



# Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council

January 14, 2026

# Tennessee Warning

In accordance with the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, MNIT is providing you with notice via this Tennessee Warning of:

- This meeting is being recorded to document survey results, selection of priorities, and future project assignments for MnGeo and the Geospatial Advisory Council. If you have your camera on this recording may include your image, which is private data under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act.
- You are not required to allow MNIT to record your image. If you do not wish to have your image recorded, please turn off your camera.
- There are no legal consequences for providing or not providing this information.
- The recorded meeting will be available to MnGeo staff, the Geospatial Advisory Council, and the general public. The recording may be provided to those who have a legal right to view the data.

**Starting recording now**

# Agenda Item 1

## Call to order

- Roll call
- Approve agenda

Mayer



# Roll Call: FY2026-27 Members

- **City, Twin Cities Metro**
  - Dennis Tumberg, *City of Chanhassen*
- **City, Greater Minnesota**
  - Michael Krueger, *City of Moorhead*
- **County, Twin Cities Metro**
  - Michelle Clasen, *Washington County*
- **County, Greater Minnesota**
  - Ryan Stovern, *St. Louis County*
- **Regional Government, Twin Cities Metro**
  - Mary Mortensen, *Met Council*
- **Regional Government, Greater Minnesota**
  - Karissa Beierle Pavek, *Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments*
- **State Government**
  - Amy Harrigan, *MnDOT*
  - Kari Geurts, *MNIT DNR*
- **Federal Government**
  - Mitch Bergeson, *US Geological Survey*
- **Tribal Government**
  - Ryan Bonney, *Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community*
- **Nonprofit Organization**
  - Jessica Fendos, *LOGIS*
- **Business**
  - Gerry Sjerven, *Minnesota Power*
  - Kendis Scharenbroich, *Pro-West & Associates*
- **K-12 Education**
  - Shana Crosson, *U-Spatial / UMN Twin Cities*
- **Higher Education**
  - Rama Mohapatra, *Minnesota State University, Mankato*
  - Stacey Stark, *U-Spatial / UMN Duluth*
- **Surveyor**
  - Pat Veraguth, *Douglas County*
- **MetroGIS**
  - David Brandt, *MetroGIS | Washington County*
- **MN GIS/LIS Consortium**
  - Carla Coates, *Minnesota GIS/LIS Consortium | MN DPS*
- **At-Large**
  - Britta Maddox, *Anoka County*
  - Heather Albrecht, *Hennepin County*
  - Matt Goodman, *St. Louis County Sheriff's Office*
  - Quentin Ikuta, *National Indian Carbon Coalition*
  - Rick Schute, *City of St. Paul*
  - Tanya Mayer, *Metropolitan Council*
- **Chief Geospatial Information Officer (ex-officio)**
  - Alison Slaats, *MNIT MnGeo*



# MnGeo Staff Support



**Megan Sisko**

MNIT MnGeo



**Sally Wakefield**

MNIT MnGeo

## Non-Member Guests

*First and last name*

*Name of your organization*

**In-Room Attendees:** Please announce verbally

**Virtual Attendees:** Place in the chat

# Agenda

Time	Topic
10:00	Call to Order
10:10	Term Priority Projects
12:00	Adjourn





**Approve agenda\***

### **Term Priority Projects: Survey results, priorities selection, and assignments**

Maddox



# Today's Work: Step 1

## Working off the **GAC Priority Ranking** spreadsheet

1. Review Changes and decision from December GAC meeting
2. Complete the Likelihood of Success score contributing fields to end up with a value for Likelihood of Success
3. Finalize Committee assignment of priorities
  - Note:
    - One committee assigned per priority for:
      - Accountability
      - Administrative Owner – reports on priority to the GAC in Committee Report
    - Other committees can contribute to the work of the project, but would not report on it in their GAC Committee report or be held 'accountable' for it
4. Discuss and adjust priority rankings as desired based on other factors (group wisdom) and rank within each committee
5. If time permits....
  1. Retired and On-Hold priorities
  2. Recruiting Priorities
  3. How to best handle the ranking exercise in future terms (plan for a separate meeting in January every time?)

# Discussion on Value Scores

Using the **Survey Results Value** spreadsheet, determine the three **Value scores**

- Critical Need = 3
- Very Important = 2
- Nice to have = 1
- No Opinion = 0
- **Non-Weighted Value Score:** Total sum for priority divided by Total number of responses
- **Value Score per sector** (average score per sector for each priority): Total sum for priority for sector divided by Total number of sector responses
- **Weighted Value Score:** Total sum of Value Scores per sector divided by Total number of responding sectors

Initial alignment of Priorities to Committees who would best complete the work of the priority project

Decision from December 2025 GAC Meeting:

Non-Weighted Value Score used for ranking spreadsheet calculations

'27-28 Term – calculate Weighted Value Score for comparison against Non-Weighted Value Score

- Assuming there is still no statistical significance between the two, future years do not need the Weighted Value Score to be calculated, and the Non-Weighted Value Score will be used

**The '26-27 Term Non-Weighted Value Scores were populated into the GAC Priority Project Ranking Sheet**

# Likelihood of Success score - changes

- Owner\* Exists: 3 – yes, 0 – no
  - \* Owner - someone who will lead the efforts on the priority project
- Committee Exists: 3 – yes, 0 – no
- ~~• Active Champion Exists: 3 – yes, 0 – no~~
- **Executive Sponsor\*** and 3 – no Exec Sponsor needed, 2 – Exec Sponsor needed and exists, 0 – Exec Sponsor needed but do not have
  - \* Executive Sponsor - someone who can advocate for resources for the project, provide or secure funding, lobby, etc.
- Funding Exists: 3 – no Funding needed, 2 – Funding needed and exists, 0 – Funding needed and does not exist
  - ~~• Est \$\$: enter dollar figure estimated to be needed to complete project or 0 if no funding is needed (value does not contribute to Success Score)~~
  - Change: documenting amount of money needed is irrelevant to ranking exercise and therefore was removed

# Likelihood of Success score - changes

- Easy Score – populates based on value entered in Effort
  - 3 – Low effort (< 200 hours)
  - 2 – Medium effort (200-400 hours)
  - 1 – High effort (400+ hours)
- ~~Effort: level of effort necessary to complete the project in terms of man hours, time, vendor considerations, etc. (Low = 0-200 hours, Medium = 200-400 hours, High = 400+ hours)~~
  - ~~Low (Easy score = 3)~~
  - ~~Medium (Easy score = 2)~~
  - ~~High (Easy score = 1)~~
- **Likelihood of Success** score = sum of above scores

# Today's Work: Steps 2-4

## Working off the **GAC Priority Ranking** spreadsheet

1. Review Changes and decision from December GAC meeting
2. Complete the Likelihood of Success score contributing fields to end up with a value for Likelihood of Success
3. Finalize Committee assignment of priorities
  - Note:
    - One committee assigned per priority for:
      - Accountability
      - Administrative Owner – reports on priority to the GAC in Committee Report
    - Other committees can contribute to the work of the project, but would not report on it in their GAC Committee report or be held 'accountable' for it
4. Discuss and adjust priority rankings as desired based on other factors (group wisdom) and rank within each committee
5. If time permits....
  1. Retired and On-Hold priorities
  2. Recruiting Priorities
  3. How to best handle the ranking exercise in future terms (plan for a separate meeting in January every time?)



Motion to accept the GAC Priorities for Term 2026-27 as listed in the **GAC Priority Ranking** worksheet.



# Today's Work: Step 5

## Working off the **GAC Priority Ranking** spreadsheet

1. Review Changes and decision from December GAC meeting
2. Complete the Likelihood of Success score contributing fields to end up with a value for Likelihood of Success
3. Finalize Committee assignment of priorities
  - Note:
    - One committee assigned per priority for:
      - Accountability
      - Administrative Owner – reports on priority to the GAC in Committee Report
    - Other committees can contribute to the work of the project, but would not report on it in their GAC Committee report or be held 'accountable' for it
4. Discuss and adjust priority rankings as desired based on other factors (group wisdom) and rank within each committee
5. If time permits....
  1. Retired and On-Hold priorities
  2. Recruiting Priorities
  3. How to best handle the ranking exercise in future terms (plan for a separate meeting in January every time?)



## Retired and On Hold Priorities

GAC should also decide which projects, if any, should be "retired" (moved to retired list due to inability to complete, lack of interest, etc.) or placed on hold

# Retired and On Hold Priorities

## On Hold

Geospatial Commons Advisory Group  
State-hosted GIS Servers with Feature Services  
MnGeo Image Service Improvements  
Statewide Future Planned Land Use  
Planned Land Use Data Standard

## Retired

Parks Data Standard  
Snow Emergency Parking Data Practices  
Street Parking Restrictions Data Standard  
Fire Hydrant Data Standard  
Recreational Trails Data Standard  
Basemap Services  
NG9-1-1 Geospatial Forum  
Strategy Team for All Types of Imagery  
State Business License Data  
Inventory of MN GeoData Assets  
Summary Crime Data



# Recruiting

What should be done with those priorities listed as 'recruiting'?

Success Stories for Geospatial Technology

Statewide Imagery Program

# Reminder: Next Meeting

**Wednesday, March 11, 2025**

**10 a.m. - 12 p.m.**

Virtual

*(online via Teams)*



# Agenda Item 3

**Adjourn\***

Mayer



*\*Motion may be required*



# Thank You!

