AZSITE Consortium Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

July 30th, 2026
10:02 a.m. to 11:18 am

A quorum was obtained.

A. CALL TO ORDER (CULLEN)

Meeting called to order at 10:02 am.

Committee members present:

Sara Cullen, Chair (2026), Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management (DFFM) – State Agency Representative
Chance Copperstone, HDR – Private Sector CRM Representative
Charles Webber, Kaibab National Forest (USDA KNF) – Federal Agency Representative

Members of the public present:

Gabe McGowan (AZSITE Manager)
Ellie Maria Renteria (AZSITE GIS Technician)
Reylynne Williams (Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Officer)

B. INTRODUCTIONS

1. **Members of the AZSITE Advisory Committee were introduced**
2. **AZSITE Personnel were introduced**

C. AGENDA ITEMS

The Committee may consider or take action on any of the following:

1. **Discussion and Approval of 2nd Quarter 2026 Meeting Minutes (Cullen)**

    a. *Motion to approve (Copperstone)*
    b. *Seconded (Webber)*
    c. *Approved (Unanimous)*

2. **AZSITE Finances & User Fees (McGowan)**

    1. McGowan summarized the financial report presented at the July AZSITE Board meeting. Participation levels for calendar year 2026 remain comparable to the previous two years and continue to reflect sustained growth despite fee increases implemented in recent years.
    2. Current invoiced revenue is somewhat lower than the same point in 2025 because the calendar year is still in progress. McGowan also noted that AZSITE has applied a somewhat more generous prorating policy for accounts added during the year.
    3. McGowan reviewed the current fund balance, noting that FY2026 ended with an operating surplus of approximately $14,000, resulting in a beginning FY2027 balance of roughly $400,000.

4. McGowan reviewed a proposed FY2027 operating budget of approximately $280,000, including anticipated compensation increases for AZSITE personnel, continued employment of the San Miguel High School student associate, recruitment of a University of Arizona student worker, equipment purchases associated with that position, and placeholder funding for development of a custom data clip widget.
5. McGowan explained that, with the restoration of AZSITE's previously frozen account balance, user fees would primarily be needed to support personnel costs, while accumulated reserves could be used to fund operational improvements and one-time development projects over the coming several years.
6. McGowan summarized the fee reduction proposal presented to the AZSITE Consortium Board at their July meeting. The proposal would return user fees to approximately the 2024 fee schedule, resulting in projected annual revenue of roughly $230,000, sufficient to cover anticipated personnel expenses. An alternative tiered volume-discount model was also analyzed but would benefit only a relatively small percentage of participating organizations.
7. McGowan reported that the Board generally favored maintaining the current fee structure rather than reducing fees and potentially needing to increase them again in future years. Instead, Board members expressed a preference for directing available funds toward additional staffing and system improvements. Because one Board member was absent, no formal action was taken, and the matter may return for consideration at a future Board meeting.
8. Copperstone stated that he supported maintaining the current fee structure and reinvesting available funds in AZSITE operations, staffing, and technological improvements.
9. Cullen agreed that maintaining stable fees while investing available reserves in improving AZSITE was an appropriate course of action.
10. Webber likewise supported maintaining consistent fees while using the available balance to expand AZSITE's capabilities and services.
11. McGowan noted that Board members also observed that holding fees constant effectively reduces their cost over time as inflation increases operating expenses.
12. McGowan stated that the Board had discussed expanding student staffing beyond the one University of Arizona student worker currently being recruited. He indicated that AZSITE would likely evaluate the effectiveness of the initial hire and the status of the ongoing ArcGIS Enterprise migration before considering additional student positions.
13. Copperstone asked about a suggestion raised during the Board meeting to provide an additional discount specifically for government agency users and inquired how many organizations would be affected.
14. McGowan explained that the Board had discussed the possibility of increasing the government agency discount while otherwise maintaining the existing fee schedule. He reviewed current participation levels among agency users and noted that the revenue impact of the additional discount mentioned by the Board (10%) would be relatively small (on the order of $10,000).
15. Copperstone noted that an additional discount specifically for Tribal governments could be appropriate. He noted that government agency budget directed away from AZSITE may no longer be directed towards cultural resources at all. Cullen noted that compared to field survey costs, the costs of AZSITE fees are minimal.

3. **Regrid Parcel Dataset (McGowan)**

1. McGowan investigated statewide parcel data resources to improve geocoding and location accuracy for historic structures. A company called Regrid provides a proprietary nationwide parcel dataset that can be purchased at the state level. Parcel details available from the counties are aggregated into a standardized dataset.
2. Regrid offers a one-time data download for Arizona for $8,000, or a hosted feature service subscription for approximately $10,000/year under a three-year contract with annual increases of 3%.
3. McGowan stated that the hosted feature service option would allow AZSITE users to interact with parcel data through the AZSITE web applications without AZSITE needing to maintain the underlying parcel dataset. Based on licensing terms, users would likely be able to query and interact with the data through AZSITE applications but not export the parcel dataset.
4. McGowan demonstrated the Regrid feature service using a trial token and described potential AZSITE applications, including the attributes associated with each parcel boundary, which include generalized land owner type information.
5. The potential use case would be to provide parcel information as an operational layer within the AZSITE web application and allow users to query cultural resource data against statewide parcels.
6. Copperstone shared experience using Regrid in consulting and indicated that it is a useful resource for statewide projects, particularly for CRM firms conducting background research and proposal preparation. He noted that Regrid ownership classifications are generally more accurate than the existing statewide BLM ownership layer and estimated approximately 90% accuracy for Arizona parcel ownership information. Copperstone identified parcel boundaries and general ownership classification (e.g., federal, state, municipal, private, tribal) as the most valuable components of the dataset.
7. Sara Cullen noted that statewide parcel information would also benefit agency workflows beyond cultural resources, including vegetation treatments and projects involving private or municipal lands.
8. Charlie Webber asked whether Regrid provides advantages over accessing individual county assessor websites; discussion noted that Regrid provides a statewide, centralized resource that reduces the need to gather information from multiple county sources.
9. Members discussed replacing the current BLM ownership layer with Regrid for general ownership visualization and parcel information.
10. Copperstone noted that Regrid does not eliminate the need for specialized datasets in some cases (such as ASLD-specific information) but provides a more useful statewide baseline resource.
    a. *Motion to recommend adding Regrid parcel data to the AZSITE service (Copperstone)*
    b. *Seconded (Webber)*
    c. *Approved (unanimous)*

4. **Data Clip Widget Proposal (McGowan)**

1. McGowan provided an update on the proposed development of a Data Clip widget for the new AZSITE Experience Builder application.
    a. A final cost estimate from the contractor is expected shortly. A placeholder cost of $12,000 has been used for budgeting based on a quote for a separate but related scope. However, having gone over the scope in detail with the contractor, McGowan notes the estimate may come in closer to $20,000..
2. McGowan described the current AZSITE Data Clip workflow and the goals of the proposed widget.
    a. The current Data Clip service uses a Survey123 form where users submit an area of interest (uploaded or sketched), select desired layers, and indicate whether they need GIS data only or additional tabular information.
    b. Requests are routed through a ticketing workflow using SharePoint lists and Power Automate, and geoprocessing scripts are used to generate the requested data.
    c. Completed clips are delivered through the Attribute Search application using a unique access code provided to the user.
3. The proposed Experience Builder Data Clip widget would integrate this workflow directly into the AZSITE web application.
    a. Users would be able to:
        i. Upload or sketch an area of interest.
        ii. Apply an optional buffer.
        iii. Select desired data layers.
        iv. Choose output format.
    b. Proposed output formats include:
        i. File geodatabase packages.
        ii. Shapefiles and CSV files.
4. McGowan described two potential delivery approaches considered with the contractor:
    a. Immediate browser download after processing.
    b. Asynchronous delivery through shared content in the ArcGIS Portal.
    c. The preferred approach is asynchronous delivery, where completed clips would be uploaded to the user's Portal content and shared with that user.
    d. Users would receive notification that their clip is ready and could download the file after logging into the Portal.
    e. This approach provides an opportunity for AZSITE staff to review and approve requests before delivery if needed.
5. McGowan noted that the proposed system would include tracking and management capabilities made possible by integration into the GIS Portal. The system would track the requesting user, the number of requests they have made, the data volume associated with each request, and other usage metrics.

6. McGowan discussed expected operational benefits.
    a. The current workflow requires staff time to verify users, review geoprocessing outputs, confirm feature counts, package and deliver files, and occasionally troubleshoot failed processing jobs.
    b. The proposed widget would reduce manual workload, particularly for Renteria, who currently manages most Data Clip requests.
    c. Ellie noted that much of the current processing time is passive while geoprocessing runs, but large requests can occupy ArcGIS Pro and limit other work.
7. McGowan noted that Data Clip demand has increased significantly, from around 50 requests annually in 2020 when he started working at AZSITE, to current demand of around 250 requests per year.
    a. Improvements in standardization and scripting have helped reduce the effort per request, but request volume continues to increase.
    b. The new ArcGIS Enterprise framework provides an opportunity to implement a more scalable self-service workflow.
8. Gabe noted that the current AZSITE Data Clip Policy may need review as part of implementation.
    a. Current policy requires board approval for requests exceeding certain data-volume thresholds.
    b. The new system would incorporate tracking necessary to support those decisions and may require updates to reflect the modernized workflow.
9. Committee discussion included long-term maintenance and support considerations.
    a. Charles Webber asked how ongoing troubleshooting and bug fixes would be handled as additional functionality is added.
    b. Gabe explained that AZSITE currently maintains an annual support and maintenance agreement with ASU's contractor covering updates, backups, and issue resolution.
    c. Gabe expects the new architecture to provide greater stability because applications will operate within the ArcGIS Enterprise/Esri ecosystem rather than relying on communication between multiple servers and a large custom .NET application.
    d. Gabe will clarify with the contractor what post-deployment support is included in the Data Clip Widget cost estimate.

D. Date and Time of Next Meeting

1. The next AZSITE Advisory Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, October 22nd, 2026 on Zoom.

E. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:18 am