

Data Endorsement ad-hoc Committee Notes

October 7, 2025

1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Attendees

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Alison Slaats , MnGeo (Co-Chair) | ☒ Alison (Ali) Wieckowicz , MNIT DOT |
| ☒ Kevin Trappe , Beltrami Co. (Co-Chair) | ☒ Linse Lahti , DNR |
| ☐ Sally Wakefield , MnGeo | ☐ Pamela Oslin , MESB |
| ☒ Gerald (Gerry) Sjerven , Allete | ☒ Jonathan Mortensen , City of Shoreview |
| ☐ Stacey Stark , U-Spatial, U of M | ☒ Robin Mertes , MN Pollution Control Agency |
| ☒ Tanya Mayer , Met Council | ☒ Kory Thurnau , MnGeo |
| ☒ Jason Ewert , MNIT MPCA | |

Discussion

Purpose of Meeting

- Review and discuss the data endorsement proposal document created by Lindsey.
- Apply the proposal form to the County Boundaries dataset.
- Clarify language and structure of the form for future use.

I. Continue working session on components of an endorsement process

Document Review

- Kory Thurnau led the walkthrough using the County Boundaries dataset as a case study.
 - The group reviewed the draft version (v1) with recent comments from Tanya and Linse
 - Kory shared his screen and walked through metadata and form responses.

Coverage Discussion

- Consensus: “Statewide” coverage should be a simple Yes/No checkbox.
- “Restricted” terminology was debated; considered ambiguous.

- Parcel dataset example used to illustrate challenges with incomplete attributes.
- Suggestion: Clarify intent vs. completeness in coverage definition.

Agency Adoption Concerns

- DNR and MnDOT expressed internal challenges with adopting the new dataset.
- Concerns include:
 - Legacy systems built on older datasets.
 - Lack of internal governance clarity.
 - Resource needs for transition.
- Alison Slaats emphasized the endorsement is meant to guide users, not mandate agency adoption.

Form Language Suggestions

- Revise Section 2.1 to ask “Who developed this proposal?” instead of “Who led the development?”
- Clarify Section 3 to distinguish between data producers and contributors.
- Ensure consistency between proposal form versions.

Justification Section

- Kory provided metadata-based justification for the County Boundaries dataset.
- Emphasized the collaborative effort between MnDOT and DNR.
- Noted the dataset is intended for general reference, not survey-grade accuracy.
- Acknowledged topological adjustments and alignment with authoritative sources (e.g., International Boundary Commission).

Proposal Contributors

- Clarified distinction between data producers and proposal developers.
- Suggestion: Update form language to reflect who developed the proposal vs. who produced the data.

Community Engagement & Review

- Suggestion to clarify roles of aggregators vs. authoritative sources (e.g., counties for parcel data).

Action Items & Next Steps

- Continue refining the proposal form language.
- Consider agency-specific pathways for endorsement and adoption.
- Explore phased updates to include county-sourced boundaries in future versions.
- Encourage agencies to use the endorsed dataset when feasible, while acknowledging transition challenges.

II. Action Items (Next Steps)

- Alison S., Kevin, and Kory revise draft v1 based on comments and revise county boundary example with updated form
- **Next meeting November 4**