

1. Agenda

Documents:

[07-28-25 CC REG MTG AGENDA.PDF](#)

2. Agenda Packet

Documents:

[07-28-25 CC REG MTG AGENDA PACKET.PDF](#)

3. Agenda Packet

Documents:

[07-28-25 CC SPECIAL TRAINING MEETING PACKET.PDF](#)

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, JULY 28, 2025

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

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 ____
Maddy ____
Sanschagrín ____
Gorham ____
DiGruttolo ____

- C. Review and Adopt Agenda

Attachments

2. **CONSENT AGENDA** The Consent Agenda is a series of actions which are being considered for adoption this evening under a single motion. These items have been reviewed by city council and city staff and there shall be no further discussion by the council tonight on the Consent Agenda items. Any council member or member of city staff may request that an item be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration or discussion. If there are any brief concerns or questions by council, we can answer those now.

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| A. City Council Work Session Minutes of July 14, 2025 | Minutes |
| B. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of July 14, 2025 | Minutes |
| C. Verified Claims List | Claims List |
| D. Water Assessment Agreement – 23622 Smithtown Road
Re-approve | City Administrator Memo
Resolution 25-066 |
| E. Codification of Supplement S-20 | City Clerk/HR Director Memo
Ordinance 623 |

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR This is an opportunity for members of the public to bring an item, that is not on tonight's agenda, but related to the governance of the City of Shorewood, to the attention of the City Council. In providing this limited public forum, the City of Shorewood expects respectful participation. We encourage all speakers to be courteous in their language and behavior, and to confine their remarks to those facts that are relevant to the question or matter under discussion. Please remember that this is a public business meeting, available for viewing on television and the internet by members of the public, including children. Consistent with FCC rules, obscenity, and profane or indecent language will not be tolerated by the presiding officer. 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 three 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. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

A. South Lake Minnetonka Police Department
2026 Budget – Chief Justin Ballsrud

City Administrator Memo

5. PARKS

6. PLANNING

7. ENGINEERING/PUBLIC WORKS

8. GENERAL/NEW BUSINESS

A. Recycling RFP

Communications/Recycling Coordinator Memo

9. STAFF AND COUNCIL REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Staff

B. Mayor and City Council

10. ADJOURN

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, JULY 28, 2025

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

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 ____
Maddy ____
Sanschagrín ____
Gorham ____
DiGruttolo ____

- C. Review and Adopt Agenda

Attachments

2. **CONSENT AGENDA** The Consent Agenda is a series of actions which are being considered for adoption this evening under a single motion. These items have been reviewed by city council and city staff and there shall be no further discussion by the council tonight on the Consent Agenda items. Any council member or member of city staff may request that an item be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration or discussion. If there are any brief concerns or questions by council, we can answer those now.

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

- | | |
|--|--|
| A. City Council Work Session Minutes of July 14, 2025 | Minutes |
| B. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of July 14, 2025 | Minutes |
| C. Verified Claims List | Claims List |
| D. Water Assessment Agreement – 23622 Smithtown Road
Re-approve | City Administrator Memo
Resolution 25-066 |
| E. Codification of Supplement S-20 | City Clerk/HR Director Memo
Ordinance 623 |

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR This is an opportunity for members of the public to bring an item, that is not on tonight's agenda, but related to the governance of the City of Shorewood, to the attention of the City Council. In providing this limited public forum, the City of Shorewood expects respectful participation. We encourage all speakers to be courteous in their language and behavior, and to confine their remarks to those facts that are relevant to the question or matter under discussion. Please remember that this is a public business meeting, available for viewing on television and the internet by members of the public, including children. Consistent with FCC rules, obscenity, and profane or indecent language will not be tolerated by the presiding officer. 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 three 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. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

A. South Lake Minnetonka Police Department
2026 Budget – Chief Justin Ballsrud

City Administrator Memo

5. PARKS

6. PLANNING

7. ENGINEERING/PUBLIC WORKS

8. GENERAL/NEW BUSINESS

A. Recycling RFP

Communications/Recycling Coordinator Memo

9. STAFF AND COUNCIL REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Staff

B. Mayor and City Council

10. ADJOURN

**CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING
MONDAY, JULY 14, 2025**

**5755 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
5:45 P.M.**

MINUTES

1. CONVENE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Mayor Labadie called the meeting to order at 5:45 P.M.

A. Roll Call

Present. Mayor Labadie; Councilmembers Labadie, Maddy (via electronic means), Sanschagrín, DiGruttolo, and Gorham (arrived at 5:55 p.m.); City Attorney Shepherd; City Administrator Nevinski; Parks and Recreation Manager Czech; City Clerk/HR Director Thone; Planning Director Griffiths; Director of Public Works Morreim; and, City Engineer Budde

Absent: None

B. Review Agenda

Sanschagrín moved, DiGruttolo seconded, approving the agenda as presented. Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed 4/0.

2. ENGINEERING SERVICES REPORT

City Administrator Nevinski explained that the Council, at the February Retreat, had expressed the desire to discuss the current engineering services model. He noted that the current contract would be up for renewal in 2026, so staff felt this was the appropriate time to review this information and prepare for any possible modifications. He highlighted information included in the staff report related to engineering services, different models, what other cities have done for engineering services, what services were included within the current engineering contract, and the history of engineering services in Shorewood.

Mayor Labadie reminded the Council that this item was not something that they would be voting on and was just intended for discussion and to give direction to staff. She explained that the switch of engineering firms in 2019 was a positive change. She stated that what she has seen from talking with other mayors was that smaller cities typically used a consultant for engineering services rather than having an engineer on staff.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she did not have an issue with the City using a consultant for engineering services but would prefer that the consultant be independent from any of the engineering firms that the City planned to use. She explained that she felt it would be difficult for the consultant to separate what is good for the residents of the City from what would be good for the firm the engineer worked for. She asked if the City had considered this before and what a consultant would do that a staff engineer could not do. She explained that she did not believe that a staff engineer would need to have an entire staff behind them because they could also pick up the phone for additional expertise, if necessary. She stated that she had heard from residents while she was campaigning, in addition to a few emails earlier today, that there did not appear to be a huge amount of incentive for accountability from the engineering consultant over the projects

CITY OF SHOREWOOD WORK SESSION COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

JULY 14, 2025

Page 2 of 9

that his firm was responsible for. She noted that there was a perception from residents that there is a conflict of interest in the situation where the City's consultant works for the firm that was doing the majority of the work for the City. She explained that she preferred the idea of having a staff engineer rather than using a consultant.

Councilmember Sanschagrín explained that it was also his preference.

Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that the staff report from City Administrator Nevinski seemed to outline the arguments for the City having a consulting engineer and not a staff engineer.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he did not believe that anyone on the Council wanted to build out an engineering department for the City. He stated that it made sense for the City the size of Shorewood to have an RFP for some engineering firm to do the wide array of projects within the City. He stated that the question became how the City would manage that suite of services.

Councilmember Sanschagrín stated that there were some pervasive issues, such as the water infrastructure, stormwater management, and road issues. He explained that there was plenty of work to do for one captive staff engineer to be able to drive the best solution for Shorewood residents.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she agreed, and it would benefit the City to have someone who had complete and total oversight of all the contracts. She shared a recent example of an issue raised by a Birch Bluff resident related to the dirt and stated that the perception is that the current City Engineer was covering for his firm in this situation.

City Administrator Nevinski clarified that Bolton and Menk was the City's engineering consultant and the contractor who did the work on Birch Bluff, and another contractor who did work on Strawberry Lane, are independent construction contractors. He stated that he wanted to be clear that Bolton and Menk did not construct those projects, and some contractors had bid on the projects. He noted that Bolton and Menk had put together the specifications for those projects, did the prep work, and bid out the projects. He explained that the City Council had reviewed the project bids and awarded them to the lowest bidding contractor, and Bolton and Menk, on behalf of the City, oversaw the overall construction activity and worked with residents to resolve problems.

Councilmember Gorham stated that there was an anecdotal misconception of Bolton and Menk's role, which was indicative of other conversations he has had. He stated that the issue was more about a misunderstanding and not the engineering model itself. He explained his background as a project engineer and did not agree that consultant engineers were somehow lining their own pockets with gilded designs. He noted that he understood there was a perception problem and had also heard it while he was campaigning but did not think it was accurate. He stated that he did not want the City to base its decision on knee-jerk misconceptions.

Councilmember Maddy asked whether the project engineering costs outlined in the staff report were hourly.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that he did not know but believed that most of it had been billed hourly and tracked.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD WORK SESSION COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

JULY 14, 2025

Page 3 of 9

Public Works Director Morreim explained that the project engineering costs were billed hourly to the different projects and noted that the majority of projects have stayed under budget.

Councilmember Maddy asked what the City's total capital expenditures had been for the amount of money the City had spent over that time frame for those projects, for example, twenty-five percent.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that it would roughly be twenty-five percent, but explained that he would have to go back and tally that information. He stated that the City had four major projects in four years and noted that in addition to those, there were also smaller projects, such as lift station rehabilitation projects.

Councilmember Gorham stated that the City has allowed the public perception of this situation to fester and stated that if Bolton and Menk were one of the options for the RFP, it would put everyone in an awkward position when they are evaluating proposals.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that there was currently no direction from the Council to proceed with an RFP and clarified that the engineering services contract had been entered into in 2019 and had been renewed through 2025. He stated that if the Council was thinking that they wanted to do an RFP, he asked that they give him this direction as soon as possible. He stated that if there were specific concerns or goals that the Council had related to engineering services, it would be helpful for staff to have as they are working through the budget. He noted that there may be some choices that the City could make that were not binary or just a black and white choice.

Mayor Labadie asked if the Council felt it would be helpful for staff to bring back information on each of the four major projects, including the overall costs of the project, so they could compare the project cost to the amount the City spent on the engineering services. She stated that this information would then become public so the community could see this information as well, which may address some of the misconceptions that were out in the public.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that it was important to see what the costs were and noted that she would like to see the direct costs for the City having City Engineer Budde and whether those costs were more than what it would cost the City to hire its own engineer. She stated that she wanted to be able to look for inefficiencies and see where the City may be able to save money and referenced her shock at the cost for Bolton and Menk to put together an RFP for the replacement of the chillers.

Mayor Labadie stated that there was a resounding desire from the Council to have more hard facts and numbers that would allow them to make a more informed decision regarding engineering services. She referenced various situations where the Council had asked City Engineer Budde to provide alternatives in projects, such as moving trails to the opposite side of the road, but noted that they had not asked what those requests would end up costing the City. She stated that some of the engineering costs were driven by the Council's requests, and some were also driven by resident requests.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that the scenario just described by Mayor Labadie was more of a reason for the City to have a staff engineer rather than a consultant. She explained that it was more transparent and more cost-effective for the City to have its own staff engineer.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD WORK SESSION COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

JULY 14, 2025

Page 4 of 9

Councilmember Maddy stated that sometimes the Council asks for too much and has been over-accommodating to the residents, which then ends up costing a lot of extra money. He stated that design engineers have a baseline of about twenty-five percent and are directly incentivized to make projects more expensive. He stated that if the City could have more direct oversight of the consultant from City staff, because they already have an engineer on staff in Public Works Director Morreim, he did not think the City would need to hire one. He explained that he believed there was a way to oversee, limit the scope, and limit the add-ons, with the staff already in place at the City.

Mayor Labadie stated that if the City added this work to Public Works Director Morreim, they may need to shift some of their current duties to other staff members, because it would be difficult to just add them on to his already full-time tasks. She agreed that this could be an avenue that the City explored because Public Works Director Morreim was an engineer, but cautioned the Council to be cognizant that the City had great department heads and did not want to burn them out by adding more responsibilities to their plate.

Councilmember Maddy stated that this oversight did not need to be done by the Public Works Director and could also be overseen by the Accounting Department, because they were keeping track of where the money was going. He clarified that he was just trying to look at ways that they could limit the scope and creep of the projects.

Councilmember Gorham stated that it was more than just looking over the numbers because it should also include presence on site, punch lists, design review, public meetings, and change orders. He explained that the Council just wanted to understand the cost effectiveness of bringing in its own staff engineer, but noted that they would still need project management on the consultant side, so he was not sure there would be a cost savings for the City.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that there are general engineering services that City Engineer Budde provides for the City, which are more administrative, but when the City does a project, those require a lot more people and engineering hours that go into those. He stated that the City may not even see all of those people because they could be out on the job site doing survey work, but they usually know who the project managers are. He clarified that for these types of projects, there would almost always be a consulting engineer acting in various capacities.

Mayor Labadie stated that, based on the feedback from the Council, for more information on engineering services, she would like to see this item brought back to a future Work Session discussion.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that the Council had not answered the question raised by staff about what their priorities were and suggested that the Council spend some time thinking about that before this was brought back. She asked them to consider whether their priority was cost or efficiency, because that should be the first thing they discuss when this information is brought back to them.

Councilmember Sanschagrín explained that he understood what it was like working in a rate-per-hour consulting position at the large firm and noted that there was a lot of pressure for billable hours. He stated that an advantage of having a staff engineer would be that there would not be the same pressure, so they would be able to spend more time thinking about what would be in line with the City's residents' needs.

Public Works Director Morreim stated that he was overseeing this work, and those duties were part of his job. He noted that there was a good job with give and take because the consulting firm provides recommendations, the City makes decisions, and moves forward. He clarified that it was not Bolton and Menk saying that the City needed to do certain projects, because the direction was mostly coming from the City. He explained that he wanted to make this point clear because there is the perception that Bolton and Menk was leading these projects and they were not.

Mayor Labadie stated that they were running out of time and suggested that they continue the meeting following the regular City Council meeting so they would have adequate time to discuss the next agenda item. She noted that this meant the Council could take a few more minutes to discuss the engineering services item.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if another alternative to a JPA would be for the City to have its own staff engineer, and allow other cities to use this individual for a cost.

City Administrator Nevinski acknowledged that would be a possible model, but was not sure the City was at that advanced point yet. He explained that his gut reaction to that idea was that he was not sure the City would ever be at that point due to the size of Shorewood, but could look into it more closely if that was the direction of the Council.

Councilmember Sanschagrín stated that he was in favor of having a captive staff engineer.

Mayor Labadie asked if he was saying he was in favor of that option before he had seen all the data.

Councilmember Sanschagrín explained that he may end up being swayed by the data, but the concept of that role for someone who could plan more proactively for the City, rather than being reactive.

3. SOUTH SHORE SENIOR PARTNERS AGREEMENT

Sanschagrín moved, Gorham seconded, to table discussion of the South Shore Senior Partners Agreement.

City Attorney Shepherd asked if the Council was attempting to recess the meeting until after the regular City Council meeting.

Mayor Labadie admitted that she was not sure of the correct approach and asked for guidance from City Attorney Shepherd.

City Attorney Shepherd suggested that they move to recess the Work Session until after the Regular City Council meeting.

Sanschagrín withdrew the motion, Gorham withdrew his second, to table discussion of the South Shore Senior Partners Agreement.

DiGruttolo moved, Sanschagrín seconded, to recess the Work Session meeting until after the Regular City Council meeting.

Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed 5/0.

The meeting was recessed at 6:48 p.m. and reconvened at 8:15 p.m.

Park and Recreation Director Czech reminded the Council that at the March 10, 2025, Work Session, they had discussed an agreement with the South Shore Senior Partners (SSSP) to provide senior programming at the Shorewood Community and Event Center (SCEC). He gave a brief overview of the two issues related to insurance and background checks that need Council direction before an agreement can be formalized. He explained that both of these could have significant financial impacts on the City and outlined the concerns that had been expressed by the SSSP regarding the sustainability of their organization if they were required to take on the insurance and volunteer background checks responsibilities.

City Attorney Shepherd stated that this came down to a policy issue on whether the City would pay for the insurance related to the work SSSP is doing. He stated that he would recommend that if there were volunteers staffing the building, there be background checks conducted, as a best practice to protect the City.

Mayor Labadie stated that background checks, to her, were necessary, in part because numerous groups with minor children utilize the SCEC. She noted that the warming house attendants need to pass a background check for the same reason, and taking this action would not be picking on the SSSP.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked what would trigger the need for insurance and what would be different about this from any other SCEC activity.

City Administrator Nevinski explained that the SSSP was already kind of covered under the City's current insurance policy, but they were a separate organization. He stated that he was not sure how this situation came to be, but staff wanted the Council to be aware of what the City would be taking on with the insurance piece. He noted that the current agreement with the SSSP was only one to two pages long and was about twelve years old. He explained there would be the potential for higher premiums if a claim were made on behalf of SSSP, but acknowledged that they provide an important service to the City. He stated that the Council needed to decide whether they were willing to take on some of the costs and risks in order for them to provide this service to the seniors in the community.

Park and Recreation Director Czech stated that with the SSSP utilizing the facility, the City did not have things like waivers for their participants, like they would for someone who signed up to rent the facility or the athletic associations who sign up to use City facilities.

City Attorney Shepherd noted that typically when the City contracts with an organization, there is an agreement to have them in the building and rent the space, and they are also usually obligated to provide insurance to cover their activities. He acknowledged that the risk in this situation was minimal, but there was always a risk of something like a slip and fall. He reiterated that right now, the City's insurance policy was covering the SSSP rather than them being required to have their own policy.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if this would be different than a situation where a resident came in for a tour and fell.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD WORK SESSION COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

JULY 14, 2025

Page 7 of 9

City Attorney Shepherd stated that it would be covered by the insurance policy and noted that typically, when the City allowed someone to use the building, they ask for the extra insurance to cover this.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she did not have a problem with using taxpayer money to provide insurance to the seniors who are providing a service to the City. She suggested that perhaps they could put some language in the agreement that says if there were a certain number of claims on the insurance, for example, two, that the City would revoke the insurance coverage for the SSSP or require them to pay the deductible.

City Attorney Shepherd stated that there was already a termination provision included in the agreement, so they could revisit the contract after just one claim, if they wanted.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she would be fine with the approach and noted that she agreed that the volunteers should have background checks done, but should not have to pay for that, and would also be a worthy taxpayer expense.

Councilmember Sanschagrín stated that the City should support the SSSP as much as possible, including figuring out additional ways to promote their group, because they provide valuable services to the community.

Councilmember Maddy asked how much the SSSP would have to pay to get their own insurance policy and background checks, so that this would be able to be clean, like the rest of the facility users.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that the background checks cost around eighty dollars each, and they have about twelve volunteers.

City Clerk/HR Director Thone stated that the regular background checks are eighty-five, but they have gone up to about one hundred ten dollars, and the BCA background checks, which are for anyone in the vicinity of children, are about forty dollars each. She explained that typically the City has done the comprehensive background checks, and on top of that, the BCA background checks, so it would be around one hundred fifty dollars for each person.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked why they would need to do the more extensive background check if they were just volunteering an hour or two at a time. She noted that they were just trying to get fingerprints and have a legal background check to ensure that they were not pedophiles. She stated that she would be comfortable just having the BCA background check.

City Attorney Shepherd stated that the BCA background check was what was needed to ensure they were okay to be around kids. He acknowledged that he did not know the ins and outs of the different types of background checks, so he could not say whether just having the BCA background check would be acceptable or not.

City Clerk/HR Director Thone stated that staff could look into this more closely to see if Councilmember DiGruttolo's idea would be possible.

Councilmember Maddy stated that he pays out of pocket for the BCA background check on an annual basis for some volunteer work he does. He stated that with the increased costs for the insurance policy and the background checks, he suggested that they clean this up by requiring

CITY OF SHOREWOOD WORK SESSION COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

JULY 14, 2025

Page 8 of 9

the SSSP to have their policy and do background checks, and the City give them a discount on their monthly fees.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that it made sense to her and asked if staff could check into this possibility.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that staff would look into that possibility and have a conversation with the SSSP.

Mayor Labadie asked if the SSSP was already getting a significantly discounted rate.

Park and Recreation Director Czech stated that they were already receiving a discounted rate and explained that the six hundred dollar per month rate had been in place since the 2009 agreement, which is one reason they were proposing incremental increases, because the facility costs have gone up pretty significantly.

Mayor Labadie asked if there had been inquiries from other groups interested in renting the facility at the full price, for the same rooms, at the same times, that have been turned away because of the long-term relationship with the SSSP.

Park and Recreation Director Czech stated that there had been some inquiries for the same times/dates, but the SSSP has been very open to adapting and accommodating so things can be shifted around. He gave the example of a recent situation where there was a business that wanted to use the conference room for a meeting, and the SSSP moved their activity. He reiterated that the SSSP was very good about being flexible, and during his time has not seen a loss of revenue because of the SSSP. He noted that the draft agreement had a five-year term, but in the initial discussions, the SSSP were looking for a shorter term and wanted to make sure that the Council was in favor of a shorter term. He stated that one of the questions staff would like some feedback from the Council on was what their long-term vision was for senior programming and noted that it is possible that the SSSP would end up dissolving in a few years as residents age out.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked how many members were part of the SSSP and how many were residents of Shorewood.

Park and Recreation Director Czech stated that he believed their mailing list has about two hundred households, but was not sure of the residences for those individuals.

Councilmember Gorham asked about the termination clause.

City Attorney Shepherd stated that it was within the second paragraph and read aloud the language included.

Councilmember Gorham stated that this language, in his opinion, was a bit buried.

There was a consensus of the Council to shorten the term of the lease, as requested by SSSP, including the possibility of a year-to-year annual contract term.

Mayor Labadie suggested that they include a clearer heading for the portion of the contract related to termination, so it was no longer buried.

Councilmember Sanschagrín shared ideas of activities that take place at a community center that members of his family are part of in New Hampshire.

Councilmember DiGruttolo suggested that the SSSP come give the Council a presentation on their organization, what was currently happening, what they wished was happening, and ways the City may be able to help them.

Mayor Labadie stated that it was a great idea and asked staff to get that scheduled at an upcoming meeting.

4. ADJOURN

Sanschagrín moved, Gorham seconded, Adjourning the City Council Work Session Meeting of July 14, 2025, at 8:42 P.M. Upon a roll call vote, motion passed 5/0.

ATTEST:

Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

Sandie Thone, City Clerk

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, JULY 14, 2025

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 7:01 P.M.

A. Pledge of Allegiance

B. Roll Call

Present. Mayor Labadie; Councilmembers Maddy (via electronic means), Sanschagrín, Gorham, and DiGruttolo; City Attorney Shepherd; City Administrator Nevinski; City Clerk/HR Director Thone; Planning Director Griffiths; Park and Recreation Manager Czech; and Communications and Recycling Coordinator Wilson

Absent: None

C. Review Agenda

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

Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Labadie reviewed the items on the Consent Agenda.

Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that she was not on the Council to know the history related to item 2.D. at 5815 Club Lane and the hazardous building demolition agreement. She explained that she had gotten several emails related to this item and asked to move this item to the regular agenda so she could relay some of the questions that were asked within the emails.

Sanschagrín moved, DiGruttolo seconded, Approving the Motions Contained on the Consent Agenda and Adopting the Resolutions Therein.

- A. City Council Work Session Minutes of June 23, 2025
- B. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of June 23, 2025
- C. Approval of the Verified Claims List
- D. ~~5815 Club Lane Hazardous Building Demolition Agreement~~ (moved to 8.A)
- E. Approve Public Works Leo New Hire
- F. Pavement Management Software Renewal

Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed.

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

4. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

A. Tour de Tonka – Minnetonka Community Education

Kim Carlson, Executive Director of Minnetonka Community Education, gave a brief presentation on the Tour De Tonka, which is celebrating their twentieth year, and expressed her appreciation to the sponsors throughout the community. She noted that they currently have just over one thousand riders registered, but anticipate that they will end up closer to two thousand five hundred riders. She reviewed the five routes they were planning and noted that they were continuing to look for additional volunteers to assist with the event. She stated that since 2006, Tour De Tonka has raised over one hundred thousand dollars for the ICA food shelf. She thanked the local law enforcement and safety partners for their support and shared some comments received from participants who also recognized the importance of making safety a priority. She stated that Tour De Tonka would be on August 2, 2025.

Councilmember Sanschagrin asked what the key safety issues would be for the Tour De Tonka.

Ms. Carlson explained that the main thing would be keeping the riders safe due to the number of roads that would be used on the various routes.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if Ms. Carlson could give recommendations for the best locations for Shorewood residents to come and watch the race.

Ms. Carlson stated that she would have to take a closer look and get back to the Council with some possible suggestions for observation locations.

Mayor Labadie asked where people may access the route map from her presentation.

Ms. Carlson stated that they could go to the Minnetonka Community Education page or www.tourdetonka.org, which would have all of that information.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he had participated for the last five years, and they were due for some good weather.

Mayor Labadie asked if the new Community Education book at been released yet.

Ms. Carlson stated that it had and should have already been delivered to mailboxes and noted that registration opens on July 15, 2025.

5. PARKS

A. Report by Commissioner Sylvester on June 24, 2025, Park Commission Meeting

Commissioner Sylvester gave an overview of the discussion from the June 24, 2025, Park Commission meeting, as reflected in the meeting minutes.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

JULY 14, 2025

Page 3 of 7

Mayor Labadie noted that since the annual park tours by the Parks Commission were being done independently, she asked that they make sure to include Gideon Glen, which had been left out of the larger tours due to limited parking space.

Park and Recreation Director Czech stated that the Park Commission will meet next week, and he would encourage the Commissioners to make sure they tour Gideon Glen.

Mayor Labadie stated that she would like to see some sort of youth representative serve on the Parks Commission.

6. PLANNING

A. Remove from Table: Subdivision Ordinance Code Amendments

Location: City-Wide

Applicant: City of Shorewood

Mayor Labadie reminded the Council that they had tabled action on this item at the April 28, 2025, meeting until they were able to discuss the City water system, which took place at the June 9, 2025, meeting.

Maddy moved, DiGruttolo seconded, Removing the Subdivision Ordinance Code Amendments from the table for discussion. Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed.

Planning Director Griffiths reviewed the proposed code update process, outlined the project objectives, which included incorporating current City practices and reflecting the direction within the Comprehensive Plan. He reviewed the public meetings that had been held as part of the process of amending the code and explained where things stood. He stated that staff has formalized the recommendations from the Council and made a final draft, and noted that it was similar to what had been presented at the April 28, 2025, City Council meeting. He explained that overall, they reorganized the Code, made it easier for residents to understand, and eliminated the redundant and conflicting language and grammar issues from the existing document. He outlined the conclusions from the Council discussion related to municipal water and briefly reviewed the changes that had been made after this item was tabled at the April 28, 2025, Council meeting, and explained that there were no substantive policy changes.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked how many properties would be affected by this code amendment.

Planning Director Griffiths stated that the Subdivision Ordinance would apply City-wide, but realistically would apply to properties that have development potential and noted that he believed that there were about fourteen properties that had the potential for substantial development, meaning six or more homes on them, which equated to about two hundred and twelve connections to City water.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if duplexes would be part of this or if they were something separate.

Planning Director Griffiths stated that duplexes were possible within this ordinance and shared different scenarios and situations where it would or would not apply.

Councilmember Sanschagrín asked if financing options were included in this amendment or if that was something still needing consideration.

Planning Director Griffiths stated that the Subdivision Ordinance does not contemplate how property owners will pay for public improvements, but noted that typically, the rationale is that the development should pay for itself. He stated that he had seen public financing options in other communities, but reiterated that would be outside the scope of the Subdivision Ordinance.

DiGruttolo moved, Gorham seconded, Adopting ORDINANCE 617, “An Ordinance Amending Shorewood City Code Title 900, Public Right-of-Way, and Property and Title 1200, Zoning and Subdivision Regulations.”

Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed.

Gorham moved, Maddy seconded, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 25-064, “A Resolution Authorizing a Summary Publication of Ordinance 617.”

Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed.

7. ENGINEERING/PUBLIC WORKS

8. GENERAL/NEW BUSINESS

A. 5815 Club Lane Hazardous Building Demolition Agreement (formerly Consent Agenda item 2.D.)

Councilmember DiGruttolo explained that the questions she had gotten via email were related to how the demolition was going to be done and had asked her to drive down the road so she could see how narrow it was. She stated that she just wanted more detailed information about how they were planning to accomplish this demolition without destroying properties on either side.

Planning Director Griffiths explained that the contractor had visited the site alongside City staff, so they were all aware of how tight Club Lane is in the area. He stated that there is a lot of room on the property for the contractor to store equipment and materials while they are working. He stated that after this contract is approved, staff was planning to hold a pre-construction meeting with them and noted that the City had already made some of their expectations clear. He stated that the contractor had not determined what equipment would be used in this situation, but explained that it does not necessarily require large equipment to tear down a house.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she had noticed that there was no City right-of-way in the area, and it appeared as though the properties went to the roadway and even had giant rocks and poles to protect their grass. She suggested that this may be something that the City considers addressing in the future.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that there is a narrow right-of-way and believed that this had been on former Planning Director Darling’s radar, as more of a long-term process.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

JULY 14, 2025

Page 5 of 7

Planning Director Griffiths stated that the original development in the area was done in 1900 and agreed that this was something that should be addressed when they get a public development project in the neighborhood, because the road is very narrow.

DiGruttolo moved, Gorham seconded, to Approve the Agreement with Bollig and Sons, Inc. to complete hazardous building demolition and related site restoration at 5815 Club Lane, and to authorize the City Administrator to execute and administer the agreement.

Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed.

9. STAFF AND COUNCIL REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Staff

1. Communications Update

Communications and Recycling Coordinator Wilson gave a brief overview of the communication efforts that had taken place from April through June of 2025, reviewed social media and website statistics, the *Shore Report*, the Spring Clean-up Flyer, and other printed materials that they put together for the City.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked about the increased numbers from the month of May.

Communications and Recycling Coordinator Wilson stated that he believes some of that was driven by Public Works Week and the beginning of some of the City's road construction projects.

Councilmember Sanschagrin stated that he had gotten feedback from residents that the visibility of the data that was available through SeeClickFix was not there, and asked what the City may be able to do to replace some of that visibility.

Communications and Recycling Coordinator Wilson noted that the City could pull the same data if he had more specific information on what data people were looking for.

Other

Parks and Recreation Director Czech reminded the Council and residents that the Park Master Plan survey was live and encouraged people to share this information so the City is able to get a lot of feedback. He reminded the Council that Concert in the Park was July 17, 2025, sponsored by Midco, beginning around 6:00 p.m., with the Shalo Lee Band and Bach to Rock. He noted that the City had put out an RFP for an SCEC facilities study/task force and will update the Council as more information becomes available at the end of the month.

Planning Director Griffiths welcomed City Planner Aaron to the City and noted that the next Planning Commission meeting would be on August 19, 2025, due to Night to Unite taking place on their usual meeting night.

City Clerk/HR Director Thone stated that the City's new LEO, Robert Hochsprung, would begin on July 28, 2025. She explained that the City had received one hundred and forty-seven applications for the Administrative Assistant position and noted that they would be interviewing ten of the candidates on July 17, 2025.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

JULY 14, 2025

Page 6 of 7

City Administrator Nevinski stated there is a lot of soil being moved in Tonka Bay and noted that there was an article published in today's *Star Tribune* about the project. He stated that the Highway 7 transportation management program work had begun with the expectation that the kick-off meeting would take place in August or just after Labor Day. He noted that the City planned to put out an RFP next week for auditing services.

B. Mayor and City Council

Councilmember Gorham suggested that he would like to see that Mayor Labadie be more centralized at the dais and noted that this may need to be included in the By-laws discussion, but wanted to bring it up to the Council.

City Administrator Nevinski explained that there had been scheduling difficulties in finding time at the upcoming meetings for the By-laws discussion and noted that he currently has it slated for discussion at the September 8, 2025, meeting. He stated that discussion would be a great time for the Council to make these kinds of changes and discuss how they wanted to see things get done.

Councilmember Sanschagrín stated that something that would make him a more effective Councilmember would be adding an agenda item that lays out what their future agenda items were expected to be, so he did not have to just be reactive to the packet that he received on Thursday evenings.

Councilmember DiGruttolo agreed that it can sometimes be stressful to receive a thick packet on Thursday evening and have to review it all before the meeting.

City Administrator Nevinski noted that staff have a general schedule of items coming up on future agendas and stated that they could start including that in the Council packets. He noted that this may change and make it easier to access the information once the new agenda software is implemented in the fall.

Mayor Labadie stated that the SLMPD is involved in budget discussions, so there will be some modified information presented to the Council in the future. She noted that earlier today, she had attended the Regional Council of Mayors meeting and noted that the July meeting asks them to bring along their local school superintendents. She noted that David Law, the Minnetonka School District Superintendent, has been elected to the School Superintendent's National Board and is currently serving as president, which is a big honor. She stated that Councilmembers DiGruttolo, Maddy, City Clerk/HR Director Thone, City Attorney Shepherd, and she had attended the League of Minnesota Cities conference in Duluth.

Councilmember Gorham stated that one thing that popped into his mind was what the Excelsior Chamber of Commerce had reported about the Fourth of July and stated that they would no longer be hosting fireworks or the annual race, based on their legal status, and were looking for someone else to run it.

10. ADJOURN

Sanschagrín moved, DiGruttolo seconded, Adjourning the City Council Regular Meeting of July 14, 2025, at 8:11 P.M.

Upon a roll call vote, the motion passed.

ATTEST:

Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

Sandie Thone, City Clerk

DRAFT



City Council Meeting Item

Title/Subject: Verified Claims
Meeting Date: July 28, 2025
Prepared by: Michelle Nguyen, Senior Accountant
Reviewed by: Jeanne Schmuck, Finance Director
Attachments: Claims Lists

Item
2C

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-07-14-2025-ACH	\$60,589.10
Payroll-07-14-2025-AP	\$48,489.67
Council-07-28-2025	\$292,187.32

Total Claims: Checks & ACH	\$401,266.09
---------------------------------------	---------------------

Financial or Budget Considerations

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.

Clearing House

Distribution Report

User: mnguyen
 Printed: 07/14/2025 - 2:03PM
 Batch: 00014.07.2025



Account Number	Debit	Credit	Account Description
700-00-1010-0000	0.00	60,589.10	CASH AND INVESTMENTS
700-00-2170-0000	60,589.10	0.00	GROSS PAYROLL CLEARING
	60,589.10	60,589.10	
Report Totals:	60,589.10	60,589.10	

Accounts Payable

Computer Check Proof List by Vendor

User: mnguyen
Printed: 07/14/2025 - 4:19PM
Batch: 00005.07.2025 - Payroll-07-14-2025



Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 4	AFSCME CO 5 MEMBER HEALTH FUND-UNION DENTAL				
July-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Dental-Union Benefit	210.00	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 1 700-00-2185-0000	ACH Enabled: True PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Dental-Union Be
	Check Total:	210.00			
Vendor: 1511	ALLSTATE BENEFITS				
July-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Insurance-Hospital Ber	253.10	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 2 700-00-2189-0000	ACH Enabled: True PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Insurance-Hospit
July-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Insurance-Critical Ben	460.73	07/14/2025	700-00-2189-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Insurance-Critica
July-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Insurance-Accident Be	64.26	07/14/2025	700-00-2189-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Insurance-Accide
	Check Total:	778.09			
Vendor: 5	EFTPS - FEDERAL W/H				
PR-07-14-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Medicare Employee Pe	1,277.72	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 3 700-00-2174-0000	ACH Enabled: True PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Medicare Emplo;
PR-07-14-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 FICA Employee Portio	5,463.41	07/14/2025	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 FICA Employee
PR-07-14-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 FICA Employer Portion	5,463.41	07/14/2025	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 FICA Employer I
PR-07-14-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Federal Income Tax	8,661.79	07/14/2025	700-00-2172-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Federal Income T
PR-07-14-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Medicare Employer Po	1,277.72	07/14/2025	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Medicare Emplo;
	Check Total:	22,144.05			
Vendor: 1165	FIDELITY SECURITY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY				
Credit-2025	Credit	-15.27	06/09/2025	Check Sequence: 4 700-00-2186-0000	ACH Enabled: True
July-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Vision-Avesis Benefit-	234.55	07/14/2025	700-00-2186-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Vision-Avesis Be
	Check Total:	219.28			
Vendor: 1510	GEN DIGITAL, INC.				
July-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Protection-NortonLife	115.89	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 5 700-00-2188-0000	ACH Enabled: True PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Protection-Norto

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 686 July-2025	Check Total:	115.89			
	KANSAS CITY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY				ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Short Term Disability I	920.94	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 6 700-00-2181-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Short Term Disab
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Long Term Disability I	856.71	07/14/2025	700-00-2181-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Long Term Disab
Vendor: 11 PR-07-14-2025	Check Total:	1,777.65			
	MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE				ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 State Income Tax	4,099.30	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 7 700-00-2173-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 State Income Tax
	Check Total:	4,099.30			
Vendor: 7 July-2025	MINNESOTA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY				ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 MN-Life Insurance Ben	1,103.48	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 8 700-00-2180-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 MN-Life Insuran
	Check Total:	1,103.48			
	MISSION SQUARE RETIREMNT-302131-457				ACH Enabled: True
Vendor: 2 PR-07-14-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Deferred-MissionSq-FI	2,246.20	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 9 700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Deferred-Mission
	Check Total:	2,246.20			
	MSRS-MN DEFERRED COMP PLAN 457				ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Deferred Comp-MSRS	25.00	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 10 700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Deferred Comp-M
Vendor: 10 July-2025	Check Total:	25.00			
	NCPERS GROUP LIFE INSURANCE				ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 PERA Life Benefit	144.00	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 11 700-00-2180-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 PERA Life Benef
	Check Total:	144.00			
Vendor: 665 PR-07-14-2025	OPTUM BANK				ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 HSA-Optum Bank-Em	1,558.11	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 12 700-00-2183-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 HSA-Optum Ban
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 HSA-Optum Bank-Ber	1,054.27	07/14/2025	700-00-2183-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 HSA-Optum Ban
	Check Total:	2,612.38			
Vendor: 9 PR-07-14-2025	PERA				ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 MN PERA Benefit Em	6,861.30	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 13 700-00-2175-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 MN PERA Benef

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
PR-07-14-2025	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 MN-PERA Deduction	5,946.47	07/14/2025	700-00-2175-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 MN-PERA Dedu
Vendor: 1512 PR-07-14-2025	Check Total:	12,807.77			
	PRE-PAID LEGAL SERVICES, INC			Check Sequence: 14	ACH Enabled: True
	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Protection-LegalShield	197.55	07/14/2025	700-00-2187-0000	PR Batch 00001.07.2025 Protection-Legal
	Check Total:	197.55			
	Total for Check Run:	48,480.64			
	Total of Number of Checks:	14			

Accounts Payable

Computer Check Proof List by Vendor

User: mnnguyen
Printed: 07/15/2025 - 12:48PM
Batch: 000006.07.2025 - Payroll-07-14-2025



Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 1511	ALLSTATE BENEFITS				
July-2025-Adj	Allstate-Medical Ins Adj	-0.96	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 1 700-00-2189-0000	ACH Enabled: True
July-2025-Adj	Adj	-0.03	07/14/2025	700-00-2189-0000	
July-2025-Adj.	Adj	1.92	07/14/2025	700-00-2189-0000	
	Check Total:	0.93			
Vendor: 1165	FIDELITY SECURITY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY				
July-2025-Adj	Vision-Adj.	-0.57	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 2 700-00-2186-0000	ACH Enabled: True
July-2025-Adj	Adj	7.45	07/14/2025	700-00-2186-0000	
July-2025-Adj.	Adj	1.14	07/14/2025	700-00-2186-0000	
	Check Total:	8.02			
Vendor: 665	OPTUM BANK				
July-2025-Adj	Adj	-0.08	07/14/2025	Check Sequence: 3 700-00-2183-0000	ACH Enabled: True
July-2025-Adj.	Adj	0.16	07/14/2025	700-00-2183-0000	
	Check Total:	0.08			
	Total for Check Run:	9.03			
	Total of Number of Checks:	3			

Accounts Payable

Computer Check Proof List by Vendor

User: mnguyen
Printed: 07/23/2025 - 3:44PM
Batch: 00007.07.2025 - Council-07-28-2025



Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 1509 62406	BLUE NET INC Monthly Network Service	4,778.93	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 1 101-19-4321-0000	ACH Enabled: True
	Check Total:	4,778.93			
Vendor: 677 366378	BOLTON & MENK, INC. Proj.#25X.138861-Park System Plan-Pk Master	6,324.50	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 2 402-00-4400-0000	ACH Enabled: True
	Check Total:	6,324.50			
Vendor: 1556 12654	BURNS EXCAVATING, INC. Material Hauling- Watermain Break-24200 Smith	6,600.00	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 3 601-00-4400-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	6,600.00			
Vendor: 915 5279573008 5280770802	CINTAS PWs-First Aid Supplies City Hall-First Aid Supplies	74.86 100.89	07/28/2025 07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 4 101-32-4400-0000 101-19-4223-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	175.75			
Vendor: 896 20422460	CINTAS CORPORATION(formerly HUEBSCH) SCEC - Mats	70.67	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 5 201-00-4223-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	70.67			
Vendor: 149 2nd Qtr-2025-UB 2nd Qtr-2025-UB	CITY OF TONKA BAY Quarterly Sewer Service Quarterly Water Service	2,828.75 1,931.01	07/28/2025 07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 6 611-00-4400-0000 601-00-4260-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	4,759.76			
Vendor: 456	CORE & MAIN, LP			Check Sequence: 7	ACH Enabled: False

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
X269569	Valve Sections	1,061.85	07/28/2025	601-00-4245-0000	
X274155	Valve Cap	71.68	07/28/2025	601-00-4245-0000	
X298544	Valve Sections	515.85	07/28/2025	601-00-4245-0000	
X309413	Valve Sections	1,455.40	07/28/2025	601-00-4245-0000	
	Check Total:	3,104.78			
Vendor: 846	ALICE MARIE DARLING			Check Sequence: 8	ACH Enabled: True
Aug-COBRA-Refnd	Cobra August-2025-Refund- Cancelled Cobra en	136.48	07/28/2025	700-00-2184-0000	
	Check Total:	136.48			
Vendor: 167	ECM PUBLISHERS INC			Check Sequence: 9	ACH Enabled: True
1057352	Water Treatment-Publication for Project	405.00	07/28/2025	601-00-4433-0000	
1057353	Ord. No. 622	81.25	07/28/2025	101-18-4351-0000	
1057516	Ord. No. 622	55.90	07/28/2025	101-18-4351-0000	
	Check Total:	542.15			
Vendor: 179	EXCELSIOR FIRE DISTRICT			Check Sequence: 10	ACH Enabled: True
I-461	Concert in the Park Inspection	80.00	07/28/2025	101-53-4444-0000	
	Check Total:	80.00			
Vendor: 1557	GOLIATH HYDRO-VAC INC.			Check Sequence: 11	ACH Enabled: False
41871	Vac Truck Svc for Emerggy Sewer Repair	3,390.75	07/28/2025	611-00-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	3,390.75			
Vendor: 1199	GREENER BLADE FERTILIZATION CO. LLC			Check Sequence: 12	ACH Enabled: False
060401145912	Turf Maintenance-Freeman Park-Soccer Fields	1,025.00	07/28/2025	101-52-4400-0000	
060401145913	Turf Maintenance-Freeman Park	825.00	07/28/2025	101-52-4400-0000	
060401146116	Turf Maintenance-Manor Park	282.00	07/28/2025	101-52-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	2,132.00			
Vendor: 211	HAWKINS, INC.			Check Sequence: 13	ACH Enabled: True
7124571	Chlorine for Treatment	1,666.24	07/14/2025	601-00-4245-0000	
7131365	Chemical Tank Rental	110.00	07/28/2025	601-00-4400-0000	

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 689 1000248575 1000250052	Check Total:	1,776.24			
	HENNEPIN COUNTY ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE				
	800 Mhz Radio Fee	233.04	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 14 101-32-4321-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	2nd Qtr- STS Charged for Svcs	2,409.54	07/28/2025	101-32-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	2,642.58			
Vendor: 1308 3096720	HI-LINE INC.				
	Hose Clamps	63.90	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 15 101-32-4221-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	63.90			
Vendor: 1456 024-035-10	HKGi				
	Subdivision Ordinance Amendments	1,805.00	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 16 101-18-4400-0000	ACH Enabled: True
	Check Total:	1,805.00			
Vendor: 1515 831129	KATH FUEL OIL SERVICE CO.				
	Fuel for Trailer	1,370.52	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 17 101-32-4212-0000	ACH Enabled: True
	Check Total:	1,370.52			
Vendor: 1432 07-14-2025	ANDREW KIROV				
	CC Meeting Videography	75.00	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 18 101-11-4400-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	75.00			
Vendor: 1058 08-01-2025	KTY 285, LLC				
	TIF PayGo: 08/01/2025	77,359.41	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 19 470-00-4400-0019	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	77,359.41			
Vendor: 707 1675	LAKE MINNETONKA COMMUNICATION COMMISSION				
	Microphone -Chambers	118.29	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 20 101-11-4245-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	118.29			
Vendor: 1075 INV070341	LAKE RESTORATION, INC.				
	Manor Park Pond Maint Treatment	526.00	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 21 101-52-4400-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	526.00			

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 1320 05-27-2025	Check Total:	526.00			
	MINNESOTA RURAL WATER ASSOCIATION				
	Valve Exerciser Rental	1,600.00	07/28/2025	Check Sequence: 22 601-00-4410-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	1,600.00			
	PERRILL			Check Sequence: 23	ACH Enabled: True
Vendor: 903 264574 264574	ROWay Web App-Monthly	75.00	07/28/2025	601-00-4400-0000	
	ROWay Web App-Monthly	75.00	07/28/2025	611-00-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	150.00			
Vendor: 1063 ROW#286889 ROW#28758 ROW#287859	RYAN LaPOINTE			Check Sequence: 24	ACH Enabled: False
	Security Deposit Refund-ROW Permit#286889-1	2,000.00	07/28/2025	880-00-2200-0000	
	Security Deposit Refund-ROW Permit#28758-2	2,000.00	07/28/2025	880-00-2200-0000	
	Security Deposit Refund-ROW Permit#287859-4	2,000.00	07/28/2025	880-00-2200-0000	
Vendor: 1324 INV309910	Check Total:	6,000.00			
	SAFE-FAST INC.			Check Sequence: 25	ACH Enabled: True
	Marking Paint & Flags	250.85	07/28/2025	611-00-4245-0000	
Vendor: 360 May-2025-HCPF	Check Total:	250.85			
	SOUTH LAKE MINNETONKA POLICE DEPARTMENT			Check Sequence: 26	ACH Enabled: True
	May County Processing Fees	430.20	07/28/2025	101-21-4440-0000	
	Check Total:	430.20			
Vendor: 657 3377527	SUMMIT FIRE PROTECTION			Check Sequence: 27	ACH Enabled: True
	Annual Kitchen Hood Cleaning	2,135.00	07/28/2025	201-00-4223-0000	
	Check Total:	2,135.00			
Vendor: 372 BO2422030	SWANK MOTION PICTURES, INC.			Check Sequence: 28	ACH Enabled: False
	Movie in the Park License - Event 08/22/2025	490.00	07/28/2025	101-53-4443-0000	
	Check Total:	490.00			
Vendor: 1348	TOSHIBA AMERICA BUSINESS SOLUT			Check Sequence: 29	ACH Enabled: True

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
5035138917	PW's - Printer Lease-Acc#450-0104647-000	135.05	07/28/2025	101-32-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	135.05			
Vendor: 877	TRUIST GOVERNMENTAL FINANCE			Check Sequence: 30	ACH Enabled: False
992300031000001-070	Shorewood GO Series 2022A-Loan#9923000310	755.00	07/28/2025	611-00-2150-0000	
992300031000001-070	Shorewood GO Series 2022A-Loan#9923000310	628.00	07/28/2025	601-00-2150-0000	
992300031000001-070	Shorewood GO Series 2022A-Loan#9923000310	34,992.19	07/28/2025	631-00-4711-0000	
992300031000001-070	Shorewood GO Series 2022A-Loan#9923000310	72,623.50	07/28/2025	322-00-4711-0000	
992300031000001-070	Shorewood GO Series 2022A-Loan#9923000310	19,440.44	07/28/2025	601-00-4711-0000	
992300031000001-070	Shorewood GO Series 2022A-Loan#9923000310	23,327.12	07/28/2025	611-00-4711-0000	
992300031000001-070	Shorewood GO Series 2022A-Loan#9923000310	1,131.00	07/28/2025	631-00-2150-0000	
	Check Total:	152,897.25			
Vendor: 393	VESSCO, INC			Check Sequence: 31	ACH Enabled: True
098182	Regular Parts/Labors	732.81	07/28/2025	601-00-4221-0000	
	Check Total:	732.81			
Vendor: 408	WM MUELLER & SONS INC			Check Sequence: 32	ACH Enabled: True
313797	Road Materials	80.18	07/28/2025	101-32-4250-0000	
314013	Road Materials	192.59	07/28/2025	101-32-4250-0000	
314110	Road Materials	294.69	07/28/2025	101-32-4250-0000	
	Check Total:	567.46			
Vendor: 411	XCEL ENERGY, INC.			Check Sequence: 33	ACH Enabled: True
935447023	5655 Merry Lane	30.84	07/28/2025	101-52-4380-0000	5655 Merry Lane
935569783	5500 Old Market Rd	55.05	07/28/2025	601-00-4398-0000	5500 Old Market Rd
936694193	Boulder Bridge	17.17	07/28/2025	601-00-4396-0000	Boulder Bridge
936694193	Lift Station Street Lights	669.91	07/28/2025	611-00-4380-0000	L.S. Street Lights
936694193	P.W. Street Lights Svc	4,250.32	07/28/2025	101-32-4399-0000	P.W. Street Lights Svc
936694193	S.E. Area Svc	458.56	07/28/2025	601-00-4398-0000	S.E. Area Svc
936694193	P.W. Bldg Svc	253.95	07/28/2025	101-32-4380-0000	P.W. Bldg Svc
936694193	C.H. Svcs	586.72	07/28/2025	101-19-4380-0000	C.H. Svcs
936694193	Amesbury	2,263.36	07/28/2025	601-00-4394-0000	Amesbury
936694193	Parks	380.11	07/28/2025	101-52-4380-0000	Parks

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
	Check Total:	8,965.99			
	Total for Check Run:	292,187.32			
	Total of Number of Checks:	33			
AP-Computer Check Proof List by Vendor (07/23/2025 - 3:44 PM)					
					Page 6



City Council Meeting Item

Title/Subject: Adopt Resolution Approving a Special Assessment
Michael Brady Wasem Jr., 23622 Smithtown Road

Meeting Date: July 28, 2025

Prepared by: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator

Attachments: Resolution Approving and Adopting a Special Assessment

Item 2D

Re-approve due to duplicate resolution number.

Background:

To assist in managing the cost of connecting to City water, the City allows homeowners to request the water access charge (WAC) of \$10,000 be specially assessed to their property and paid through property taxes through an assessment agreement. The owner of the above captioned address wishes to enter into such an assessment agreement pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Chapter 429.

The special assessment will be certified to taxes and will be payable in five annual installments beginning in 2026 at an interest rate of 5.0%. The assessment will run with the property and the owner may pay off the assessment balance at any time. The owners also waive any rights to appeal the assessment, and the agreement will be recorded against the property.

Financial or Budget Considerations:

Connecting to City water provides revenue which supports the City's water utility fund.

Action Requested:

Motion to adopt the resolution approving and adopting a special assessment agreement and authorizing the Mayor to sign the assessment agreement.

ASSESSMENT AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is made this 23rd day of June, 2025 by and between the City of Shorewood (SHOREWOOD), a municipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of Minnesota, located at 5755 Country Club Road, Shorewood, MN 55331 and Michael Brady Wasem, Jr. 26085 Oak Leaf Trail, Shorewood, MN 55331 (OWNER).

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the OWNER is the owner of the real property located at: 23622 Smithtown Road, Shorewood, MN, 55331; PID: 34-114-23-23-0049, legally described as follows:

(“SUBJECT PROPERTY”)

That part of Lot 294, Auditor's Subdivision No. 135, Hennepin County, Minnesota, lying South of a line hereinafter referred to as "Line A" said "Line A" being described as follows: Commencing at the Southeast corner of Lot 3, Block 3, Excelsior Park; thence North along the East line of said Lot 3 a distance of 13.00 feet to the point of beginning of said "Line A"; thence deflecting right 90 degrees to the East line of said Lot 294, and said "Line A" there ending, and lying East of a line hereinafter referred to as said "Line B", said "Line B" being described as follows: Commencing at the point of intersection of said "Line A" with the West line of said Lot 294; thence East along said "Line A" a distance of 53.40 feet to the point of beginning of said "Line B"; thence deflecting right 90 degrees 18 minutes to the South line of said Lot 294, and said "Line B" there ending, lying Westerly of a line drawn from a point on the North line of said property distant 115.90 feet East of the Northwest corner thereof to a point on the South line of said property distant 138.39 feet East of the Southwest corner thereof and there terminating, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

WHEREAS, the OWNER desires to connect to the municipal water supply; and,

WHEREAS, the present Water Access Charge is \$10,000; and

WHEREAS, the OWNER requests that the full amount of the Water Access charge be assessed against the SUBJECT PROPERTY pursuant to Minn. Stat. Ch. 429.

AGREEMENT

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to the mutual agreements provided herein, it is agreed by and between the CITY and the OWNER as follows:

1. The OWNER represents and warrants that he is the OWNER of the SUBJECT PROPERTY and that he has full legal authority to encumber the SUBJECT PROPERTY and that as of the date of the execution of this agreement, the OWNER has fee title to the SUBJECT PROPERTY subject only to the liens, interests or encumbrances of record.
2. The OWNER understands and requests that the City levy the Water Access Charge assessed against the PROPERTY in the amount of **\$10,000.00** ("Assessment").
3. The OWNER understands and agrees that SHOREWOOD will provide that the Assessment is payable in five (5) annual installments without deferment and will bear an interest rate of five (5.0) percent per annum. The Assessment shall be deemed adopted on the date this Agreement has been signed by all parties. The installments shall begin with taxes paid in 2024 and collected with the ad valorem taxes at the times due as determined by Hennepin County.
4. The OWNER agrees that the covenants, waivers and agreements contained in this Agreement shall bind the successors and assigns of the OWNER and shall encumber the PROPERTY in accordance with the agreements described herein.
5. The OWNER its successors and assigns, waives any and all procedural and substantive objections to the Assessment including but not limited to public hearing requirements and any claim that the assessment exceeds the benefit to the Subject Property. Property Owner waives any appeal rights otherwise available pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 429.081.
6. The OWNER, its successors and assigns, hereby unconditionally releases and forever discharges the City, its elected officials, employees, agents and insurers from any and all claims and causes of action of whatever kind or nature that is in any way connected with the Assessment.

This Agreement shall be binding upon Property Owner and its successors and assigns. This Agreement shall run with the land and may be recorded against the title to the Subject Property.

[Remainder of page is intentionally left blank.]

Signature pages follow.]

OWNER

By: _____

Date: _____

By: _____

Date: _____

CITY OF SHOREWOOD

By: _____

Date: _____

Its _____

By: _____

Date: _____

Its _____

STATE OF MINNESOTA)

) SS:

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)

The foregoing ASSESSMENT AGREEMENT dated _____ was sworn and
subscribed before me in person this ____ day of _____, 20__ by _____
_____ and _____.

Notary Public

STATE OF MINNESOTA)

) SS:

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)

The foregoing ASSESSMENT AGREEMENT dated _____ was sworn and
subscribed before me in person this ____ day of _____, 20__ by Jennifer Labadie, Mayor,
and by Sandie Thone, City Clerk of the City of Shorewood (a Minnesota Municipal Corporation), who are
personally known to me, on behalf of the Corporation and pursuant to the authority of the City Council.

Notary Public

CITY OF SHOREWOOD

RESOLUTION NO. 25-066

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND ADOPTING A SPECIAL ASSESSMENT

WHEREAS, Micheal Brady Wasem, Jr, (“Owner”) has requested that the Shorewood City Council specially assess water access charges that affect Owners’ property at 23622 Smithtown Road, Shorewood, Minnesota (PID 34-117-23-23-0049) and legally described in Exhibit A attached hereto (“Subject Property”); and

WHEREAS, the City has received the following signed Assessment Agreement, Exhibit B attached hereto, waiving all applicable assessment procedural requirements and requesting to be assessed for the water access charge in the amount itemized therein for the Subject Property.

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

1. The signed Assessment Agreement is hereby accepted and approved.
2. The water access charge amounting to \$10,000.00 is hereby adopted and shall constitute a special assessment against the Subject Property and hereby made part of this Resolution by reference and that the tract of land therein included is hereby found to be benefited by the charge and connection to municipal water in the amount of the assessment levied against it.
3. Such assessment shall be payable in equal annual installments without deferment extending over a period of five (5) years, the first of the installments to be payable with taxes paid in 2026 and shall bear the interest rate of 5.0% per annum.
4. The Owners, at any time prior to certification of the assessment to the County Auditor, may pay the whole of the assessment on such property, with interest accrued to the date of payment, to the City, except that no interest shall be charged if the entire assessment is paid within thirty (30) days from the adoption of this Resolution; and such owner may at any time thereafter, pay the City the entire amount of the assessment remaining unpaid, with interest accrued to December 31 of the year in which such payment is made. Such payment must be made before November 15 or interest will be charged through December 31 of the next succeeding year. The Owners may also at any time prior to November 15, of any year, pay the remaining unpaid principal balance with interest accrued to December 31 of the year in which such prepayment is made.
5. The City Clerk shall forthwith transmit a certified duplicate of this assessment to the County Auditor to be extended on the property tax lists of the County.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Shorewood this 28th day of July, 2025.

Mayor Jennifer Labadie

ATTEST

Sandie Thone, City Clerk

Exhibit A

Legal Description

That part of Lot 294, Auditor's Subdivision No. 135, Hennepin County, Minnesota, lying South of a line hereinafter referred to as "Line A" said "Line A" being described as follows: Commencing at the Southeast corner of Lot 3, Block 3, Excelsior Park; thence North along the East line of said Lot 3 a distance of 13.00 feet to the point of beginning of said "Line A"; thence deflecting right 90 degrees to the East line of said Lot 294, and said "Line A" there ending, and lying East of a line hereinafter referred to as said "Line B", said "Line B" being described as follows: Commencing at the point of intersection of said "Line A" with the West line of said Lot 294; thence East along said "Line A" a distance of 53.40 feet to the point of beginning of said "Line B"; thence deflecting right 90 degrees 18 minutes to the South line of said Lot 294, and said "Line B" there ending, lying Westerly of a line drawn from a point on the North line of said property distant 115.90 feet East of the Northwest corner thereof to a point on the South line of said property distant 138.39 feet East of the Southwest corner thereof and there terminating, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

Exhibit B

Assessment Agreement



City Council Meeting Item

Title/Subject: Approve Codification of Supplement S-20; Ordinance 623
Meeting Date: July 28, 2025
Prepared by: Sandie Thone, City Clerk/Human Resources Director
Reviewed by: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator
Attachments: Ordinance 623

Background

On November 22, 2004, Council adopted Ordinance 409 which approved the Municipal Code Book codification provided by American Legal Publishing Corporation and the League of MN Cities. Nineteen supplements have been completed since the initial codification.

The process of reviewing and incorporating changes to the City Code is called "codification." All ordinances that are approved are incorporated into the City Code. On an annual basis, Council-approved ordinances are incorporated into the official code document at the City Clerk's office, and the online representation of the Code is updated. Ordinances adopted after the annual codification process are kept in the City Clerk's Office as approved, but not yet codified ordinances, and are available on the city website as well. American Legal Publishing serves as the City's codifier and online host of the web version of the City Code.

The twentieth supplement (S-20) to the City Code contains ordinances up through and including Ordinance 611. Ordinance 623, if so adopted, shall take effect upon publication in the city's official newspaper.

Financial Considerations

Budget Item: Administration Budget: Cost of the S-20 Supplement does not exceed budgeted funds.

Action Requested

Motion to approve Ordinance 623 Codification of Ordinances Supplement S-20 to the Shorewood City Code, provided by American Legal Publishing Corporation.

Motion, Second, and Majority required.

**CITY OF SHOREWOOD
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

ORDINANCE 623

**AN ORDINANCE ENACTING AND ADOPTING THE 2024 S-20 SUPPLEMENT TO THE CODE OF
ORDINANCES FOR THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD MINNESOTA**

American Legal Publishing Corporation has completed the Twentieth Supplement to the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shorewood, which contains ordinances up through and including Ordinance 611 enacted since the prior supplement; and it is the intent of the City of Shorewood to accept these updated sections, as outlined in Supplement S-20, available for review and inspection at City Hall and on the City's website in its entirety.

NOW THEREFORE the City Council of the City of Shorewood, Minnesota, ordains:

Section 1. That the 20th supplement to the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shorewood as submitted by American Legal Publishing Corporation of Cincinnati, Ohio, is hereby accepted.

Section 2. This ordinance adopting the 2024 S-20 Supplement to the Code of Ordinances shall take effect upon publication in the City's official newspaper.

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL of the City of Shorewood, Minnesota, this 28th day of July 2025.

Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sandie Thone, City Clerk



Item
4A

City Council Meeting Item

Title/Subject: South Lake Minnetonka Police Dept 2026 Budget Presentation
Meeting Date: July 28, 2025
Prepared by: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator
Attachments: NA

Police Chief Justin Ballsrud will discuss the 2026 SLMPD Budget. SLMPD is proposing a 12.2% increase of \$195,543. There was a one-time use of Public Safety Aid Funds in 2025 that reduces the budget impact to \$146,835, (an 8.5% increase), or a 1.93% direct levy impact.

No action is required at this time. The Council will consider approval of the SLMPD 2026 Budget at a future meeting.



City Council Meeting Item

Title/Subject: Recycling RFP
Meeting Date: July 28, 2025
Prepared by: Eric Wilson, Communications & Recycling Coordinator
Reviewed by: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator
Attachments: Recycling & Organics Services Request for Proposals
2025 Community Survey Results
Shorewood Recycling RFP

Background

The City currently contracts with Republic Services for organized recycling collection. The current contract term will expire December 31, 2025. At its June 10, 2025, work session, the Council stated its intention to issue an RFP in 2025 for recycling and possibly curbside organics collection.

A draft RFP was brought to City Council for review and approval at the March 10, 2025, work session. An RFP was published on April 1, 2025, with a submittal deadline on May 30, 2025. Four proposals were received from the following companies: Curbside Waste, Suburban Waste, Republic Services, and WM. Proposers submitted bids for two scenarios:

- Scenario A: Single-sort recycling collection
- Scenario B: Organics material collection

The review and selection process began on June 9, 2025, and is scheduled to conclude by July 31, 2025, with a proposed contract execution deadline by August 31, 2025.

During the review process, City staff reached out to city references named by each proposer and conducted a community survey as additional tools to determine the best value for the City and its residents. *Community survey results related to recycling and organics attached.*

The City of Shorewood seeks, at minimum, to enter in a single-sort recycling contract with a company that has the resources and ability to provide curbside residential recycling services. In addition, the City seeks to enter into a possible contract with a company that has the resources and ability to provide organic materials collection for residential properties for the entire city. Waste hauling will continue through an open system where residents select their preferred licensed hauler.

Summary of Proposals

Scenario A: Single-sort recycling collection

The single-sort system is one in which residents place their city designated recyclables into one container for collection. Under this scenario, a recycling cart shall be provided, assembled and maintained by the Contractor for each residential household for recyclable material storage and set-out. Fully commingled recyclables are kept in one category throughout the collection, transportation and unloading at the processing facility. Recyclables are then processed and sorted into commodities for sale.

Proposers provided rates based on 3,001 households. The current rate is \$5.32 per household per month.

Scenario B: Organics material collection

The scenario was included in the RFP as optional because in accordance with the 2022-2042 Metro Solid Waste Plan, cities with a population over 5,000 residents will be required to provide curbside organics recycling service to all households. This mandate is primarily enforced through Hennepin County Ordinance 13, which already mandates curbside organics recycling for cities with populations exceeding 10,000 people.

The date for the mandate for cities with a population over 5,000 has not been set; however, City staff recommend that Shorewood enters into a contract for curbside organics recycling collection beginning in 2027, in order to (a) allow time for transition of haulers' equipment, such as routes and bin, (b) to give time for staff to provide communication, education, and outreach, and (c) begin to make steps toward meeting the Ordinance 13 and Metro Solid Waste requirements in anticipation of their rollout.

Currently, the City operates 2 organic drop-off sites. One in Freeman Park and the other in Southshore Park. Shorewood residents may also use drop-off located in Haralson Park, operated by City of Greenwood. As of July 22, 2025, there are 163 households registered for this program, or a 5.4% participation rate, based on the 3,001 households.

As it typical when a curbside organics program is introduced, all 4 proposers provided rates based on percent participation. Like single-sort recycling, all residents must be charged the same amount whether or not a household participates (Ordinance 13). Rates would increase as participation percentage rate increases.

City staff recommends introducing organics pricing at a 0-10% participation rate beginning in 2027 and then the 10-20% rate 2028-2030, with the understanding that amendments may need to be considered in anticipation of changing participation rates, laws, and economic changes.

Scenario Questionnaires

In addition to pricing, proposers were asked to answer several scenario questions to gain an understanding of things like type of bins, customer service, reporting, handling of contamination, technologies in use, sustainability goals, capacity, and more.

City staff have objectively evaluated the submitted proposals based on the following criteria. These evaluation criteria are not presented in any special order.

- Comments from the Proposer's reference clients.
- Innovations proposed to increase participation and recyclable material quantities collected.
- Innovations proposed to improve public education about recycling to all residents.
- The price of recycling services.
- Overall, net annual cost to the City.
- Responsiveness of the proposer to all other provisions of this RFP.

Please note, all rates and responses to RFP have been left out of this memo in accordance with MN State Statute 13.591, subdivision 3.

MN State Statute 13.591, subdivision 3 (b)

In accordance with, data submitted by a business to a government entity in response to a request for proposal, as defined in section [16C.02, subdivision 12](#), are private or nonpublic until the time and date specified in the solicitation that proposals are due, at which time the name of the responder becomes public. All other data in a responder's response to a request for proposal are private or nonpublic data until completion of the evaluation process. For purposes of this section, "completion of the evaluation process" means that the government entity has completed negotiating the contract with the selected vendor. After a government entity has completed the evaluation process, all remaining data submitted by all responders are public with the exception of trade secret data as defined and classified in section [13.37](#). A statement by a responder that submitted data are copyrighted or otherwise protected does not prevent public access to the data contained in the response.

If all responses to a request for proposal are rejected prior to completion of the evaluation process, all data, other than the names of the responders, remain private or nonpublic until a resolicitation of the requests for proposal results in completion of the evaluation process or a determination is made to abandon the purchase. If the rejection occurs after the completion of the evaluation process, the data remain public. If a resolicitation of proposals does not occur within one year of the proposal opening date, the remaining data become public.

Staff is looking for City Council to:

1. Choose a hauler to award a single-sort recycling contract. Based on pricing, scenario questions, and responses from references. Staff is recommending the selection of WM as they provided the lowest rate of all four proposals, outlined innovative responses to scenario questionnaires, and were highly recommended by references. If the City

Council agrees, staff will negotiate a contract with WM for Council approval at a future meeting.

2. Consider if the City will pursue curbside organics recycling. If the decision is made to do so, staff will develop a schedule and process for rolling out such a program, including education, communication, timing, and phasing.

Pros and cons of organics collection vs curbside organics

Organics Collection Site – Pros - Residents don't pay monthly - Accessible during park hours - Residents don't need to keep/store organics (they can take their bags immediately when full)	Organics Collection Site – Cons - Organics drop off dumpster does not look different from other waste receptacles - Can be contaminated with non-organic materials - At times requires city staff to maintain - Locks are difficult to use - Inconvenient to haul materials
Curbside Organics – Pros - Convenience - Reduces odor and pest from trash bins - Promotes education and awareness - Increased participation rates - does not require an opt-in - Potentially can reduce trash costs (for example, another bin) - Better ability to track	Curbside Organics – Cons - Must pay for it even if not using it - An extra bin to remember to set out - An extra truck driving down road (depending on how hauler does it) - Requires a different kind of bag if not throwing directly into bin

Recycling Program Goals

	2023	2024	2025	2026
Goal 1. Increase material tonnage of recyclable materials				
Total tonnage (tons)	820.22	770.91	800	850
Goal 2. Decrease residual garbage in recycling				
Residual Tonnage (tons)	54.95	96.51	80	80
Percent Residual	7%	13%	10%	9%
Goal 3. Increase Participation Rate - Organics Recycling				
# Households Registered	202	239	279	300
Percent of Total HH (# out of 3,001)	7%	8%	9%	10%

Financial Considerations

The Recycling Fund is funded through user fees. These fees may need to be adjusted under a new contract or if new services (curbside organics) are added. It should be noted that, like recycling collection, fees for organics collection are “everyone pays”, regardless of participation.

Action Requested

1. Motion to direct staff to negotiate a contract for curbside recycling with WM.
2. Motion to direct staff to develop a propose a schedule and process to implement a curbside organics collection program.

2025 Shorewood Community Survey Results Recycling & Curbside Organics

A community survey was conducted in Spring 2025. A few questions regarding recycling and organics were included in this survey. While the responses may not be completely accurate, it does provide some insights.

Please rate the quality of recycling services in Shorewood				
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
40.42% (116)*	44.95% (129)	9.41% (27)	2.44% (7)	2.79% (8)

*Indicates number of responses received out of 301 responses. 287/301 answered this question.

To what extent do you support or oppose providing curbside organics materials collection (food waste) in Shorewood?				
Strongly support	Somewhat support	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know
27.89% (82)*	32.31% (95)	11.9% (35)	15.31% (45)	12.59% (37)

*Indicates number of responses received out of 301 responses. 294/301 answered this question.

Comments from survey related to recycling and organics collection:

“Organic recycling is great, but please investigate an alternative to yet another heavy, noisy, stinky vehicle on our streets? What about compost bins? What happened to that idea? Just as we keep rainwater runoff on our property, we should find a way to compost our vegetable waste.”

“Please bring back and allow curbside organics recycling/food composting. All neighboring cities allow it and it is very odd that it was allowed and then taken away.”

“have recycling pick-up once a week”

“I really feel like composting, recycling and single truck garbage service are so important and we need all citizens to get on board with it. It needs to be easy for people to do”

“Organics recycling is a must! “

“I would love it if Shorewood brought back the curbside compost program!”



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

Residential Curbside Recycling and
Organics Material Collection Services

Posted: April 1, 2025

Deadline: May 30, 2025, 4:30 p.m. CST

The City of Shorewood, MN seeks a qualified company to provide curbside single-sort recycling services, along with potentially providing curbside organics material collection services.

City of Shorewood
5755 Country Club Road
Shorewood, MN 55331
952-960-7900

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. BACKGROUND AND HISTORY	4
3. CONTRACTOR SELECTION PROCESS AND SCHEDULE	5
3.1 Contractor Selection Process	5
3.2 Evaluation Criteria	5
3.3 Schedule	5
3.4 Notification of Intent	6
3.5 Requests for Clarification.....	6
3.6 Proposers May Team Up with Other Companies.....	6
3.7 How to Submit Proposals	6
3.8 Proposals May Be Rejected in Whole or Part	7
3.9 RFP and Proposal to Become Part of Final Contract	7
4. PROPOSAL CONTENT	8
4.1 Price Worksheets and Questionnaires.....	8
5. PROPOSAL SCENARIOS.....	9
5.1 Single-Sort Recycling	9
5.1.1 Single-Sort Start Date	9
5.1.2 Collection Vehicle Equipment Requirements.....	9
5.1.3 Recycling Containers	9
5.1.4 Collection.....	9
5.1.5 Collection Days	9
5.1.6 Collection Frequency.....	9
5.1.7 Missed Collection Policy and Procedures	10
5.1.8 Non-Completion of Collection and Extension of Collection Hours	10
5.1.9 Weighing of Loads	10
5.1.10 Reporting.....	10
5.1.11 Publicity, Promotion, and Education.....	10
5.2 Organics Material Collection	10
5.2.1 Organics Material Collection Start Date	10
5.2.2 Collection Vehicle Equipment Requirements.....	10
5.2.3 Organics Recycling Containers	10
5.2.4 Collection.....	11
5.2.5 Collection Days	11
5.2.6 Collection Frequency	11
5.2.7 Missed Collection Policy and Procedures	11
5.2.8 Non-Completion of Collection and Extension of Collection Hours	11
5.2.9 Weighing of Loads	11
5.2.10 Reporting.....	11
5.3 Alternate Scenario	11
ATTACHMENT A: PRICE WORKSHEETS.....	12
ATTACHMENT B: CONTRACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE	13
ATTACHMENT C: SCENARIO QUESTIONNAIRE	14

1. INTRODUCTION

This request for proposals (RFP) defines the service standards, specifications and proposal requirements of the residential recycling collection and organics materials collection programs for the City of Shorewood.

The City of Shorewood seeks, at minimum, to enter in a single-sort recycling contract with a company that has the resources and ability to provide curbside residential recycling services. In addition, the City seeks to enter into a possible contract with a company that has the resources and ability to provide organic materials collection for residential properties for the entire city if this aligns with direction from residents and City Council.

The City of Shorewood will accept and evaluate proposals for residential recycling and organics material collection services including collection, processing, and marketing. The goals are to:

- A. Maximize the participation;
- B. Maximize the amount of recyclable materials collected;
- C. Achieve the most cost-effective solution; and,
- D. Reduce the amount of waste sent to the Waste to Energy Facility or Landfill.

2. BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

Shorewood currently provides biweekly curbside collection for all single-family households. Collection days are Wednesday on the “mainland” and Thursday on the islands. The above-mentioned collection days are the same as municipal solid waste (MSW) collection days and will change only as MSW collection changes.

Shorewood uses several forms of communication to promote the recycling and waste reduction program. We have a monthly newsletter, a website, and social media. The Proposer shall work cooperatively with City of Shorewood staff in creating promotional materials for each of these media.

The current population of Shorewood is approximately 7,500. We have approximately 3,001 residences eligible for the curbside collection.

Shorewood residents placed 748 tons of material for collection in 2024. On average, there were 5,334 stops per month. The charts below provide additional details.

Resident Participation Rates & Materials (2024)

Month	Pounds	Recycling Part %	Actual Stops	Possible Stops
January	176,019	96%	7,386	7,680
February	97,276	96%	4,924	5,120
March	109,128	96%	4,924	5,120
April	113,390	96%	4,924	5,120
May	124,595	96%	4,924	5,120
June	127,314	96%	4,924	5,120
July	182,993	96%	7,386	7,680
August	110,340	96%	4,924	5,120
September	107,501	96%	4,924	5,120
October	110,516	96%	4,924	5,120
November	122,927	96%	4,924	5,120
December	114,227	96%	4,924	5,120
Total	1,496,226			

Materials	%
OCC	32.80%
Mixed Paper	31.50%
Glass	13.50%
PET	5.70%
Tin	1.29%
Pigmented	1.16%
Natural	1.09%
PP#5	0.06%
Residual	12.90%
Total	100.0%

3. CONTRACTOR SELECTION PROCESS AND SCHEDULE

3.1 Contractor Selection Process

To the best of the ability, the City will use the following process for its decision-making:

- City staff will review and analyze the details of the qualified submitted proposals (see Section 3.2, "Evaluation Criteria"). The City reserves the right to ask Proposers for additional information/clarification to better understand the proposals. City staff will prepare an analysis of all proposals, and rank recommendations in order of priority to City Council.
- City staff will negotiate with the selected Proposer. If negotiations with top-ranked Proposer are not successful, the City may then initiate negotiations with the second ranked Proposers, and so on.
- Once a draft contract has been successfully negotiated, City staff will present its recommendations to City Council. The City Council may then award the contract and authorize staff to execute it.
- The new recycling contract will commence as determined by the contract.

3.2 Evaluation Criteria

The City will objectively evaluate the proposals submitted to determine the best value for the City and its residents. A comprehensive set of criteria will be used to quantify the merits of each proposal package, including (but not limited to):

- Strength of qualifications of the Proposer (together with any proposed subcontractor, if any), especially related to the needs of the City. Qualifications will include (but not be limited to) the proven capacities of the Proposer (and any subcontractor) to meet the operational requirements of the City.
- Comments from the Proposer's reference clients.
- Innovations proposed to increase participation and recyclable material quantities collected.
- Innovations proposed to improve public education about recycling to all residents.
- The price of recycling services.
- Overall, net annual cost to the City.
- Responsiveness of the proposer to all other provisions of this RFP.

These evaluation criteria are not presented in any special order. No ranking of these criteria within this RFP is intended or implied. The City reserves the right to consider other criteria in their review of proposals.

3.3 Schedule

Proposal & Selection Task	Date
RFP Published	April 1, 2025
Notification of Intent	April 18, 2025
Deadline for Proposers to Submit Questions	May 2, 2025, 4:30 p.m. CST
Responses to Questions Published	May 16, 2025
Submittal Deadline	May 30, 2025, 4:30 p.m. CST
Review and Selection	June 9, 2025 – July 31, 2025
Contract Execution Deadline	August 31, 2025
Contract Term	January 1, 2026 – December 31, 2030

3.4 Notification of Intent

Prospective Proposers interested in responding to this RFP shall notify the City in writing (emails are acceptable) of their interest in proposing. Notifications of intent shall be sent to:

Sandie Thone, City Clerk
5755 Country Club Road
Shorewood, MN 55331
sthone@shorewoodmn.gov

Notifications shall include name, title, address, phone number, email address and an itemized list of each Prospective Proposer intends to submit proposals to. Notification of intent must be made by Friday, April 18, 2025, 4:30 p.m. CST.

3.5 Requests for Clarification

Questions, requests for clarification or requests for information about this RFP or process must be submitted in writing to the City Clerk by Friday, May 2, 2025, 4:30 p.m. CST. All questions and requests for more information and the City response will be summarized in writing and forwarded to all other qualified Proposers on or before Friday, May 16, 2025, 4:30 p.m. CST. Any other unauthorized contact with other City staff or City Council members will subject the company to disqualification from further consideration. This restriction will be in effect from the date this RFP is finalized and released through the date of final contract award (including authorization for execution) by the City Council.

3.6 Proposers May Team with Other Companies

It is recognized that some prospective haulers may wish to subcontract with other companies for processing services. This is allowed as needed, but all such Proposer-Subcontractor relationships must be explicitly described in each proposal scenario. The City will only contract with one primary Contractor for the recycling services.

Multiple Proposers may team up with other complimentary hauling or recycling companies provided there is no collusion. A company may be listed as a part of more than one team as long as this company submits a written certification that no collusion occurred between competing proposals.

3.7 How to Submit Proposals

Proposals shall be postmarked and submitted to the City of Shorewood City Clerk no later than Friday, May 30, 2025, 4:30 p.m. CST, to be considered eligible. Proposals shall be submitted in a sealed envelope with the name of the proposing company on the outside and addressed as follows:

Recycling Services Proposal
c/o Sandie Thone, City Clerk
5755 Country Club Road
Shorewood, MN 55331

Proposals will be treated in accordance with Mn. Statutes 13.591, Subdivision 3 (b), Data Practices Act.

Proposers must include seven (7) printed copies and one electronic copy of the proposal on a flash drive inside the sealed envelope. The proposal file must be formatted in PDF or a suitably compatible alternative. Only the company names of the Proposers submitting proposals will be made public. All proposal documents shall be held as confidential until the City Council awards a new contract and authorizes staff to execute the new contract.

3.8 Proposals May Be Rejected in Whole or Part

The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals or parts of proposals, to negotiate modifications of proposals submitted, to accept part or all of the proposals on the basis of consideration(s) other than proceeds or cost, and to negotiate specific work elements with a respondent into a project of lesser or greater expense and reimbursement than described in this RFP or the respondent's reply.

3.9 RFP and Proposal to Become Part of Final Contract

The contents of this RFP, the successful proposal, and any written clarifications or modifications to the contents thereof submitted by the successful Proposer may become part of the contractual obligations and be incorporated by reference into the ensuing contract. If any provision of the contract is in conflict with the referenced RFP or proposal, the contract shall take precedent.

4. PROPOSAL CONTENT

At minimum, Proposers must submit a proposal for the Single-sort Recycling Collection Scenario (*see section 5.1 Single-Sort Scenario*), along with responses to accompanying *Attachments A, B & C*. Organic Materials Collection Scenario (*see section 5.2 Organics Material Collection*) and Alternate Scenario (*see section 5.3 Alternate Scenario*) are optional. If an alternate scenario is proposed, it will be considered using the same evaluation criteria and process as the recycling or organic scenarios. Alternate proposals must have clear and complete descriptions of the proposed operations to be considered.

4.1 Price Worksheets and Questionnaires

Prospective Proposers must complete a price worksheet and questionnaire as part of each proposal they submit (*see Attachments A, B, C*). In addition, Proposers may complete an additional alternate price worksheet if their proposed system does not fit into one of the other scenarios.

Qualified proposals must include at least the following elements for each scenario:

- Completed price worksheets (*see Attachment A*)
- Completed responses to contractor questionnaire (*see Attachment B*)
- Completed responses to scenario questionnaire (*see Attachment C*)

5. PROPOSAL SCENARIOS

5.1 Single-Sort Recycling

To meet RFP requirements, proposers must submit a single-sort proposal scenario. The single-sort system is one in which residents place their city designated recyclables into one container for collection. Proposer agrees to provide residential recycling services to all households.

5.1.1 Single-Sort Start Date

The start date for any new single-sort recycling contract, if such a contract is awarded by the City, shall be January 1, 2026. Proposers may suggest an alternative “change date” to start the new single-sort recyclables collection service, but this must be clearly specified in their response to this RFP.

5.1.2 Collection Vehicle Equipment Requirements

All collection vehicles used in the performance of the contract shall be duly licensed and inspected by the State of Minnesota and shall operate within the weight allowed by Minnesota Statutes. Appropriate container vehicles shall be used that are in proper working condition and that prevent loss in transit of liquid or solid cargo. All vehicles shall be kept clean and as free from offensive odors as possible.

5.1.3 Recycling Containers

Proposer shall provide containers for single-stream collection programs. The Proposer will maintain an inventory of new and replacement containers and will be required to service and repair damaged containers. The Proposer shall maintain sufficient cart inventory of various sizes to meet supply and demand needs for the entire term of the contract.

5.1.4 Collection

Except for selected multifamily dwellings, all organics material collection services will occur at the curbside. All collection operations commence no earlier than 7:00 a.m. and are completed by 6:00 p.m. on the scheduled collection day. The Proposer shall collect from each participating household, all acceptable materials that have been prepared according to publicized procedures.

Proposer shall adequately clean up any materials spilled or blown during the course of collection and/or hauling operations. Any unacceptable materials left behind should be secured within resident's recycling container, if provided. Proposer shall have no responsibility to remove any items that are not recyclable materials.

5.1.5 Collection Days

The current collection days are Wednesday for mainland areas of the City, and Thursday for the island properties. Delayed pick-ups due to holidays shall be designated in the final contract.

5.1.6 Collection Frequency

Single-sort recyclables shall be collected bi-weekly. An alternate collection frequency can be submitted under Scenario C: Alternate Scenario. If an alternate scenario is proposed, it will be considered using the same evaluation criteria and process as other scenarios.

5.1.7 Missed Collection Policy and Procedures

Residents will be directed to call the Proposer or City for missed collection and other service issues.

5.1.8 Non-Completion of Collection and Extension of Collection Hours

Proposer shall inform the City of the areas not completed, the reason for non-completion, and the expected time of completion.

5.1.9 Weighing of Loads

Proposer will keep accurate records consisting of an approved weight slip or electronic equivalent.

5.1.10 Reporting

Proposers must adequately report how they will track customer service reports, participation rates, tonnages and contamination rates.

5.1.11 Publicity, Promotion and Education

The Proposer shall work with the City to prepare and distribute recycling information to residents each year.

5.2 Organics Material Collection

The organic material collection scenario is one in which residents place their organics recycling into one container for collection. The proposer shall collect the organics, transport and unload at an organic processing facility. Proposer agrees to provide curbside organics services to all households.

5.2.1 Organics Material Collection Start Date

Because curbside organics services are currently not required, the start date for any organics contract, if such a contract is awarded by the City, is currently unknown. The City anticipates that Hennepin County, Minn. Stat. § 473.149 will determine a start date for curbside organic collection. Proposers may suggest any date within the five-year proposed contract period to start the new organic collection service, but this must be clearly specified in their response to this RFP.

5.2.2 Vehicle Equipment Requirements

All collection vehicles used in the performance of the contract shall be duly licensed and inspected by the State of Minnesota and shall operate within the weight allowed by Minnesota Statutes. Appropriate container vehicles shall be used that are in proper working condition and that prevent loss in transit of liquid or solid cargo. All vehicles shall be kept clean and as free from offensive odors as possible.

5.2.3 Organics Recycling Containers

Proposer shall provide containers for organics material collection programs. The Proposer will maintain an inventory of new and replacement containers and will be required to service and repair damaged containers. The Proposer shall maintain sufficient cart inventory of various sizes to meet supply and demand needs for the entire term of the contract.

5.2.4 Collection

Except for selected multifamily dwellings, all organics material collection services will occur at the curbside. All collection operations commence no earlier than 7:00 a.m. and are completed by 6:00 p.m. on the scheduled collection day. The Proposer shall collect from each participating household, all acceptable materials that have been prepared according to publicized procedures.

Proposer shall adequately clean up any materials spilled or blown during the course of collection and/or hauling operations. Any unacceptable materials left behind should be secured within resident's recycling container, if provided. Proposer shall have no responsibility to remove any items that are not recyclable materials.

5.2.5 Collection Days

The current collection days are Wednesday for mainland areas of the City, and Thursday for the island properties. Delayed pick-ups due to holidays shall be designated in the final contract.

5.2.6 Collection Frequency

The frequency in which organic recycling services would occur has not been determined. Proposers that are responding to the organics material collection scenario must suggest collection frequency in their response to this RFP on Worksheet A.

5.2.7 Missed Collection Policy and Procedures

Residents will be directed to call the Proposer or City for missed collection and other service issues.

5.2.8 Non-Completion of Collection and Extension of Collection Hours

Proposer shall inform the City of the areas not completed, the reason for non-completion, and the expected time of completion.

5.2.9 Reporting

Proposers must adequately report how they will track customer service reports, participation rates, tonnages and contamination rates.

5.2.10 Publicity, promotion and education

The Proposer shall work with the City to prepare and distribute information to residents each year.

5.3 Alternate Scenario

Proposers may elect to also submit a proposal for an alternate scenario that does not conform to the specifications listed in the single-sort or organic RFP scenarios as described above.

Alternate scenarios could include major changes in the system such as:

- Alternate collection method, i.e. compostable bag instead of cart for organics or other method.
- Alternate collection frequency.
- Other innovative proposals.

ATTACHMENT A: PRICE WORKSHEETS

All Proposers must fill out at least one price worksheet with each proposal scenario. Multiple scenarios may be submitted. Proposers may fill in the attached form or use their own similar format; however, the contents in the attached price worksheet must be included if alternate formats are submitted.

If the Proposer proposes under any alternate proposal scenarios, the proposal must explicitly describe the collection service design (e.g., resident materials sorting/preparation requirements, collection frequency, cart size, cart ownership, etc.)

The proposed price per household charge to the City for all recycling services must be completed for each scenario.

Single-Stream Recycling Collection Scenario

Year (January-December)	Number of stops (per month)	Collection Rate (per household/month)	Processing Fee (per household/month)	Total Rate (per household/month)
2026				
2027				
2028				
2029				
2030				

Organics Material Collection Scenario

Year	Start-End Date	Number of stops (per month)	Collection Rate (per household/month)	Processing Fee (per household/month)	Total Rate (per household/month)
2026					
2027					
2028					
2029					
2030					

ATTACHMENT B: CONTRACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Please provide the requested information to the items listed below. All questions should be answered fully in order to provide the City with an understanding of the services you would provide. Information and answers can be attached on separate sheets as needed.

Qualified proposals must include at least the following elements:

1. Name and Address of Contractor.
2. Are you currently a Licensed Solid Waste Collector with the City? If not, do you intend to do so prior to a contract being signed?
3. Provide names and titles of key personnel and related tasks they would perform during the transition and during the term of the Agreement. Include personnel that would handle Shorewood during the operation of recycling service.
4. How many years have you been engaged in residential recycling collection?
5. How many years have you been engaged in residential organics collection?
6. List current and past municipal recycling contracts you have had in the past 15 years. If applicable, list the date when the contract ended and the reason for the loss of a contract.
7. List current and past municipal organics contracts you have had in the past 15 years. If applicable, list the date when the contract ended and the reason for the loss of a contract.
8. Provide contact information for three references from cities where you have recently provided residential recycling services of similar size and scope. Contact information should include Organization Name, Contact Person Name, Email Address, and Phone number.
9. Describe any new contracts you have recently begun in the last 5 years. Provide a detailed list of the steps you took to ensure the contract transition was successful both from a field and customer service perspective. As a new provider, what issues or problems did you encounter and how did you deal with those issues? What challenges do you expect with this contract?
10. List company, locations and contact person for the materials processing facility for recyclables and organic materials.
11. How do you minimize missed pickups when starting a new contract and when new drivers are added during the contract?
12. Describe the number, type, size and age of collection vehicles that will be used. What type of fuel do they use? Will there be additional vehicles available should one breakdown during service?
13. What new technologies or innovations have you added or are you considering adding to vehicles to better track materials, contamination, collection problems, etc. in the field?
14. Describe how you will staff and deliver excellent customer service for this contract. Including information regarding service during route collection and office support.
15. Specify if and how you will change your capacity (i.e., staff, vehicle fleet and processing / marketing) to fulfill the Agreement, if awarded.
16. State your company safety philosophy. Provide written, signed confirmation that all required safety plans are on file and available for review upon request. Include your safety manager's name and contact information (i.e., phone number, e-mail) in the proposal.
17. Describe any environmentally sustainable initiatives in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area (TCMA) that are currently a part of your company's business operations. List any future plans for your operations in the TCMA.

ATTACHMENT C: SCENARIO QUESTIONNAIRE

Please provide requested information to the items listed below. All questions should be answered fully in order to provide the City with an understanding of the services you would provide for each scenario. Information and answers can be attached on separate sheets as needed.

1. What are your policies and truck-side procedures to manage prohibited items that residents may place in carts?
2. What is your proposed cart color, lid color or other labels?
3. Describe the methods you propose to use to perform recycling participation study for both set-out and participation rate.
4. Describe your interest and capability of adding materials in the future. Please note the types of materials that may be included in the future.
5. Describe what you propose as plans for education to better the quality of the program, to increase participation and volume of materials collected, both initially and over the term of this contract for each scenario in which you have applied. Please describe in sufficient detail and include examples from other existing City programs, if applicable.
6. State your means to estimate process residuals from your (or subcontracted) recycling facility.
7. Describe plans for processing and marketing materials collected.
8. What is your proposed list of publicity and education tools? Please describe in sufficient detail and include examples from other existing City programs, if applicable.

SHOREWOOD CITY COUNCIL TENTATIVE MEETING TOPICS

The following items are anticipated topics for future City Council meetings. This is not an exhaustive list and topics are subject to change.

July 28, 2025

Work Sessions

- Budget Work Session #4 – General Fund, Levies, tax impact
- CLOSED SESSION following regular Meeting: City Administrator Annual Review
- Budget Work Session #5 – Special Rev & Enterprise Funds
- Engineering Services Follow up
- City Council Bylaws
- Review 2026 Budget #6 – CIP and Debt Service Funds

Regular Meeting

- Cannabis Code Amendment
- Grading & Steep Slope Code Amendment
- Presentation – Christmas Lake AIS Program
- Retention schedule
- Approve Preliminary Budget
- Adopt Master Fee Schedule Resolution (Ord- Zoning)
- Annual Tobacco License Renewals
- Recycling Contract approval
- Curbside Organics
- Quarterly Communications Report / CRT
- Engineering Services Contract Renewal
- Contract Renewal for Civil/Prosecution
- Certify Unpaid Charges
- Certify Special Assessments
- Approve Meeting Minute Agreement for following year
- TNT Public Hearing; Adopt Final Budget
- Set the 2026 City Council Regular Meeting Schedule
- Annual Employee Service Recognition



CITY COUNCIL LAND USE TRAINING SESSION
SPECIAL MEETING

MEETING DATE: MONDAY, JULY 28, 2025

MEETING TIME: 8:00 PM (or directly following the regular city council meeting)

MEETING LOCATION: Shorewood City Hall Council Chambers
5755 Country Club Road
Shorewood, MN 55331

The meeting is for the purpose of providing land use training to the city's elected officials.



City of Shorewood

City Council Land Use Planning & Zoning Training

Title/Subject: Land Use Planning & Zoning Training
Meeting Date: July 28, 2025
Prepared by: Jake Griffiths, Planning Director
Jared Shepherd, City Attorney
Reviewed by: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator

City Attorney Jared Shepherd and Planning Director Jake Griffiths will provide a land use planning and zoning training presentation. The following will be discussed:

1. Municipal Authority to Plan
2. The Role of the Planning Commission
3. Zoning: Implementing the Comprehensive Plan
4. Conditional Use Permits
5. Variances
6. Time Limits
7. Public Hearings