

Data Endorsement ad-hoc Committee

July 7, 2026

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

I. Data Endorsement Procedures Review

[GAC Operational Procedures for Data Endorsement_DRAFT_V1.docx](#)

Discussion Summary

1. Draft Process Overview

Alison Slaats noted the committee aims to finalize the endorsement process for GAC approval in September.

Kevin Trappe reviewed the draft, including guiding principles, defined roles, and the workflow.

Members agreed proposals should demonstrate statewide value and direct users to authoritative local data when appropriate.

Initial feedback was positive, with members finding the workflow clear and well organized.

2. Endorsement Workflow

The committee reviewed the eight-step process from proposal submission through GAC endorsement and post-endorsement activities.

The workflow includes proposal screening, technical evaluation, committee recommendation, public review, GAC approval, and publication of endorsed datasets.

3. Accessibility

Members identified color contrast issues in the workflow diagram and agreed to review the document for accessibility before the next draft.

4. Periodic Review of Endorsed Datasets

The committee discussed establishing a 3–5 year review cycle to ensure endorsed datasets remain current.

Consensus was to develop a separate periodic review workflow later, while referencing it in the current process document as future work.

5. Re-Review Process

Members discussed whether periodic reviews should include another public review.

A general concept emerged: datasets that continue to meet endorsement criteria retain their status; those that do not would lose endorsement and require resubmission.

Details will be developed during future work on the review process.

6. Review Tracking

The committee agreed MnGeo is best positioned to track review schedules and notify the committee when datasets are due for evaluation.

7. Stewardship and Funding

Members noted that datasets may remain foundational even if stewardship or funding declines.

Rather than simply removing endorsement, the review process could prompt GAC outreach to data stewards to identify challenges and encourage continued support.

8. Dataset Summary Sheets

Kory Thurnau is developing a standardized summary sheet for endorsed datasets.

MnGeo will complete the summary sheet for each endorsed dataset using the approved template.

9. Public Review

The committee agreed to model the public comment process after the Standards Committee using an online survey managed by MnGeo.

A 45-day public review period was selected as a balance between timely review and stakeholder participation.

Action Item(s):

1. Fill out the  [data endorsement proposal form](#) for:

- a. Minnesota Counties; Kory/ MnGeo
 - b. MPCA's AUID streams data; Jason/ MPCA
- 2. All members be prepared to complete the [!\[\]\(7e19807c61da14f515588e95cd49886c_img.jpg\) Data Endorsement Evaluation Form - DRAFT v5.docx](#) for:
 - a. Minnesota Counties
 - b. MPCA's AUID streams data
- 3. Workflow diagram
 - a. color accessibility review
 - b. place holder box/ reference for future periodic review sub-process

- Kevin, Alison, Kory
- 4. [Dataset Summary Sheet Draft](#)- Kory
- 5. [Standard Disclaimer Draft](#)- Kory
- 6. Re-review [GAC Operational Procedures for Data Endorsement_DRAFT_V1.docx](#) – All Members

Next Meeting

Tuesday, August 4, 2026 at 1:30 PM