

MINUTES

1. CONVENE CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

Mayor Labadie called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M.

A. Pledge of Allegiance

B. Roll Call

Present: Mayor Labadie; Councilmembers Maddy, Sanschagrín, Gorham, and DiGruttolo (Zoom); City Attorney Shepherd; City Administrator Nevinski; City Clerk/HR Director Thone; Planning Director Griffiths; Planner Osowski; Park and Recreation Director Czech

Absent: None

C. Review Agenda

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked whether Agenda Items 4.F. and 4.G. should be reordered, as one is a petition against the Deer Management Program and the other is an agreement for it. Mayor Labadie asked the Staff why the items were ordered that way on the Agenda. Planning Director Griffiths noted that the petition concerns a specific City-owned property, not the Deer Management Program as a whole. He added that the Staff is not partial to an order, and items could be discussed in whatever order the Council would like.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether what is discussed in 4.G. would affect 4.F. Planning Director Griffiths noted that, assuming the Council's intention is to continue with the Deer Management Program, the previous discussion should continue. Item 4.F. authorizes the agreement to continue for the upcoming year and has no impact on the program's logistics. He noted that, with item 4.G., the Council would be considering whether to allow the hunt on a specific City-owned property. Councilmember Gorham asked if the agreement would need to be amended at all. Planning Director Griffiths shared that the agreement with the hunter group authorizes them to conduct the hunt. Theoretically, the City could agree with the group and then not do the hunt in its entirety. Mayor Labadie stated that it made sense that if 4.F. is not approved, then 4.G. does not need to be discussed. Councilmember Sanschagrín stated that things can be left as presented.

Maddy moved, Sanschagrín seconded, approving the agenda as presented.

Motion passed 5-0.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Labadie reviewed the items on the Consent Agenda.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 2 of 22

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked what Audit Field Work under LB Carlson on page 45 of the Agenda Packet in the Claims List is. City Administrator Nevinski stated that LB Carlson is the City's new auditor, replacing Abdo. The City went through a Request For Proposals last year and selected LB Carlson. He added that audit work is underway, and the bill reflects the time spent on the project.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked about the Bolten & Menk, Shorewood Lane Restoration item and if the Council had approved the restoration. City Administrator Nevinski shared that the project has been underway for a while, and the City has recently received two grants from Hennepin County for it. At the last update, the Council affirmed its intent to continue working on the project. He added that the work being done is scoping and developing the project, which will come back to the Council before going out to bid.

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

- A. City Council Work Session Minutes of May 11, 2026**
- B. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of May 11, 2026**
- C. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**
- D. Park Commission Meeting Minutes**
- E. Claims List**
- F. Adopt Resolution Approving a Special Assessment for Dale & Karan Newberg, 26960 Beverly Dr, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 26-31, "A Resolution Approving and Adopting a Special Assessment."**

Motion passed 5-0.

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

Tina McIntyre, 16211 Temple Drive, Minnetonka, stated that she is there as a board member of the Minnetonka Baseball Association (MBA) and a coach of a Minnetonka travel team. She thanked the City for the strong partnership that has been built with MBA over the years. She noted that the partnership has always been collaborative and that the MBA has invested heavily in the Freeman Park facilities to create a best-in-class experience for players, families, and the community. She stated that there is a longstanding Bigsy Tournament in the Minnetonka Baseball Community. The tournament honors David Bigum, known for his fun-loving personality and dedication to youth baseball. She shared that this year's tournament marks eleven years with over 40 teams traveling to Shorewood to play at Freeman fields. She added that the tournament benefits the players, families, and broader communities. The visiting teams support local restaurants, hotels, gas stations, and other businesses throughout the tournament weekend. Creating a positive economic impact for the area while also showcasing the exceptional facilities and the community experience that Shorewood and Minnetonka provide. She explained that music is becoming increasingly common at baseball tournaments, and the MBA is requesting approval for the limited, controlled use of team speakers during the tournament weekend at Freeman Fields one through three on June 5 and 6. The intent is not to request unrestricted use,

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 3 of 22

rather to allow a managed and respectful experience that aligns with the atmosphere that many teams now experience at tournaments. She added that the MBA wants to continue earning the City's trust by demonstrating that this can be done responsibly and respectfully. She explained that the tournament starts on Friday with games at 4:00 P.M. and 6:00 P.M., and Saturday games from approximately 8:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M. There are no games on Sunday at Freeman, no field lights are used, and all games conclude before dark. She stated that to ensure the experience remains respectful for the surrounding residents and the park environment, MBA will implement the following guidelines: tournament directors will remain onsite throughout the tournament to actively monitor music volume and usage, coaches and volunteers will also assist in ensuring compliance, speakers will be positioned away from nearby homes whenever possible, and volume levels will be kept at a reasonable level, vulgar or inappropriate music will not be allowed, teams will be expected to maintain a family friendly environment at all times, music use will primarily occur for limited use before games, brief batter walk-up music, and short breaks between innings, if a complaint is received the team will receive one warning, a second complaint will result in that team losing music privileges for the remainder of the tournament. She noted that the request applies only to the June 5- 6 Bigsy Tournament, where 40 teams from throughout the State will be hosted. She added that MBA is fully willing to comply with any additional guidelines or restrictions that the City deems appropriate as part of the permit approval process. She shared that MBA values its partnership with the City and appreciates the consideration of the request. The goal is to continue providing a memorable, best-in-class tournament experience while respecting the surrounding community and park environment.

Rebecca Jasper, 538 Grace Street, Excelsior, thanked the Council for renewing the Massage Therapy license. She noted that she was there to discuss item 4. C., which is the partner of the owner who has a license from a school in Texas, and the license is not recognized because the school in Texas went out of business, making it difficult for the partner to get another license. She asked that the Council consider granting a license to Helen Zhao. This needs to be done so that the business can have more than one massage therapist and pay the high building rent.

Nancy Westman, 19515 Vine Ridge Road, stated that she has been in contact with Planner Osowski regarding approving the contract with the Metro Bow Hunters Resource Base to conduct the deer management in the area. She noted that she wanted to raise issues that have come up in her neighborhood. She explained that she comes from a family of bow hunters, and her husband is one as well. She does not have a problem with bow hunting or deer management; it is great in the right place and situation. She shared that over the many years she has lived in Shorewood; sharpshooters have been observed in her backyard because the Shorewood property where the hunt takes place is adjacent to Silverwood Park and lies behind her neighborhood and another neighborhood. She stated that the area of the hunt looks large, but there is a section where the property is very narrow. She noted that the narrowness of the property led to some issues for her neighborhood, specifically. She explained that last fall, the issue was brought forward when she heard a sharpshooter shoot their bow, a deer leaps forward and die on her property. She continued that she went to see where the shooter was and found that he was shooting in the direction of her on her porch from the edge of the neighbor's property. She shared that later that week, her husband called City Hall to find out some information. Many of the neighbors most affected by the hunt have signed a petition against it because of a couple of concerns. She noted that during her husband's call to City Hall, he learned that the neighbors do not need to be notified of where the hunters are hunting, even if it faces her property. She shared some of her concerns: is the size and the shape of the green space appropriate that are designated for the hunt, are the hunt areas adjacent to areas where it may not be appropriate to hunt, how is it reconciled that private citizens can still permit individuals to hunt on their land even

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 4 of 22

if it is less than an acre, where would the deer get when it gets shot and may end up in others yards. She noted that the situation needs to be assessed in certain hunting areas. She asked how those affected by the hunt on others' property would be notified. She asked that the Council consider some of the questions in the decision-making process. She noted she was not opposed to the hunt, but that there is a right place for it and procedures to help notify others.

Gary Westman, 19515 Vine Ridge Road, stated that, as a lifelong hunter, he always found places without houses, people, or other things nearby that could be in the line of fire. He noted that it is important for all hunters to be doing. The men being used for the hunt are sharpshooters, but with archery equipment, many things can go wrong. He shared his concerns with the safety, being that there are many children in the area, and the shooting is taking place within 100 yards of houses. He added that in using a crossbow, the arrow can go much farther than that. He sees the matter as a safety issue and has no problem finding good places to reduce the number of deer in the City. He asked the Council to do the hunt in a way that is safe for all the residents.

4. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Presentation by Lake Minnetonka Conservation District

Executive Director of the Lake Minnetonka Conservation District (LMCD), David Krueger, stated that he would give a presentation to the Council. He noted that the Summer Rules 2026 book, included in the Agenda Packet, is available in print in the surrounding area and on the LMCD website, and has been mailed to some households. He shared the information that would be included in the presentation. He stated some fun facts about Lake Minnetonka: 125 miles of shoreline, 14,043 acres of surface area, 42 bays, the deepest bay of 113 feet (Crystal Bay), and the first known "electric-lit" inland steamboat in the United States (1881). The facts can also be found on the website. He explained that LMCD has been around for more than 50 years and is comprised of the 14 cities around Lake Minnetonka, including Shorewood. By Statute, the LMCD was created in 1967. He explained that the mission is to preserve and enhance the "Lake Minnetonka experience". He noted that the LMCD has a new strategic plan for 2026. In the past, Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) was a major part of the LMCD's work, and the LMCD Board decided to include it again in this year's Strategic Plan. He added that the LMCD Board will work with stakeholders and partners to bring those programs to light in the future. He stated that the LMCD Board would continue to review the fee structure annually, with a specific focus on the reserves, at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Krueger reviewed the rental watercraft requirements, noting that in 2024, the LMCD Board passed an ordinance that was used in 2025 and again in 2026 for rental watercraft licensing. The ordinance requires all watercrafts, both restricted and non-restricted, that are rented on Lake Minnetonka to be inspected by Hennepin County Water Patrol and restricted watercraft to obtain a license through the LMCD. He added that this creates a safer environment. A sticker is now required on the watercraft upon the completion of inspection. He explained that nighttime bow fishing is a special event that takes place on the whole lake, after public comment from last year, from April 25 to June 30. The event takes place from one half hour after sunset until 1:00 A.M. This event is a recreational activity; it can reduce some of the crap on the lake and is becoming a tourism draw. He added that the event is still a pilot program and that, by holding it on the entire lake this year, the LMCD Board will look into an ordinance for the event in the future. He shared the 2026 budget and stated how all of the cities on the capacity take into account all the taxable market values. The maximum levy of \$942,665 set by statute last year. He shared that the net tax capacity is \$449,930,245; the city of Minnetonka's net capacity is deducted, as they pay a

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 5 of 22

maximum of 20 percent, leaving \$288,136,601 for the remaining 13 cities. He explained that the total levy for 2026 is \$375,000, with Shorewood's portion being \$33,305. He stated that in 2026, the levy will increase by \$375,000 due to his appointment as Executive Director, as there had been a contracted director prior. The increase is only 40 percent of the State of Minnesota's Maximum Levy Amount. He shared that, in reviewing the 2027 budget, the LMCD is projecting a 14 to 20 percent increase. Before the reduction, the levy was set at \$375,000 in 2021.

Mr. Krueger explained that in 2020, the LMCD decided to end the harvesting program and work with partnering agencies on that. Then, from 2021 to 2023, LMCD used proceeds from the sale of the harvesting equipment to award grants to local entities supporting AIS treatment efforts. He added that, at this time, LMCD does not have any active budgetary programs to manage AIS and may look into this in the future. The Save the Lake work group is working to determine how funds may be used to help educate and identify AIS in the future. He shared that in 2023, the LMCD adopted a new rule requiring all watercraft to maintain a minimum wake of 300 feet. The LMCD continues to work with Hennepin County Water Patrol to educate the public on the ordinance. He noted that in 2025, the Hennepin County Water Patrol made stops for both educational and enforcement purposes and will continue to do so. No tickets were issued to wake boat operators for violating the 300-foot ordinance, so the education seems to be helping. He stated that there is a 5-mile-per-hour speed limit on all boats within 300 feet of shore. The Board continues to hold on to that decision because the rule seems to be working. The LMCD will continue to work with various groups to educate the public about the rule, which seems to be more effective than simply passing an ordinance.

Mr. Krueger shared that in 2019, there was a change in LMCD authority in the legislature, removing the LMCD's ability to work on land-use-type opportunities. The LMCD does not currently deal with any land issues. He explained that, during the application process, applicants are also informed that they must work with State, County, and local officials. The LMCD is not always the final say beyond the dock itself.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked what the biggest threats to Lake Minnetonka are. Mr. Krueger stated that, from an organizational perspective, the focus would be on safety, codes, and speed enforcement. There are other environmental concerns, but the LMCD does not address them specifically. He noted that AIS will need to be discussed further, particularly regarding the different plant and animal species near the Lake. He stated that the LMCD would continue to work with other agencies and explore ways to address AIS in the future, using the right people and resources.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked what cities can do to work with the LMCD in supporting the mission. Mr. Krueger stated that the LMCD has a good relationship with the cities. He noted an opportunity for all the cities to come together to discuss the issues, then identify any concerns or reeducate people about what the LMCD is doing.

Mayor Labadie stated that she was glad to see that regulations related to boating licenses have expanded. She asked if the plan is to expand that rule until everyone on the whole lake has a license. Mr. Krueger explained that the rule is for rental watercraft. People are renting from a business on the lake or somewhere else. He stated that in the past, people could rent without a permit or inspection. Now, those renting commercial watercraft are required to display the stickers on their vessels. Mayor Labadie asked whether renters under a certain age were required to have a boater's license. Mr. Krueger noted that it is DNR, and the Water Patrol would be checking on that. He noted that the LMCD has been trying to educate people about the law through social

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 6 of 22

media and its website. Mayor Labadie noted that he liked the QR codes in the Summer Rules booklet that link to the DNR and other places. She asked whether the LMCD has partnered with any marinas or boat sellers in the area to provide similar QR codes so the information is accessible in those spaces. Mr. Krueger stated that those businesses carry brochures or marketing materials. He added that when people buy new boats, many of the items are discussed. The QR codes are also on certain landings. He shared that the LMCD has a good relationship with the marinas and boat sellers, but will continue to work on those relationships. Mayor Labadie stated that it is great because most boat operators want to follow the rules, but when the rules are changing so much, many people do not know they have changed. Mr. Krueger stated that the LMCD does not want to confuse people. He expressed hope that the LMCD would collaborate more with other agencies in the future.

Mayor Labadie asked how many water patrol boats Hennepin County has on Lake Minnetonka. Mr. Krueger stated that he did not know for sure.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked about the LMCD's decision to reduce funding for AIS and then reinstate it. She asked what had changed and where the funding would be found. Mr. Krueger stated that the LMCD was originally heavily involved in harvesting weeds in the lake. In 2021, that effort was stopped because it was very expensive and the LMCD was not sure that it was very effective. He stated that when the equipment was sold, the reserve fund was put in AIS and that the levy for the cities was reduced until the reserves were met. The reserves are now in the 25 to 30 percent range. He added that in 2023, the reserves funded grants to AIS. There are no additional funds at the time to put towards that. He explained that money could be raised through Save the Lake, and the cities could be levied more to do AIS.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked when the LMCD would decide whether to raise the levies for cities. Mr. Krueger stated that at the meeting in June, a decision would need to be made because it must be sent to the cities by the end of June. He noted that the levy does not currently include any AIS funding.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked the Staff to gather feedback from residents on the importance of AIS to them. Mr. Krueger noted that the LMCD welcomes feedback, and the cities of Minnetrista and Minnetonka have expressed interest in it as well. He shared that the LMCD could conduct a survey or something similar, as it is interested in the public's view.

B. Minnetonka Baseball Bigsy Tournament Request

Park and Recreation Director Czech presented the request as found in the Agenda Packet.

Mayor Labadie explained that because the MBA representatives are at the meeting, she would consider them applicants, and they can come to the microphone to answer questions, but it is not a public hearing. She noted that she was the Mayor at the time of the first request and that there is a significant difference between the two requests. This request focuses on one big tournament, and another big difference is that there was a loud outcry from the neighborhood next to the fields at that time. She stated that she had received no phone calls regarding the request, so she called some of the residents herself, as they are very informed and involved. The people she spoke with in Shorewood Ponds saw no problem with a limited event, and if there are complaints, then those would be shared with the Council. She noted that it was a reasonable request. She asked if the Council had heard from anyone in the surrounding area. Councilmember Sanschagrín noted that he reached out to one resident, Mr. Brecke, president of the homeowner's association for

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 7 of 22

Shorewood Ponds, and he was generally supportive because it was a single weekend, and he offered to communicate the event to the rest of the residents. He suggested conducting outreach to residents, inviting them to participate and enjoy the event. He asked who the residents should complain to if they are concerned about the noise. Park and Recreation Director Czech noted that the MBA staff would be at the tournament, but if residents do not want to go down there, then it could be addressed like any park issue by using the parks line or his own number. He shared that the Staff would not be in the office, but he would take ownership if a call came through with a noise complaint to notify MBA.

Councilmember Maddy stated that he lives close to Freeman Park. In moving there, people know that it is a Regional Park. He loves the activities at the Park. If the music is restricted to one weekend, then it should be allowed to let the kids have their fun. He supports the request.

Councilmember Gorham stated he has enforceability questions: how is it determined what is too loud, how are reasonable levels decided, who monitors it, and how is appropriate music decided. Councilmember Maddy asked if Councilmember Gorham is asking for an A-weighted decibel level that cannot be exceeded. Councilmember Gorham stated that is how noise ordinances usually work. Councilmember Maddy shared that he used to enforce noise ordinances, but for this, let the kids play their music. Mayor Labadie noted that if Park and Recreation Director Czech is giving the Council some assurances, the Tournament Director is on site. Residents listening to the meeting: if they live in the neighborhood and the noise is too loud, or they like the tournament, let their feedback be known. She added that as long as the MBA knows this is not a precedent-setting situation, but a trial, then she is for it. Park and Recreation Director Czech shared that he set the precedent since this did not go well last time, and if it does not go well this time or does not pass, then this is not something the City would go through every year. He added that the term "reasonable level" is vague, and in the last proposal, there was a decibel-level requirement, but the question became how to enforce it. The MBA is more than willing to cooperate and comply, as this may be the last opportunity to allow music at the tournament.

Mayor Labadie stated that, regarding the appropriateness of the music, most of the people involved in running the organization are parents, and she would be fine with their discretion.

Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that she is fine with the request, as long as Park and Recreation Director Czech is comfortable shutting things down if the city receives two noise complaints from residents. She noted that the Council will have to okay things and let it be, or the city will have to put someone there to monitor the music. She added that the request is a little ambiguous and not well articulated about what is acceptable and what is not. She stated concern over two people calling in, and then that would be over for the music. Mayor Labadie stated that it is a good point, and if someone is leaving a complaint that weekend, they need to provide their name and address so the City can verify the complaint and invite them to the discussion of the request. She noted that the interest is to protect and serve the Shorewood residents, and that cannot be done unless the name and address are given in this case. Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether things would be shut down if two phone calls were received. Mayor Labadie stated that she did not think those parameters were being set at this meeting. Councilmember Maddy stated that, as written, the resolution allows any two people to shut down the music. He suggested removing number two from the resolution. Mayor Labadie noted no problem removing number two under the Now Therefore section of the Resolution. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that if something cannot be enforced, then it should not be in the resolution. She added that it is a trial for this year, and action will be taken next year. Any two people can call in and shut the whole thing down right now. Councilmember Gorham pointed out that the language is per team.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 8 of 22

Tina McIntyre, 16211 Temple Drive, Minnetonka, shared that there are over 40 teams, and not all 40 teams will be at Freeman. She added that another city permitted them to have music. She added that Freeman will be full for games, but not with all of the teams. At the end of the day, MBA is trying to promote a positive baseball experience for the kids. She stated that music at tournaments is a known thing. MBA is asking the City to trust them for this tournament.

Councilmember Gorham asked how the information would be distributed to the staff, teams, coaches, and volunteers. Ms. McIntyre shared that an email will be sent to all coaches as the tournament approaches and that the parameters will be shared. She added that this is also communicated at coaches' meetings at the beginning of the season and is a well-known rule, so the coaches are responsible for letting away teams know this is the park's rule.

Mayor Labadie pointed out that MBA has nothing to gain from being obnoxious but much to gain from following the guidelines. She noted the points regarding the language in number two and would be willing to remove the point entirely.

Maddy moved, Sanschagrin seconded, Approving RESOLUTION NO. 26-32, "A Resolution Approving Music for the 2026 Minnetonka Baseball Association Bigsy Baseball Tournament on June 5-6, 2026." removing point number two.

Motion passed 4-1 (Gorham).

C. Appeal hearing on a Massage Therapist License Denial

City Clerk/HR Director Thone summarized the denial of a massage therapist license as found in the Agenda Packet. She noted that the Applicant, Ms. Zhao, was present if there were any questions.

Mayor Labadie asked if the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (TDLR) is working with former students. Ms. Thone clarified that TDLR is working with current and former students of the program to verify their legitimacy and whether any certifications or course hours can be found. The City requires that massage therapists provide a transcript of their hours and proof of graduation from the program. She added that, since the school is being accused of falsifying records, TDLR is working with the students to validate the certifications and hours of legitimate students. She noted that it could be a path for the Applicant to go down to get things legitimized so the credentials meet the city code.

Councilmember Gorham asked how the City found out the information. Ms. Thone shared that a background check is conducted on all applicants, and this information came up during that check. Councilmember Gorham asked if the school was then called. Ms. Thone stated that the school was contacted. Councilmember Gorham asked if anyone was at the school. Ms. Thone explained there was no response from the school and that a further search revealed that the TDLR had shut the school down.

Mayor Labadie asked how many massage therapists have applied to work at the location to which the Applicant has applied. Ms. Thone stated that this year, just one Applicant. She noted that she was providing historical references showing that it is typical for the City to deny applicants because applicants must meet the requirements to obtain the license. Others have been denied

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 9 of 22

in similar scenarios; this issue has become a problem not just in Minnesota but across the United States.

The Applicant handed out copies of her statement to the Council.

Zoe Cybert, translator for Quiyan (Helen) Zhao, 5960 Grant Street, read the statement from the Applicant: Shorewood City Councilmembers, I, Quiyan (Helen) Zhao, respectfully request reconsideration of the denial of my massage license application. It cost me thousands of dollars in tuition, airfare, and boarding while I attended the school in Texas. Since then, I have been licensed in St. Louis Park in 2025 and am currently licensed in 2026. I perform massages in a professional environment and conduct myself in an honorable manner. The fact that the school has had its license suspended in the last 90 days does not reflect dishonorably on me, or at least it should not. Also, my time of license issuance reflects a time when the school was licensed and in compliance in the state of Texas. It is for this reason that I request a reconsideration of your decision to issue me a license in Shorewood. I reside in Shorewood and would prefer to work closer to my residence. Thank you for your time in this manner. Sincerely, Quiyan Zhao.

Mayor Labadie asked the translator to tell the Applicant that no one is thinking of her dishonorably.

Mayor Labadie stated that just a short time ago, the business itself appeared before the Council. She asked if the Applicant is the business owner. Ms. Thone stated no. Mayor Labadie asked if the business owner also has a massage license. Ms. Thone explained that in the City of Shorewood, there is a business massage therapy license, and each therapist must have their own individual license as well. Mayor Labadie clarified that the issue before the Council is not the business's complete shutdown, but rather concerns a particular massage therapist Applicant. Ms. Thone added that it is just an individual massage therapist license holder who would like to provide those services at Tonka Wellness.

Councilmember Maddy asked if there are continuing education requirements. He noted that if his school were to shut down, that would not leave him with nothing. He asked whether she had gone to the school when it met the regulations, and that this had nothing to do with her. Ms. Thone stated that she cannot answer the second part of the question; she can only apply the Code consistently across the board. She noted that this is an issue for everyone who was licensed there because it makes it more difficult to earn continuing education credits, since the school can no longer offer them. She added that the continuing education credits could be received elsewhere. The biggest issue students from the school will have is getting their license in a city. She shared that each city has different licensing codes, but if the cities understand the situation, the credibility of the certification and transcripts is in question. She explained that the school typically sends an unopened transcript directly to requesters which ensures its credibility, but that is not possible in this case, making it difficult for the city to validate. The TDLR is intervening on behalf of legitimate students by seeking validation based on the school's records. She shared that she does not know what the TDLR will provide, but they may be able to validate the Applicant.

Councilmember Maddy asked whether the City is waiting on TDLR to provide validation or is cutting off the Applicant until records of completion are received. Ms. Thone stated that it would be a question for the Council. She added that whatever is decided will set a precedent, because there are others out there with similar questionable credentials, and the Applicant may very well have valid credentials, but she has no way to know that. She asked if the City should wait for

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 10 of 22

TDLR. She noted that she cannot answer whether to wait; she can only apply the Code and cannot make arbitrary decisions based on assumptions.

Councilmember Gorham asked if the TDLR option had been communicated to the Applicant. Ms. Thone stated that the option had been communicated. Councilmember Gorham asked if the city had heard any update from the Applicant. Ms. Thone stated that she does not know if the Applicant has explored the option. This is the first step at Council; based on the decision, the Applicant will go from there. If the denial is upheld, the next step would be to go to the TDLR. She added that if TDLR can validate the Applicant's credentials and those align with the Code, then the license could be issued. Councilmember Gorham stated that the Council could reverse the denial and issue the license, but doing so would mean approving a license from an unaccredited institution with a history of malfeasance. He asked, in the context of that information, that the denial is not that uncommon in this industry. Ms. Thone stated that it is correct. She added that it also opens the City up to what would be done when a different applicant comes in with the same situation.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether adding conditions to the request, such as a time to explore the TDLR option, would allow anything. Ms. Thone stated that the Council can either uphold the denial and send the Applicant information on how to validate their credentials. The application would be reconsidered based on validation from TDLR, or the license would be approved without knowing. She added that a condition could be added stating that if the license were not validated within three months, it would be pulled. Councilmember Gorham stated that it is hard to know, since he is not familiar with the process for going through TDLR. Ms. Thone shared that no one knows the process because this does not happen very often, and TDLR is just trying to help the students.

Mayor Labadie pointed out that the memo outlines numerous ways the Applicant could be licensed. She asked whether point number two was the only option being discussed. Ms. Thone shared that it is the only option that the Applicant meets. Mayor Labadie clarified that the Applicant has not obtained an associate's degree, has not taken the national exam for therapeutic massage, and has not been previously licensed by the City. She added that point two is the only option, and the Applicant does not meet the criteria. She noted that she was worried about the Council setting precedence, since other applicants have been denied. She shared that the Applicant should be encouraged to work with the TDLR or pursue one of the other options.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if the Applicant had provided any documentation to support option two. Ms. Thone stated that she has provided the 500 hours and the certificate of program completion. Councilmember Sanschagrín stated that, upon reviewing the Code, she found that it does not address validation. He added that his concern is that the City is overreaching with this denial, because the City does not say that it needs to validate it with the institution; it just states that there are requirements. The Code does not say that if the organization is no longer certified, the Applicant does not meet the requirements. Mayor Labadie stated that there is no way for Ms. Thone to verify that 500 hours have been completed, because there is no one to reach out to. Councilmember Gorham noted that falsifying accreditations is different from going out of business. Ms. Thone shared that the school no longer meets the accreditation criteria; this has been in the works for a long time. She stated that when the Applicant completed the program last year, were the records falsified, and did she complete the program to get the certificate? This is unknown to the City. Ms. Thone explained that the Applicant is probably a very nice person and maybe did everything correctly, but that cannot be validated, and other therapists have been turned away for the same reasons. She explained that it is a public safety concern as well. The

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 11 of 22

City provides legitimate businesses licenses based on the qualifications and regulations. In addition, the massage therapy industry wants to make sure that businesses in the communities are reputable. She has no way to validate the information, which is concerning, especially given the trends in this industry. Mayor Labadie stated that if the denial is upheld, the Council is not stating that the Applicant has falsified anything. She shared that the school that issued her license was shut down for falsifying student records. She agreed that until the City has validation, this is a proper denial. If the Council were to approve the license, it would open the door to others. She added that the Council has a duty to look out for the Shorewood residents. She noted that she would vote to support the recommendation to deny the license.

Councilmember Gorham stated that if the Council decides to uphold the license denial, the Applicant will be informed, with Ms. Thone and the translator, that the pathway is clear. Ms. Thone summarized that if the Council upholds the denial, the Council would like Ms. Thone to inform the Applicant and the translator of the remaining opportunities to obtain the license: either obtain validation from TDLR or take the national examination. Councilmember Maddy shared that either option would meet the Code. Mayor Labadie stated that, unless the Code is modified, upholding the decision is necessary.

Mayor Labadie noted that Councilmember DiGruttolo had dropped off the Zoom call.

Gorham moved, Maddy seconded, Affirming the Denial of the License.

Motion passed 4-0.

D. 25485 State Highway 7 Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept Plan

Planner Osowski presented on the Concept Plan for a PUD as found in the Agenda Packet.

Planning Commissioner Magistad shared that the Commission liked aspects of the Concept Plan: the project extends the water main, the tree replacement plan is more than adequate, and the rezoning request fits with the particular intersection. He noted the cautionary items with the plan: the density as it affects the impervious surface displacement, which is one of the listed conditions, and the Applicant seemed open to adjusting the density. He added a note from a resident in Walnut Grove on the north side, who was concerned about noise and what natural barriers would shield the older development from the newer one. He pointed out that the biggest thing is the MnDOT Highway 7 project, the unknowns around it, and how that would affect it. He explained that one perspective is that it is not the first project to grow up around a MnDOT project, and that things do need to move forward. The Commission requested MnDOT's perspective on the project to determine whether the right-of-way, as drawn, is adequate. He stated he did not know if the feedback would come. He added that the Commission was unanimous in its concerns.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if the Commission went into detail about the traffic impact. Commissioner Magistad stated that the public has raised safety concerns. Safety is a concern, but it is hard to answer right now because what will happen to the intersection is unknown.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked about the need to make a right turn and how likely that would be. Planner Osowski asked if Councilmember Sanschagrín was talking about the three-quarter turn in the intersection. Councilmember Sanschagrín stated that it was correct. Planner Osowski noted that right now, that is the proposed improvement to the intersection. Assuming that all of the funding plays out, and after talking with the project manager, all of the funding was received

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 12 of 22

for the recommended improvements. He added that if everything goes as planned, a three-quarter inspection will be conducted on site. MnDOT was tight-lipped about the project because it is still in the planning phase.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked how far back the proposed trees will be from Highway 7 and what the impact will be on sight lines. Planner Osowski stated that, on the tree replacement plan, the trees appear to be right up next to the lot line. Planning Director Griffiths stated that one of the comments from City Engineer Budde was to review the sightlines and, when the City receives a more concrete tree replacement plan, ensure that none of the trees impede sightlines. He shared that there appears to be adequate room to make the changes. Currently, the Applicant proposes to place the trees as close to the property line as possible without entering MnDOT's right-of-way, which is about 30 feet from the traveled portion of the road. He explained that the main place to pay attention to sightline impacts is when a person turns the corner, but the Staff is monitoring that for potential future phases of the project.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether the Planning Commission discussed rezoning the parcel before the Comprehensive Plan process kicks off. Commissioner Magistad stated that it was not discussed directly, but there was some sensitivity to the rezoning in general and to the concerns. Nothing was raised regarding the timing of the new Comprehensive Plan, but the Commissioners acknowledged that this was not a trivial adjustment. He added that the Planning Commission agreed that this type of project was a good fit for this intersection. Councilmember Gorham asked what that was based on. Commissioner Magistad stated it was based on opinion. He noted that the project is on Highway 7, that there are not many other low-density units nearby, that it is on a major thoroughfare, and that it seemed to fit visually.

Ben Passolt, Civil Engineer for the Applicant at 3625 Glendale Terrace, Minneapolis, stated that he would take any questions the Council has for the Applicant.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked whether the Applicant had considered the high-water table in the area. Mr. Passolt stated that they are aware of the high-water table, but because of the large green space at the east and north ends of the property, the Applicant feels confident that there may be an option to handle the runoff.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if the proposed units would have basements. Mr. Passolt stated the units would not have basements.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether the Applicant had seen MnDOT's comment regarding noise mitigation. Mr. Passolt stated the comment was seen, but, as a concept plan at this time, the Applicant is not looking into noise mitigation and is more concerned with whether the option can be pursued. Councilmember Gorham noted that the noise mitigation might affect the minimum lot density. Mr. Passolt asked if the Councilmember was referring to noise density along Highway 7. Councilmember Gorham stated noise mitigation on the property. Mr. Passolt noted that although it was just a concept plan, the Applicant could propose different trees to mitigate noise.

Mayor Labadie shared that she likes that the process allows the Applicant to get a feel for where the Council stands without incurring an exorbitant cost. She asked Planner Osowski to show the slide titled Analysis. She stated that although increasing the density in the City is appealing, it is something the Met Council is asking cities to do. She noted that this is not the location to increase the density. The properties nearby are substantially lower than what is being proposed; she did

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 13 of 22

not see how making this property higher-density at one of the more dangerous intersections is an appropriate decision. She stated that four letters in the Agenda Packet said "stop development" and "do not build houses"; that is not what she is saying. She shared that the land can be developed, but to go beyond what the Code permits, the project must obtain special approval. She added that she is not willing to give this parcel a density higher than the surrounding developments. She noted that she would not support the concept plan as presented, but if a lower-density plan were proposed in the future, she might entertain it. She added that even the five houses discussed at the Planning Commission meeting are too many for this particular parcel.

Councilmember Gorham stated that the area is zoned R1-A and is proposed to be changed to R-3A, but the Comprehensive Plan states otherwise. The Plan is preempting the Comprehensive Plan process that is about to begin. He explained that the application requests a PUD to rezone and to override the Comprehensive Plan process. He asked why a PUD should be approved for the site. He noted not getting much of the "why" behind this site being a PUD. Mr. Passolt explained the reason behind the PUD. In considering all potential developments for the site, the Applicant evaluated the R-3A option. The R-3A option was one unit per 7,000 square feet; with the site's initial total area, before seating the right-of-way, the Applicant was at 5.85 units per 1,000 feet. This was just shy of the six units, but due to the constraints of the site. He added that, with the impervious two, the Applicant is giving up green space to the City as a right-of-way. So the previous exceeds if what is currently on the property is included, but it is not as over as it would be. Councilmember Gorham stated that the pervious surface is way over for what is zoned there, and nothing is really being given back. Mr. Passolt agreed, but from a development standpoint and in terms of what could be done on the lot, this was the highest and best use of the land. Councilmember Gorham asked about the highest and best use for whom. Mr. Passolt shared with the developer and the residents who could live in the City.

Mayor Labadie asked whether a simple majority is required to proceed with the concept plan. Planning Director Griffiths stated that it is correct. Mayor Labadie shared that if anyone else votes no, as she did, then the concept plan is done. Councilmember Gorham noted that he would like to hear the Applicant out fully. Mr. Passolt shared that the Applicant is ultimately seeking clarification on what is allowed on the site. There was a single-family home on the site, but everything else around it has increased in density. He noted that the Applicant is open to going to four or even five units if approved by the City Council. Councilmember Gorham stated that the site is currently zoned for R-1A. He asked what the Comprehensive Plan states. Planning Director Griffiths shared that the Comprehensive Plan matches. The site is zoned for minimum-density R1-A, which would allow one home. Councilmember Gorham asked what the Comprehensive Plan is designed for. Planning Director Griffiths stated that minimum density residential, which is zero to one house, is. He added that under the current zoning rules, the most that could be built on the property with a building permit would be one single-family home. Any other request would require the Applicant to return before the Council for a Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Councilmember Gorham asked whether the parcel would be considered in any capacity during the Comprehensive Plan process. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the parcel could be, but if the Council's direction is no, the parcel should be minimum-density residential. The property would not be viewed as part of the Comprehensive Plan. That would be the direction for the site, given the rationale that is described. He noted that requests for Comprehensive Plan amendments or rezoning can be submitted at any time. The site's path is up to the Council.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 14 of 22

Councilmember Sanschagrín shared that he is concerned about safety and is leaning toward voting no. Councilmember Maddy stated that he is on record voting against the density of the golf course and the adjacent north development. He added that the project seems reasonable, but is asking too much for what the Comprehensive Plan has. He is against the project. Mayor Labadie stated that, for her, it is the parcel's actual location. She shared that she cannot support that high a density, when she has been advocating for a decade for safety at the intersection.

Merle Steinkraus, the Applicant, stated that he was seeking to determine exactly what would be allowed on the property. He shared that the parcel is surrounded by medium density: four houses per acre across the road and two houses per acre to the north. He added that it is unlikely that someone would want to buy the one-acre lot, surrounded by medium-density, and on Highway 7. It makes sense to add a few more buildings to the site. He asked how many could be done on the site. Councilmember Maddy pointed out that the Applicant requested six units per acre. Mr. Steinkraus stated that he decided to start high. Councilmember Maddy stated that that is what the process is about. The Council and the Applicant can meet of the mind to determine what would be reasonable for the site. Mr. Steinkraus shared that in the last meeting, they concluded that adding another five houses would not have much impact on traffic at the intersection. A right-turn-only configuration at that intersection will also make it much safer. Councilmember Maddy agreed. Mayor Labadie agreed with the points as well, but six does not sit well with her. She added that no matter what is suggested tonight, the matter would have to go before the Council again. Mr. Steinkraus noted that he would love to hear some of the guidance. Mayor Labadie shared that five or six units are too much. Councilmember Maddy stated that four units are fourfold of what the property rights allow, but are not too far from what the neighboring communities have done.

Mayor Labadie asked for the slide showing low-density versus high-density to be shown. She read from the slide: low density is one to two units per acre; medium density is six to eight units per acre. She asked what three or four units per acre would be. Planner Osowski explained that it is low- to medium-density. Mayor Labadie pointed out that there is a designation in between. Planner Osowski stated that the proposed six bumps up to the medium density. The Planning Commission's recommendation is to allow five units, resulting in a low- to medium-density designation. The Council could approve the resolution for the five or reduce further if that is what is fit for the site.

Councilmember Maddy asked whether it would make sense to change the Comprehensive Plan to low- to medium-density and then follow the rules instead of the PUD. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the Council could provide that direction.

Mayor Labadie asked if low to medium would authorize three to five units. Planner Osowski stated that the Staff would have to consult the Comprehensive Plan to make sure.

Councilmember Gorham stated that the City has a process that should be used instead of a one-off PUD.

Planner Osowski shared that, for low- to medium-density, it is three to six units per acre.

Mayor Labadie noted that she had trouble with the impervious surface issue as well. Mr. Steinkraus explained that the impervious surface requirement was not met because of the strip of land given to the City. That was why the proposal was reduced to five units to meet the

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 15 of 22

requirements. He added that if that is an issue, then they could come back with a proposal for four that would meet the criteria. Mayor Labadie stated that four units would be better.

Councilmember Gorham stated that the parcel is one of the last and a focal point for the City, as everyone is watching what happens to it. There are safety concerns. He shared that the decision is important and does not want to make it whimsically, as is being done. He stated that giving the parcel the thought it deserves is part of the Comprehensive Plan process. Mayor Labadie suggested not making the Applicant wait that long.

Planning Director Griffiths explained that the next step, if the Applicant chose to move forward, would be to apply for a Comprehensive Plan amendment. For a Comprehensive Plan amendment, the Council will not be reviewing the site plans. Only the change to the Comprehensive Plan would be reviewed, and whether it would make sense given the property's location. He added that if there is specific feedback on the property, this is the time to provide it. The next submission will not be an updated concept plan.

Councilmember Gorham stated that the Applicant is seeking guidance and wants to ensure the Council's guidance is thoughtful.

Mayor Labadie asked to do the concept plan. How much did that cost the Applicant? Planning Director Griffiths shared that the concept plan process is optional. The Staff strongly encouraged the Applicant to go through this process. Planner Osowski stated that the total cost is \$2,500, including the fee and escrow, so some of the escrow could be refunded. Mayor Labadie asked if the Council could direct that an amended concept plan be submitted. Planning Director Griffiths stated that the City Code does not require a concept plan, so the Council cannot require the Applicant to submit an application that the Code does not require. The Council could strongly indicate that it is the desire. Mayor Labadie asked whether the \$2,500 is mainly for staff time. Planning Director Griffiths shared that, at this time, the escrow covers the legal and engineering review, the cost of the review, and the public notice. Mayor Labadie asked whether, if the Council suggested submitting a new concept plan, there would be an additional \$2,500 fee. Planning Director Griffiths stated that his take would be that if the Council decided against this concept plan, that would close the application, and a new application would be needed. The process would start over again.

Mr. Steinkraus asked whether, if the Council allowed them to build four buildings on the lot, the City would have a say over how the buildings look. Planning Director Griffiths stated, potentially. He added that if the application met the City Code, the Council would have less discretion, but if the PUD continued, there would be more discretion depending on the nature of the application.

Councilmember Maddy asked whether there was an option to go to low- to medium-change, and then the Applicant would be able to build whatever-looking buildings they want. Planning Director Griffiths stated that if the Council required the property to be in the Comprehensive Plan, the zoning district would match. The Applicant could submit an application that fully complies with the City Code. He added that building permit plans would not be reviewed, but the subdivision process would still need to take place. Mayor Labadie explained that if the parcel were rezoned, the applicant could put whatever they want there that meets the zoning code, with low- to medium-density uses potentially up to five houses. Planning Director Griffiths shared that the property was not part of any adjacent development and is the remnant of the Walnut Grove project to the north. He added that had it been a part of the project, there would have been a different design.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 16 of 22

Councilmember Maddy stated that he would rather amend the Comprehensive Plan than approve a PUD because the City has adopted a higher-density baseline, and this parcel is a remnant. Mayor Labadie shared that she is now willing to do that because it could allow for 5.9 houses on the lot, which is too dense. She would rather keep the zoning as is and allow the Applicant to apply for a different type of PUD.

Councilmember Sanschagrín clarified that there is not a 0.9 home that could be on the property. Planning Director Griffiths stated that, on the property, the maximum would be five homes.

Councilmember Sanschagrín stated that the location is the problem for him. Mr. Steinkraus stated that the location seems ideal for him. Councilmember Sanschagrín explained that if he knew for sure that only the right turn would go in, he would have an easier time with it. Mr. Passolt shared that the concept plan shows a 30-foot setback along the south side to maximize the distance from the new development to the north. He stated that the drive aisle could be pushed north to try to preserve trees, allow more storm ponding, and increase the distance from the neighbors. He shared that the whole thing could be shifted about 20 feet north, resulting in a 50-foot setback from the existing 75-foot right-of-way.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if one home or one to two homes were allowed. Planning Director Griffiths stated one to two, but this is where the differentiation between the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance comes into play. The Comprehensive Plan states that, in theory, one to two units should work if there is enough land. He explained that this property has a minimum lot size of one acre, so one unit can be built on this property. He added that under the current Zoning Ordinance, the Applicant could have only one unit on the property because it is not two acres. The Applicant could choose several options to comply with the City's rules.

Planning Director Griffiths summarized the Council's many concerns. There has been no feedback that the Council agrees with the Planning Commission's recommendation. He explained that the next step would be to give the Staff direction to prepare a resolution for denial, including the points from the discussion and any other specific findings to include. That will be brought back at an upcoming meeting.

Mayor Labadie spoke with the Applicant and stated that they would need to present the Council with an alternative idea if the concept plan is denied.

Councilmember Gorham summarized that the Council does not, at this time, seem comfortable with more than one unit on the property. He added that he would like to know more about MnDOT's one-way decision.

Gorham moved, Maddy seconded, Directing Staff to draft a Resolution for Consideration at an Upcoming Meeting to deny the PUD Concept Plan Application based on the City Council's discussion and stated findings of fact.

Motion passed 4-0.

E. Legislative Changes to AB Voting

City Clerk/HR Director Thone shared the changes to AB Voting as found in the Agenda Packet, including the option to change the AB/Early Voting period from 46 days before the elections to 18 days, as recently passed.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 17 of 22

Councilmember Gorham asked if this would result in less voting, the same amount of voting, or more voting. Ms. Thone stated that the City always has an excellent turnout. She shared that she did not believe it would affect turnout; people will flex when they vote. This change does not limit mail-in voting or in-person voting at the County. She added that the change would shorten the 46 days for city voting whenever an election is held. She explained that last year there were five elections, and the election staff all have full-time jobs outside of elections, making it hard to do both within the 46 days. She noted that the preferred method for voting is Early Voting or feeding your ballot directly into the ballot counter. There is not much traffic on those 28 days of AB voting days, but it is still a lot of work. She explained AB voters are essentially doing the same steps as mail-in voting with the exception that city staff are sending the envelopes with the ballots to the county. She explained that many voters who come in during this time, find out they cannot feed their ballots into the ballot counter, and come back when they can. She noted that it feels like a good balance to reduce the 46 days to 18 of all Early Voting for the Shorewood Staff and the community.

Councilmember Maddy asked whether the 18 days could be reduced to seven days. Ms. Thone explained that five years ago the Direct Balloting period was at seven, then it went to 14, and then in 2023 it went to 18 days. She shared that 18 is the current option.

Mayor Labadie explained that the League of Minnesota did get behind the cities, especially the smaller ones, and that this passed with bipartisan support. The change received overwhelming support from the local mayors as well. She supports the 18-day change.

Councilmember Gorham asked which option Tonka Bay was looking at. Ms. Thone shared that all three options were available to the cities. She noted that she does not know what Tonka Bay is proposing, but all 13 cities are bringing it to their councils because of the June 1 deadline to get the choice to the State. Most are recommending the 18 days.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked, during a prior discussion of the election judges, whether the pay was calculated based on the 46 days or the 18 days. She also asked whether there is concern for those who might miss out, such as those who leave for the winter or those expecting it to be just the way it always is. Ms. Thone shared that a communications plan is in place, and this change does not mean people cannot vote during those 46 days. There will not be in-person voting at the city for the 28 days until the 18-day mark, but people can still vote in person at the county or drop their ballot off at city hall for staff to send to the county. She explained that a new initiative requires that each ballot be initialed, so the City may have one election judge each day for the 18 days to ensure there is enough staff. She added that a \$9,000 grant from the County will be used to pay the election judges.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked for clarification on the distinction between absentee voting and advanced voting under the legislative changes. Ms. Thone shared that absentee voting is available for 46 days before the election, which includes the 18-day early voting period. During the first 28 days of the 46-day absentee voting period, the person is just coming in, voting the ballot, putting the vote in the secrecy envelope and the other envelopes, witnessing it, and then the city couriers those to the County. It is very similar to mail-in voting. Early voting is feeding the ballot into the ballot counter, much like on election day.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked how voters receive mail-in voting ballots. Ms. Thone shared that there are several options: request a ballot from Hennepin County, which takes about half a

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 18 of 22

week; pick up ballots at City Hall during AB voting; or use 18-day early voting. If the City goes to 18 days, all of the ballots would come from the County. That would save additional money on printing the ballots. Councilmember Sanschagrín stated that the person would pick up the ballots from City Hall or request them from the County. Ms. Thone stated that it is correct. Many Shorewood residents are already on a mail-in permanent absentee ballot list with the County and automatically receive ballots by mail. She added that if a resident comes in to vote but has a mail-in ballot, the ballot is spoiled and removed from the voting system. Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if that would be explained in the communication plan. Ms. Thone stated that it would be explained.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked about the two different resolutions to be decided between. Ms. Thone explained that the 18 days would be applied to either both elections or to the primary, and that the 46 days would be kept for the general. Councilmember Sanschagrín asked whether Staff was recommending that the first 18 days be applied to both elections. Ms. Thone explained that it was correct.

Sanschagrín moved, Maddy seconded, Approving RESOLUTION NO 26-29, “Approving Change to AB Voting Period.” The first option; switching to an 18-day voting period for all elections.

Motion passed 5-0.

F. 2026 Deer Management Program Agreement

Planner Osowski presented the Agreement as found in the Agenda Packet.

Mayor Labadie noted that the Council recently discussed the Program at length. She asked if there were any questions for the Staff.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked whether any other approaches to deer management have been considered. Planning Director Griffiths shared that, as part of the Staff’s annual review of the program, they speak with the Conservation Officer. He noted that the issues that Shorewood faces with the deer population are not unique. He added that hunting is the best method for reducing the population. Some cities have ordinances requiring residents to act in a certain way. Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if there is any conversation about the potential use of contraceptive vaccines on deer. Planning Director Griffiths stated that there has been no conversation about that, and he looked that up, and contraceptive chemicals are illegal in Minnesota to use for controlling population unless done for a research project. Hunting is what most of the surrounding communities do. There will be issues that come up with this program. He added that if the program continues, there will be requests from individual neighborhoods. Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if capturing the deer is an option. Planning Director Griffiths shared that typically, that is not an option. He guessed that not enough deer would be captured to make it worth it. In conversation with the DNR officers, generally, animals find their way back. Councilmember Sanschagrín asked that other options be brought to the Council in the future.

Sanschagrín moved, Maddy seconded, Approving the Attached 2026 Deer Management Program Agreement.

Motion passed 4-1 (DiGruttolo).

G. Vine Ridge Neighborhood Petition Against Deer Management Program on Adjacent City-Owned Properties

Planner Osowski shared the information on the petition as found in the Agenda Packet.

Mayor Labadie stated that she sees no problem with granting the residents' request.

Sanschagrín moved, Gorham seconded, Acknowledging the Vine Ridge Neighborhood Petition and Removing Silverwood Park and 19605 Waterford Place from the Deer Management Plan Program Going Forward.

Motion passed 4-1 (Maddy).

5. STAFF AND COUNCIL REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Staff

i. Response: Duane Laurila, Matter from the Floor

Mayor Labadie asked if the memo stands for itself. City Administrator Nevinski shared that it stands for itself.

Councilmember Sanschagrín noted concern with the memo not being specific enough. He added that the specific response is what residents are looking for.

Mayor Labadie asked whether the information had been sent to Mr. Laurila. City Administrator Nevinski stated that the information was just included in the Agenda Packet.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that the resident identified a critical governance issue: that changes over time are not an adopted policy. She added that the Staff needs to explain to the resident what the policy is, when the policy was formally adopted, and where those decisions could be located in the formal record. She asked if the Staff needs any official policy direction from the Council in the future that should be included in the letter.

Mayor Labadie asked what Councilmembers Sanschagrín and DiGruttolo are proposing. No action is needed on this item. Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that the language needs to be added to the memo about when the policy changed and where residents can locate those decisions in the public record. Councilmember Sanschagrín shared that more specifics on the math used for the changes are being added. The residents have to go to the budget and calculate it themselves; instead, the information could be explained in the memo.

Mayor Labadie asked that the memo be amended and included on the agenda for the next meeting.

Park and Recreation Director Czech shared that last week there was the kick-off meeting for the SCEC Task Force, and it was a really good, productive meeting. He noted that there were many perspectives. He added that the meeting did not go too deep into the details, but it set some things up and brainstormed in the end. People on the Task Force who have never been in the building think the SCEC is a valuable amenity, and there are ways to enhance the building. There was a lot of discussion about marketing. He shared that on May 27, there was a Parks Unplugged

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 20 of 22

event at Camp Fire from 5:00 to 8:00 P.M. He explained that the MBA Tournament would be June 5 and 6, and the Tonka Splash Tournament would be at Freeman from June 12 to 14.

Mayor Labadie asked how well attended the last Parks Unplugged event was. Mr. Czech noted that it was not great; there was only one person there specifically for the event, and they recruited others. Over time, 12 to 15 people attended. Mayor Labadie thanked the Staff for the outreach. Mr. Czech stated that those who came learned a lot about trees.

Planning Director Griffiths shared that things have been busy with the construction season. He noted that the Legislative session had ended, and, fortunately, none of the proposed zoning reforms that the Council had passed a resolution opposing had been passed. He added that the Staff is monitoring one piece of legislation that passed relative to homeowner's associations. He explained that at a previous meeting, the Council approved a boundary adjustment with Tonka Bay, and Tonka Bay approved the adjustment as well, so the Staff is working with the State to finalize the boundary adjustment. He shared that there are two opportunities for public engagement: feedback on the draft of the Zoning Code update and a survey on the Comprehensive Plan website. He asked the Council to share about the website. Residents can visit shorewoodmn.gov/compplan to complete the survey and sign up for email updates.

City Administrator Nevinski updated that the Council approved the Mill Street Watermain project. Chanhassen Water serves the area, and the City has been in contact with them throughout the planning process to discuss various matters. He shared that conversations have continued, but the City has hit a bit of a hurdle with Chanhassen, as they are suggesting that there should be connection charges paid to Chanhassen for Shorewood properties. He noted that this could have a significant impact on the project budget. In 2026, an agreement was put in place for the purchase of water from Chanhassen, which included installing a meter and a pipe. There was a charge at the time, and there have been several connections since then that have not paid charges. He stated that the matter will likely be before the Council shortly. He explained that the bonding bill included no funds for Highway 7. Considering this, the City will meet with the Highway 7 group to discuss the regional solicitation and move forward with the project. The consultant is meeting with MnDOT to discuss different things. He added that there is also a question about who the applicant is, so one city may have to handle that.

B. Mayor and City Council

Councilmember Gorham asked if there is a petition from Yellowstone for a sidewalk. City Administrator Nevinski shared that nothing had been submitted. There have been inquiries, and part of the conversation has been that the topic is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan process. He added that it would be a good location for the conversation. Councilmember Gorham asked if any past studies had been communicated to the group. City Administrator Nevinski stated that he was unaware of any studies. Councilmember Gorham noted that the area had been discussed previously. Councilmember Maddy noted that it was talked about, but the geography makes it difficult. City Administrator Nevinski stated that there may be a conversation underway with the City Engineer, but he is not aware of any petition.

Councilmember Sanschagrin stated he attended the recycling event, that it seemed to go well, and that he looked forward to hearing from the Staff on that. He also attended the severe weather discussion at the Fire Department and learned a great deal from it.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 21 of 22

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked whether there is a timeline for hiring a new fire chief. Mayor Labadie stated that the EFD board meets on May 27 and would discuss the matter.

Mayor Labadie shared that she attended the work session with the Minnetonka Schools, David Law, the Superintendent, and the mayors of the cities proper. They discussed classroom technology and the idea of changing the district calendar. She stated that school starts before Labor Day because the school has added additional holidays and is looking at adding more. The School Board would be discussing that at a work session on May 28. She noted that she attended the cleanup day and handed out flyers about the Comprehensive Plan. She asked if people had taken the survey in the past week. Planning Director Griffiths stated that people did. Mayor Labadie noted that outreach events like that work. She explained that at the last SLMPD meeting, there were two topics, one of which was the budget, which took up the majority of the meeting. She noted that the budget is not looking good, and the funding formula, which determines the percentages for each city, indicates that Shorewood and Tonka Bay will pay more. She encouraged the Council to attend the upcoming budget meetings if they are interested. She explained that the other topic at the meeting was the JPA, which governs the SLMPD and states that the mayors of the four cities shall be the representatives for their cities at the coordinating committee meetings, and that the administrator should be the representative at the operating committee meetings. She noted that Greenwood does not have a full-time administrator, but has an individual who is on call to the city and offices out of Tennessee. The mayor has historically served as the representative of both committees, which has been an issue in the past. She stated that the coordinating committee can hire and fire the chief, set the chief's salary, give bonuses, etc. The operating committee includes the chief, who can be in a difficult situation. She stated that the issue has been raised again by the three mayors of the other cities, and that a lawyer has been hired because there was no meeting of the minds. The lawyer has completed their analysis of both case law and statutes, and the League of Minnesota Cities has a handbook that defines the concept of wearing two hats. After looking at all of that, the lawyer stated that Greenwood does not allow what they are doing. She noted at the last meeting that Greenwood objected again. The lawyer went through the funding formula to see how the cities would pay for the lawyer. She explained that the cities are at an impasse and all of the Councils are discussing the issue at their next meetings. She asked for direction from the Council.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if the concern is that having the Greenwood mayor be on both committees undermines the operating committee. Mayor Labadie stated that it is correct. City Administrator Nevinski stated that there is an issue with incompatible offices. He added that there is difficulty when someone is in two roles, where hiring and firing decisions need to be made. There was an issue in the hiring process of the police chief in both roles. He shared that it was not a disaster but a recognized situation. He noted that he would send out the information from the lawyer, and further discussion could be had at a future meeting if desired.

Mayor Labadie stated that the issue has nothing to do with the current mayor as an individual; it is the concept that is hindering the process and procedure.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked what the solution would be for Greenwood. He suggested having a councilmember fill the role. Mayor Labadie explained that it cannot be done without rewriting the JPA, and that is a whole different thing. Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if Greenwood has anyone on staff who could fill the role. Mayor Labadie stated that a woman on staff who lives in Tennessee could fill the role.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026

Page 22 of 22

Councilmember Gorham asked what the Greenwood argument is. Mayor Labadie stated that Greenwood argues that Mayor Fletcher is also the administrator.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if the JPA can be amended. She asked which would cost more: litigating this or just having a lawyer amend the JPA. She added that this has not been a problem for Greenwood and that there is no cause for concern about the mayor. Mayor Labadie stated that it is a tough question. She noted that she does not know if this has been a problem for Greenwood in the past. She shared that opening the JPA is difficult because it loads the entire thing, and there's a risk it will implode. Litigation is never cheaper or the best option, but opening the JPA is tricky.

Councilmember Gorham asked if Greenwood needs to sign an amendment to the JPA. City Attorney Shepherd stated that Greenwood would have to sign. Councilmember Gorham stated that Greenwood could not sign it.

Councilmember DiGruttolo pointed out that there are only three options: stay the course, litigate, or change the JPA. Mayor Labadie shared that Greenwood could agree to accept the advice of the lawyer who was hired in good faith by the four cities. Councilmember DiGruttolo pointed out that she heard it is unlikely to happen. Mayor Labadie noted she did not know the opinion of the other councilmembers.

City Attorney Shepherd shared that if the JPA were opened, then that could be very difficult. There is still the lawyer's opinion about incompatible offices, which is a strong consideration.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked whether it is possible to focus only on a specific issue and ensure nothing else comes up. City Attorney Shepherd stated that, in theory, yes. Mayor Labadie pointed out that, then, any time a city has a problem with something, it would set the precedent that the JPA could be opened. Councilmember Sanschagrín asked whether the cities could enter the process with the understanding that it would be about only one thing, and that if that is not what happens, the whole process would be abandoned. City Attorney Shepherd explained that it is all hypothetical, but in theory, the JPA is still being opened to several councils and many individuals. He noted that the opinion of the attorney hired by the SLMPD board needs to be considered. Mayor Labadie pointed out that the phrase "incompatible offices" may not have been used specifically by the attorney.

6. ADJOURN

Maddy moved, Sanschagrín seconded, Adjourning the City Council Regular Meeting of May 26, 2026, at 10:25 P.M.

Motion passed 5-0.

ATTEST:



Sandie Thone, City Clerk


Jennifer Labadie, Mayor