CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 24, 2026

5755 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
7:00 PM

For those wishing to listen live to the meeting, please go to shorewoodMN.gov/CityCouncil for the meeting link. Pursuant to MN Statute 2024, Section 13D.02, subdivision 4, members may participate in the meeting by interactive technology.

AGENDA

1. CONVENE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

A. Pledge of Allegiance

B. Roll Call

Mayor Labadie	______
Councilmember Maddy	______
Councilmember Sanschagrin	______
Councilmember Gorham	______
Councilmember DiGruttolo	______

C. Review and Adopt Agenda

2. CONSENT AGENDA

The Consent Agenda is a series of actions which are being considered for adoption this evening under a single motion.

Motion to approve items on the Consent Agenda & Adopt Resolutions Therein:

A. City Council Work Session Minutes

B. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes

C. June 2, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

D. Claims List

E. Recruitment for Public Work's Supervisor Position

F. Accept Resignation and Approve Recruitment for LEO-Utilities Position

G. Records Retention Annual Review

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

This is an opportunity for members of the public to bring a matter related to the governance of the City of Shorewood to the attention of the City Council. If the matter relates to a topic that is identified on tonight's agenda as a public hearing, please hold your comments until the public hearing is opened. The full rules for this forum can be found on the agenda table in back and on the City's webpage. Anyone wishing to address the Council should raise their hand, or if attending remotely, please use the “raise hand” function on your screen and wait to be called on. Please make your comments from the podium and identify yourself by your first and last name and your address for the record. Please limit your comments to five minutes. No discussion or action will be taken by the Council on this matter. If requested by the Council, City staff will prepare a report for the Council regarding the matter and place it on the next agenda.

4. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Accept LMCC 2027 Budget

B. Report on Proposed Amendment to Excelsior Fire Department JPA

5. STAFF AND COUNCIL REPORTS

A. Staff

i. Primary Election Update

B. Mayor and City Council

6. ADJOURN

City of Shorewood

City Council Item 2.A.

Title/Subject: City Council Work Session Minutes
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Sandie Thone, City Clerk/ HR Director

Attachments

1. 08.10.2026 WS Meeting Minutes

Background

08/10/26 City Council Work Session Minutes

Strategic Alignment

Organizational Strength & Good Governance

- Sound and strategic record keeping of government activities lead to comprehensive long-term planning, principled, data, and stakeholder-driven decisions, and a culture of continuous improvement.

Budget Impact

Minute preparation costs vary based on length of meeting and level of detail.

Action Requested

Simple majority vote is required.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING
MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 2026

5755 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
5:30 P.M.

MINUTES

1. CONVENE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Mayor Labadie called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

A. Roll Call

Present. Mayor Labadie; Councilmembers Labadie, Maddy(5:35), Sanschagrin, Gorham, and DiGruttolo; City Administrator Nevinski; Director of Public Works Morreim; and Finance Director Schmuck

Absent: None

B. Review Agenda

Sanschagrin moved, DiGruttolo seconded, approving the agenda as presented.

Motion passed 4/0.

2. BUDGET WORK SESSION #4: 2027-2036 DETAIL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Finance Director Schmuck reviewed the schedule and the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as found in the Agenda Packet. She noted she would turn it over to Council for discussion of the SCEC.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked why the City is upgrading the kitchen if the future of the SCEC is unknown. Park and Recreation Director Czech stated that if the SCEC is not used, the kitchen project will not proceed. He noted that, working with the consultant, the initial task force thoughts suggest there is value in fixing the kitchen and repurposing it as a warming kitchen rather than for commercial use. If, through the study, that is not something to be pursued, then the project will not be done. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether the kitchen project is not about upgrades or safety, but about taking the kitchen as is or downgrading it. Mr. Czech explained that it is taking the kitchen from the commercial level it is at and downgrading it to a warming-and-preparation style. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether that would be discussed further. Mr. Czech noted that the study consultant will have recommendations on that as well.

Councilmember Gorham asked why it costs money to downgrade the kitchen. Mr. Czech stated that modifications will be needed to get the equipment out, and then new equipment would need to be purchased to have a prep kitchen. Councilmember Gorham asked if the oven is old. Mr. Czech noted that most of the items in the kitchen were installed at the beginning. The freezer is not operational, and doing anything with that has been proposed.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether this change should be done before the outcomes of the SCEC report are known. Mr. Czech stated that the changes would not be made before any decisions about the SCEC. This kitchen project stemmed from the Kraus-Anderson study and its recommended improvements. Since the City is in budget season, Staff is moving forward with the recommendation, but if the study produces different outcomes, then this project would not be completed. Councilmember Gorham assumed that this project was a recommendation from the study rather than the facility assessment. Mr. Czech explained that this was a recommendation from the Kraus-Anderson facility assessment and the ten-year deferred maintenance within the Capital Plan. Councilmember Gorham noted that he did not understand that there was a program recommendation from the Kraus-Anderson study. He pointed out that there is also a study being done on the SCEC with the task force.

Mayor Labadie asked when the next SCEC task force meeting is. Mr. Czech stated it is this Wednesday. Mayor Labadie asked if that is the final meeting. Mr. Czech shared that a tentative date is scheduled for August 26, if needed.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether the report will be given to the Council before a decision is made on the kitchen project. Mr. Czech stated that the report will come before the preliminary levy. City Administrator Nevinski stated that the report is scheduled for the same night as the preliminary levy. He pointed out that when the study was initiated, things would be very close with the budget process. He added that the Council could move into the preliminary levy with this project still in and then continue the discussions depending on what the report says and what Council wants to do. He noted that the preliminary levy can be lowered after the fact. It is a good option; he does not typically like that. He likes to bring the levy in September because what is discussed in December then aligns with what residents see in the notice. If the levy is coming down, then that is in the positive direction. Finance Director Schmuck noted that the CIP is not finalized until the December 14 meeting. All the projects are just holding places at this point, so if something comes out of the study, Council can choose to modify them accordingly.

Councilmember Gorham shared that the Council wants to take a wait-and-see approach, but this project is a holdover from another process, not a placeholder for the new one. Mr. Czech stated that it is a holdover from the building assessment that is used as supporting documentation for the current consultant on how the City moves forward with the building. Councilmember Gorham asked whether there is a recommendation for the consultant to begin with the warming strategy in the kitchen. Mr. Czech agreed with that. Councilmember Gorham asked how likely an outcome is. Mr. Czech noted that, in conversations, that is probably a likely outcome.

Mayor Labadie shared that the Shining Stars Luncheon was held at the SCEC last week. She asked if there were 65 people registered for that. Mr. Czech stated it was in that range. Mayor Labadie noted that they used the concept of warming the food; it was not cooked there. That is the same thing that has been done with other events. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that it sounds like nothing needs to be done then. Mayor Labadie shared that the refrigerator was out, and the food arrived warm. She added that many events serve food at the facility. Mr. Czech agreed and noted that few people actually cook the food on site.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether the SCEC will be discussed further at the Regular Meeting. She wanted to make sure that the City is not trying to include items in the budget that the Council has not yet approved. The Southshore Senior Partners are leaving, but their letter stated that they would do so while still wanting the City to continue what they were doing. She added that senior programming is not in the CIP, but the numbers will shift based on the decisions made for it. Mr. Czech shared that those will be incorporated into the study that the Council will receive the report on, with the recommended operational scenarios and how that should play out. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether there will be any additional changes or requests for the

CIP infrastructure for the building. Mr. Czech stated that, for capital needs, no, other than what is on the CIP for remodels and such.

Finance Director Schmuck noted that it was a request to go line by line. She asked whether the Council wanted to go through the future-year line items or were content with them as they are. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked how that can be done without knowing what the City is doing with the SCEC. City Administrator Nevinski stated that this may be revisited in conjunction with the recommendations or after. The CIP does change year to year based on new information and circumstances. He stated that the City does want to identify things and include them, but that does not necessarily mean that the things identified in the CIP for a few years out will happen that year.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked whether a revised CIP will be included in the study report. Mr. Czech shared that part of the report will contain recommendations on capital items. He added that there will probably not be a complete makeover; the consultant is using the facility assessment as the foundation, but there could be some shifts based on the recommendations.

Mayor Labadie asked what building tuckpointing is. Mr. Czech explained that, upon inspecting the bricks around the SCEC structure, there is a lot of caulking that needs to be replaced, as well as the exterior sealing.

Mayor Labadie noted that Staff has identified that many of the numbers are still to be discussed based on the results of the study. She asked how many sessions there have been. Mr. Czech shared that there have been two, with the third on Wednesday. Mayor Labadie asked how big the task force is. Mr. Czech stated that there are 11 members.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked what the $30,000 capital outlay is for the SCEC. Finance Director Schmuck explained that, if 2027 is considered, that is $24,149 plus $7,872, for a total of $32,021, which is reflected in the budget as capital outlay.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked if those expenses directly hit the budget right away. Finance Director Schmuck stated that this is correct.

Councilmember DiGruttolo shared that she thought the CIP is different from the budget. Finance Director Schmuck stated that the current year is reflected in the budget, but the activity is not completed until Council approves the project. Any project in a CIP or capital outlay item for equipment purchase or major road projects will come back to Council. The kitchen project will come back to Council, and at that point the project could be denied and not proceed.

Finance Director Schmuck reviewed the Park Improvement Fund, 402, as found in the Agenda Packet.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked if the $350,000 for Freeman Park Playground hits the budget right away or is depreciated. Finance Director Schmuck stated that all the line items hit the budget right away as expenditures because cash flow is going into the special revenue funds, and the capital project funds are governmental funds, so they are on a modified cash accrual basis.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if the City has estimates for the Freeman Park Playground. After attending the Parks Commission meeting, she did some research, and the cost seemed quite high. Mr. Czech stated that the number has been in the CIP for a while and is a shot in the dark. With playground replacements, many factors come into play, such as pea gravel removal and the required ADA-compliant materials. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if estimates have been received. Mr. Czech stated that the number is currently a rough estimate. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that if the number has been in the CIP for 10 years, the estimate could be bad. Then the Council is making a decision on this year's budget based on an outdated number, and nothing has been done to update it. Mr. Czech shared that the City just went through the Parks Master Plan and that the $350,000 figure is what the consultant confirmed to be accurate based on past estimates. The CIP directly reflects the consultant's study for the Parks Master Plan. Mayor Labadie noted that another park that was preliminarily earmarked went to the Parks Commission, and they began looking in more detail at different concept types. Until that happens, this number is just conceptual. She shared that there are many variables in the playground, depending on the decisions made about it. The number is just a ballpark estimate based on the space the City has and its potential uses. She added that everything on the playground is kept at a certain distance for safety.

Mayor Labadie asked what would happen to the remaining funds if the preliminary levy and budget are approved and the playground comes in under $350,000. Finance Director Schmuck stated that the budget will be set at $350,000, which will be the ceiling for quotes. If those dollars are not fully spent on the project, they will go into the reserves. She noted that a specific levy dollar does not fund the Park Improvement Fund for specific projects. The City is not levying specifically $350,000 in 2027 for this specific project. The City is levying a set annual dollar amount, based on the Long-Term Financial Management Plan, to cover the next 10 years on a rolling-forward basis, in accordance with the City's reserve policy. So, if the project is removed from the ten-year CIP, that would reduce the ten-year long-term plan, but if the project is just shifted down, it will just modify the timing of when the funds are needed. It is building up reserves to sustain the full ten years of this rolling budget. Mayor Labadie stated that if there were excess funds, then those could be applied to improvements on other parks. Finance Director Schmuck noted that the excess funds would remain in the reserve of the Park Improvement Fund.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked when the City last used any of the reserves for anything other than what was in the CIP. For example, the City would have loved to replace the tennis courts rather than do the $15,000 project that will eventually have to be done again in five years. She asked whether that could have been taken from the reserves. Finance Director Schmuck stated that it could have been done, but the fund has a negative reserve balance.

Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that she is confused about the reserves. She thought she was told that the City only keeps exactly the amount of money in the reserves needed to pay the bills every year. Finance Director Schmuck explained that in the General Fund, the City has 50 percent of the subsequent year's expenses. Within a capital project fund, this is the subsequent year plus the three-year rolling period, and it is recalculated each year based on the next three years of the rolling period. That is why the ten-year long-term financial management plan is beneficial, as it allows the ups and downs of the reserve balance to be seen. It is a three-year rolling process in line with the reserve policy. She noted that upon reviewing the policy and its categories, this category is separate from the General Fund.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if there is a reserve policy for every fund. Finance Director Schmuck shared that there is a different reserve policy for every type of fund. There are the General Fund, the Special Revenue Fund, four CIP funds, and four enterprise funds, so there are four categories for these funds. She added that when the Council goes through the Reserve Policy, those are separate items, separate Roman numerals within the Policy.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether, if the Council only wanted to spend $200,000 on the playground and $150,000 was not spent, the policy is not to return the money to taxpayers; the policy is to put the money in the fund. She asked what the policy is for using the fund if it is not negative. Finance Director Schmuck stated that at any time, the Staff could say they intend to purchase something and would like to use reserves to offset the costs. The Staff will budget to tap into the reserves for that expenditure, but that could not be done for the basketball court because the fund has a negative reserve. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked why, if there is a negative reserve for parks, the City is spending $350,000. She asked if the Staff looked into what could be done for less. Mr. Czech shared that, in discussions with vendors, he is asking them to provide a few concepts so the Park Commission and the Council can see the options. The Freeman North Playground is one of the most heavily utilized, and Staff would be hesitant to scale that down, but if that is what finances dictate and what the Council would like, then it can be done.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether the data show which decisions are being made. She pointed out that, according to the US Census, there are only 400 children in Shorewood between the ages of 0 and 11. The City would spend $9,000 per child on the park. She asked whether different data show how many people use the park and how that data is collected. Mr. Czech noted that he does not have data on hand, but any time someone is at the park on a weekend or weeknight, the playground is always in use. The visual data is all the City has; there are no people in the parks tracking usage. Finance Director Schmuck stated that the City would not use census data because infrastructure is built for today and for the future, and those numbers are constantly changing. The census numbers are a benchmark, but they do not drive the buildout of facilities. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that it could; she does not know how things are done in Shorewood. She shared that she is pursuing her Master's in Public Policy, and that it is one of the benchmarks used. A growth model is used to estimate the investment's lifetime.

Mayor Labadie pointed out that many residents have grandchildren who also use the parks. She noted that parks are community amenities and that Freeman Park is a flagship venue that hosts a variety of events. Getting an accurate number would be difficult. Councilmember Gorham shared that if someone goes to Freeman on a Saturday morning, around 30 kids are using the park. He asked if the City is on track to build the playground next year. Mr. Czech stated that the Parks Commission did discuss the playground and the planning process; community engagement will start soon, and an RFP will be issued after that; purchase in 2027, then install in late 2027. Councilmember Gorham stated that he was part of Badger Park and that it was a bit of a process to reach a final design. Mayor Labadie noted that some ideas were voted out, and that the Commission will go through many steps before the Council votes on it.

Councilmember Gorham asked how heavily the Cathcart Park basketball court is used. Mr. Czech shared that, based on conversations with people in the area, it is used quite frequently. He shared that during park tours, a resident came over and asked when the tennis and basketball courts would be updated. From driving by, it looks like the basketball court is used often. Mayor Labadie agreed that the court is frequently used in the evenings. Mr. Czech shared that it is the only full-court basketball court in the City. Councilmember Gorham asked what condition the court is in. Mr. Czech stated it is due for a replacement in 2028 and that it will be necessary.

Councilmember Sanschagrin stated that there is an ending fund balance of $481,000. He asked if that is different from the reserves. Finance Director Schmuck stated that it is a projected reserve number based on individual CIP items and the proposed increase in the levy. Councilmember Sanschagrin stated that there are no reserves. Finance Director Schmuck stated that, as of 2024, the existing reserves are -$47,000. The 2025 audit is still being wrapped up, so that number is a benchmark estimate, and not all capital activity has been completed. She added that 2026 is based on the budget; it does not reflect actual reserves and activity coming in and out. In calculating the reserves, once the audit is finished, the 2025 financials will be compared with the 2027 budget to determine the percentage of reserves the City has. That will be done in the Long-Term Financial Management Plan.

Councilmember Gorham asked if it takes two years to do an audit. Finance Director Schmuck stated that the Finance Department is significantly behind due to major staffing changes, which the City is still resolving. The City was given an extension from the Office of State Auditors. The City is required to submit the audit to the Office of State Auditors by June 30, and it has filed for an extension. Mayor Labadie pointed out that Council was informed of the extension. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she did not know the budgeted numbers were over two years old. Councilmember Sanschagrin stated that it was budgeted at $473,000 as of the end of 2026. Finance Director Schmuck stated that this is because Staff recommends the additional increase in the levy. Councilmember Sanschagrin noted that the City is projected to be at $473,000 at the end of 2026. Finance Director Schmuck stated that in 2026 there was a significant jump: the transfer of $175,300 from the Street Improvement Fund to the Park Improvement Fund. That was done because the City is trying to get the reserve to what it needs to be for the fund. She added that, in the future, there will be a $50,000 increase because Staff is trying to level out the levy increase on an ongoing basis. Councilmember Sanschagrin asked if Staff is targeting $481,000 as the fund balance. Finance Director Schmuck shared that she does not have the target, but that will come with the Long-Term Financial Management Plan in October when the 2025 audit is done, and the 2027 CIP is locked in. Many of the numbers are rolling numbers until Council approves the two documents to make the projections going forward. She added that it is hard to say what the reserves are on that day because things are constantly changing. The City operates on a cash basis and a modified accrual basis throughout the year, then back-fills the accrual at year-end, which is a pretty standard municipal function.

Councilmember Gorham asked when the Council will see a vision for Southshore Park. Mr. Czech stated that as long as funding is available, 2030 is a realistic timeline. The City already has the concept plans. Councilmember Gorham asked if the design is in the CIP. Mr. Czech stated that the design itself is not included, but it would be incorporated into the project as a whole, and that would be in the CIP. Councilmember Gorham shared that he is considering the Cathcart Park replacement and its relationship to the City's priorities. He noted that at some point, the City will have to pay around $60,000 to get Southshore to a design, so that will have to live the year before the project. He stated that would be a discussion for another day, but that is not seen on the CIP.

Finance Director Schmuck gave an update on the Equipment Replacement Fund (403).

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked how many trucks the City has. Public Works Director Morreim shared that the City will have five once it gets its hook truck and will surplus two trucks after that. Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that she asked whether the truck would be needed this year and how much service reduction that would cause. This year the budget has $280,000 for one truck, and then next year there is around $350,000 for another truck. She asked why the City is spending $12,000 on computer upgrades every year. Finance Director Schmuck explained that there is a rolling schedule that every three to five years, everyone analyzes their own computers. Various computers throughout the City are analyzed annually. Computers can be reassigned to less-used purposes if needed to stay within the budget. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that there must be many computers in Public Works to justify spending $12,000 annually. Finance Director Schmuck noted that it is not just Public Works; it is Citywide.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that the City is getting a new truck in 2027, followed by another new truck, a trailer, and a multipurpose vehicle in 2028. She stated that there would be nothing for several years. She asked why it is being done that way. Public Works Director Morreim pointed out that it is nothing for several years; there are still some larger purchases. He explained that last year, he put most of the larger equipment on a replacement cycle. That does not mean things cannot be shifted around as needed. He pointed out that the mower is approved for purchase in 2026, but that was pushed to 2027. He stated that one big purchase is made each year and that the rest of the purchases are evened out if possible. That is the general concept behind a ten-year CIP.

Councilmember Sanschagrin stated that the budgeted $44,000 for last year is not needed again. Finance Director Schmuck explained that it goes into the reserves. Councilmember Sanschagrin stated that it is not impacting the budget then. Finance Director Schmuck stated that it impacts the budget as a capital outlay item, but the levy is not based on a single item. The City says the levy will increase by $60,000 to even things out over the next 10 years. Some years, the entire levy will not be needed, and some years, all of it will be used, with additional tapping into the reserves. Cities use capital funds to even things out over time.

Finance Director Schmuck reviewed the Street Reconstruction Fund, 404, as found in the Agenda Packet.

Councilmember Gorham asked when the local share number is calculated. Finance Director Schmuck explained that, depending on the project, engineering will review it, and Public Works will work with the state to determine whether the project qualifies for any MSA dollars, based on the roads. Engineering will also determine the City's share, as some roads are shared with other cities. This also reflects outside grant funding. Public Works Director Morreim shared that the cost participation calculator is also used, so there are several Shorewood intersections along Highway 7, the largest being at 41.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether the number will worsen as the project grows. Public Works Director Morreim stated that, potentially, yes, but it could also improve with more funding mechanisms. The number is the best guess at this point, but the project is still three to four years out. The number will also be updated in the CIP. Finance Director Schmuck stated that, in looking at a ten-year CIP, years one and two are good estimated dollar amounts; years three through five are ballpark estimates being honed; and years six through ten are just ballpark estimates.

Councilmember Gorham stated that the number is based on the minimum scope, and as the project expands, Shorewood's share will increase. He read that MnDOT is revising its local share policy. Public Works Director Morreim stated that the number will not be zero. The policy stated that if the population is under 5,000, then the amount would be zero. He noted that the new policy is now based more on tax capacity, and, unfortunately, Shorewood has a significant tax capacity. He would check whether the numbers were run through under that policy. He pointed out that he mentioned there are cities around the lake with populations over 5,000, and their tax capacity is very high compared to other cities that are not on a lake.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that the memo states that Staff proposes bonding for this, which would avoid a large current levy contribution. She noted that this is true, but this does create future debt service, which is in the levy. It is not entirely accurate to say that it is not a levy thing. Finance Director Schmuck noted that it is a levy thing. Cities view debt differently. Either cities create levies on an annual basis to have money for a project, so people would be paying for ten years to get the money for a project and then the project is built, or other cities look at it as issuing debt so that the people who are using it over the ten years are the ones paying for it. Shorewood has always had a debt service process; there used to be a rolling process where debt would fall off and then come in so that things would stay net neutral. What happened is that the City provided one-time funding for a few years, then postponed some projects, and then four projects bunched all at once, so the City went from nothing to spiking for four years in a row. She noted that 2027 will roll off in 15 years, and that is when the City will start plateauing again, though there will still be some incremental increases. Councilmember DiGruttolo wanted to be clear that although it is not a current levy, it is a levy issue for the future. Finance Director Schmuck stated That Staff can review how bonds are structured and take various actions with the bonds. Various mechanisms can be used when cities begin structuring bond issuances.

Councilmember Sanschagrin stated that one item for next year is the Manor Road resurfacing, led by Greenwood. He asked whether the Council would approve that in the future. Public Works Director Morreim stated that the project is in 2028. That was brought to the City by Greenwood, and they wanted to do that in the CIP this year, but Staff told them no. The road does need improvements, and Staff talked to Greenwood about pushing that out by a few years to allow time to plan the project. As that project moves forward, the number is a general estimate, but the City will define a more precise scope before they feel comfortable adjusting it. Councilmember Sanschagrin noted that the road improvements only benefit one resident. Public Works Director Morreim stated that the project benefits many residents; many people live in the northeast part of town and use Manor Road quite a bit. Councilmember Sanschagrin noted that the document only shows one road. Public Works Director Morreim shared that it is not just the driveway; roads are part of a system that benefits more than just the residents abutting them. Councilmember DiGruttolo pointed out that $500,000 per resident does not seem accurate and that, given the project's optics, it does not seem right for Shorewood. City Administrator Nevinski shared that the project would need further clarification, including the traffic count and how many other people benefit from the road. The handouts were provided to give more context, but sometimes a larger discussion is needed.

Councilmember Sanschagrin read “Manor Road only serves one Shorewood resident’s driveway.” Public Works Director Morreim pointed out that there is only one driveway that abuts Manor Road. That would be a misrepresentation of what Staff was trying to say. If the information were taken literally, that would mean it is a driveway, which it is not. The road serves 400 to 500 cars a day, which may not seem like a lot, but many roads in Shorewood see the same volume, including Smithtown Road. Mayor Labadie added that Vine Hill Road is also a good comparison, with the middle of the road being a division between Minnetonka and Shorewood. Minnetonka has a lot of apartment buildings that need to come on the road, but when it comes time to do the road, Shorewood would cost-share in that road as well.

Mayor Labadie stated that Greenwood wants the project done already, but Shorewood asked them to push back the timeline. She asked what Shorewood’s timeframe would have been if Greenwood did not want the project done now. Public Works Director Morreim stated it might have been a project in 2029 or 2031. Mayor Labadie pointed out that the focus needs to be on whether Greenwood wants this sped up and whether Shorewood wants to accommodate it. Public Works Director Morreim shared that Staff has pushed back significantly on Greenwood because Manor Road is their number one priority, but it is not Shorewood’s. He added that the

$500,000 is conservative, but Staff has not conducted detailed scoping on the project; he is not comfortable saying that is the maximum, as no engineering has been done yet. He shared that, normally, scoping and engineering would have been done, and a good number would come in 2027. There is quite a bit of stormwater on this road for Shorewood, so there will be a few different options.

Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that the City rarely says no to projects or considers alternatives. She added that sometimes she would like to see the City discuss whether 40 smaller projects could have high impact, or whether one project costing $500,000 could affect 1,000 people. She noted that one is not better than the other; she wants to have the discussions. That is not something that is done, and that is frustrating for her. When she was in government, she was told This is the budget; stay within it.

Mayor Labadie asked whether the City ever refused to agree to Shorewood's half of the project on shared roads. Public Works Director Morreim stated that the City is addressing that issue on Minnetonka Boulevard. The City paid for part of it, but did not finish something that should have been done. He added that he has dealt with it in other cities, but it is not good for anyone. He stated that he could go back to Greenwood, tell them that Shorewood is not going to do the project, and see what they say. The project needs to be completed eventually, and if it is deferred for a few years, the City will face many issues. He added that this project would be in 2029, but would now be in 2028 in conjunction with another city. Shorewood did say no to the project for this year. Finance Director Schmuck shared that the Pavement Management Plan, including the scope of work and road scoring, is analyzed annually. So instead of saying what can be done for $200,000, the Staff is looking at the needs and where they are best met. Sometimes that could be a larger segment that will not make as many people happy. Looking at the slide that presented the Pavement Management Plan, if projects are not done along the way, costs go up sooner.

Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that her comment was not just about Streets and Pavement, but about all the things the City is trying to fit into the budget. Every year, the City asks for more and more money, pricing people out of the City. Making hard decisions is what leadership is. Not everything can be funded, and she is asking that leaders make harder decisions.

Councilmember Gorham noticed that Yellowstone Trail is back on for 2036 and there is a petition about this stretch. There is a gap in the City's connection to the trail system. He pointed out a significant gap between 2029 and 2036. This area of the trail has been considered before, but it would be good to take advantage of this big gap when there are no major capital outlays and to consider putting the trail in this area. Public Works Director Morreim shared that Vine Hill Road is in 2031, so there is not as much of a gap as it appears. He noted that Yellowstone Trail is included in the CIP because Staff has heard that residents would like to prioritize it. Councilmember Gorham noted that it would take some engineering. Public Works Director Morreim stated that it would be an expensive trail but would be heavily used.

Finance Director Schmuck reviewed the MSA Street Reconstruction Fund, 405, as found in the Agenda Packet.

Councilmember Gorham asked if the City fronts the money and then MnDOT reimburses the City. Finance Director Schmuck noted that to be true. Councilmember Gorham asked how the City plans to reimburse. Finance Director Schmuck explained that at this point the City has the contract dollars available, and those numbers are tracked on an ongoing basis. When the project is completed, and the checklist is done, those funds might not be reimbursed for a few years.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether the City has an MOU with MnDOT before letting. Finance Director Schmuck stated that the project will undergo a State aid review before it is let. Public Works Director Morreim stated that it will be an important component of the trail because state-aid design elements and watershed requirements must be followed. Councilmember Gorham asked how the City gets a commitment from MnDOT for the project. Public Works Director Morreim explained that the City goes through the review process; the plan is submitted with the engineer's estimate; MnDOT will have comments; and then MnDOT will approve it, which means the project can be reimbursed. All approvals must be obtained upfront. The project is done like most other projects, and then it gets reimbursed in the end. Councilmember Gorham asked how long after the project is completed the City is reimbursed. Finance Director Schmuck stated that this is a 2029 project and will probably not be completed until 2030. Depending on the time of year, reimbursement requests might not be submitted until the end of 2030 or the beginning of 2031, and then it takes about a month to review. Councilmember Gorham noted that the City would be out a couple million dollars in 2029 and might not get that back until 2031.

Finance Director Schmuck reviewed the Community Infrastructure Fund and Water Fund as found in the Agenda Packet.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether the 4-by-4 water utility truck is in addition to the other trucks being bought. Public Works Director Morreim shared that the trucks are in both. Finance Director Schmuck explained that the truck is referenced because it is the funding source for it. It is a truck in the equipment fund, but the water fund will contribute $101,250 to the equipment fund as its share of the piece of equipment. It is also shared with the Sanitary Sewer Fund. Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that she did not see the numbers. Finance Director Schmuck stated that she was referring to a different truck. Public Works Director Morreim explained that the utility truck is in 2028 and shows on the 403 Equipment Fund. The pickup in the Water Fund is the utility pickup used and most commonly seen. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked how many trucks the City has in total. Public Works Director Morreim stated he would have to count exactly, but it is around 12. The pickups are the most used trucks, and the larger trucks are used less in the summer.

Councilmember Gorham asked what the difference is between Mill and Overlay and the striping in the Water Fund. Finance Director Schmuck explained that the Mill and Overlay is every other year, $2,000,000, within the Street Fund. Depending on the segments completed, water components beneath the surface are included, and that is what comes into the budget. There is also ongoing water main activity that is financed.

Finance Director Schmuck reviewed the Sanitary Sewer Fund as found in the Agenda Packet.

Councilmember Sanschagrin pointed out that it would be helpful to have the underlying assumptions driving the growth rates or year-to-year changes. He shared that more of that, in everything the Council is looking at for budgeting, is driving the numbers. Finance Director Schmuck stated that the numbers are inflated by $2,500 annually, as an earmark to manage things in the future. Councilmember Sanschagrin noted that this is what is happening with all of the lines.

Finance Director Schmuck reviewed the Stormwater Fund as found in the Agenda Packet.

Councilmember Gorham asked if the MSA covers stormwater. Finance Director Schmuck stated that the stormwater component of the project is not eligible. MSA dollars are based on road taxes and can only be used for roads, sometimes trails; it is only the surface.

Finance Director Schmuck is requesting public engagement and overall direction for the CIP and the Long-Term Financial Management Plan.

Councilmember DiGruttolo shared that when CIP projects are given to the Council, she would like to see the alternatives and the trade-offs. She would like to see what the City will not do, because money will be spent on something. She added that, for the CIP, the Staff is trying to keep the Long-Term Financial Management Plan within a band; she would like that band to be tighter. Public Works Director Morreim stated that offering options increases the cost of developing the CIP. Project options are identified during the scoping phase, following Council approval. That is something that can be done, but it will come at a higher cost. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked what that cost would be. Public Works Director Morreim stated that, depending on the projects, costs will range from $2,000 to $10,000 per project, with larger projects costing more. Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that she does not speak for all of Council, but that is what she would like to see: alternatives, tradeoffs, and creative thinking. That might actually go to the argument that a Staff Engineer is needed. She noted that, for all of these things, it would be great for Council to have data to back up the decisions. Public Works Director Morreim stated that if he has to go through every piece of equipment with that process, that will be unmanageable. If Council wants Directors to dedicate a lot of their time to CIP items, that can be done, but many other things will not get done.

Mayor Labadie noted that there is a point at which the Council must trust the department heads; if they say something is needed, the Council must act on their recommendation. Councilmember DiGruttolo agreed that if the department heads are only getting a certain amount of money, they would not have to come to Council to show those things because they stayed within the given budget. If Staff is going to come to Council asking for big projects, they will need to show data to back up why they need them, rather than saying it was in the CIP for 10 years; so that is what we are going with. Mayor Labadie stated that ten years is a good projection of what is to come. There are also situations where things might arise, making the budget not 100 percent predictable. Councilmember DiGruttolo agreed but pointed out that in personal budgets, if something comes up, you only buy what is in the budget. She pointed out that emergency services have to be paid for, so there has to be a trade-off, but since she has been on Council, there have been no trade-offs; it has only been to raise the levy. Mayor Labadie noted that as costs rise, the City's expenses will mirror the uptick in prices. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that the property taxes should mirror that and the City should be getting more from people every year because property taxes are increasing. The City is going on top of that. She is asking that, as the representative of the people, residents are stressed out and being pushed out. Mayor Labadie noted that she did not hear any of that, only thank-you to the various departments. Residents noted that they loved living in Shorewood but were concerned about what is being done to amenities such as the SCEC and the parks. All those things cost, but the City should be proud of them. If the City wants to pay less, then something has to give, but the people that she has talked to are not willing to let the services the City provides slide. She noted that so many people are complimenting the City, and she receives no complaints.

Councilmember Gorham shared that he does not think the solution is for every director to go through their budget line by line. At one point, City Administrator Nevinski tells the directors they have reached a certain threshold and that the budget cannot go to Council until it is met. Then the directors review what can be removed to stay within the threshold, and those options are brought to the Council to decide what should be removed to meet the threshold, or the Council may decide to go beyond the threshold. Mayor Labadie agreed, and she thought it had been done at the beginning of the year. She noted that the Council did not want things over double digits. Finance Director Schmuck shared that is what Staff is still trying for. Councilmember Gorham shared that it is good, but then Staff presented a budget over ten percent without any context. Finance Director Schmuck stated that those things are being pulled together, but the projections did not have such an increase in public safety. Staff has been working on fine-tuning the numbers since receiving the budget from Public Safety. She noted that Staff is taking steps in the CIP to stay within the means, but the General Fund is difficult because the City does not control the two largest pieces of that budget. She shared that Staff is working on that.

Mayor Labadie noted that Council talked a lot, but still has the Reserve Policy overview. Finance Director Schmuck noted that the information was just provided and Staff is not asking for any action or direction regarding that. It is to give a summary of the Reserve Policy.

3. RESERVE POLICY OVERVIEW

Mayor Labadie asked if the Council had any questions that needed to be answered now. Seeing none, she noted that if the Council has questions regarding the Reserve Policy or the budget, they should contact Ms. Schmuck.

Sanschagrin moved, Gorham seconded, Adjourning the City Council Work Session Meeting of August 10, 2026, at 7:08 P.M. Motion passed 5/0.

ATTEST:

____
Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

____
Sandie Thone, City Clerk

City of Shorewood

City Council Item 2.B.

Title/Subject: City Council Regular Meeting Minutes
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Sandie Thone, City Clerk/ HR Director

Attachments

1. 08.10.2026 CC Reg Meeting Minutes

Background

08/10/26 City Council Regular Meeting Minutes

Strategic Alignment

Organizational Strength & Good Governance

- Sound and strategic record keeping of government activities lead to comprehensive long-term planning, principled, data, and stakeholder-driven decisions, and a culture of continuous improvement.

Budget Impact

Minute preparation costs vary based on length of meeting and level of detail.

Action Requested

Simple majority vote is required.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 2026

5755 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
7:00 P.M.

MINUTES

1. CONVENE CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

Mayor Labadie called the meeting to order at 7:15 P.M.

A. Pledge of Allegiance

B. Roll Call

Present. Mayor Labadie; Councilmembers Maddy, Sanschagrin, Gorham, and DiGruttolo; City Administrator Nevinski; City Clerk/HR Director Thone; Director of Public Works Morreim; Park and Recreation Director Czech; and Finance Director Schmuck

Absent: None

C. Review Agenda

Sanschagrin moved, Labadie seconded, approving the agenda as presented.

Motion passed 5/0.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

DiGruttolo asked to remove Item 2.F. from the Agenda.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that Item 2.G. should read Resignation of Public Works Supervisor.

Maddy moved, Gorham seconded, Approving the Motions Contained on the Consent Agenda and Adopting the Resolutions Therein.

A. City Council Work Session Minutes

B. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes

C. June 30, 2026 Park Commission Park Tours Meeting Minutes

D. Claims List

E. Annual City Code Supplement S-21/Ordinance 632, Adopting ORDINANCE NO. 632, "An Ordinance Enacting and Adopting the 2025 S-21 Supplement to the Code of Ordinances for the City of Shorewood, Minnesota."

~~**F. Dissolution of the Southshore Senior Partners**~~ **(moved to 4.F.)**

G. Resignation of Streets Supervisor

Motion passed 5/0.

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

Barry Brown, 6050 Burlwood Court, stated he would like to discuss the budget items not discussed in the Work Session. He shared that the MSA fund 405 shows a fund balance of $1,584,000; however, on June 30, during Public Works Director Morreim's presentation on the Pavement Management Plan, the MSA fund balance was $2,760,000. He pointed out that Council should know which number is accurate to make appropriate financial decisions and why there is such a discrepancy. He noted being concerned that the Recycle Fund is missing from the discussion. With nearly a half-million-dollar fund balance, it would be useful for Council to have the available fund balances for the budget discussion. He added that Council may want to transfer funds to pay for upcoming projects or to reduce the levy. He shared that in 2025 Northland Securities provided the City with a ten-year long-term financial management plan. Under this plan, the 2027 levy was projected to increase by 7.66 percent; Staff subsequently presented a 12 percent levy increase to City Council. He stated that taxpayers deserve to know why the City pays consultants to create the plans and, less than a year later, departs from the recommendations. He pointed out that it is hypocritical for the City to tell residents that the consultants need to be trusted, but when it comes time to take their advice, the City can disregard it. He shared that the next topic he would speak on is Highway 7, and that in 2029, $3,800,000 is allocated to Highway 7, funded by a $3,800,000 bond. More details about the bond would be provided later in the meeting. He stated that it appears MnDOT has made a professional recommendation; the City's consultants are preparing additional recommendations. That puts the Councilmembers in a difficult position of deciding which recommendation to follow. He recommended that Highway 7 be designated a State Highway and that the State do what is right for residents' safety. The City should not be relying on local taxpayer dollars to correct problems that are the State's responsibility. He added that MnDOT should address the greatest safety threats to the residents first, even if that means completing less roadway. MnDOT even publishes a newsletter called *Safety First*, with the byline "We Are Here to Keep People Safe." He shared that the City should make MnDOT live up to its own words. He noted that he submitted a data request to the Police Department regarding what was referred to as a UPS battery backup system. Those are two very different systems. To date, he has not received an acknowledgment or information. He shared that he has some experience with this issue; in his previous work, he was responsible for 42 data centers, all of which used UPS systems. All of the systems were installed solely for critical data production, and the remaining facilities relied on automatic transfer switches to bring generators online, similar to those used by police and fire today. These generators typically restore full power within five to nine seconds and run for days. He understands that the police and fire have critical zero-tolerance systems that must remain up at all times. He questioned whether the proposed equipment is sized to power the critical systems or unnecessarily power the entire facility. He asked that, with respect for the taxpayers, before $150,000 is spent, Council should be provided with the answers. He recommended that Council table this CIP item until more information is available.

4. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Presentation of Hwy 7 TMO Study

City Administrator Nevinski introduced the presentation of the Highway 7 TMO Study.

<u>Becky Alper, SRF</u>, stated that it was wonderful to work with the many partners in completing the study. She shared that she would be speaking to the "why" of the project, which concerned safety. She showed a map that highlighted that there had been quite a few serious injuries and fatalities along Highway 7. She stated that over the past few years, MnDOT has been conducting a planning study focused on three primary needs: safety for all users, reliability for all drivers, and walkability and bike ability. She noted that her company's role, along with a $200,000 grant from the State Legislature, was to work on a Transportation Organization Management Study. The idea was to examine the issues along the corridor and, in tandem with the MnDOT study, explore options for corridor communities to advocate for Highway 7. She shared that the study started in the summer of 2025 with a focus on safety. The study examined the development of the government structure, financial plan, and stakeholder engagement. Several options were evaluated, including a transportation management organization there are several others in the Twin Cities, a safety coalition and commission, and a joint powers agreement. She pointed out that the MnDOT study concluded in February, and ultimately in April, stakeholders decided to pursue membership in the Southwest Corridor Transportation Coalition (SWCTC) to continue to advocate for safety improvements. She shared that the final report has been completed and that the report and executive summary have been submitted to the City. She added that $7,000,000 has been applied for in regional solicitation funding through the Met Council, which would go toward safety improvements and the highway modernization category.

<u>Kevin Julie, SRF</u>, stated that Ms. Alper focused on the study, which was about formally getting together the stakeholders along Highway 7. He pointed out that there was not much debate; the need is well known, and everyone came together well on the topic. The Coalition raised questions about what will be done about Highway 7 and how that will be advocated for. He shared that the overarching goal of the Study was to come together as a single unit that represented the corridor. He added that having a single voice from a single entity is important. He stated that, as the study was concluding, the opportunity to apply for Federal money through the Met Council regional solicitation process arose; that is, a process set up for local communities to apply for money to build on their own, typically, but it can also be combined with other projects. He noted that the Coalition applied for several intersections along the corridor in conjunction with MnDOT's current planned project. The idea would be that if the grant is awarded to the Coalition, the money would be given to MnDOT, and they would incorporate it into the overall highway project. He noted that there are some concerns about Highway 7 being a State Highway and therefore MnDOT's responsibility, but MnDOT's budget is constrained and their focus is safety, yet there is so much to be done. He pointed out that, in looking at the current Highway 7 project, it is a maintenance project with mostly Mill and Overlay work being done, and some roundabouts being built as well. That is not all of what MnDOT would like to build. So, that is when the local cities need to get involved to chase down some of the available money. He shared that they are hearing that the project is scoring well, which is not a surprise given the safety factors. He stated that he would be surprised if the Coalition were not granted at least some of the grant money. Looking to the future, one of the main goals is to advocate for the corridor so that cities along it join the SWCTC. The SWCTC has advocated intensely for Highways 212 and 5, and major improvements are coming to those corridors, as the group has been tremendously successful and politically organized in advocating for safety improvements. He added that the timing was good, as the Highway 212 and 5 corridors were pretty much funded, the SWCTC was ready for the next thing, and the Highway 7 Study was concluding. The SWCTC is now focusing its efforts on Highway 7. He shared that things are looking good for the future and that it is important to stay together and organized as they seek additional funding. This is a several-year effort to get money lined up, so it is not too early to get things lined up. He pointed out that the stakeholders along the Highway 7 corridor have been really good, even those who will not see immediate improvements. He

shared that SRF is part of the SWCTC as a firm and continues to stay up to date on what is going on. There is a group going out to Washington, D.C., in the fall, not with a specific ask, but to remind the Congressional Delegation of the importance of investing in transportation corridors. This is enjoyable, as it is not a controversial topic, but rather what can be afforded and where the money should be steered.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether a grant funded the TMO Study. City Administrator Nevinski shared that the Legislature allocated $200,000 for the TMO study to determine how all the agencies along the corridor work together. He noted that Shorewood was designated as the recipient of the corridor grant, so Shorewood is the fiscal agent.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether the grant covered the study and whether the funds had been depleted. Ms. Alper noted that the funds covered the study and are depleted.

Councilmember Gorham asked how SRF states engaged in the process. Ms. Alper shared that SRF worked on the regional solicitation grant application and is hopeful about the outcome. SRF is also working on the Shorewood Comprehensive Plan, and elements of the TMO will be included in that.

Councilmember Gorham asked how the study informs the City in the future. City Administrator Nevinski shared that there was a thorough review of different options and of what other corridors are doing. There could be a focus on safety, transportation, or congestion reductions. The study also examined potential governance structures, costs, and the possibility of a formal entity forming to advocate for Highway 7. He added that after reviewing all the work, the coalition concluded that going with the SWCTC as the respected entity was the right course at this point. He noted that if, at some point, there is a desire to form a specific Highway 7 entity, the study provides a roadmap for that process. He shared that there is a strong desire among Highway 7 communities for consistent, specific conversations about Highway 7 to ensure it is well represented.

Councilmember Gorham asked who created the regional solicitation. City Administrator Nevinski stated that the regional solicitation arose as part of the coalition, noting an opportunity with MnDOT's project now open and the need for the coalition to apply. He added that all the cities in the coalition committed funds based on each city's size to help fund the application process. Councilmember Gorham asked who the City funded. City Administrator Nevinski shared that all of the money ran through the SWCTC. The SWCTC invoices all communities, and the funds then go to SRF, which handles the application. He added that if the application is successful, that would be great; if not, there is a smaller grant to pursue or, in 2028, the next regional solicitation, with some of the information carrying over. He noted that there are many moving pieces, and MnDOT will have to start making decisions.

Councilmember DiGruttolo pointed out that there are two separate studies, the MnDOT Highway 7 study and the TMO study. The TMO study was done to tell the cities along the corridor whether they could be a TMO and, if not, what else they could be. She asked whether the TMO study also included the $11,000,000 recommendation for other potential projects. She also asked if receiving the study would commit the City to anything. City Administrator Nevinski stated that Shorewood was the fiscal agent for the TMO grant that was received from the legislature. Shorewood was named, and how the money could be used was stated.

Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that Mayor Labadie had stated that she felt Shorewood should be the lead. She asked if Shorewood is the lead. City Administrator Nevinski shared that, for the regional solicitation application, Shorewood was initially the lead agency, but Chanhassen ultimately took it over for technical reasons.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether receiving the study does not approve phase one, the budget, the project priority list, the fiscal agent role beyond the existing grant, any dues or consulting contracts, JPAs, or local matching funds. City Administrator Nevinski explained that the TMO study is simply an examination of forming an organization to advocate for Highway 7. The study does not obligate the City to construct anything for Highway 7 or any similar facility. If regional solicitation dollars are received and there is an issue with the local match that Shorewood cannot afford, those funds do not have to be accepted. He added that the idea is for the funds to go to MnDOT, which will determine how to allocate them through its system. That does not mean that Shorewood will not have a local cost share, but that is different than local match. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether the City is committed to any cost-sharing yet. City Administrator Nevinski stated that the City does not know the project scope; MnDOT is now starting that process.

Councilmember DiGruttolo pointed out that she was confused while reading the documents, because there are several projects but they do not seem to be prioritized. She added that the memo says the budget impact would be none, but the report describes a $40,000-$50,000 Phase One Budget, with Shorewood as the lead agency. She asked what action would come back to the Council next. City Administrator Nevinski shared that he does not know what action will come back next. Mr. Julie stated that in September, the outcome of the regional solicitation application will be known; if funding is received, coordination with MnDOT will be required to turn it over. He noted that there is absolutely no obligation for anything that was done that would have a financial implication later. The study aims to identify the needs and put forward the best application. He added that if the money for the projects is awarded, there is still a decision to accept the money and take on the projects. He shared that the grant from the legislature for the study had a specific scope focused on organizing an advocacy group for Highway 7, and $200,000 was enough to do that, which is not always the case. He stated that SRF was as efficient as it could be with the application. He assured Council that all the work was done efficiently and that the City is not on the hook for anything beyond submitting the application.

Councilmember DiGruttolo shared that after speaking with many seniors at the Night to Unite event, they are strongly opposed to any roundabouts, resulting in significant pushback against installing them on Highway 7. She added that there was frustration about potential T-intersections on Highway 7, especially if that would be near Eureka Road. She noted that she is trying to get the information into the record so that questions do not have to be answered repeatedly. She asked why specific intersections were chosen over others. Mr. Julie stated that MnDOT had their study that was wrapping up right as the TMO study was being finished. SRF was not out studying the corridor and recommending improvements; MnDOT was doing that with their own public engagement process. The timing lined up for the cities along the corridor to put together this application to secure more funds for what MnDOT had determined in the study. He added that SRF never conducted any engineering or traffic analysis that would change anything in the study; in fact, some of the money applied for will go directly toward the intersections that MnDOT said needed improvements. He pointed out which intersections would be upgraded and which would not; that was all part of MnDOT's study, which included all the technical analysis. Ms. Alper stated that there is a QR code linking to a graphic describing each intersection.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked if half of the intersections are funded. Mr. Julie stated that about half of them are funded. The original need was in the $80,000,000 to $90,000,000 range, and the funding is in the $40,000,000 to $45,000,000 range.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked whether it was safe to assume that MnDOT selected the highest-impact intersections to fund. Mr. Julie stated that this was correct and that MnDOT did have certain criteria for ranking the intersections. MnDOT typically has a list of criteria, and crash history is typically one of the top criteria. He added that MnDOT also looks at corridor-wide what would make the most sense holistically. He noted that the MnDOT study includes a write-up of the criteria used to identify the improvements. Public Works Director Morreim stated that there was also significant public involvement. Some items were removed from the 2029 project scope based on public input.

Councilmember Sanschagrin shared that the Council needed to consider that there are likely diminishing returns to continuing to pursue these improvements, since this is already addressing the highest impact areas. Mr. Julie noted that the intersections in Shorewood are subject to near-term improvements. He shared that one of the great things was the group sticking together as a corridor. He noted that what Councilmember Sanschagrin stated was a decision the Council would have to make going forward, but he will wait to see what gets built post-2029 and what issues remain. MnDOT will have to reprogram a future project. He pointed out that the 2029 project addresses the intersections where many crashes occur. The MnDOT long-term vision is to rebuild both eastbound and westbound lanes with a raised center median to prevent cross-over accidents, which is not part of the project. He added that things will change in the next five to ten years, and the Council will have to decide whether the City should stay involved, but he guesses that they would want to be there to see things fully implemented.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked about the number in the 2029 bond that was labeled as Shorewood's share of Highway 7 and where that number came from. Public Works Director Morreim stated that the estimated number is based on the Staff's best estimate of the project's scope and Shorewood's share. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that the number should be included in the memo, since it is the City's planning assumption, to provide more detail on where the estimate came from. Finance Director Schmuck shared that the Staff is waiting for MnDOT to define more of the project, and the City does not have the funding, so that would require future debt service to facilitate it. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether that is the City's share of the $11,000,000, or where the number came from. City Administrator Nevinski asked whether that is the City's cost for various lags at the intersection. Public Works Director Morreim noted that it is Staff's estimate at this point. City Administrator Nevinski stated that Staff does not know the numbers because MnDOT is just starting the work. He noted that Shorewood did ask for some bonding money from the State legislature, and that it will need to remain part of the strategy. He shared that the number is based on the potential for improvements and the City's share of those lags.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that the number from Shorewood could be significantly more. City Administrator Nevinski pointed out that it could not be assumed right now. Mayor Labadie shared that this is why it is so important to continue lobbying at the State and Federal levels, such as the Fly-in that Shorewood attended. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if the City received any money from that. Mayor Labadie noted that they did not, but many of the projects take years before they see any returns. She added that the $200,000 received for the TMO study was due to multiple mayors lobbying, and without the strength in numbers, many things that could benefit Shorewood would be lost. She pointed out that the Legislature gave the group money for the study, and many of the cities could not do what is needed without the group's help. She shared that continuing to lobby diligently is important. Mr. Julie pointed out that there are several other corridor coalitions and added that it will take a few rounds of lobbying to secure what is needed.

Mr. Julie shared that SRF is a member of the SWCTC and will share any information he receives with the SWCTC to keep it on their radar for future consideration.

B. Report by Commissioner Sylvester on the July 28 Park Commission Meeting

Commissioner Sylvester shared that at the July 28 meeting there were no matters from the floor, but there were four agenda items. The Park Commission first discussed the SCEC task force, which has a separate budget from the park budget. Because it falls under the Parks Department, Park and Recreation Director Czech wanted to keep the Park Commission involved and seek their input. Mr. Czech shared all the meeting minutes, the timeline, and an update on the building with the Commission for its awareness. She explained that the next topic was the Parks Capital Improvement Plan, which the Commission reviews annually. Since the Master Plan was just gone through, there is not much to change, but there was new information about the tennis court resurfacing in Cathcart Park that would only buy the City five to seven years, and replacing it needs to be considered. There was a change to the plan to add $95,000 in 2036, with the anticipation of replacing and resurfacing the Badget Park tennis court for $20,000 in 2036. She noted that the SCEC Capital budget was added for visibility and awareness. She shared that the Commission discussed adopting a cost-saving mentality as plans are being developed, and that Councilmember DiGruttolo said the Commission should be prepared to share the thought process behind the projects. She noted that the playground equipment is all nearing the end of its life at the same time, but the Commission will keep in mind leveling the load across projects as things progress. The third agenda item was the Freeman Park North Playground, as it will be the major expense for 2027. She explained that this year Mr. Czech has lined up various community engagement events to collect community input. The hope is to discuss that input at the end of the year, release the Request for Proposals to vendors, then, in early 2027, receive the proposals, collect community input, finalize contracts by spring, place the order by next summer, and proceed with installation and the grand opening. She added that the Commission discussed creative ways to help with the funding or grants that could be received. The final agenda item was the Safety Camp preview, which is scheduled for August 25. The camp is full, with 40 students enrolled and a waitlist, unlike last year, when it had to be canceled. The reasons the camp was full were choosing a better date and partnering with Minnetonka Community Education.

C. Presentation of Excelsior Fire District Draft 2027 Budget

Interim Fire Chief Nate Basinger noted that he was in attendance to provide an update on the proposed 2027 budget for the Excelsior Fire District. He shared that the goal in preparing the 2027 budget was to keep it as streamlined as possible after a big year last year with several capital projects. He explained that the big thing for the 2027 budget was finalizing the staffing plan, which includes bringing in the final full-time Battalion Chief and getting the firefighter pay up to the final step increase. That put the proposed budget at a little over $2,900,000, which is a 6.39 percent increase. He added that one of the biggest things to work through when looking at this budget, along with the Police Department, was looking at the facilities. A study of the facilities identified about $10,000,000 in deferred maintenance. He noted that the Fire Department had to work with the Police Department, and the Tonka Bay Administrator helped determine how to collaborate and address the projects. When thinking through the options, it became apparent that a bonding discussion was in order. On the Fire Department side of things, there were a few projects put in that need to be done in 2027: flat roof repairs and IT hardware upgrades. There were some email server hacks, so nothing more can be done with the current system; it needs to be upgraded. That put the Fire Department at a 3.64 percent increase. As the bonding discussion continued, one of the big items was the uninterrupted power supply (UPS) that goes between the generator and the building. That failed a couple of years ago and has been on the radar for repair. This is something that the police wanted to prioritize for 2027, and because it is a shared system, Fire shares 50 percent of the cost. He explained that, after discussing this with the fire board, the direction is to work with the Police and determine the best UPS system to use. He shared that both he and the Police Chief feel the number is higher than necessary, but have not had the chance to select the best system, so the number included in the budget is the worst-case scenario. He stated that Shorewood's current increase is 4.41 percent, and all of it is on the operations side. He pointed out that, looking ahead to 2028, they are considering how to address deferred maintenance and the best plan for it. He noted that, for Fire, he is trying to increase capital reserves, a request from many of the cities. When there is discussion about acquiring reserves and building them up, it is hard to reach agreement on where that money will be allocated. Another goal is to maintain staffing; right now, they have been staying at about 45 firefighters. The Fire Department is allocated for 50, but 43 to 45 is the sweet spot. The Fire Department is also focused on improving: getting trucks out the door quickly and getting to the residents quickly to give the highest level of care. He added that having the Battalion Chiefs on 24/7 has made the numbers comparable to those of career departments, but with a paid on-call model. He stated that the Fire Department is really proud of that.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether the budget amount for UPS is an overallocation relative to what may be needed. He asked if the number is lower for UPS, then Fire would want to keep the money for the next year. He pointed out that the number in the budget is a big ask, and the City has to levy, so the ask is to lower the number now rather than levy. Chief Basinger noted that he and the Police Chief are currently looking into the UPS. The UPS is really heavy police-side equipment, so it is not something he has had much history with. He understood that the current system is oversized for what the city needs, but given the system in place, is there something that could be used alongside it to lower costs?

Councilmember Gorham asked what needs an uninterrupted power supply. Chief Basinger stated that his understanding is that the Police have networks that tie directly to the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA), which they must maintain to ensure continuity in the chain of evidence and the like. If the computers go down and the connection is lost, there are potential ramifications. Councilmember Maddy added that, at the last fire budget meeting, this came up, and fire does not need it. He noted that they were at the calendar deadline to set the budget, so the UPS was added, but the board is skeptical about whether the police need the building-wide system. He shared that the money is in there, but the expectation is that the levy can be lowered down the road unless the Police Department makes a very good argument for why a building-wide system is needed. Mayor Labadie shared that it relates to the chain of custody, so if there is a gap in the chain of custody, evidence can be questioned as to whether it was tampered with. She noted that if the Council has questions, then Chief Ballsrud is the one to ask. She added that she does not want to give the impression that the levy will decrease, but the UPS number was included because the budget can always go down but cannot go up.

Councilmember Gorham asked, in situations where more information is needed, who ensures the Police Chief receives the Council's information in time. Mayor Labadie noted that the UPS was a line item in the police budget as well, and the Police Chief is diligently working to work through the issue in the budget. City Administrator Nevinski pointed out that the Council has identified the UPS as needing further work, so the Council can now specify what it wants to see. He asked whether the Council wants to see a levy reduction or would rather see any savings go into the reserves. That information can be taken back to the boards, and Shorewood's thoughts will be conveyed.

Councilmember DiGruttolo shared that if the building can get a UPS that can go under the desks and be plugged in, then the extra $70,000 could be put into a reserve. She added that way, when things come up, there is some money to offset the costs. Mayor Labadie noted that in the police meetings, all the numbers were being crunched as much as possible to have reserves. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether this option was considered in the meetings. Mayor Labadie stated that it was not discussed at length, but it is something that the Police Chief is looking into now. She agreed that the Council should provide direction on how to use the cost savings, and if Shorewood gives its direction, it may sway some of the other councils as well.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked whether the departments have a policy on the reserves needed to operate. Chief Basinger stated that he believed that the JPA for the Fire Department is 20 to 30 percent. He added that it has been at about 17 to 19 percent in the past few years. City Administrator Nevinski shared that it is a Fire Department policy not established in the JPA, but he is not sure on the Police Department side.

Councilmember Maddy asked whether it is possible to put the money into an interest-bearing account. Chief Basinger noted that this is the perpetual question, but he is not entirely sure. He noted that building reserves for future purchases would be very helpful.

Councilmember Gorham pointed out that the levy is pushing double digits. It would be great to keep the savings in reserve, but if the UPS does not cost $150,000, he would rather pay the cost and drive the decision-making to make the City's budget.

Mayor Labadie asked how, with $100,000 in savings, that would affect the levy. Finance Director Schmuck noted that it would be slightly over one percentage point.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if, once the new Battalion Chief and the Fire Chief are in place, the staffing will be stable. Chief Basinger stated that the good news is that the Fire Chief is already budgeted for. The only staff addition is the final Battalion Chief; that is the plan for now, with no further career hiring and continued monitoring of the paid on-call staff. The idea behind establishing career administrative positions was to adapt to whatever firefighter staffing model is in place. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked what the third Battalion Chief will be doing. Chief Basinger stated that the third Chief is slated to be Professional Standards and Logistics. A big part of what they will do is coordinating the boat, the ATV, and all the SCBAs, as well as OSHA compliance and maintenance. Councilmember Maddy stated that with the final person, the Fire Department will have an experienced, trained person available 24/7, 365 days a year to get out the door immediately, which is something the Fire Department has not had. The board has no plans for staffing going forward. City Administrator Nevinski pointed out that Chief Basinger is the interim chief, and the department is preparing to interview interim administrators to help stabilize finance, HR, and certain governance functions. He pointed out that the board will at some point have to consider appointing a district administrator, as the JPA includes language to that effect. Hiring an interim administrator will help the board explore the future.
Councilmember Sanschagrin stated that he read that some fire departments are now charging for lifts. He asked if this is something that Fire could look into. Chief Basinger shared that it could be looked into, but would probably have to be done by the cities. He added that the Fire

Department is tracking those sorts of things and the data could be shared if needed. He shared that it would be a police-driven discussion because it is ultimately up to them whether Fire gets driven into those. Councilmember Maddy noted that Mound just started charging organizations for their lift assists, so that would be something to look at how that goes for them. Fire does not want to dissuade anyone from calling for emergency services if needed, but there are some abusers out there. Finance Director Schmuck added that Shorewood does charge for false alarms. Councilmember Sanschagrin asked if the funds stay with the City. Finance Director Schmuck stated that was correct and is part of the City's fee schedule.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked about the $399,355 for Total Capital Outlay in the budget. Chief Basinger stated that a big chunk of that is the final payment for the newest engine, which is about $177,000. There are six leased vehicles, which total about $60,000, and the rest would be the roof repairs, IT repairs, about $10,000 for lost equipment, and the UPS system.

City Administrator Nevinski noted that for items D and E, the Council should give more thought as to what to do if there is excess money in the budgets. He added that clarity is always a gift.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether the Council wants the budget lowered, and then to reject items D and E. City Administrator Nevinski stated that both the Fire and Police boards have given the budgets careful consideration and discussion, and these are the recommended budgets for the councils. Councilmember Gorham pointed out that the recommendation had an unclear aspect. City Administrator Nevinski shared that the Council can consider the budgets and hedge a little by saying that if the UPS system comes in lower than Shorewood would like, Shorewood could either put the money in reserves or lower the levy if the information comes in time. He added that, for the benefit of Mayor Labadie and Councilmember Maddy, they can have a clear position from Shorewood to present at future meetings. He noted that other cities may have different thoughts.

Councilmember Gorham noted that he would like to lower the levy. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she would like to put the money into the reserves, since it will not reduce the levy by much. She noted that over the last two years, when the budget for Police and Fire has come in, there have been big asks, and it would be nice if they could start building out the reserves.

Councilmember Maddy asked whether, if the Council decides to keep the levy as is, the City has an interest-bearing place to put the money. Finance Director Schmuck stated that the City would probably create a special revenue fund for the money and then allocate those funds and interest across all the pooled funds, proportionately to the cash balance every month. Councilmember Maddy noted that the City could keep the money if necessary. Finance Director Schmuck stated that the City would probably prefer to keep the money and manage it that way. The JPA is silent on things in this category.

Mayor Labadie noted that Councilmember DiGruttolo has stated she prefers to keep the money; Councilmembers Sanschagrin and Gorham have stated they prefer to return the money to the residents and lower the levy. She added that she is considering keeping the money as well. Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that she could go either way. Mayor Labadie brought up the SCBAs needed last year and how they all have to be replaced at the same time, so that will always be a big hit when the year comes up. She noted it would be a way to help even things out, even though certain expenses cannot be broken up. Councilmember Gorham shared that it sets a precedent that the Departments need to come in with what something costs, not with a budget item that is still in formation.

Councilmember Maddy asked whether any major items from KA should be addressed in the next year. Chief Basinger noted that many items on KA's list are past their expected life expectancy. He shared that they are in the zone where another chiller could emerge if the department is not proactive about the list. However, nothing is on their radar. He noted that putting off the UPS system for another year is something he would have to defer to the Police Chief, as it impacts their system the most. As for large building expenditures, that was the reason for pushing off the bond until 2028: there was nothing they felt needed to be done.

Mayor Labadie noted that this does not have to be figured out by the Council, but the Council is looking for some direction for the boards. City Administrator Nevinski pointed out that Councilmember DiGruttolo could go either way on the money, so it would be helpful to hear the strength of the Council's convictions. Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that her first instinct is to even things out and avoid anything else that could throw the council for a loop. She preferred to give the departments a reserve, but it could go either way. Councilmember Gorham stated that there is a benefit to it either way. Councilmember Maddy stated that costs will be paid now or later as part of the building's capital upkeep. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that whatever the other cities say, she would be fine either way. Mayor Labadie noted that the cities will be looking to Shorewood because it is a big part of the budget. Councilmember Maddy shared that he thinks the budget number for the UPS needs to stay as is for now, and if there is an excess, he would want to reduce the levy slightly. Mayor Labadie stated that, upon returning to the boards, they would say it was a close discussion. Still, overall the majority opinion was to reduce the levy if there is an excess.

D. Excelsior Fire District 2027 Budget

Mayor Labadie noted that the Agenda Packet contains all the line items. She asked if anyone had questions relating to the items. If not, then there are several resolutions.

Councilmember Maddy noted that the Council will approve the number now, and it can always be reduced by December. Councilmember Gorham asked whether anything needs to be stated in the resolution regarding potential savings from the UPS system. City Administrator Nevinski stated he did not think so if the Council is comfortable approving the budget and the discussion has taken place about the excess.

Councilmember Sanschagrin noted that the alternative would be to table the resolution and then have the departments update the budget. Mayor Labadie stated that the boards have until December. Finance Director Schmuck shared that the Council has until the end of September to establish the preliminary levy. So for the departments to go back and get everything done, that would be a time crunch. At this point, if the preliminary levy is approved in September, the number can always be reduced but not increased. She shared that the departments would have time to come back to the Council between September and December with amendments to the original budget. Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that the departments should be given a certain date by which they should return to the Council with that information.

Mayor Labadie shared that the next SLMPD board meeting is in October and the Chief would need some time after that meeting. City Administrator Nevinski stated that if the preference to reduce the budget is known, the information can be sent back to the boards, and the cities can receive it within the appropriate timeframe. As long as the number is received in time to prepare the final levy, there is no time crunch. Mayor Labadie shared that the October meeting would allow the Police Chief to attend the Council meeting in time for the final budget.

Maddy moved, Gorham seconded, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 26-47, "A Resolution Approving the 2027 Annual Operating Budget of the Excelsior Fire District."

Motion passed 5/0.

Maddy moved, Gorham seconded, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 26-048, "A Resolution Approving the 2027 Annual Facilities/Capital Budget of the Excelsior Fire District."

Motion passed 5/0.

E. SLMPD 2027 Budget

City Administrator Nevinski reviewed the SLMPD 2027 Budget as found in the Agenda Packet.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if other cities had issues with the budget. City Administrator Nevinski shared that the concern was on the fire side. Shorewood is the first City to discuss the budgets this year, so there is no information to share. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked about how the other cities seemed in the meetings. City Administrator Nevinski noted that Shorewood is increasing significantly, the Tonka Bay percentage is rising, and Excelsior is declining. The Police board did a lot of work, and the cities understand the implications to their own budgets. The cities held several work sessions to identify places to save. He shared that the Police Chief is in a bit of a juggling act, trying to do certain things while also having a fiscal responsibility to keep the budget in check. He stated that Shorewood is the city to lead the charge. Mayor Labadie shared that everyone is a little unhappy because costs have gone up. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that this is not a surprise because both the Police and Fire Chiefs told them last year to expect at least a 15 percent increase every year. She noted that Shorewood took the brunt of it because of the change in the funding formula. It may never be less than 15 percent, which is why she suggested keeping money in reserve for them.

Councilmember Maddy asked what led Shorewood to experience such a large increase. Mayor Labadie stated that Shorewood's tax capacity increased more than the other cities', and its population also increased more than the other cities'. There are several prongs to the formula, and those two prongs increased significantly enough that Shorewood's portion jumped. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked when the next review of that is. City Administrator Nevinski shared that the factors will be in play for the 2027, 2028, and 2029 budgets, and that 2030 will be an adjustment year for the police. He noted that, for fire, it is purely a tax capacity.

Maddy moved, DiGruttolo seconded, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 26-49, "A Resolution Approving the 2027 Annual Operating Budget of the South Lake Minnetonka Police Department."

Motion passed 5/0.

F. Dissolution of the Southshore Senior Partners (formerly Consent Agenda 2.F.)

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked about the rent that has been prepaid through June of 2027 and if the lease survives the dissolution of the seniors program. She also asked whether all the core senior programs would be preserved and, if so, whether that would be included in the budget. Mayor Labadie noted that those are all great questions, but what is before the Council is simply accepting the letter from Southshore Partners stating that they are dissolving, and that the remainder will be part of the discussion with the SCEC task force recommendations. Park and Recreation Director Czech noted that is correct. Mayor Labadie stated that she shared some of the same concerns as Councilmember DiGruttolo, but that is not the matter before the Council.

Councilmember DiGruttolo shared that she is comfortable accepting the notice with gratitude. Still, she wants to be clear that accepting the letter does not obligate the City to pick up where the Southshore Partners left off. She wanted to be clear that the City is not accepting responsibility. Councilmember Sanschagrin shared that the letter lists what they will no longer do. Mr. Czech stated that the letter is just the Southshore Partners telling the City that they are no longer continuing operations. Mayor Labadie added that the letter is not a binding contract; it is simply the Southshore Partners sharing what they hope the City will step into. Mr. Czech stated that the Southshore Partners are outlining what they would hope to see and that they are a valuable asset to the community. If the programs are to continue, it would be the City's responsibility, but the City can say the programming will not continue. He added that, through the SCEC study, all the pieces are being reviewed and a decision will be made. The letter makes it clear that the Senior Partners will no longer exist at the end of the year and will not provide any services to the City.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked when the rent and lease issue will be discussed. She noted that Southshore Senior Partners is dissolving as an entity, but the contract remains binding. City Administrator Nevinski shared that there was not much of a lease in place; something was put in place in 2014. The City has been working with them to solidify matters, and that marked the start of the conversation about the future of Southshore Senior Partners. He added that a lease entails a whole lot more responsibility, sparking a discussion about the organization's sustainability. He noted that there is no lease in place to enforce. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that there may not have been a lease, but there were things such as insurance. City Administrator Nevinski shared that those topics came up in the conversation about trying to formalize the arrangement but never got across the finish line. Those conversations raised questions about the sustainability of the Southshore Partners. He added that there is not much more for the City to deal with, since little was actually in place. He noted that there will be future conversations about senior programming and what Council will want to do.

Councilmember Gorham asked if the City needs to accept the notification of the dissolution to make it valid. City Administrator Nevinski stated that it was on consent, like a job resignation, to receive the notice and acknowledge it, but there is not much other action at this time. Mayor Labadie noted that Southshore Partners had extended a courtesy by formally notifying the City of the dissolution. She added that Southshore Partners was in the building a lot, doing so many different activities and staffing the desk. She noted that there will need to be a more robust discussion about staffing the SCEC. She added that at lunch, they asked whether voting could be addressed and whether those in the room needed to attend Council meetings to demonstrate the value of the SCEC. She pointed out that the letter expresses the group's hopes for the future and its appreciation for the space.

Maddy moved, Sanschagrin seconded, Accepting the Notice of Dissolution of the Southshore Senior Partners, Effective December 31, 2026.

Motion passed 5/0.

Mayor Labadie thanked the board members of the Southshore Senior Partners for all that they did for the community. He shared that the memo does not include SRF's consulting time for the Comprehensive Plan or ISG's consulting time for the SCEC study.

5. STAFF AND COUNCIL REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Staff

i. Engineering Staffing and Consultant Transition Update

Public Works Director Morreim reviewed the updated Engineering Staffing and Consultant Transition, as found in the Agenda Packet.

Councilmember DiGruttolo about the resignation of the Streets Supervisor and for the date to post the vacancy, so that the City does not lose two or three Council cycles. Public Works Director Morreim stated that the next Council meeting is August 24, so he hopes the vacancy will be posted on August 25. He shared that the Streets Supervisor will be done on September 4, so the City will be without that position for a couple of months.

Councilmember Gorham noted that the report is good, but he is considering a major capital project, which will place a heavier load on Bolton and Menk. He asked how the City would adapt at that point. Public Works Director Morreim stated that some of that remains to be seen; however, in some of the larger capital projects, he has been taking a more active role behind the scenes in the past. He noted that Staff will work well together with Bolten and Menk on the larger capital projects. There is a larger project coming up that will be fairly critical to begin scoping for the 2027 Mill and Overlay. He added that the engineering contract item will be brought to the next Council meeting or two. Some of the Staff's time has been spent on fiber, which has been ongoing for a couple of years and is reasonably efficient at handling it. He shared that next year, the City is looking to move out of the fiber projects, or they will be managed differently with only one drilling rig, which will help slow them down and allow Staff to manage things more easily. He noted that Midco is slowing down because they do not have as many crews. The items will ebb and flow, so the ability to do that with the consultant is critical.

Councilmember Gorham noted that he would be interested in knowing how Public Works Director Morreim would deploy his team differently for a larger capital project. Public Works Director Morreim stated that the employee public engagement part will be a more active role, and the Staff is good at that, which plays a larger role in the projects that are done.

Councilmember Sanschagrin stated that consulting costs are $204,000. He asked what the costs would have been if the measures had not been done. Public Works Director Morreim stated that this year is a down year, but there might be a 30 to 40 percent increase, especially with City Engineer Budde not attending all the meetings. That being said, there are no large capital projects this year. He said he did not think the cost would double, but it is hard to say. He shared that development also matters for the number, and there is not that much going on this year.

ii. Tentative Upcoming Agenda Topics

Mayor Labadie stated that the document stands on its own and asked if there were any questions.

Park and Recreation Director Czech thanked the Southshore Senior Partners board members. He shared that there is a task force meeting on Wednesday for the SCEC; the consultant developed some scenarios: one that keeps things as they are, one that adds programs and services, and one that is more robust. The task force will review those and offer recommendations. He noted that they are gearing up for Safety Camp and seeking volunteers to help with the programs. Concert in the Park is rescheduled for August 27 at Freeman Park, starting at 6:00 P.M. There will be work at Cathcart Park soon to repair the hockey boards and replace the end fencing with a new net. Then there will be a volunteer painting of the boards in the fall.

Mayor Labadie asked if the paint for the boards will be donated again. Mr. Czech shared that it will be the likely outcome. Mayor Labadie suggested not painting on homecoming Saturday.

Public Works Director Morreim shared that lead and copper tests are being conducted; 12 have been completed, eight more remain, and six replacements are needed. He stated that the seasonal work will be completed soon, and maintenance capacity will be slightly reduced. He added that pavement sealing will be done in the next couple of weeks, with more information to come. Staff has been repainting parking arrows and lines, with a striping contract to come. For the Galpin Lake Trail project, there has been verbal approval, with the requirement to resubmit a design memo; once that is done, approval will follow soon. He noted that they will advertise at the end of the week, and bids will be open in early September, with some work to be done in the fall and the trail to be opened in the spring. The reason for that is that there is bad soil ten to fifteen feet down, so the Staff plans to do soil stabilization and let that rest for the rest of the winter; if there is any settlement that will appear in the spring, it will then be taken care of. He noted that it is the most cost-effective option. The plan is to be done by May 2027.

Finance Director Schmuck stated that the Staff continues to work on the budget, and the audit should wrap up shortly, with the financials coming before the Council in September, along with the Long-Term Financial Management Plan. She added that Staff continues working on Staff training with the new senior accountant. The annual TIF report has been submitted and will be published in the August 20 *Sun Sailor.* She added that Staff sent out 325 delinquent utility notices, which will return for a public hearing before year-end to assess any remaining delinquent accounts. That is about $160,000, 320 accounts that are over 90 days past due.

City Clerk/HR Director Thone stated that two candidates filed for City Council seats: Guy Sanschagrin and Eric Magistad. Those two seats will be on the November ballot. She shared that the primary election was the next day. She shared that the DOJ has informed Hennepin County that they will be sending Election Monitors to the primary; the DOJ specifically identified Minneapolis, Brooklyn Park, and Brooklyn Center. That does not mean that they will not send anyone to Shorewood. The Election Monitors will stay outside the 100-foot boundary, identify themselves, and may interview voters as they leave the polling place. She added that there are directions for election judges if needed. Shorewood currently has 6,085 registered voters; 353 early voters came to City Hall, and 108 of them were on August 10. She shared that 82 ballots have been mailed in to Hennepin County. She added that the Council made a great decision regarding early voting, as there has been a lot of positive feedback. She noted that the City Code has been updated with tonight's approval and that the information is online, and hard copies can be updated by bringing them to City Hall. She stated that the Massage License denied in April has requested a refund of the licensing fees and is no longer pursuing it. Water connection brochures were mailed to households eligible to connect to water, and door hangers and emails will follow to let people know as well. She added that school supply donations were still being accepted for two more days for the Resource West back-to-school program. She stated that the tree sale is now open; residents can now preorder trees through September 14 for delivery in May 2027. There are 10 different types of trees, all at wholesale prices. She shared that the Comprehensive Plan 2050 engagement sessions have been added to the website and will be promoted through the other communication avenues.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that last week there was a quarterly Mound Fire Commission meeting with updates on staffing and where they are headed. He shared that the budget came up, and the City of Mound has been reviewing cost allocations, with more costs being shifted to the fire department and then spread out to the cities under contract with them. He added that this likely means a $6,000 to $7,000 increase in service costs for the cities contracted with the Mound Fire Department. Last year, Shorewood spent $33,000 there, and this year it will be closer to $40,000. He noted that they are working on refining the numbers, and there is frustration among the contracting cities that this came up so late in the process. He added that, to some extent, Shorewood is doing the same thing: it provides some public safety services and is now starting to charge for them because it should not be bearing all the costs. He shared that last week Staff met with Minnewashta School's Finance Director and their architect. They will start an expansion project next summer to add a media center to the north of the building, and the following summer, some internal remodels will take place. He shared that the water quality issue at Silver Lake is being looked at. The issue is currently unknown, and the City has eliminated the use of sand, which will reduce the amount of soil and dirt entering the water. A lot of street sweeping is being done around curbs and gutters to collect debris and keep it out of the lakes. There is a stormwater separator across from Silver Lake Park that helps clean runoff. He added that some beavers were building a dam in that area and could have contributed to the issue. That is what is known right now. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan is well underway and he appreciated the support at National Night Out.

City Administrator Nevinski shared that there is a work session on August 24 to discuss SCEC staff and the overall budget. He asked about what the start time could be for that meeting. Councilmember Sanschagrin asked if anything could be moved to the regular Council meeting. City Administrator Nevinski stated that it could be considered, especially if many members cannot be there early. Councilmember Gorham stated that if it is a rarity, he could figure it out. He asked how the discussion of SCEC staffing is being framed. City Administrator Nevinski stated that the task force will meet Wednesday and will have some recommendations, so he does not exactly know. He noted that the discussions will focus on what the Council wants to do with the senior programming. The Council can discuss different models and whether they want to staff them. The big question is how quickly the Council wants to move with the SCEC. He shared that, on the Fire Department side, they sometimes delay hiring for positions, so that could be discussed.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he is considering which tools are needed to start those discussions. Starting senior programming on the City side of things is not as simple as just hiring someone; many factors will need to be considered, and what does that mean for the SCEC's goals? He shared that he does not know whether there is even enough support to make the decisions. City Administrator Nevinski stated that there are still some unknowns, and Staff is thinking about the discussion. The City does want to get to a point where, at least for the levy, it knows what will be needed. He shared that the discussion about the task force's formal recommendations will not be held, but a preliminary levy is needed.

Councilmember Gorham pointed out that it is unknown if one person will make things successful. City Administrator Nevinski agreed that it is currently unknown. Mr. Czech shared that the consultant is conducting an analysis and that the task force will incorporate the consultant's input. Councilmember Gorham asked if the consultant has started senior services. He asked if the recommendation is to do this or if the City needs this person. He stated that in two weeks, the Council will have to decide whether to add another person to the SCEC staff. He asked whether the person is a solution to where the City wants to get. City Administrator Nevinski shared that it is part of the discussion and that a half-time person was included in the budget, so the conversation has already started. That is where the City is, trying to figure out what to include and where it wants to go.

Councilmembers Sanschagrin, DiGruttolo, and Gorham, and Mayor Labadie stated they could arrive early. Councilmember Maddy stated that it varies for him. Mayor Labadie noted that holding part of it as a work session and part as an Agenda Item would be good, so that all five voices can be involved. City Administrator Nevinski stated that he appreciated Council's willingness to do so, and that Staff will try to respect the normal times as much as possible.

B. Mayor and City Council

Councilmember DiGruttolo shared that she brought her water letter. She noted that the letter states that the agreement form commits the City to installing and connecting the service, and that the property owner will pay over 10 years. She asked if that is correct. Staff informed her that it is correct. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated she has been telling everyone for five years. She asked whether, for the Long-Term Financial Management Plan, there will be no data until October, which is after the preliminary levy. Finance Director Schmuck shared that this was correct. She added that the City would have it before the preliminary levy. Still, since the extra CIP was added, Staff ended up falling a little farther behind on the audited financial statements. All of that needs to be pulled together before the Long-Term Financial Management Plan can be completed. She noted that the Staff also postponed adopting the fee schedule until October, as it is based on some data from the Long-Term Financial Management Plan. Councilmember DiGruttolo shared that she wanted to see in the plan what the City will do with the money not being spent on Mill Street. She asked if the cost of water could be lowered for people. Finance Director Schmuck shared that water rates did not go up; it was the water bill, which was mostly sanitary and stormwater, that people felt the impact of. Councilmember DiGruttolo shared that she received a lot of feedback during Night to Unite. She shared that people are super happy with Public Works in the Manor Park area. Some seniors are highly concerned about the Highway 7 proposals.

Mayor Labadie asked if that was the Waterford group. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that it was. Mayor Labadie shared that she went there after they had been there and was able to give them a really thorough rundown on all the activity that has been happening on Highway 7. She noted that when she was there, EFD came, and they discussed together that every time there is an incident on Highway 7, it involves the first responders as well. She noted that she did not get the same complaints, but the seniors really understood after the conversations and are ready to see safety improvements.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he is still considering the hire for senior programming. In two weeks, Staff will propose an employee. He proposed that Staff provide the Council with enough background so they can understand. He added that in any other scenario, hiring would be the last thing that is done. He shared that he could not imagine a world where, in two weeks, the Council is ready to discuss hiring someone to execute a vision that the City does not have, fit into a staffing plan that the City does not have, and support services that are not yet created. The hope is to understand the big picture of the SCEC. He shared that the LMCC is meeting on Thursday and he will report back.

Councilmember Sanschagrin noted that he and City Administrator Nevinski had a call with Chief Ballsrud to discuss the harassment on Manor Road. He shared that there is a TikTok challenge that encourages youth to knock on people's doors and harass them. They discussed possible solutions to inform the neighborhood.

Councilmember Maddy stated that he spent a lot of time volunteering as a coach for a youth sport where the coaches are at risk. He thanked those who are volunteering for youth activities.

Mayor Labadie stated that regarding the TikTok challenge, she asked parents to talk to their children about it. She pointed out that these are dangerous things.

6. ADJOURN

Maddy moved, Sanschagrin seconded, Adjourning the City Council Regular Meeting of August 10, 2026, at 9:56 P.M.

Motion passed.

ATTEST:

____
Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

____
Sandie Thone, City Clerk

City of Shorewood

City Council Item 2.C.

Title/Subject: June 2, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Jake Griffiths, Planning Director

Attachments
1. 06.02.26 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Background
Approved minutes from the June 2, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting are attached. Minutes were approved by the Planning Commission during the August 18, 2026, Planning Commission meeting.

Strategic Alignment
Organizational Strength & Good Governance

- Sound and strategic record keeping of government activities lead to comprehensive long-term planning, principled, data, and stakeholder-driven decisions, and a culture of continuous improvement.

Budget Impact
Minute preparation costs vary based on length of meeting and level of detail.

Action Requested
Accept the minutes from the June 2, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting. A simple majority vote is required.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD | **COUNCIL CHAMBERS**
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING | **5755 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD**
TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 2026 | **7:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Huskins called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Huskins; Commissioners Holker, Magistad, and Braithwaite; Planning Director Griffiths; Planner Osowski; and, Council Liaison Maddy

Absent: Commissioner Longo

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Holker moved, Magistad seconded, approving the agenda for June 2, 2026, as presented. Motion passed 4/0.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. 05-05-26 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Braithwaite moved, Magistad seconded, approving the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for May 5, 2026, as presented. Motion passed 4/0.

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

No one wished to address the Commission.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. PUBLIC HEARING – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
Applicant: Ross & Kathleen Simpson
Location: 5850 Boulder Bridge LN

Chair Huskins stated that this evening, the Planning Commission would consider a conditional use permit (CUP) for 5850 Boulder Bridge Lane.

Planning Director Griffiths reviewed the request for a CUP as found in the Agenda Packet.

Commissioner Magistad asked whether there were any deviations between the Planned Unit Development and the City's requirements. Planning Director Griffiths explained that there is no provision for accessory buildings. When the Boulder Bridge development occurred, there were unique requirements regarding lot sizes and dimensions. He noted that this property would have been allowed under normal zoning rules and that the Boulder Bridge Development requirements match the City Code for accessory dwelling units. He shared that the Applicant's request meets both the Bould Bridge and City requirements.

Chair Huskins asked if the Applicant wished to address the Commission. The Applicant declined. Chair Huskins asked if the Commission had any questions for the Applicant. The Commission declined.

Chair Huskins opened the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:10 P.M.

Abigail Key, 27545 Brynmawr Place, stated that she is the president of the Brynmawr Association that borders Boulder Bridge. She shared that her property backs up to the property. She noted that it was difficult to tell from the map how far back the structure would come. She asked how far back the structure would be and if any of the tree coverage would be lost.

Planning Director Griffiths shared a slide showing the property and where the building would be located on it. He stated that the proposed garage would be built on the north corner of the property. The corner of the garage will be located 85 feet from the northern property line and will comply with all setbacks. He added that the Applicant will need to submit a tree preservation plan, along with the building permits, to the City. Still, based on the review, the Staff is not anticipating any significant impacts on vegetation or sightlines.

Chair Huskins asked whether the northern property line was the one Ms. Key was referring to. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the Brynmawr neighborhood is even farther north and will be even farther from that property line.

Chair Huskins closed the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:15 P.M.

Commissioner Holker shared that she did not see any issue with the application and supports it. Commissioner Magistad agreed. Commissioner Braithwaite stated that he did not see any issue. He appreciated going through the steps and seeing all the plans.

Chair Huskins stated that he had no reservations about the application.

Magistad moved, Braithwaite seconded, recommending approval of the Conditional Use Permit at 5850 Boulder Bridge Lane. Motion passed 4/0.

Chair Huskins confirmed that the matter would be brought before the City Council on June 22.

B. PUBLIC HEARING – VARIANCE
Applicant: HOLMmade, LLC
Location: 6145 Club Valley Rd

Chair Huskins stated that this evening, the Planning Commission would consider a variance for 6145 Club Valley Road.

Planner Osowski reviewed the variance request as found in the Agenda Packet. He noted that the matter would be taken up at the City Council on June 22.

Commissioner Holker asked about the setback on the north side of the property, whether that is what the variance is needed for, or if, even with the addition, the setback will fall within the required amount. Planner Osowski stated that the Applicant is requesting a variance to encroach 13 feet into the setback and that the addition would be 27 feet from the property line, rather than 40 feet.

Commissioner Magistad asked if the encroachment was 13 feet or 14 feet. Planner Osowski stated that the encroachment is 13 feet into the setback, so 27 feet from the lot line.

Chair Huskins asked whether the addition would affect the overall square footage of the accessory dwelling. Planner Osowski stated that he would have to look. Chair Huskins clarified whether the addition would exceed 1,200. Planner Osowski noted that the addition would not be anywhere close to that. Planning Director Griffiths shared that it would take a little bit to get the exact number, but the square footage is substantially under. He suggested going on to the next question if there were any.

Commissioner Magistad asked what the impervious surface calculation is. Planner Osowski explained that the impervious surface would increase by 3 percent to 18.3 percent, and that the limit is 33 percent.

Chair Huskins asked whether, in addition to building the structure, a modification to the driveway would be needed. Planner Osowski stated that it would need to be part of a separate permit, and not part of this variance application. He added that, in the survey, the Applicant notes that a gravel driveway will be added to accommodate the garage addition; there is currently a concrete driveway.

Planning Director Griffiths stated that the maximum allowed square footage is 1,200 square feet. With the addition, the Applicant would be at 900 square feet and in compliance with City Code.

Chair Huskins asked whether, if the square footage exceeded 1,200 square feet, the Applicant would need both a variance and a conditional use permit. Planner Osowski shared that the Applicant would then need both a variance and a conditional use permit for the encroachment into the setback and the increase in square footage. If that is what happened, but this application does not do that.

Commissioner Magistad explained that he is supportive of the application, but if the neighbor to the north attends the City Council meeting with concerns, that could change the Council's thoughts on the matter.

<u>Kris Beck, 6145 Club Valley Road</u>, shared that she spoke with the neighbors to the north when they moved in about a month ago. She asked the neighbors about doing the addition, and they were both in favor of it at the time. She added that the neighbors said to let them know if anything needs to be done. She shared that there is ample space between the two properties. The other neighbors across the street attended the meeting as well.

Chair Huskins opened the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:24 P.M.

<u>Rob Wright, 6110 Club Valley Road</u>, stated that he lives kitty-corner to the property. He shared that he was in discussions with the neighbors to the north as well, and they stated they had no problem with the addition. He added that there is a lot of room between the properties, and it is unfortunate how the property is disguised on the map. He explained that he and other neighbors have no problem with the addition. The neighbors would love for the Applicant to have another garage so they can get into their house safely and avoid getting hurt again.

<u>Ed Sheridan, 6150 Club Valley Road</u>, stated that he lives across the street from the Applicant. He added that he has spoken with all the neighbors, and no one is objecting to the addition. He noted that he is a former builder and has run into these situations before. This variance seems

fairly straightforward compared to some others he has seen. He explained that when the house was built, it faced the side yard. When looking at the drawing, the existing front yard, according to the original plat, was silly to have as the front yard. He added that the existing house is now a linear structure, with the house to the north, with nothing going in or out. There is no hardscape issue; nothing is being encroached on, even if a concrete driveway is put in. He noted that both residents living in the house are in good health but have mobility issues, which is the reason for the addition. He explained that there is an option for a variance to make the existing front the side. In many other communities, a similar situation has happened, and that was what was done.

Chris Capesius, 6120 Club Valley Road, stated that he had nothing to add but wanted to show his support for moving the application forward.

Chair Huskins closed the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:30 P.M

Commissioner Braithwaite stated that he was supportive of the project. He added that the variance is the simpler of the two routes rather than trying to change the plat. Chair Huskins agreed.

Braithwaite moved, Holker seconded, recommending approval of the variance at 6145 Club Valley Road. Motion passed 4/0.

C. PUBLIC HEARING – VARIANCE
Applicant: Tim O'Connor, Align Building & Remodeling, LLC/Jonathan Rienstra
Location: 23120 Summit Ave

Chair Huskins stated that this evening, the Planning Commission would consider a variance for 23120 Summit Avenue.

Planning Director Griffiths reviewed the variance based on the information found in the Agenda Packet.

Commissioner Holker asked where the neighbor's driveway goes through. She noted that in looking at the addition, it would be right up to the neighbor's driveway. Planner Director Griffiths shared that the addition does not do that. He showed a map of the area. He added that the City Engineer reviewed the application and had no concerns regarding drainage. When looking at the drainage patterns in the area, everything ultimately drains to Summit Avenue and then onto Murray Hill Road at the bottom of the road. He added that, with respect to the existing neighbor's driveway, the Staff had no comments or concerns.

Commissioner Holker asked what the distance would be from the addition to the neighbor's driveway. Planning Director Griffiths explained that the distance of the addition to the property line is 22 feet, and the edge of the neighbor's driveway is further than that. So, the addition would be at least over 20 feet away.

Chair Huskins asked about the impervious surface and the accessory building square footage. He assumed that since neither was commented on in the Staff report, they were a non-issue. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the total proposed hardcover is 22.8 percent, with the maximum being 33 percent. He added that the proposed garage addition would increase the area by 276 square feet, and the existing garage is about 500 square feet, so that is well under the 1,200-square-foot maximum.

Commissioner Braithwaite stated that the site plan shows a proposed addition at the back and a proposed deck. He asked if those were part of the variance. Planning Director Griffiths stated that those are not part of the application. The Applicant is proposing an addition to the back of his house. That addition meets all the zoning setbacks for the property, so it is not part of the application. He added that the only part of the variance is the proposed garage addition. Chair Huskins asked whether that addition is the one noted as a new dining room. Planning Director Griffiths confirmed that to be true.

Chair Huskins opened the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:39 P.M.

Tim O'Connor of Align Building & Remodeling in Excelsior stated that the plan is deceptive. He noted that, from driving by, it looks like the building would be within the side-yard setback because of the way the driveway runs. He shared that the garage was designed to be as narrow as possible, so there is room to store things while minimizing impact on the side yard.

Commissioner Holker asked to see the driveway again. Mr. O'Connor shared that the driveway runs parallel along the right-of-way to the property, so it is a unique situation. Commissioner Holker noted that the driveway is along the City right-of-way. She asked how close the addition would be to the City right-of-way. Planning Director Griffiths noted 22.7 feet.

Chair Huskins closed the Public Testimony portion of the Public Hearing at 7:42 P.M.

Commissioner Braithwaite stated that he is generally supportive of this application. He appreciated that the neighbor's letter was attached, as that neighbor is the most affected. Commissioner Holker stated that the neighbor's driveway is 23110, but the letter came from someone else.

Jon Rienstra, 23120 Summit Avenue, shared that the letter came from the neighbor in question. Commissioner Holker confirmed 23110. Mr. Rienstra explained that he had spoken with his neighbor, who was fully supportive of the project. He showed the neighbor where the garage would go.

Holker moved, and Magistad seconded, to recommend approval of the variance at 23120 Summit Avenue. Motion passed 4/0.

Chair Huskins noted that the application would be brought to the City Council on June 22.

5. OTHER BUSINESS –

A. Planning Commission Photo

Chair Huskins noted that Commissioner Longo was not present. Planning Director Griffiths shared that he had sent an email apologizing for his unexpected absence from the meeting. He suggested taking the picture in July. Chair Huskins tabled the matter for discussion at the next meeting.

6. REPORTS

A. City Council

Council Liaison Maddy gave a brief overview of recent Council discussions and decisions.

B. Staff

Planning Director Griffiths followed up on an email that he sent about the presentation at the last meeting on the Zoning Code update. The full draft language is on the website for review. He noted that the Commission should provide feedback. He added that Chair Huskins has provided a lot of feedback, but the Staff would like to hear from everyone, including community members. He shared that the feedback would be incorporated in the Zoning Code and be brought before the Commission at the next meeting on July 7 for a public hearing. He shared that, since the last meeting, the State of Minnesota's Legislative Session concluded, and no major bills the City was worried about were passed. He noted that one bill passed significantly limits Homeowners Associations (HOAs) in Minnesota. The Staff is tracking this because there are some minor implications for the City, the most notable being that cities will not be able to require a development to have an HOA. He added that a Code amendment will likely be seen around that, likely as an annual update to the Code at the end of the year. He noted that some space was left in the work plan for the third quarter to address legislative changes, but that will not be needed. He shared that the Staff anticipates those zoning preemption proposals back next year, so space will continue to be reserved for legislative updates in work plans.

Planning Director Griffiths asked for a liaison at the June 22 meeting to cover the three agenda items. Commissioner Holker stated that she could be the liaison.

Commissioner Holker noted that the lot next to the Legion was for sale. She asked if the plan to put townhomes in the space was no longer happening. Planning Director Griffiths explained that the developer had their plat approval expire, and decided to sell the property. He added that the sale of the property was not about the property itself or its design, but rather about internal matters the developer is working through in their business. He anticipated that the Commission would likely see a very similar proposal from a different developer in the future. He added that whoever acquires the property will need to start the process over because the City Council vacated the plat approvals at a meeting in May, after they expired.

Commissioner Magistad asked if there was anything that could be publicly disclosed about the status of Watton Ponds 2nd Addition. Planning Director Griffiths shared that not at this point.

Chair Huskins stated that the draft Zoning Code update is now in the public eye, and he wants to tie it to the Comprehensive Plan update and to the City's efforts to gather as much feedback as possible. He asked the Staff what their experience is with a review of the codes. He worried that there might not be many people who take the time to go through the Code and give feedback. He asked what would worry the Staff when reviewing the draft regarding finalizing the Code that all residents would be bound to. Planning Director Griffiths stated that nothing in particular worries him about the public engagement portion. He added that this is a lengthy section of the Code, but based on the presentation from HKGi, the first Phase is very technical and does not involve substantive policy changes. He noted that he does want to receive feedback, that the public notice went out, and that public comment will have been open for about a month by the time it closes. The Code will also undergo the full public hearing process before the Commission and the City Council. He shared that, to the extent that the comments get parceled out or the scope of who is involved is, it is the Commission and Council's role to legislate and sort through feedback. Chair Huskins explained that he would be interested in the date by which public comments close to get a general sense of how many people engaged with the Code and offered comments. Planning Director Griffiths stated that this could be provided in the memo for the next meeting. He expected more engagement once the formal notice process began, before the matter went to the Commission during the July meeting. He added that, in addition to Chair Huskins, at least seven other people have engaged with the Code. He noted that people are reviewing the Code, and he hopes they find changes that align with the main goal of cleaning it up and making it more user-friendly.

Commissioner Magistad asked whether HKGi would do anything with the comments before they go back to the Commission. Planning Director Griffiths explained that the public hearing commentary will close on June 5, and there will be a few weeks between the closing and the Commission's next meeting on July 7. The comments will be reviewed, and adjustments will be made based on feedback. He added that there may be some responses in response to the feedback. He noted that the expectation is not to bring a laundry list of comments to the Commission, but that the Staff will present the Commission with an ordinance for adoption based on the comments received. Chair Huskins noted that the public is new to the process, so some of the comments may not be germane or feasible at this point. No one should expect that the comments given will be added verbatim to the new Code. Planning Director Griffiths stated that, for this update, he is most excited to see people using the draft and to see where the public is stumbling so the Code can be improved. He wants the Code to be a strong foundation in the future, so that when the Comprehensive Plan update is complete, it will be much easier to make future changes.

Commissioner Holker asked whether there was a reaction to the initial survey for the Comprehensive Plan. Planning Director Griffiths shared that there have been a fair number of responses. Out of several community events, information has been handed out. The Shore Report has included information on the Comprehensive Plan update survey, the Staff has been utilizing social media, and one more direct mailing to the community will be included with the next utility bill. He asked the Commission to share with their circles as well.

C. Commission

Commissioner Braithwaite noted that his employment would be changing and he would no longer be working with the City of Hutchinson, but has taken a position with the City of Orono as the Director of Public Works. He stated that during the interview process, he let them know he was on the Planning Commission and could resign if needed, but Orono did not have any problems with it. He shared that he had also informed Planning Director Griffiths to see if there were any issues with that, and the Staff let him know that Orono is far enough away and that there should not be an issue from the Staff perspective. He noted that the one issue is that the City of Orono's council meetings are on the same day and at the same time as Shorewood's Council meetings, which prevents him from attending as a liaison. He shared that if there is ever an item that would be an issue, he would let both parties know.

Chair Huskins mentioned that the Commission had lessened the reporting requirements in the bylaws. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the Commission is still reporting, but it has just been done elsewhere. The liaison still attends the meeting at the Council and now provides the report in context. He added that this was communicated to the Staff, and that Commissioner Braithewaite used to work for the City of Hutchinson; now it is Orono, so in the Staff's eyes, there is really no difference.

The Commission was okay with Commissioner Braithwaite staying on the Commission.

Chair Huskins suggested the Commission engage with the draft code.

Planning Director Griffiths shared that he will not be at the July 7 meeting, but Planner Osowski and HKGi will be there. Council Liaison Maddy noted that he would be switching with Councilmember Gorham.

Commissioner Magistad asked if anything else would be on the July 7 agenda besides the Code update. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the Commission photo would also be on the agenda.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Holker moved, Magistad seconded, adjourning the Planning Commission Meeting of June 2, 2026, at 8:09 P.M. Motion passed 4/0.

City of Shorewood

City Council Item 2.D.

Title/Subject: Claims List
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Dalton Kraay, Senior Accountant

Attachments

1. Payroll 08-10-2026
2. Payroll 08-10-2026 AP
3. Council 08-24-2026

Background

Council is asked to verify payment of the attached claims. The claims include compensation, operational or contractual expenditures anticipated in the current budget, or otherwise approved by the Council. Funds will be distributed following approval of the claims list.

Claims for Council Authorization:	
Payroll 08-10-2026	$67,444.34
Payroll 08-10-2026 AP	$96,728.75
Council 08-24-2026	$376,193.54
Total Claims: Checks & ACH	**$540,366.63**

Strategic Alignment

Fiscal Responsibility

- Implement best practices to support sound financial management
- Maintain stable and predictable finances over the long-term

Budget Impact

The expenditures have been reviewed and determined to be reasonable, necessary, and consistent with the City's budget.

Action Requested

Motion to approve the claims list as presented.
Simple Majority is required.

Clearing House

Distribution Report

User: DKraay@shorewoodmn.gov
Printed: 08/10/2026 - 3:17PM
Batch: 00010.08.2026

Account Number	Debit	Credit	Account Description
700-00-1010-0000	0.00	67,444.34	CASH AND INVESTMENTS
700-00-2170-0000	67,444.34	0.00	GROSS PAYROLL CLEARING
	67,444.34	67,444.34	
Report Totals:	67,444.34	67,444.34	

Accounts Payable

Computer Check Proof List by Vendor

User: DKraay@shorewoodmn.gov
Printed: 08/11/2026 - 10:55AM
Batch: 00003.08.2026 - PR-08-10-2026

City of Shorewood

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 4	AFSCME CO 5 MEMBER HEALTH FUND-UNION DENTAL			Check Sequence: 1	ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Dental-Union Benefit	294.00	08/10/2026	700-00-2185-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Dental-Union Be
	Check Total:	294.00			
Vendor: 12	AFSCME MN COUNCIL 5 - UNION DUES			Check Sequence: 2	ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Union Dues	216.37	08/10/2026	700-00-2182-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Union Dues
	Check Total:	216.37			
Vendor: 1511	ALLSTATE BENEFITS			Check Sequence: 3	ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Insurance-Hospital Ben	269.49	08/10/2026	700-00-2189-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Insurance-Hospit
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Insurance-Accident Be	97.16	08/10/2026	700-00-2189-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Insurance-Accide
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Insurance-Critical Ben	367.41	08/10/2026	700-00-2189-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Insurance-Critica
	Check Total:	734.06			
Vendor: 5	EFTPS - FEDERAL W/H			Check Sequence: 4	ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Medicare Employer Po	1,481.40	08/10/2026	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Medicare Employ
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Federal Income Tax	8,730.17	08/10/2026	700-00-2172-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Federal Income T
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 FICA Employer Portion	6,334.36	08/10/2026	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 FICA Employer I
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 FICA Employee Portio	6,334.36	08/10/2026	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 FICA Employee
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Medicare Employee Po	1,481.40	08/10/2026	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Medicare Employ
	Check Total:	24,361.69			
Vendor: 1165	FIDELITY SECURITY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY			Check Sequence: 5	ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Vision-Avesis Benefit	259.23	08/10/2026	700-00-2186-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Vision-Avesis Be
	Check Total:	259.23			

Invoice No		Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor:	1510	GEN DIGITAL, INC.			Check Sequence: 6	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Protection-NortonLife	94.41	08/10/2026	700-00-2188-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Protection-Norto
		Check Total:	94.41			
Vendor:	6	HEALTH PARTNERS-MEDICAL			Check Sequence: 7	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Health Insurance-CoPa	13,330.16	08/10/2026	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Health Insurance
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Health Insurance-HSA	18,784.34	08/10/2026	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Health Insurance
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Health Insurance - CoP	79.01	08/10/2026	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Health Insurance
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Health Insurance-HSA	730.83	08/10/2026	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Health Insurance
		Check Total:	32,924.34			
Vendor:	1166	HEALTHPARTNER-DENTAL			Check Sequence: 8	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Dental-Non Union Ben	1,820.00	08/10/2026	700-00-2184-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Dental-Non Unio
		Check Total:	1,820.00			
Vendor:	686	KANSAS CITY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY			Check Sequence: 9	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Short Term Disability I	1,009.67	08/10/2026	700-00-2181-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Short Term Disab
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Long Term Disability I	953.37	08/10/2026	700-00-2181-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Long Term Disab
		Check Total:	1,963.04			
Vendor:	11	MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE			Check Sequence: 10	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 State Income Tax	4,582.01	08/10/2026	700-00-2173-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 State Income Tax
		Check Total:	4,582.01			
Vendor:	869	MINNESOTA UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE			Check Sequence: 11	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MN PAID LEAVE PRI	883.11	08/10/2026	700-00-2190-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MN PAID LEAV
		Check Total:	883.11			
Vendor:	2	MISSION SQUARE RETIREMNT-302131-457			Check Sequence: 12	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MissionSq-ER	1,581.18	08/10/2026	700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MissionSq-ER
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Mission Sq-Flat Amou	122.47	08/10/2026	700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Mission Sq-Flat A
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MissionSq-Flat Amoun	4,718.85	08/10/2026	700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MissionSq-Flat A
		Check Total:	6,422.50			

Invoice No		Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor:	10	NCPERS GROUP LIFE INSURANCE			Check Sequence: 13	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 PERA Life Benefit	112.00	08/10/2026	700-00-2180-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 PERA Life Benef
		Check Total:	112.00			
Vendor:	665	OPTUM BANK			Check Sequence: 14	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 HSA-Optum Bank-Em	561.22	08/10/2026	700-00-2183-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 HSA-Optum Ban
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 HSA-Optum Bank-Ber	1,735.20	08/10/2026	700-00-2183-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 HSA-Optum Ban
		Check Total:	2,296.42			
Vendor:	9	PERA			Check Sequence: 15	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MN-PERA Deduction	6,697.05	08/10/2026	700-00-2175-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MN-PERA Dedu
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MN PERA Benefit Em	7,727.38	08/10/2026	700-00-2175-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MN PERA Benef
		Check Total:	14,424.43			
Vendor:	1512	PRE-PAID LEGAL SERVICES, INC			Check Sequence: 16	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Protection-LegalShield	131.70	08/10/2026	700-00-2187-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Protection-LegalS
		Check Total:	131.70			
Vendor:	7	SECURIAN FINANCIAL			Check Sequence: 17	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MN-Life Insurance Ber	1,023.54	08/10/2026	700-00-2180-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 MN-Life Insuran
		Check Total:	1,023.54			
Vendor:	1091	VOYA FINANCIAL			Check Sequence: 18	ACH Enabled: True
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Deferred Comp-Voya-I	100.00	08/10/2026	700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Deferred Comp-V
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Deferred Comp-Voya-I	2,035.38	08/10/2026	700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Deferred Comp-V
		PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Deferred Com-Voya	2,050.52	08/10/2026	700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00001.08.2026 Deferred Com-Vo
		Check Total:	4,185.90			
		Total for Check Run:	96,728.75			
		Total of Number of Checks:	18			

Accounts Payable

Computer Check Proof List by Vendor

User: DKraay@shorewoodmn.gov
Printed: 08/20/2026 - 9:35AM
Batch: 00004.08.2026 - Council-08-24-26

City of Shorewood

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 887	ADVANCED ENGINEERING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, LLC			Check Sequence: 1	ACH Enabled: True
113216	Water Utility Control Services	4,180.50	08/24/2026	601-00-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	4,180.50			
Vendor: 105	ADVANCED IMAGING SOLUTIONS			Check Sequence: 2	ACH Enabled: True
INV384323	Konica Copier Base Rate - Aug 2026	58.00	08/24/2026	101-19-4221-0000	
	Check Total:	58.00			
Vendor: 817	ARCPOINT LABS OF EDINA			Check Sequence: 3	ACH Enabled: False
20080	Q3 Quarterly DOT Drug Testing Compliance	84.75	08/24/2026	101-32-4305-0000	
	Check Total:	84.75			
Vendor: 1509	BLUE NET INC			Check Sequence: 4	ACH Enabled: True
63954	IT Services - August 2026	4,891.30	08/24/2026	101-19-4321-0000	
	Check Total:	4,891.30			
Vendor: 677	BOLTON & MENK, INC.			Check Sequence: 5	ACH Enabled: True
0402847	Proj.# 24X.136948-2025 Mill & Overlay Design	2,152.50	08/24/2026	420-00-4303-0000	
0402848	Proj.# 0C1.123603-General Engineering Crack S	2,645.00	08/24/2026	421-00-4303-0000	
0402848	Proj.# 0C1.123603-General Engineering Jul 202(	7,676.00	08/24/2026	101-31-4303-0000	
0402849	Proj. # 24X.135610.000 Denman Subdivision Ju	3,380.00	08/24/2026	880-00-2210-0000	
0402850	Proj.# 26X.144849.000 5980 Glencoe Road Jul 2	106.50	08/24/2026	880-00-2210-0000	
0402851	Proj.# 24X.135611-6180 Cardinal Drive Jul 202(	415.00	08/24/2026	880-00-2210-0000	
0402852	Proj.# 25X.141779.000 Engineering Bulding Per	2,977.00	08/24/2026	101-31-4303-0000	
0402853	Proj.# 0C1.127485-Excelsior Woods Jul 2026	1,150.50	08/24/2026	880-00-2210-0000	
0402854	Proj.# 0C1.125586-Galpin Lake Road/TH7 Trail	5,213.00	08/24/2026	422-00-4303-0000	

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
0402855	Proj.# 0C1.120898-1-GIS-Utilities-Sewer Jul 20	150.00	08/24/2026	611-00-4303-0000	
0402855	Proj.# 0C1.120898--2-GIS-Utilities-Water Jul 20	838.50	08/24/2026	601-00-4303-0000	
0402855	Proj.# 0C1.120898-3-GIS-Utilities-Streets Jul 20	1,296.00	08/24/2026	101-31-4303-0000	
0402856	Proj.# 0C1.130016-Lake Park Villas-24250Smith	345.50	08/24/2026	880-00-2210-0000	
0402857	Proj.# 0C1.129164-Mill Street Trail Jul 2026	1,583.50	08/24/2026	417-00-4303-0000	
0402858	Proj.# 24X.136257-SE Area Water Improvement	1,317.00	08/24/2026	601-00-4303-0000	
0402859	Proj.# C16.120341-Shorewood Ln Ravine Resto	11,230.50	08/24/2026	631-00-4303-0000	
0402860	Proj.# 24X.136951-Water Connection Program J	902.00	08/24/2026	601-00-4303-0000	
0402861	Proj.# 26X.143042.000 Woodside Lane Drainage	532.50	08/24/2026	631-00-4303-0000	
	Check Total:	43,911.00			
Vendor: 1221	CAMPBELL KNUTSON P.A.			Check Sequence: 6	ACH Enabled: True
Jul-26	3526-0999G 58 Prosecution	2,801.54	08/24/2026	101-16-4304-0000	
Jul-26	3526-0002G 45 Public Works	58.80	08/24/2026	101-16-4304-0000	
Jul-26	3526-0001G 55 Planning & Zoning Services	156.80	08/24/2026	101-16-4304-0000	
Jul-26	3526-0009G 43 Code Enforcement-5815 Club L	1,479.50	08/24/2026	101-16-4304-0000	
Jul-26	5980 Glencoe Road	432.90	08/24/2026	880-00-2210-0000	
Jul-26	Excelsior Woods 2nd Addition	366.30	08/24/2026	880-00-2210-0000	
Jul-26	3526-0000G 55 General Matters/Administration	2,559.16	08/24/2026	101-16-4304-0000	
	Check Total:	7,855.00			
Vendor: 136	CENTERPOINT ENERGY-GAS			Check Sequence: 7	ACH Enabled: True
0015011-2Jul26	28125 Boulder Bridge - Jul 26	21.00	08/24/2026	601-00-4396-0000	
0015011-2Jul26	20405 Knighsbridge Rd - Jul 26	31.51	08/24/2026	601-00-4394-0000	
0015011-2Jul26	24200 Smithtown Rd - Jul 26	55.88	08/24/2026	101-32-4380-0000	
0015011-2Jul26	6000 Eureka Road - Jul 26	49.62	08/24/2026	101-52-4380-0000	
0015011-2Jul26	5755 Country Club Rd - Jul 26	38.00	08/24/2026	101-19-4380-0000	
	Check Total:	196.01			
Vendor: UB*00755	Jeffrey Chernivec			Check Sequence: 8	ACH Enabled: False
	Refund Check 005530-000, 26165 Oak Leaf Trl	11.45	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 005530-000, 26165 Oak Leaf Trl	5.73	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 005530-000, 26165 Oak Leaf Trl	13.36	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 005530-000, 26165 Oak Leaf Trl	5.72	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
	Check Total:	36.26			
Vendor: 915	CINTAS CORPORATION (Formerly HUEBSCH)			Check Sequence: 9	ACH Enabled: False
4278950039	SCEC Mat Maintenance - Aug 2026	70.90	08/24/2026	211-00-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	70.90			
Vendor: UB*00762	City Of Deephaven			Check Sequence: 10	ACH Enabled: False
	Refund Check 007993-027, 4625 St James Gate	2.31	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
	Check Total:	2.31			
Vendor: UB*00764	City Of Deephaven			Check Sequence: 11	ACH Enabled: False
	Refund Check 007993-022, 4700 Old Kent Rd	2.91	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
	Check Total:	2.91			
Vendor: 1394	CSG FORTE PAYMENTS, INC			Check Sequence: 12	ACH Enabled: True
0016125169	CivicRec Credit Card Fees - July 2026	309.78	08/24/2026	201-00-4450-0000	
0016125170	CivicRec Credit Card Fees - July 2026	22.98	08/24/2026	201-00-4450-0000	
	Check Total:	332.76			
Vendor: 1096	DAVEY RESOURCE GROUP, INC.			Check Sequence: 13	ACH Enabled: True
9000339726	Forestry Consulting Services - Jul 2026	571.01	08/24/2026	101-52-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	571.01			
Vendor: 166	EARL F. ANDERSEN			Check Sequence: 14	ACH Enabled: False
0143723-IN	Replacement Street Signs	2,224.75	08/24/2026	101-32-4250-0000	
0143751-IN	Replacement Sign Posts	862.50	08/24/2026	101-32-4250-0000	
	Check Total:	3,087.25			
Vendor: 167	ECM PUBLISHERS INC			Check Sequence: 15	ACH Enabled: True
1109843	Public Hearing Notice	153.00	08/24/2026	101-18-4351-0000	
1109844	Public Hearing Notice	70.12	08/24/2026	101-18-4351-0000	
	Check Total:	223.12			
Vendor: 188	FLEETPRIDE TRUCK & TRAILER PARTS			Check Sequence: 16	ACH Enabled: False

Invoice No		Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
135068266		Oil Cap	40.29	08/24/2026	101-32-4221-0000	
		Check Total:	40.29			
Vendor:	1665	Mert Gokce			Check Sequence: 17	ACH Enabled: False
7196		Refund Permit	101.00	08/24/2026	101-00-3224-0000	
		Check Total:	101.00			
Vendor:	200	GOPHER STATE ONE CALL			Check Sequence: 18	ACH Enabled: True
6070752		GSOC Service - Jul 2026	200.00	08/24/2026	611-00-4400-0000	
6070752		GSOC Service - Jul 2026	200.00	08/24/2026	631-00-4400-0000	
6070752		GSOC Service - Jul 2026	187.25	08/24/2026	601-00-4400-0000	
		Check Total:	587.25			
Vendor:	1199	GREENER BLADE FERTILIZATION CO. LLC			Check Sequence: 19	ACH Enabled: False
124339		Freeman Park Turf Treatment - Jul 2026	1,051.00	08/24/2026	101-52-4400-0000	
124341		Manor Road Turf Treatments - Jul 2026	290.00	08/24/2026	101-52-4400-0000	
		Check Total:	1,341.00			
Vendor:	1664	Hanson Builders			Check Sequence: 20	ACH Enabled: False
5776		Escrow Refund - 27660 Woodside Rd Permit #5'	27,000.00	08/24/2026	880-00-2200-0000	
		Check Total:	27,000.00			
Vendor:	216	HENNEPIN COUNTY RECORDER'S OFFICE			Check Sequence: 21	ACH Enabled: False
1000272093		Hennepin Country RecordEASE Subscription	2.50	08/24/2026	101-18-4433-0000	
		Check Total:	2.50			
Vendor:	689	HENNEPIN COUNTY ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE			Check Sequence: 22	ACH Enabled: False
1000271786		800 Mhz Radio Fee	239.84	08/24/2026	101-32-4321-0000	
		Check Total:	239.84			
Vendor:	1127	HENNEPIN COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER			Check Sequence: 23	ACH Enabled: False
2026		PID 32-117-23-22-0037	1.18	08/24/2026	101-15-4440-0000	
		Check Total:	1.18			

Invoice No		Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor:	UB*00766	Randy Herman			Check Sequence: 24	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 005889-000, 19795 Muirfield Cii	184.22	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 005889-000, 19795 Muirfield Cii	78.95	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 005889-000, 19795 Muirfield Cii	78.94	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 005889-000, 19795 Muirfield Cii	157.89	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
		Check Total:	500.00			
Vendor:	1456	HKGi			Check Sequence: 25	ACH Enabled: True
025-059-8		Zoning Code Update - Jul 2026	676.25	08/24/2026	101-18-4400-0000	
		Check Total:	676.25			
Vendor:	1350	INGERSOLL-RAND INDUSTRIAL U.S., INC			Check Sequence: 26	ACH Enabled: False
31301271		Air Compressor Maintenance and Parts	3,154.30	08/24/2026	601-00-4221-0000	
		Check Total:	3,154.30			
Vendor:	1637	ISG			Check Sequence: 27	ACH Enabled: False
135347		SCEC Facility Analysis - July 2026	6,577.50	08/24/2026	201-00-4302-0000	
		Check Total:	6,577.50			
Vendor:	1355	JDP ELECTRICAL SERVICES, INC.			Check Sequence: 28	ACH Enabled: True
10976		Electrical Work - CH Front Office - Aug 2026	425.00	08/24/2026	101-19-4223-0000	
		Check Total:	425.00			
Vendor:	1401	JENCO PROPERTY MAINTENANCE			Check Sequence: 29	ACH Enabled: True
7392		Badger Park Campus Landscaping - 2026	400.00	08/24/2026	101-32-4223-0000	
7392		Badger Park Campus Landscaping - 2026	400.00	08/24/2026	101-32-4223-0000	
7392		Badger Park Campus Landscaping - 2026	425.00	08/24/2026	101-32-4223-0000	
		Check Total:	1,225.00			
Vendor:	UB*00758	Jeffrey & Colleen Johnson			Check Sequence: 30	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 007660-006, 20515 Manor Rd	18.42	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 007660-006, 20515 Manor Rd	18.42	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 007660-006, 20515 Manor Rd	42.99	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	

Invoice No		Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
		Check Total:	79.83			
Vendor:	1515	KATH FUEL OIL SERVICE CO.			Check Sequence: 31	ACH Enabled: True
12749		Fuel for Trailers	1,521.77	08/24/2026	101-32-4212-0000	
		Check Total:	1,521.77			
Vendor:	1559	KILLMER ELECTRIC CO., INC.			Check Sequence: 32	ACH Enabled: False
J004652		Replace LED Signal Light - TH7/TH41	564.43	08/24/2026	101-32-4400-0000	
		Check Total:	564.43			
Vendor:	1058	KTJ 285, LLC			Check Sequence: 33	ACH Enabled: False
AUG26 TIF PAYGO		8/2026 TIF PayGo	77,089.72	08/24/2026	470-00-4400-0019	
		Check Total:	77,089.72			
Vendor:	1075	LAKE RESTORATION, INC.			Check Sequence: 34	ACH Enabled: False
INV091865		Manor Pond Treatment	548.00	08/24/2026	101-52-4400-0000	
		Check Total:	548.00			
Vendor:	1619	LB Carlson, LLP			Check Sequence: 35	ACH Enabled: False
258477		Audit Field Through July 2026.	550.00	08/24/2026	611-00-4301-0000	
258477		Audit Field Through July 2026.	550.00	08/24/2026	631-00-4301-0000	
258477		Audit Field Through July 2026.	550.00	08/24/2026	601-00-4301-0000	
258477		Audit Field Through July 2026.	550.00	08/24/2026	101-16-4301-0000	
		Check Total:	2,200.00			
Vendor:	UB*00765	Chuck Lodge			Check Sequence: 36	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 005940-000, 5370 Shady Hills C	96.28	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 005940-000, 5370 Shady Hills C	82.53	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 005940-000, 5370 Shady Hills C	41.27	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 005940-000, 5370 Shady Hills C	41.26	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Check Total:	261.34			
Vendor:	1163	LOFFLER			Check Sequence: 37	ACH Enabled: True
5426763		Check Plot Bond Paper	43.06	08/24/2026	101-19-4200-0000	

Invoice No		Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
5431825		Folding Machine Service Aug 2026	165.00	08/24/2026	101-19-4400-0000	
		Check Total:	208.06			
Vendor:	UB*00753	Kim W. & Lori Michelle MacFarlane			Check Sequence: 38	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 009291-000, 20680 Garden Rd	43.22	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009291-000, 20680 Garden Rd	100.85	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009291-000, 20680 Garden Rd	43.23	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Check Total:	187.30			
Vendor:	1607	MAGNEY CONSTRUCTION INC			Check Sequence: 39	ACH Enabled: False
24X.136257 APR2		Water Treatment Upgrade-Final Pay Request	29,628.47	08/24/2026	601-00-4680-0000	
		Check Total:	29,628.47			
Vendor:	1378	MAYA MAINTENANCE LLC			Check Sequence: 40	ACH Enabled: True
1931		Janitorial Services - Public Works - July 2026	520.00	08/24/2026	101-32-4400-0000	
1932		SCEC Janitorial Services - Jun 2026	460.00	08/24/2026	201-00-4400-0000	
1932		SCEC Event Setup/Teardown - July 2026	315.00	08/24/2026	201-00-4248-0000	
		Check Total:	1,295.00			
Vendor:	279	METROPOLITAN COUNCIL (WASTEWATER)			Check Sequence: 41	ACH Enabled: True
0001211260		MCES Monthly Wastewater Charge - Sept 2026	100,018.09	08/24/2026	611-00-4385-0000	
		Check Total:	100,018.09			
Vendor:	UB*00754	Gwen Migliaccio			Check Sequence: 42	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 009819-000, 5760 Echo Rd	93.48	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009819-000, 5760 Echo Rd	61.96	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009819-000, 5760 Echo Rd	144.56	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
		Check Total:	300.00			
Vendor:	311	NATIONAL RECREATION & PARK ASSOCIATION			Check Sequence: 43	ACH Enabled: False
305218-Aug26		NRPA CPRP Renewal	75.00	08/24/2026	101-53-4331-0000	
		Check Total:	75.00			
Vendor:	UB*00756	Jill M. & Jeffrey D. Noack			Check Sequence: 44	ACH Enabled: False

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
	Refund Check 009339-000, 19965 Waterford Ct	94.74	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 009339-000, 19965 Waterford Ct	47.37	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 009339-000, 19965 Waterford Ct	47.37	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 009339-000, 19965 Waterford Ct	110.52	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
	Check Total:	300.00			
Vendor: 719	NORTHLAND SECURITIES, INC.			Check Sequence: 45	ACH Enabled: True
INV-2479	LTFMP Update	4,264.00	08/24/2026	101-15-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	4,264.00			
Vendor: 1612	NYSTROM PUBLISHING COMPANY INC			Check Sequence: 46	ACH Enabled: False
50251	Water Connection Brochure and Doorhanger Pri	897.76	08/24/2026	601-00-4351-0000	
	Check Total:	897.76			
Vendor: 325	ON SITE SANITATION-TWIN CITIES			Check Sequence: 47	ACH Enabled: True
0002112039	Portable Toilet Rental	88.90	08/24/2026	101-52-4400-0000	
0002112040	Portable Toilet Rental	177.80	08/24/2026	101-52-4400-0000	
0002112041	Portable Toilet Rental	199.39	08/24/2026	101-52-4400-0000	
0002112042	Portable Toilet Rental	88.90	08/24/2026	101-52-4400-0000	
0002112043	Portable Toilet Rental	88.90	08/24/2026	101-52-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	643.89			
Vendor: UB*00768	Ketan Patel			Check Sequence: 48	ACH Enabled: False
	Refund Check 009040-000, 20115 Manor Rd	660.09	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 009040-000, 20115 Manor Rd	1,566.32	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 009040-000, 20115 Manor Rd	731.54	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
	Check Total:	2,957.95			
Vendor: 1545	PENS.COM			Check Sequence: 49	ACH Enabled: False
114670333	Election Supplies	443.22	08/24/2026	101-14-4200-0000	
114671203-1	Credit for Incorrect Shipment	-486.77	08/24/2026	101-13-4200-0000	
114701881	Office Supplies	486.77	08/24/2026	101-13-4200-0000	
	Check Total:	443.22			

Invoice No		Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor:	UB*00761	Ellen & Alan Qureshi			Check Sequence: 50	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 009542-000, 20270 Excelsior Bl	21.23	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009542-000, 20270 Excelsior Bl	49.55	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009542-000, 20270 Excelsior Bl	21.24	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Check Total:	92.02			
Vendor:	1663	Jaime Rossiter			Check Sequence: 51	ACH Enabled: False
7202		Refund Permit - Withdrawn	176.00	08/24/2026	101-00-3224-0000	
		Check Total:	176.00			
Vendor:	305	SAFEBUILT LLC-LOCKBOX #88135			Check Sequence: 52	ACH Enabled: False
4358490		Consulting Building Inspections	1,544.00	08/24/2026	101-24-4400-0000	
4361355		Consulting Building Inspections - Minnewashta	2,012.34	08/24/2026	101-24-4400-0000	
		Check Total:	3,556.34			
Vendor:	UB*00759	Tony & Mimi Sandler			Check Sequence: 53	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 005070-000, 4976 Devonshire Ci	16.05	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 005070-000, 4976 Devonshire Ci	13.77	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 005070-000, 4976 Devonshire Ci	6.89	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 005070-000, 4976 Devonshire Ci	6.88	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Check Total:	43.59			
Vendor:	1351	SCHWICKERT'S TECTA AMERICA LLC			Check Sequence: 54	ACH Enabled: True
S510158640		HVAC Repair - Aug 2026	240.00	08/24/2026	201-00-4223-0000	
		Check Total:	240.00			
Vendor:	UB*00757	Michael & Patricia Senescall			Check Sequence: 55	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 006233-000, 19515 Waterford Pl	7.22	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 006233-000, 19515 Waterford Pl	16.82	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 006233-000, 19515 Waterford Pl	14.43	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 006233-000, 19515 Waterford Pl	7.21	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Check Total:	45.68			
Vendor:	353	SHALO LEE MROZEK			Check Sequence: 56	ACH Enabled: False

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
08.27.26Event	2026 Concert in the Park Performer	2,100.00	08/24/2026	101-53-4444-0000	
	Check Total:	2,100.00			
Vendor: 1101	SPRINGBROOK HOLDING COMPANY LLC			Check Sequence: 57	ACH Enabled: True
INV-024647	July CivicPay Transaction Fees	409.00	08/24/2026	611-00-4450-0000	
INV-024647	July CivicPay Transaction Fees	409.00	08/24/2026	621-00-4450-0000	
INV-024647	July CivicPay Transaction Fees	409.00	08/24/2026	601-00-4450-0000	
INV-024647	July CivicPay Transaction Fees	409.00	08/24/2026	631-00-4450-0000	
	Check Total:	1,636.00			
Vendor: 1570	SRF Consulting Group, Inc.			Check Sequence: 58	ACH Enabled: True
19866.00-6	Comprehensive Plan Update	9,068.61	08/24/2026	101-18-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	9,068.61			
Vendor: 296	STATE OF MN-MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH			Check Sequence: 59	ACH Enabled: False
Q2 2026	2nd Qtr Water Surcharge	6,399.00	08/24/2026	601-00-2082-0000	
	Check Total:	6,399.00			
Vendor: UB*00763	David & Carol Teclaw			Check Sequence: 60	ACH Enabled: False
	Refund Check 005555-000, 25555 Park Ln	112.64	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 005555-000, 25555 Park Ln	50.17	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 005555-000, 25555 Park Ln	73.10	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
	Refund Check 005555-000, 25555 Park Ln	94.25	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
	Check Total:	330.16			
Vendor: 694	TIMESAVER OFF SITE SECRETARIAL, INC.			Check Sequence: 61	ACH Enabled: True
32775	CC Meeting Minutes 7/13/2026	329.39	08/24/2026	101-13-4400-0000	
32839	CC Meeting Minutes 7/27/2026	535.01	08/24/2026	101-13-4400-0000	
32841	Park Commission Meeting Minutes 07/28/2026	219.50	08/24/2026	101-53-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	1,083.90			
Vendor: 1348	TOSHIBA AMERICA BUSINESS SOLUT			Check Sequence: 62	ACH Enabled: True
5039726965	SCEC Printer Aug 2026	130.07	08/24/2026	201-00-4400-0000	

Invoice No		Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
		Check Total:	130.07			
Vendor:	386	TWIN CITY WATER CLINIC			Check Sequence: 63	ACH Enabled: True
25826		Water Distribution Testing	120.00	08/24/2026	601-00-4400-0000	
		Check Total:	120.00			
Vendor:	1635	United States Postal Service			Check Sequence: 64	ACH Enabled: False
Q3 2026		Delinquent Certification Notification Letters	100.00	08/24/2026	611-00-4208-0000	
Q3 2026		Delinquent Certification Notification Letters	100.00	08/24/2026	631-00-4208-0000	
Q3 2026		Delinquent Certification Notification Letters	100.00	08/24/2026	621-00-4208-0000	
Q3 2026		Delinquent Certification Notification Letters	100.00	08/24/2026	601-00-4208-0000	
		Check Total:	400.00			
Vendor:	UB*00767	Heidi Welsch			Check Sequence: 65	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 009064-000, 5880 Bldr Bridge L	37.89	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009064-000, 5880 Bldr Bridge L	18.95	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009064-000, 5880 Bldr Bridge L	44.22	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009064-000, 5880 Bldr Bridge L	18.94	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Check Total:	120.00			
Vendor:	UB*00760	Cheryl Wieder			Check Sequence: 66	ACH Enabled: False
		Refund Check 009842-000, 5465 Gideons Ln	67.11	08/24/2026	621-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009842-000, 5465 Gideons Ln	67.12	08/24/2026	631-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009842-000, 5465 Gideons Ln	134.23	08/24/2026	601-00-2010-0000	
		Refund Check 009842-000, 5465 Gideons Ln	156.60	08/24/2026	611-00-2010-0000	
		Check Total:	425.06			
Vendor:	401	AS PAYMENT AGENT WM CORPORATE SERVICES INC			Check Sequence: 67	ACH Enabled: False
8268337-1593-9		City Clean-Up Day Disposal Expenses - May 20	3,309.82	08/24/2026	621-00-4347-0000	
8297083-1593-4		Recycling Service - July 2026	14,764.37	08/24/2026	621-00-4400-0000	
		Check Total:	18,074.19			
Vendor:	408	WM MUELLER & SONS INC			Check Sequence: 68	ACH Enabled: True
326505		Road Fill Material	299.95	08/24/2026	101-32-4250-0000	

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
326573	Road Fill Material	248.87	08/24/2026	101-32-4250-0000	
326889	Asphalt Patch Material	186.55	08/24/2026	101-32-4250-0000	
327024	Asphalt Patch Material	409.53	08/24/2026	101-32-4250-0000	
	Check Total:	1,144.90			
Vendor: 1662	Qiyan Zhao			Check Sequence: 69	ACH Enabled: False
00137838	MASSAGE LICENSE FEE REFUND	150.00	08/24/2026	101-00-3218-0000	
	Check Total:	150.00			
	Total for Check Run:	376,193.54			
	Total of Number of Checks:	69			

City of Shorewood

City Council Item 2.E.

Title/Subject: Recruitment for Public Work's Supervisor Position
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Sandie Thone, City Clerk/ HR Director

Attachments

1. Public Works Supervisor JD

Background

Staff recommends the City Council authorize staff to begin recruitment for the Public Works Supervisor position at the full compensation rate for Grade 13, with a hiring range of $44.57 to $55.71 per hour.

Chris Heitz has been employed by the City of Shorewood since 2017, when he was hired as a Light Equipment Operator in the Public Works Department. In July 2022, Chris was promoted to Lead Field Supervisor in recognition of his growing responsibilities and leadership within the department. On January 8, 2024, the City Council approved the reclassification of the position to Public Works Supervisor to reflect the duties that had evolved over time and to provide the appropriate title and compensation for the position and duties following the 2023 compensation study conducted by DDA. Following the resignation, staff again reviewed the job description for alignment with duties, considered how the position fits within the City's current operations and if any changes were needed to the position at this time. Staff concluded the position is appropriately structured and is necessary for efficient operations. The current job description is attached for reference.

Chris has served the City with dedication, professionalism, and leadership throughout his tenure. His career path is also a strong example of how employees can grow, develop, and successfully take on additional responsibilities within a small workforce like Shorewood. Staff would like to thank Chris for his years of service and leadership in the Public Works Department and wish him well in his role as Assistant Fire Chief with the Mound Fire Department.

The Public Works Supervisor is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the Public Works Department, including coordination of field operations, oversight of staff and equipment, response to service needs, and support for the City’s infrastructure maintenance programs. This is a key leadership position within the organization, and the individual selected will be pivotal in ensuring a smooth transition and maintaining the high level of service the City has been able to provide to residents, businesses, and the broader community.

Given the importance of this position and the need to attract qualified candidates with the necessary supervisory, operational, and technical experience, staff recommends authorization to recruit in the full Grade 13 compensation range of $44.57 to $55.71 per hour.

Strategic Alignment

Hiring talented employees at a fair and competitive wage supports organizational strength by attracting and retaining individuals who have the skills, leadership ability, and commitment needed to grow within the organization and meet evolving service demands. It is also a reflection of good governance because it ensures the City is responsibly investing in the workforce necessary to maintain continuity, accountability, and high-quality service to residents.

Budget Impact

The position is budgeted for in both the 2026 and 2027 Public Work's Personnel budgets. Heitz' current rate of pay is $55.71, which has been effective since his ninth anniversary of May 18, 2026.

Action Requested

Motion to authorize staff to begin recruitment for the Public Works Supervisor position at Grade 13 with a hiring range of $44.57 to $55.71 per hour. Second and simple majority required.

CITY OF
SHOREWOOD

POSITION DESCRIPTION

POSITION TITLE:	Public Works Supervisor
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
ACCOUNTABLE TO:	Public Works Director
FLSA STATUS:	Non-Exempt

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE

To support in the planning, coordinating, directing, communicating, and evaluating of a comprehensive public works program, in the capacity of Public Works supervisor, to ensure the most effective service to the public consistent with City Council policies, federal, state, and metropolitan regulations.

CITY VALUES & EXPECTATIONS

- To provide leadership and assistance in the development and modeling of a positive and productive workplace culture based on the city's core values of respect, integrity, communication, positive attitude, team work, and responsiveness. Allows employees to be successful by providing opportunities for increased responsibilities and creating a positive work culture.

- Supports and advances organizational development efforts such as developing a high performing organization, employee engagement, workforce development, inclusion, equity, and performance measurement efforts.

- Works cooperatively with others; responds to internal and external customers alike providing exceptional customer service. Develops and maintains respectful and effective working relationships with coworkers and community members; consistently brings a high level of self-awareness and empathy to personal interactions.

- Proactively resolves conflicts based on the greater good of the team, the city, and the community to ensure a respectful and inclusive workplace.

- Embrace the City's Mission, Management Philosophy and Core Values/Attributes by carrying out ones duties with a high degree of professionalism, honesty, and truthfulness.

ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE POSITION

- Supervise public works personnel responsible for the maintenance of city streets, operation, maintenance and repair of city utilities and related operations, including sanitary sewer, municipal water system, and storm sewer.
- Effectively manages and directs daily activities and make sound decisions in the absence of the Director of Public Works.
- Ability to work cooperatively with others, even during emergencies and challenging situations, maintain a positive work attitude, and not negatively impact the morale of others.
- Maintain an attitude of respect and professionalism at all times.
- Ability to effectively supervise others in the carrying out of assignments for the operation and maintenance of the City's municipal utilities, streets, parks.
- Responds to inquiries, concerns and complaints from the general public.
- Ensure routine safety inspections are completed for fire extinguishers, eyewash stations, automated external defibrillator, and confined space entry equipment for all city-owned buildings.
- Update and maintain traffic sign inventory and coordinate timely sign replacements.
- Direct tasks and activities to update and maintain sanitary sewer cleaning and maintenance activities.
- Works in conjunction with other utility companies to schedule work.
- Establishes department goals and measures performance. Researches, recommends process and equipment replacement and improvements.
- Assist Public Works Director in planning and performing the MS4 storm water inspections.
- Assists in the interviewing and hiring process of public works personnel.
- Performs snow removal from streets, parking lots, ice rinks, trails, and sidewalks.
- Maintains and repairs City streets including blacktopping, and culverts repair.

- Ensures confined space entries of sanitary sewer, municipal water systems, and other confined space areas are performed in a safe manner and in accordance with OSHA safety standards and City policies.

- Attends safety meetings as required and follows necessary safety precautions in performance of duties.

- Attends meetings and training as required and maintains daily and weekly work records.

- Must be available for on-call duties on a rotating basis and for work on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays. Responds for on-call duty and emergency call-outs as required for snow removal and ice control operations, severe rainstorms and other emergency conditions.

- Provides leadership in effort to ensure continuous focus on improvement to public works operations.

- Assists Public Works Director in coordinating the Safety Programs, including mandated OSHA training and certification, equipment safety inspections, development and documentation of department standard operating procedures, and coordination of monthly department safety program meetings.

- Acting Public Works Director in the Director's absence.

Performs other duties as apparent or assigned.

SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES

Light Equipment Operators (Utility)
Light Equipment Operators
Light Equipment Operator - Shop Technician
Light Equipment Operator – Utility Lead
Seasonal Public Works Staff

Supporting role and assistance with the overall direction, coordination, and evaluation of this unit. Carries out supervisory responsibilities in accordance with the City's policies and applicable laws.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE

High School Diploma or general education degree (GED). Post-secondary degree, course work or additional education/training in the public works field preferred. Minimum of six years of experience in a municipal public works department or utility, or eight years of similar work in private sector, including three years supervisory experience; or equivalent combination of education and experience.

Must have a proven track record of being able to work effectively with other employees, the ability to effectively supervise others, and to build positive work relationships.

OTHER KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES

- Ability to read and interpret documents such as safety rules, operating and maintenance instructions, as-built utility records, maps, and procedure manuals.
- Ability to prepare routine reports and correspondence.
- Ability to maintain records, complete daily logs, forms, and prepare reports.
- Ability to follow written and oral instructions.
- Ability to communicate effectively with City staff, elected officials, contractors and the general public.
- Must be proficient in reading, writing and speaking English.
- Ability to make arithmetic computations using whole numbers, fractions and decimals.
- Knowledge of weights, measures and volumes and the ability to convert between various units.
- Ability to operate light and heavy Department equipment.
- Knowledge of proper use of tools, equipment used in utility maintenance and repair.
- Knowledge of utility maintenance and repair.
- General knowledge of computer operations and software programs.
- Considerable knowledge of standard materials, equipment and safe work practices related to public works operations.
- Working knowledge of utility maintenance and/or construction activities.
- Knowledge of OSHA rules and regulations.
- Knowledge of the “Right to Know – Safety Material Data Information”.

CERTIFICATES, LICENSES, REGISTRATIONS

Valid Minnesota Class B Commercial Driver’s License with Tanker and Hazardous Materials endorsement, or ability to become licensed within 8 months of employment with the City.
Valid Minnesota Class SD Wastewater License or become licensed within one year of employment with the City.
Valid Minnesota Class D Water License or become licensed within one year of employment with the City.

In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act the following represents the Physical and Environmental Demands:

The position requires an equal amount of time spent standing, walking, and sitting. Lifting, pushing/pulling, or carrying objects weighing up to twenty five (25) pounds is regularly required, fifty (50) pounds is frequently required, and moving over one hundred (100) pounds occasionally required. Climbing, stooping, kneeling, crouching, crawling, twisting, and bending are sometimes required. Repetitive movements of the hands are sometimes required. Audio, visual, and verbal functions are essential functions to performing this position. Specific vision abilities required by this job include close vision, distance vision, peripheral vision, depth perception, and the ability to adjust focus. While performing the duties of this job, the employee frequently works in outdoor weather conditions. The employee occasionally works near moving mechanical parts; in high, precarious places; and is frequently exposed to fumes or airborne particles, toxic or caustic chemicals, and risk of electrical shock. The employee is occasionally exposed to wet and/or humid conditions, extreme heat; and vibration.

City of Shorewood

City Council Item 2.F.

Title/Subject: Accept Resignation and Approve Recruitment for LEO-Utilities Position
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Sandie Thone, City Clerk/ HR Director

Attachments
1. LEO Utilities JD

Background
The City has received the resignation of Utility Light Equipment Operator Bruce Stark, effective October 30, 2026, due to his retirement. Bruce has served the City for 25 years, beginning his career as a Light Equipment Operator and later being promoted in 2022 to Light Equipment Operator for the Utility Department. Bruce expressed his appreciation for his time with the City.

The City extends its sincere appreciation to Bruce for his dedicated service, professionalism, and contributions to the Public Works and Utility operations over the past 25 years. His knowledge, experience, and commitment to the community have been valuable assets to the organization, and we wish him the very best in retirement.

Staff is requesting authorization to recruit for the Utility Light Equipment Operator position. Pursuant to the AFSCME union contract, the position will be posted internally first before any external recruitment process is initiated. The position supports the overall activities of the Public Works Department and provides capacity for critical utility-related tasks such as proactive maintenance of infrastructure, timely locating of utilities in advance of construction work, and overnight and weekend on-call staffing for after-hours needs.

Strategic Alignment
Hiring competent employees demonstrates organizational strength and good governance because it ensures the City has the knowledge, judgment, and professionalism needed to provide reliable services to residents. Looking first internally also reflects organizational strength by valuing current employees, encouraging advancement, and recognizing the experience and commitment already within the City.

Budget Impact
The position is included in the Public Works/Utility Department personnel services budget. The 2026 salary range for the Utility Light Equipment Operator position is $32.98 to $41.09 per hour. Bruce Stark’s current rate of pay is $41.09 per hour.

If filled internally, staff would expect to place an employee in their current years of service band.
2026 AFSCME Union Wage Schedule:

Classification	Start	After 6 Months	After 1 Year	After 2 Years	After 3 Years	After 4 Years	After 5 Years	After 6 Years
LEO	$31.55	$32.69	$33.84	$35.03	$36.14	$37.34	$38.49	$39.64
Shop Tech	$32.26	$33.41	$34.57	$35.75	$36.85	$38.04	$39.18	$40.36
Utility Operator	$32.98	$34.12	$35.27	$36.45	$37.57	$38.75	$39.89	$41.09
Utility Lead	$35.47	$36.77	$38.08	$39.39	$40.67	$41.93	$43.28	$44.57

Action Requested

Motion to accept the resignation of Utility Light Equipment Operator Bruce Stark, effective October 30, 2026 and authorize staff to recruit for the Utility Light Equipment Operator position, with the position posted internally first pursuant to the AFSCME union contract. Motion, second and simple majority vote required.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD

POSITION DESCRIPTION

POSITION TITLE:	Light Equipment Operator - Utilities
DEPARTMENT:	Public Works
ACCOUNTABLE TO:	Director of Public Works/Utility Lead
FLSA STATUS:	Non-Exempt

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE

To provide support to the public work's department and serve in the capacity of light equipment operator - utilities, ensuring effective service to the public consistent with City Council policies, federal, state, and metropolitan regulations.

CITY VALUES & EXPECTATIONS

- Supports and models a positive and productive workplace culture based on the city's core values of respect, integrity, communication, positive attitude, teamwork, and responsiveness.
- Supports organizational development efforts for a high performing organization, employee engagement, workforce development, inclusion, equity, and performance measurement.
- Works cooperatively with others; responds to internal and external customers alike providing exceptional customer service. Develops and maintains respectful and effective working relationships with coworkers and community members; consistently brings a high level of self-awareness and empathy to personal interactions.
- Proactively resolves conflicts based on the greater good of the team, the city, and the community to ensure a respectful and inclusive workplace.
- Embrace the City's Mission, Management Philosophy and Core Values/Attributes by carrying out ones duties with a high degree of professionalism, honesty, and truthfulness.

ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE POSITION

- Performs skilled, semi-skilled and manual labor in the maintenance of city street.
- Performs skilled, semi-skilled and manual labor in the operation, maintenance and repair of city utilities and related operations, including sanitary sewer, municipal water system, and storm sewer.
- Must be able to work cooperatively with others, even during emergencies and challenging situations, maintain a positive work attitude, and not negatively impact the morale of others.
- Must maintain an attitude of respect and professionalism at all times.
- Operates, maintains and repairs Sanitary Sewer System.
- Troubleshoots and repairs electrical pump panels, and wastewater pumps.
- Performs inspections of sanitary sewer connections, disconnections, and pressure testing of services.
- Maintains wastewater lift stations.
- Operates, maintains and repairs municipal water system.
- Operates, troubleshoots and repairs well control panels, fluoride and chlorine pumps and injection systems.
- Performs inspections for water service connections and disconnections.
- Maintains City fire hydrants for water maintenance and fire suppression.
- Performs required chlorine, fluoride and water testing as required by the Minnesota Department of Health.
- Performs routine maintenance and repair of storm sewers, ditches and culverts.
- Performs drain cleaning manually and utilizing vacuum equipment.
- Performs snow removal from streets, parking lots, ice rinks, trails, and sidewalks.
- Maintains and repairs City streets including blacktopping, and culverts repair.
- Performs confined space entries of sanitary sewer and municipal water systems in a safe manner and in accordance with OSHA safety standards and City policies.

- Maintains accurate records of sanitary sewer and municipal water service ties.

- Attends safety meetings as required and follows necessary safety precautions.

- Attends meetings and training as required.

- Responds for on-call duty and emergency call-outs as required for snow removal and ice control operations, severe rainstorms and other emergency conditions.

- Must be available for on-call duties on a rotating basis and for work on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

- Performs other duties as apparent or assigned.

EDUCATION and/or EXPERIENCE

High School Diploma or general education degree (GED); and a minimum of two (2) years experience in a municipal utility; or equivalent combination of education and experience.

OTHER KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES

- Ability to read and interpret documents such as safety rules, operating and maintenance instructions, maps, and procedure manuals.
- Ability to prepare routine reports and correspondence.
- Ability to maintain records, complete daily logs, forms, and prepare reports.
- Ability to follow written and oral instructions.
- Ability to communicate effectively with City staff, elected officials, contractors and the general public.
- Must be proficient in reading, writing and speaking English.
- Ability to make arithmetic computations using whole numbers, fractions and decimals.
- Knowledge of weights, measures and volumes and the ability to convert between various units.
- Ability to read and decipher as-built utility record drawings.
- Ability to operate light and heavy Department equipment.
- Knowledge of proper use of tools, equipment used in utility maintenance and repair.
- Knowledge of utility maintenance and repair.
- General knowledge of computer operations and software programs.
- Considerable knowledge of standard materials, equipment and safe work practices related to public works operations.
- Working knowledge of utility maintenance and/or construction activities.
- Ability to understand electrical designs, schematics, and drawings.
- Knowledge of OSHA rules and regulations.

- Knowledge of the “Right to Know – Safety Material Data Information”.

CERTIFICATES, LICENSES, REGISTRATIONS

- Valid Minnesota Class A Commercial Drivers License with Tanker Endorsement, or become licensed within 8 months of employment with the City.
- Valid Minnesota Class SC Wastewater License
- Valid Minnesota Class C Water License

In compliance with the American With Disabilities Act the following represents the Physical and Environmental Demands: The position requires an equal amount of time spent standing, walking, and sitting. Lifting, pushing/pulling, or carrying objects weighing up to twenty five (25) pounds is regularly required, fifty (50) pounds is frequently required, and moving over one hundred (100) pounds occasionally required. Climbing, stooping, kneeling, crouching, crawling, twisting, and bending are sometimes required. Repetitive movements of the hands are sometimes required. Audio, visual, and verbal functions are essential functions to performing this position. Specific vision abilities required by this job include close vision, distance vision, peripheral vision, depth perception, and the ability to adjust focus. While performing the duties of this job, the employee frequently works near moving mechanical parts and in outside weather conditions, including inclement weather conditions. The employee is frequently required to work in wet, humid conditions. The employee is occasionally exposed to fumes or airborne particles, toxic or caustic chemicals, risk of electrical shock and vibration.

City Council Item 2.G.

Title/Subject: Records Retention Annual Review
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Sandie Thone, City Clerk/ HR Director

Attachments

1. 26-50 Resolution Approving Records Retention Annual Review
2. Shorewood Records Retention Policy

Background

The City of Shorewood has a long history of complying with the General Records Retention Schedule developed by the Minnesota State Department of Administration, Information Policy Analysis Division and the Minnesota Historical Society. The Schedule establishes minimum retention periods for city records based on their administrative, fiscal, legal, and historical value. The City Clerk is responsible for developing and implementing policies governing the retention and disposal of the city's records. A record/log is provided to the city clerk by departments when they periodically destroy records pursuant to the Schedule.

In 2024, the City Council adopted the Minnesota General Records Retention Schedule pursuant to State Statute §138.17 and §325L17 permitting electronic files to be substituted for original hard copies as the official version of record retention for the City. We have worked diligently in the last two years to replace hard copy records with electronic versions. While an annual review is not explicitly mandated, it is recommended as good practice to ensure the record's retention schedule and policy remain current and compliant with applicable laws and regulations. A resolution approving the annual review of the Minnesota General Records Retention Schedule and the City's Record Retention Policy are attached for your review and consideration. The schedule and policy remain in compliance and require no changes at this time.

Strategic Alignment

Good Governance: Keeping a records management and retention policy shows good governance by proving that the city follows the MN Retention Schedule and handles data in a responsible, organized way. Reviewing this policy every year keeps it up to date with new developments and minimizes security risks of access to outdated records.

Budget Impact

N/A

Action Requested

Motion to Approve Resolution 26-50: Approving the Annual Review and the Shorewood Records Retention Policy. Second and Simple Majority Required.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA

RESOLUTION 26-50

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE MINNESOTA GENERAL RECORDS RETENTION SCHEDULE AND THE RECORDS RETENTION POLICY FOR THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD

WHEREAS, the City of Shorewood has a long history of complying with the General Records Retention Schedule developed by the Minnesota State Department of Administration, Information Policy Analysis Division, and the Minnesota Historical Society; and

WHEREAS, the General Records Retention Schedule establishes minimum retention periods for city records based on their administrative, fiscal, legal, and historical value; and

WHEREAS, the City Clerk is responsible for developing and implementing policies governing the retention and disposal of the city's records; and

WHEREAS, in 2024 pursuant to MN State Statutes §138.17 and §325L.17 the city adopted electronic files as a substitute for original hard copies as the official version of record retention for the City of Shorewood; and

WHEREAS, an annual review of the Schedule and Shorewood's Records Retention Policy is best practice to maintain compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD, MINNESOTA:

Section 1) That the City Council of the City of Shorewood approves the annual review of the Minnesota General Records Retention Schedule and the City's Records Retention Policy.

Adopted by the City Council of Shorewood, Minnesota this 24th day of August 2026.

____
Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

____
Sandie Thone, City Clerk

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
RECORDS RETENTION POLICY

PURPOSE:
This policy will ensure necessary records and documents are adequately protected and maintained. This policy will ensure records that no longer need to be maintained or records of no value are discarded at the appropriate time. Minnesota State Statutes sections §138.17 and §325L.17 permit retaining electronic records substituted for the original records as a permanent record retention method.

STATEMENT OF POLICY:
The City of Shorewood adopts the General Records Retention Schedule developed by the Minnesota State Department of Administration, Information Policy Analysis Division, and the Minnesota Historical Society. The City of Shorewood adopts electronic files as a substitute for original hard copy records as the official version of the record retention for the City of Shorewood. This Schedule establishes minimum retention periods for city records based on their administrative, fiscal, legal and historic value.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

> **A) City Clerk:** The City Clerk is responsible for developing and implementing policies governing the retention and disposal of the City's records.
>
> **B) City Departments:** Departments that maintain city records are responsible for establishing appropriate records management procedures and practices. Each department will be responsible for periodically reviewing currently used records and forms to determine their appropriateness for their department's requirements. Each department will retain and destroy records in compliance with the General Records Retention Policy and this Policy.

DISPOSAL AND DESTRCUTION OF RECORDS:
Upon determination and consistency with the City's General Records Retention Schedule it is appropriate to dispose of records in one of the following ways:

- Recycle non-confidential paper records
- Shred or otherwise render unreadable confidential paper records
- Erase or destroy electronically stored data

A written destruction log must be provided to the City Clerk for all records disposed of that pertain to the Retention Schedule.

POLICY EFFECTIVE DATE:	**August 26, 2024 (Resolution 24-070)**
REVIEWED AND APPROVED:	**August 25, 2025 (Resolution 25-071)**
REVIEWED AND APPROVED:	**August 24, 2026 (Resolution 26-50)**

City of Shorewood

City Council Item 4.A.

Title/Subject: Accept LMCC 2027 Budget
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator

Attachments

1. LMCC 2027 Budget

Background

Attached is a letter and 2027 budget from Tyler Rabe, Operations Manager at the Lake Minnetonka Communications Commission. Mr. Rabe reports that the budget was unanimously approved by the board at the Full Commission meeting on August 13th. The LMCC is funded by PEG fees (Public, Educational and governmental access) and franchise fees from cable providers. In response to decreasing cable subscriptions, the LMCC has reduced staffing and sold its building, using proceeds from the sale to cover its 2027 budget shortfall. This trend should be monitored.

Technically, under the terms of the Joint Agreement with LMCC no action is required to approve the LMCC budget. However, the budget will not become effective if a majority of the member cities reject the budget.

The LMCC's purpose is to grant, administer and enforce cable franchisees for member cities; produce public, educational and government programming; and advise member cities on communications matters. The LMCC is governed by a board of directors comprised two representatives from each member city. One director must be a city council member or designee (Council Member Gorham in 2026) and a second be a resident (Eric Magistad in 2026). The LMCC is formed pursuant to MN Statutes 238.08 and 471.59 and has the authority to grant a cable franchise, regulate rates, enter into agreements, own property and employee staff or consultants.

Strategic Alignment

Effective Engagement & Communication

- Prioritize communications and engagement
- Explore and experiment with different formats and mediums
- Be strategic about sharing information and obtaining input
- Dedicate time and resources to communication and engagement

The LMCC provides a valuable service to its member communities by recording, producing, broadcasting and hosting recordings of Council meetings. LMCC staff also provide the expertise to support the operation, maintenance and integration of AV equipment.

Budget Impact

The LMCC is funded directly by PEG fees and franchise fees paid by cable companies.

Action Requested
Motion to accept the LMCC 2027 budget.

LMCC-TV.org
Lake Minnetonka Communications Commission

2145 DANIELS STREET ▪ BOX 117 ▪ LONG LAKE, MN 55356-9274 ▪ 952.471.7125 ▪ tyler@lmcc-tv.org

DEEPHAVEN
EXCELSIOR
GREENWOOD
INDEPENDENCE
LONG LAKE
LORETTO
MINNETONKA BEACH
ST. BONIFACIUS
SHOREWOOD
SPRING PARK
WOODLAND

8/17/26

To All LMCC Member Cities,

Attached, please find a copy of the Lake Minnetonka Communications Commission's 2027 budget. The budget was unanimously approved last Thursday night at our August 13th Full Commission meeting.

Our 2027 budget is balanced with the use of reserve funds from the sale of our building last year to cover the deficit caused by cable-cord cutting.

I ask that you bring the LMCC's budget to your city council for approval. Please feel free to contact me *or* your LMCC Commissioner if you have any questions.

Note: City approval is not required under our Joint Powers Agreement, but your city's vote of confidence is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your support of the Lake Minnetonka Communications Commission!

Tyler Rabe

Tyler Rabe, LMCC Operations Manager

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	**Lake Minnetonka Communications Commission:**					
2	***Approved 2027 Budget***					
3				**2025**	**2026**	***2027***
4			**Code #:**	**Actuals**	**Budget**	***Budget***
5	**Budget Revenues:**					
6	Mediacom - Franchise Fees		**990.1**	$ 147,499.32	$ 120,731.79	$ 95,956.00
7	Midco - Franchise Fees		**990.1**	$ -	$ -	$ 8,928.00
8	Mediacom - Peg Fees		**915.2**	$ 33,831.35	$ 28,148.42	$ 21,064.00
9	Midco - Peg Fees		**915.2**	$ -	$ -	$ 3,137.00
10	Commercial Production		**930.2**	$ 11,500.00	$ 4,800.00	$ 9,700.00
11	Insurance Refunds/Misc		**940.1**	$ 711.00	$ -	$ -
12	**Revenues Total:**			**$ 193,541.67**	**$ 153,680.21**	**$ 138,785.00**
13						
14	Franchise Salaried Full -Time	Franchise	**101**	$ 94,668.86	$ 67,980.00	$ 70,019.40
15	PEG Prod. Full Time Salaries	PEG	**102**	$ 62,988.38	$ -	$ -
16	PEG Prod. PERA	PEG	**120**	$ 4,723.88	$ -	$ -
17	Franchise PERA Contributions	Franchise	**121**	$ 7,100.08	$ 4,332.97	$ 5,251.29
18	Franchise FICA Contributions	Franchise	**122**	$ 6,779.09	$ 4,758.60	$ 4,755.20
19	PEG Prod. FICA	PEG	**123**	$ 4,093.70	$ -	$ -
20	Minnesota Paid Leave	Franchise	**125**	$ -	$ 448.07	$ 464.10
21	Franchise Health Insurance	Franchise	**131**	$ 16,568.63	$ 7,076.78	*$ 12,000.00*
22	PEG Prod. Health Insurance	PEG	**132**	$ 8,215.12	$ -	$ -
23	Franchise Worker's Comp. Ins.	Franchise	**151**	$ 258.50	$ 561.50	$ 206.00
24	PEG Prod. Worker's Comp. Ins.	PEG	**152**	$ 258.50	$ -	$ -
25	**Personnel Expenses Total:**			**$ 205,654.74**	**$ 85,157.92**	**$ 92,695.99**
26						
27	Office Supplies	Franchise	**200**	$ 2,499.89	$ 1,000.00	$ 500.00
28	Repairs & Maintenance Supplies	PEG	**220**	$ -	$ 100.00	$ -
29	Studio Expendables	PEG	**221**	$ 106.45	$ 200.00	$ -
30	Audit/Accounting Fees	Franchise	**301**	$ 5,840.60	$ 5,200.00	$ 7,005.00
31	Access Contractors Studio	PEG	**302**	$ 22,517.25	$ 25,000.00	$ 22,500.00
32	Legal Fees	Franchise	**304**	$ 812.00	$ 2,500.00	$ 1,500.00
33	Copier Expense	Franchise	**309**	$ 39.99	$ -	$ -
34	Payroll Services	Franchise	**314**	$ 3,691.29	$ 3,150.00	$ 3,200.00
35	Janitorial Services	Franchise	**318**	$ 2,517.90	$ -	$ -
36	Security Services	Franchise	**319**	$ 980.00	$ 335.00	$ 550.00
37	Telephone/Communications	Franchise	**321**	$ 2,071.64	$ 1,800.00	$ 1,100.00
38	Postage	Franchise	**322**	$ 588.00	$ 350.00	$ 165.00
39	Computer Consulting	Franchise	**325**	$ 1,287.23	$ 500.00	$ 400.00
40	Mileage	Franchise	**332**	$ 381.42	$ 100.00	$ 500.00
41	Insurance	Franchise	**360**	$ 5,412.00	$ 2,875.00	$ 2,430.00
42	Utilities	Franchise	**380**	$ 10,600.06	$ -	$ -
43	Refuse & Recycling	Franchise	**384**	$ 11,126.22	$ -	$ -
44	Bank Finance Fees	Franchise	**395**	$ 368.47	$ -	$ -
45	Contracted Maintenance	Franchise	**401**	$ 1,268.00	$ -	$ -
46	Maintenance Repair Equipment	Franchise	**404**	$ 9,220.00	$ -	$ -
47	Building Rent	Franchise	**412**	$ 3,750.00	$ 15,000.00	$ 15,885.00
48	Equipment Rental	Franchise	**413**	$ 184.18	$ -	$ -
49	Advertising	Franchise	**440**	$ -	$ -	$ -
50	Van Operation	PEG	**441**	$ 1,087.24	$ 1,500.00	$ 315.00
51	Web Streaming/Broadband	Franchise	**442**	$ 4,202.68	$ 4,000.00	$ 3,225.00
52	Licenses	Franchise	**443**	$ 1,768.46	$ 1,750.00	$ 225.00
53	Building Improvements	Franchise	**445**	$ 926.76	$ -	$ -
54	Fund Contingency	Franchise	**740**	$ 47.83	$ -	$ -
55	**Expenses Total:**			**$ 93,295.56**	**$ 65,360.00**	**$ 59,500.00**
56						
57	Capital Outlay	PEG	**720**	$ 1,986.53	$ 5,000.00	$ 2,750.00
58	Capital Licenses	PEG	**722**	$ 3,290.80	$ 2,750.00	$ 2,220.00
59	**Capital Expenses Total:**			**$ 5,277.33**	**$ 7,750.00**	**$ 4,970.00**
60						
61	Franchise Renewal Legal/Consul	Franchise	**733**	$ 12,713.20	$ -	$ -
62	**Special Projects Total:**			**$ 12,713.20**	**$ -**	**$ -**
63						
64	**ALL Expenses Total:**			**$ 316,940.83**	**$ 158,267.92**	**$ 157,165.99**
65						
66	**Revenues Total:**			**$ 193,541.67**	**$ 153,680.21**	**$ 138,785.00**
67	**ALL Expenses Total:**			**$ (316,940.83)**	**$ (158,267.92)**	**$ (157,165.99)**
68	**Funding Balance After ALL Expenses:**			**$ (123,399.16)**	**$ (4,587.71)**	**$ (18,380.99)**
69	**Transfer from Pershing Investments:**			**$ 65,000.00**	**$ 4,587.71**	**$ 18,380.99**
70	**Total After Transfer from Pershing Investments:**			$ -	$ -	$ 710,437.42

City of Shorewood

City Council Item 4.B.

Title/Subject: Report on Proposed Amendment to Excelsior Fire Department JPA
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator

Attachments

1. JPA Amendment Proposal Report
2. JPA Amendment Memo and Draft

Background

On May 22, 2026, the City of Deephaven proposed an amendment to the Excelsior Fire Department Joint Powers Agreement. The JPA has outlined a procedure for dealing with proposed amendments

Section 15.2 of the Joint Powers Agreement provides: "The Board shall review the proposed amendment and issue a report on it to the Member Cities within ninety (90) days of proposal of the amendment. Member Cities shall have ninety (90) days after the Board issues its report in which to adopt city council resolutions as identified in Section 15.1."

On June 22, 2026 the Shorewood City Council reviewed the amendments proposed by the City of Deephaven. Although the Council was open to discussing changes to the JPA, it did not believe the timing was appropriate given the leadership changes in the EFD. This conclusion was reported back to the EFD Board at its July 15, 2026 meeting. The other member cities also discussed the proposed amendments by Deephaven and had conclusions similar to Shorewood.

At that meeting the Board discussed if it was necessary for it to issue a report on the proposed amendments to the member cities. EFD Board Attorney Joshua Dorothy recommended that, "out of an abundance of caution... the Board issue a report to the Member Cities. That way, there is no question that the Board has fulfilled its obligations under the JPA to review and issue a report, and the clock has started on the deadline for the Member Cities to act."

It is Attorney Dorothy's opinion that the cities do not need to take formal action to reject the proposed amendment. "I don't think that Member Cities who don't want to adopt a proposed amendment have to pass resolutions rejecting it. They can simply not act, and if there are not five resolutions (one from each of the Member Cities) adopted within 90 days of the Board's report, the proposed amendment is dead."

Based on the Council's June 22 discussion, staff is recommending the Council simply take no action regarding the proposed amendments by Deephaven. Conversely, if Council wishes to approve the proposed amendments, it should direct the preparation of a resolution for all the member cities to adopt, as identified in Section 15.1 of the JPA.

Strategic Alignment

Organizational Strength & Good Governance

- Culture of continuous improvement — Review of agreements and collaboration with neighboring cities is good practice to ensure joint arrangements are producing desired outcomes.

Budget Impact

None

Action Requested

It is recommended the Council take no action regarding the proposed JPA amendment.

EXCELSIOR FIRE DISTRICT

Proudly serving the communities of: Deephaven, Excelsior, Greenwood, Shorewood, & Tonka Bay

To: Excelsior Fire District Member Cities

From: Board Chair Jennifer Gallagher

Date: 08/07/2026

Re: **Report on Proposed Amendment to Joint Powers Agreement**

On May 22, 2026, the City of Deephaven proposed an amendment to the Joint Powers Agreement. Copies of the City of Deephaven's cover memorandum and proposed amendment are enclosed with this report.

Section 15.2 of the Joint Powers Agreement provides, in pertinent part: "The Board shall review the proposed amendment and issue a report on it to the Member Cities within ninety (90) days of proposal of the amendment. Member Cities shall have ninety (90) days after the Board issues its report in which to adopt city council resolutions as identified in Section 15.1."

At its meetings held on May 27, 2026, and July 15, 2026, the Board reviewed the proposed amendment. This document constitutes the Board's report on the proposed amendment, which is being issued to the Member Cities. Accordingly, if the Member Cities wish to adopt city council resolutions approving the proposed amendment, such city council resolutions must be adopted within 90 days of this report.

24100 Smithtown Road
Shorewood, MN 55331

Phone 952-401-8801
www.excelsiorfire.org

EXCELSIOR FIRE DISTRICT BOARD MEETING
6:00 P.M. WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2026
JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT AMENDMENT MEMORANDUM

Friday, May 22, 2026

Members of the Excelsior Fire District Board:

The events over the past year have highlighted the need to review and revise the Excelsior Fire District Joint Powers Agreement (hereinafter "JPA"), last updated as amended in 2011. I believe our cities are aligned that the current JPA needs modernization, and the attached is the City of Deephaven's earnest effort to provide leadership and direction in that process. These amendments are presented for discussion and review by the Fire Board. It is not our intent to call for action on this item at our meeting on Wednesday; more so, it is our intention to provide these changes for presentation, consideration and review, to be discussed and available for formal action at a future meeting. Ideally, board members will bring the draft Amendment to their City Councils for discussion and provide feedback at the next board meeting.

We have learned a lot about the operation and leadership at the Fire Department over the past several months and have gained valuable insight into support that is needed from the Board for the successful operation of the Fire District. We have heard from our leadership team, as well as our rank-and-file firefighters, that additional support and resources are necessary to continue the levels of service they provide to our communities. Additionally, we have seen through our own operations and actions as a Board that we are deficient in some areas of guidance and support that contributed to the challenges we have navigated this past year. As a result, the City of Deephaven is presenting amendments to the JPA that address these stated and observed areas for improvement by providing a review process for the Fire Chief, providing an onboarding process for the education of new Fire Board Members, establishing an Ethics and Conflict of Interest Policy applicable to Board Members, formally establishing the provision of Human Resources support, equitably amending the allocation of Fire Board votes, placing limitations on the voting ability of Alternate Board Members, formally establishing the provision of a Fiscal Agent for financial and audit support, and amending the process for withdraw, including the notice period, continuing obligations during the notice period and equitably amending the winddown process.

Thank you for your time in review of our recommended amendments to the JPA. I look forward to presenting this matter next Wednesday evening and appreciate the timely process of discussion and review. It is important that we work diligently on this matter to actively support our Firefighters, Fire Department Leadership and the residents of our respective communities.

Sincerely,

Tony Jewett

Tony Jewett
Deephaven City Council
Vice Chair, Excelsior Fire District Board

AMENDMENT TO THE EXCELSIOR FIRE DISTRICT JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT

THIS AMENDMENT TO THE EXCELSIOR FIRE DISTRICT JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT is entered into on __________________, by and between the Cities of Deephaven, Excelsior, Greenwood, Shorewood, and Tonka Bay, all of which are municipal corporations of the State of Minnesota (collectively, the "Member Cities").

WHEREAS, the Member Cities executed the Excelsior Fire District Joint Powers Agreement (the "Agreement") on November 16, 2011;

WHEREAS, the Member Cities desire to change and amend the terms of the Agreement;

WHEREAS, the original joint powers agreement stated all amendments shall be in writing;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AND HEREIN MUTUALLY AGREED, in consideration of each party's promises and considerations herein set forth, as follows:

1. Section 2.2(a) of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

   "a) <u>Voting Members</u>: Voting Members shall include one (1) elected official of the city council of each Member City, <u>with votes cast by the Voting Members from Deephaven and Shorewood counting as two (2) votes. All votes cast by the Voting Members from Excelsior, Greenwood and Tonka Bay shall count as one (1) vote.</u> No employee of the District or any police department serving any of the Member Cities may serve on the Board as a Voting Member.

   If any Member City/Cities are hereafter consolidated into a new municipal corporation, the corporation will have one (1) Voting Member representative."

2. Section 2.2(c) of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

   "c) <u>Alternate Members</u>: The city council of each Member City shall name one (1) elected official of its city council to serve as an Alternate Member in case of absence of the Voting or Ex-Officio Member. The Alternate Member shall have the authority to vote in place of (but not in addition to) the Voting Member <u>at one (1) meeting in any calendar year</u>. The Alternate Member shall not participate as a Board Member except in the absence of the council member or the Ex-Officio Member."

3. Section 2.7 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"2.7 **Operating Committee**. The Ex-Officio Members shall comprise the Operating Committee. The Operating Committee shall meet with the Fire Chief/District Administrator on a monthly basis and report to the Board at each regular meeting.

The Operating Committee shall perform an annual review of the Fire Chief and shall have the authority to approve expenses consistent with the yearly operating budget for District services and a capital improvement program/finance plan adopted by the Board pursuant to Section 3.1(i) ~~budgeted expenditures during monthly meetings. Non-budgeted expenditures must be approved by the Board~~. A list of bills shall be provided to each member of the Operating Committee on a monthly basis."

4. Section 2.9 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"2.9 **Fiscal Agent.** "Fiscal Agent" shall mean the entity designated by the Board to receive, hold, disburse, account for, and otherwise manage the District's funds and financial transactions. The City of Excelsior shall act as the initial Fiscal Agent for the District. The Fiscal Agent shall be compensated by the District at a rate mutually agreed upon by the Fiscal Agent and the Board. The Board may change the Fiscal Agent as it deems necessary from time to time, but must at all times have a fiscal designated agent. The District shall indemnify and hold the Fiscal Agent harmless from any claims, causes of action, or liability arising out of actions it takes in performing duties under this section except for claims, causes of action or liability arising out of the negligent or intentional acts of the fiscal agent in performing its duties under this paragraph."

5. Section 3.1(i) of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"i) To establish a yearly operating budget for District services and a capital improvement program/finance plan (including an equipment replacement schedule) of not less than ten years' duration, which shall require approval consistent with the terms of this Agreement.

To act as agent for receipt, custody, and disbursement of funds, gifts, or other funds paid or given by the Member Cities on behalf of or for the use of the District, and shall take into account the respective usage levels of district services by the respective Member Cities."

6. The following shall be added as Section 3.1(p) to the Agreement:

"p) To ensure all employees and Board Members are bound by and act in accordance with the ethics and conflicts of interest policy established by the Board pursuant to Section 5.8."

7. The following shall be added as Section 3.1(q) to the Agreement:

“q) To ensure that the mandatory process is in place for effective training and onboarding of new Board members.”

8. The first paragraph of Section 5.1 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“5.1 **Fire Chief/District Administrator**. The Fire Chief/District Administrator shall be responsible to the Board for the efficient and economical operation of the District; the hiring, termination, supervision, discipline and the direction of the District personnel; the establishment of rules of conduct for those personnel consistent with the ethics and conflicts of interest policy established by the Board pursuant to Section 5.8; and carrying out the policies and procedures adopted by the Board. The Fire Chief/District Administrator is appointed by the Board and serves at the pleasure of the Board. The Fire Chief/District Administrator is a full time employee of the District and may enter into an employment contract with the Board.”

9. Section 5.2 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“5.2 **Fire Marshal**. The District shall ~~may~~ have a position of Fire Marshal, who shall be appointed by the Fire Chief/District Administrator solely on the basis of training, experience, and administrative, and other qualifications. The Fire Marshal's responsibilities will be to enforce the Minnesota State Fire Code and perform other duties that may be assigned by the Fire Chief/District Administrator. The Fire Marshal need not be a "member" of the Excelsior Fire District. Fire Marshal responsibilities may be performed by a contractor who is not an employee of the District; however, the Fire Marshal under the employ of the City of Excelsior on December 31, 2000 shall automatically be appointed as the District's first Fire Marshal with continuation of his/her status as a regular employee including continuation of salary, benefits, accrued leave, and other customary issues of employment. The first Fire Marshal and all subsequent persons filling that position shall serve at the pleasure of the Fire Chief/District Administrator.”

10. Section 5.3 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“5.3 **District Positions and Independent Contractors.** The Board may, from time to time, establish, eliminate or reconstitute other employee positions as it deems to be appropriate. The Board must at all times provide for a Human Resources function through employment or through contracting with an independent contractor.”

11. Section 5.8 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

“5.8 **Continuation of Prior Policies, Plans, and Procedures.** All Excelsior Fire Department policies, plans~~planes~~, procedure, and by-laws not superseded by this Agreement, in place on January 1, 2002, shall remain in effect until changed by the Board.

The terms and provisions of this Agreement shall supersede any conflicting Excelsior Fire Department policies, plans, procedures, and by-laws in place at the time of the effective date of this Agreement. The Board must establish and implement an ethics and conflicts of interest policy."

12. Section 8.1 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"8.1 **Approval of Capital Improvement Program/Finance Plan**. After approval of the District's annual Operating Budget covering the calendar year 2001, the Member City councils shall approve a Capital Improvement Program/Finance Plan by an affirmative vote of the ~~a two-thirds~~ majority of the Member City councils. Any proposed amendment to the Capital Improvement Program/Finance Plan shall be approved by an affirmative vote of the ~~two-thirds~~ majority of the Member City councils no later than September 15. The vote on the Capital Improvement Program/Financial Plan or any amendment thereto shall be binding upon all Member Cities."

13. Section 10.1 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"10.1 **Notice**. Notice of intent to withdraw from participation in the District may be given in any year ~~only in March of odd-numbered years~~, with a minimum of 24 ~~33~~ months' notice of intent to withdraw, and the final month of the term must end in December."

14. Section 10.2 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"10.2 **Continuing Obligations After Notice ~~Withdrawal~~**. The withdrawing Member City shall continue to pay its share of the operating budget and capital expense budget until it withdraws from the District. There shall be no further obligations after withdrawal.~~an amount equal to 500% of the amount allocated to it during the year of its notice of intent to withdraw. The withdrawing Member City may make this payment during the five years succeeding its leaving the District, but in no year shall the amount paid be less than one-fifth of the 500% amount.~~"

15. Section 10.3 of the Agreement is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"10.3 **Vesting**. Any party withdrawing from the Agreement shall have no vested rights or ownership in any of the property or assets of the District; provided, however, that upon withdrawal by a Member City under this Section, the District will reimburse the withdrawing Member City for the value of that Member City's share of the District's capital assets. This amount will be determined by an appraisal of the capital assets at the time of the withdrawal multiplied by the percentage of the withdrawing Member City's allocated share of the total operating budget (as determined in Section 7.1). The resulting amount due to the withdrawing Member City may be paid by the District over the three years succeeding the Member City's withdrawal, but in no year shall the amount paid be less than one-third of the total amount due."

16. All other provisions of the Agreement remain unchanged and in full effect and are incorporated herein as necessary.

[*Remainder of page left intentionally blank*]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned governmental units have caused this Amendment to be duly executed on the day and year first above written.

CITY OF DEEPHAVEN

By: ______________________________
Name: ____________________________
Its: ______________________________

ATTEST:

____
Its:

CITY OF EXCELSIOR

By: ______________________________
Name: ____________________________
Its: ______________________________

ATTEST:

____
Its:

CITY OF GREENWOOD

By: ______________________________
Name: ____________________________
Its: ______________________________

ATTEST:

____
Its:

CITY OF SHOREWOOD

By: ______________________________
Name: ____________________________
Its: ______________________________

ATTEST:

____
Its:

CITY OF TONKA BAY

By: ______________________________
Name: ____________________________
Its: ______________________________

ATTEST:

____
Its:

City Council Item 5.A.i.

Title/Subject: Primary Election Update
Meeting Date: August 24, 2026
Prepared By: Sandie Thone, City Clerk/ HR Director

Attachments

Background
The City of Shorewood held the Primary Election on August 11, 2026. The City had a total of 2,079 Primary voters; 1603 election day voters in its three precincts; and 476 early voters for the Primary which is a 34% turnout. Although this pales in comparison to General election turnouts, it is a BIG win for Shorewood who, in the 2024 Primary had a total of 918 voters; 768 election day voters, and 150 early voters for the Primary at a 15.4% turnout. We just keep getting better!

Many thanks to all who helped make these elections a success!

Thank you to the following election judges who worked in our polling place locations on election day and helped out at City Hall during Early Voting:

Ken Huskins - Anne Straka-Leland - Roxanne Martin - Jane Stein - Elaine Love - Steve Baer - Ralph Ballard - Dianne Aslesen - Joy Frederickson - Bill Erickson - Michael McDonald - Annie Paul - Sheila Augustine - Court Queen - Mary Sue Bahneman - Anne Rivers-Ditsch - Laura Doten - Gordon Levack - Mike Kovalesky - Pat Kovalesky - Elizabeth Grover - Steve Dzurak - Julie Einhorn - Janice Zumsteg - Theresa Zerby - Jim Berdahl - Andrea Vencl - Karen Boynton - Charles Niles - Kristen Kowalski - David Suggs - Brahim Zabeli - Nancy Anderson - Steve Ferry - Karen Petron - Annette Kasier - Julie Tessier - Catherine Demars - Guadalupe Pfaff - Jennifer Fortner - Scott Richard Morris - Jessica Elegert - Patty Wolff - Cindy Holker - Cynthia Clark - Lee Nill-Deborah Luedtke - Glen Coakley - Justin McDonald - James Berdhal - Kurt Pfaff - Sandra Kelly-Morris - Pamela Ulvestad - Sheila Van Sloun

Thank you to the following public works employees who helped with set-up and tear-down for the polling places for election day:

Jeremy Moe
Robert Hochsprung

Thank you to the following election staff who work all year to ensure a seamless and successful election process:

Brenda Pricco
Nelia Criswell
Eric Wilson

We could not do this without all these dedicated professionals! We appreciate YOU!

CANDIDATE FILING has closed. The following have filed for City Office and will be on the November Ballot (in alphabetical order):

Eric Magistad
Guy Sanschagrin

The upcoming elections schedule includes the following:

NOVEMBER 3 GENERAL ELECTION

Absentee voting begins in Hennepin County on September 25, 2026
Early voting begins at Shorewood City Hall on October 16, 2026

We will also be open for voting on:
Saturday, October 24th from 9AM to 3PM
Tuesday, October 27th until 7PM
Saturday, October 31st from 9AM to 3PM
Sunday, November 1st from 9AM to 3PM
Monday, November 2nd until 5PM

Sample Ballots will be available to view on our website and at City Hall.

Polls are open 7AM to 8PM on Election Day.

SHOREWOOD'S POLLING LOCATIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

Precinct 1: Branch Church located at 26710 West 62nd Street
Precinct 2: Shorewood Community Center & Event located at 5735 Country Club Road
Precinct 3: Excelsior Covenant Church located at 19955 Excelsior Boulevard

Strategic Alignment

Running effective elections supports good governance by ensuring public officials are selected through a fair, transparent, and legally compliant process that protects voter confidence. Well-managed elections also demonstrate accountability, strengthen trust in local government, and uphold the community's right to meaningful participation in civic decision-making.

Budget Impact

Election Judge Pay is included in the 2026 Election Budget. A grant was received to pay additional election judges at City Hall to support new legislative changes in 2026.

Action Requested

No action required - for informational purposes only.