NA	NA	0	NA	NA
Projected Income	\$235,237.50									
Δ	(\$24,257.50)									
personnel costs										
deficit	\$10,604.58									

14% of user organizations get a discount

Table 8: Proposed Fee Reduction

Account Types	Proposed Rate
Consortium	\$0
30 Day	\$350
Educational	\$100
<i>Mid-Year (from 6/1)</i>	\$60
Standard II	\$650
<i>Mid-Year (from 6/1)</i>	\$450
Tribal Government Standard I	\$550
<i>Mid-Year (from 6/1)</i>	\$375
Government Standard I	\$650
<i>Mid-Year (from 6/1)</i>	\$450
Standard I	\$750
<i>Mid-Year (from 6/1)</i>	\$525

Table 8: Summary of Annual Uploads

Mean Annual (past) Total Annual (current)	2004- 2014	2015- 2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Projects	951	109	452	2,225	172	220	421	503	63
New Sites	1,497	194	1,084	4,087	1,663	696	387	594	113
Site Updates	-	-	752	5,033	299	360	578	666	269
ASM PRFs	-	-	335	231	257	361	400	127	415
New/Updated ASM Site Cards	-	-	322	511	405	743	169	1,016	1,294
ASM Reports	-	-	-	-	4	3,975	2,401	566	68
ASU Site Cards	-	-	-	-	117	56	810	745	167
MNA Reports	-	-	-	-	-	-	53	1	0
USFWS Site Forms	-	-	-	-	-	-	171	52	7
USFWS Survey Reports	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	19	4
SHPO Site Info Entries	-	-	-	-	-	872	982	306	1,117
SHPO Project Info Entries	-	-	-	-	-	1,266	1,456	1,543	1,737
SHPO NRHP Eligibility Dets.	-	-	-	-	-	806	812	540	1,237

Table 9: Summary of Upload Progress, ASM New Fee Structure

Type	ASM Curation Queue*	Total Available to AZSITE	Uploaded	Outstanding
PRFs (ARO/PO/REPO)	63 [-8]	1,931 [+96]	1,892 [+84] (99%)	39 (2%)
Reports (ARO/PO/REPO)	66 [+12]	1,927 [+76]	1,527 [+53] (79%)	400 (21%)
Negative Surveys (ARO/PO)	167 [+8]	945 [+41]	902 [+0] (95%)	43 (5%)
Projects w/ Sites (ARO/PO) - project	48 [-4]	676 [+13]	625 [+31] (92%)	51 (8%)
Original Site Recordings	312 [-1]	1,115 [+8]	879 [+11] (79%)	236 (21%)
Site Update Recordings	121 [-5]	1,292 [+24]	869 [+55] (67%)	423 (33%)
Site Cards	13	1,414 [+362]	1,345 [+393] (95%)	69 (5%)

Tables 10 & 11: Upload Metrics for ASU, MNA, USFWS Data

Document Type	Total Available to AZSITE	Document Uploaded	On Tribal Land (not uploaded)	AZSITE has GIS data?
ASU Site Forms	1,928 [+1]	1,895 [+0] (98%)	3 (0.2%)	1783 (93%)
MNA Project Reports	970 [+0]	54 [+0] (6%)	-	54 (6%)

Data Type	Total Available to AZSITE	Data Uploaded	Document Uploaded
USFWS Sites	453 [+4]	255 [+4] (56%)	227 [+3] (50%)
USFWS Projects	37 [+1]	33 [+1] (89%)	31 [+1] (84%)

Tables 12 & 13: Data Clip and Fix Requests

Clips	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Requests	48	46	51	200	102	176	227	140 [+65]

Fixes	2023	2024	2025	2026
Requests	3	62	54	53 [+17]
Closed	3	61	53	47 [+14]