

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 10, 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. Contact the city at 952.960.7900 during regular business hours with questions.

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 Retreat Minutes of February 18, 2025 Minutes
- B. City Council Work Session Minutes of February 24, 2025 Minutes
- C. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of February 24, 2025 Minutes
- D. Verified Claims List Claims List
- E. Service Agreement with Barr Engineering City Planner Memo
- F. Agenda Management Software City Clerk/HR Director Memo

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. Excelsior Lions Club: Josh Radziej

City Administrator Memo

5. PARKS

6. PLANNING

7. ENGINEERING/PUBLIC WORKS

A. 2025 Mill & Overlay Final Plans and Specifications, City
Project 24-10

City Engineer Memo
Resolution 25-027

8. GENERAL/NEW BUSINESS

9. STAFF AND COUNCIL REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Staff

B. Mayor and City Council

10. ADJOURN

MINUTES

2A

1. Meeting was convened at 8:31 a.m.

2. Present at the meeting were: Mayor Labadie, Council Members Maddy, Sanschagrin, Gorham and DiGruttollo; City Administrator Nevinski, City Clerk/HR Director Thone, Public Works Director Morreim, Finance Director Schmuck, and City Engineer Budde

Agenda: Motion to approve the agenda was made by Councilmember Sanschagrin and seconded by Councilmember Gorham; Motion approved.

Meeting Agenda: Marc outlined the meeting agenda, which includes a consensus workshop, funds discussion, and conclusion, and emphasized the importance of strategic thinking and consensus-building. Marc mentioned the possibility of adjusting the schedule if needed, with an option to extend the meeting or schedule a work session on Monday night.

PART I – CONSENSUS WORKSHOP

- **Visioning Exercise:** Marc introduced a visioning exercise to identify three to five strategic priorities for Shorewood, aiming to build consensus and develop goals and action steps.
- **Strategic Priorities:** Marc asked participants to write down 15 to 20 strategic priorities individually, then pair up to compare notes, eliminate overlaps, and summarize ideas on post-it notes.
- **Group Discussion:** Participants grouped their ideas into categories discussing the importance of each. These groups formed the basis for Shorewood's strategic priorities. These included: Environmental Stewardship, Fiscal Responsibility, Safety, Organizational Effectiveness or Strategic integration & Alignment, Infrastructure, Planning & Development, and Engagement. Discussion included:
 - **Consistent Policies** across the organization to ensure alignment and effective governance.
 - **Strategic Thinking** in decision-making processes to align resources and achieve long-term goals.
 - **Resource Alignment** with strategic priorities to ensure efficient and effective use of available assets.
 - **Good Governance** practices, including transparency, accountability, policies and integration of efforts across departments.
 - **Infrastructure that is** quality, resilient, and inclusive infrastructure, including roads, water, parks, and trails, and the need for life cycle analysis for projects.

- **Quality and resilient Infrastructure** including well-maintained roads, reliable water systems, resilient infrastructure, and accessible parks and trails.
- **Inclusivity**, ensuring that all community members have access to essential services and amenities.
- **Life Cycle Analysis** in infrastructure projects to ensure long-term sustainability and cost-effectiveness.
- **Environmental Stewardship through** strategies to manage natural resources, including parks, public spaces, and land use, aligned with City values and policies.
- **Community-Centered Development:** Participants discussed the importance of community-centered planning and development, addressing the needs of both long-term and new residents, and updating outdated plans.

Ideas Discussed:

- **Strategic Plan Draft:** Draft a strategic plan document incorporating the discussed priorities and values for review by the Council.
- **Parks Master Plan RFP:** Ensure proposal aligns with strategic priorities.
- **Green Step Cities Program:** Discuss the next steps and goals for the Green Step Cities program in work session
- **Be Safe Resolution Review:** Engage experts to educate the Council and residents on the implications of the Be Safe resolution and develop a comprehensive understanding of its impact.
- **EDA Utilization:** Outline how the EDA can be used to influence development and investment.
- **Communication Strategy:** Consider hiring a strategic communications consultant to improve resident engagement and measure the effectiveness of communication efforts.
- **Resident Engagement Data:** Collect and analyze demographic data to better understand resident engagement preferences and improve communication strategies.
- **Public Safety Strategy:** Develop a proactive strategy for public safety services, including long-term planning and Council involvement in JPA decisions. (Council)

PART II. FUNDS DISCUSSION

- **Overview of Governmental Funds:** Jeanne provided an overview of the city's governmental funds, including the general fund, special revenue funds, capital funds, and debt service fund. She explained the purpose and structure of each fund, highlighting the importance of the general fund as the main legal source of financial activity.
 - **General Fund:** The general fund is the primary operating fund, supported mainly by property taxes. It covers the city's normal operating activities and is crucial for maintaining essential services.

- **Special Revenue Funds:** Special revenue funds have specific financing mechanisms and are used for designated purposes, such as public safety aid received in 2023.
- **Capital and Debt Service Funds:** Capital funds are allocated for infrastructure and facility needs, while the debt service fund manages debt issuances and payments.

GENERAL FUND

- **General Fund Revenue and Expenditures:** Jeanne discussed the general fund's revenue sources, primarily property taxes, and the expenditures, with a significant portion allocated to personnel services and public safety (70%). She emphasized the need for a balanced budget and the challenges of maintaining fund balance policies.
- **Fund Balance Policy:** Jeanne explained the city's fund balance policy, which requires maintaining a minimum of 60% fund balance. She discussed the historical context and the need to replenish resources if the balance falls below the threshold. The policy has evolved over time, and the current 60% threshold is higher than the state auditor's recommendation.
 - **Policy History:** The fund balance policy was established in 2007, initially not to exceed 60%. It was later revised to maintain a minimum of 60%, which is higher than the state auditor's recommendation of 35-50%. The 60% threshold is maintained to ensure cash flow for six months of activity, as the city receives 80% of its revenue from property taxes, which are collected biannually. The policy allows spending down reserves to 60%, with an obligation to replenish them within one year through other revenue sources or tax levy increases. The current fund balance of 80-90% is acceptable within the policy, but strategic planning is needed to maintain this level and avoid falling below the threshold.
- **Future Financial Projections:** Jeanne presented future financial projections, indicating that the city will fall below the 60% fund balance threshold by 2030. She stressed the importance of strategic planning to address the projected shortfall and the need for sustainable financial practices.
 - **Projection Details:** Jeanne projected that the city will fall below the 60% fund balance threshold by 2030. Even if the policy is adjusted to 50%, it would only delay the shortfall until 2034.
 - **Strategic Planning:** Strategic planning is essential to address the projected shortfall. Decisions on street maintenance, park maintenance, and infrastructure will impact the general fund and require careful consideration. Jeanne noted that past one-time fixes, such as transfers to the park and environmental funds, are not sustainable solutions and do not address the underlying issues with the general fund. Long-term solutions are needed to ensure financial sustainability, including potential changes to the fund balance policy and strategic decisions on expenditures and revenue generation.

Discussion

- **Fund Balance Policy:** Participants discussed the need to revisit the fund balance policy, considering options such as lowering the minimum fund balance rate or making substantial spending or revenue changes. They also explored the possibility of raising fees for services and permits. The discussion included the possibility of revising the fund balance policy to lower the minimum threshold from 60% to 50% or even 35%, though the latter was deemed unrealistic. Jeanne presented scenarios for 60% and 50% fund balance policies, noting that neither is viable over 10 years without significant changes.
- **Revenue and Expenditure Adjustments:** The participants considered various options including raising fees, exploring new revenue streams, and making strategic decisions on expenditures. They emphasized the importance of aligning financial decisions with the city's strategic vision. The need to balance revenue generation with maintaining affordable services for residents was highlighted.
 - **Fee Increases and New Revenue Streams:** Raising fees for permits and other services was discussed as a potential way to increase revenue, though it was noted that fees must align with expenses. Exploring new revenue streams, such as increasing fees for services, introducing new services, or developing new revenue-generating ventures, was considered.
 - **Strategic Expenditure Decisions:** Strategic decisions on expenditures, such as prioritizing essential services and finding cost-saving measures, were emphasized to align with the city's strategic vision.
- **Impact of State and Federal Funding:** The uncertainty of state and federal funding was noted and to avoid relying on it for budget planning. ARPA money and public safety aid are reserved for specific purposes.
- **Cost Savings and Efficiency:** The participants discussed potential cost-saving measures, such as reviewing big expenditures, collaborating with other communities on resource utilization, and divesting unused assets. They emphasized the importance of finding efficiencies to minimize the need for tax increases.
- **Police and Fire Department Budgets:** The participants acknowledged the challenges in cutting police and fire department budgets without reducing services. They discussed the importance of maintaining adequate staffing and resources for public safety and the potential impact of cost-saving measures on service levels.
- **Revenue Generation Opportunities:** The participants explored various revenue generation opportunities, such as partnering with local businesses for events, running concession stands, and developing mixed-use properties. They emphasized the need to find creative ways to generate revenue without raising taxes.
- **Next Steps for Fund Balance Policy:** Jeanne proposed bringing back the existing and previous fund balance policies in detail for further discussion. The participants agreed to consider potential changes to the policy, with a focus on maintaining a sustainable fund balance while addressing the city's financial needs.

Follow-up

- **Fund Balance Policy Review:** Bring back the existing fund balance policy in detail and the previous policy in detail for review.
- **Revenue Opportunities:** Investigate potential revenue opportunities such as mixed-use developments, partnerships with local businesses, and other revenue-generating activities.
- **Cost Savings Initiatives:** Continue to review of programs and vendors to identify potential cost savings opportunities.
- **EDA Tax Levy:** Evaluate the possibility of utilizing the EDA tax levy for specific purposes to expand tax capacity and better the city.
- **Permit and Fee Adjustments:** Review and compare current permit and fee structures to ensure they cover costs.
- **Investment Strategy:** Develop a strategic investment plan for the city's funds, including exploring more comparative investments.
- **Public Communication:** Continue to educate residents on the breakdown of their taxes and the impact of market value increases through newsletters and public addresses.

SCEC

- **Special Revenue Funds:** Jeanne explained the concept of special revenue funds, which are designated for specific purposes and usually have their own revenues. They highlighted the importance of maintaining a balanced budget and the challenges faced by the SCEC.
 - **SCEC Challenges:** Jeanne highlighted the challenges faced by the SCEC, including the need for a balanced budget and the evolving nature of the facility, which is not currently sustainable. Jeanne mentioned that the Council elected to have a balanced budget for 2025, resulting in a 66% levy increase to support the SCEC. Jeanne noted changes in the nonprofit fees in the fee schedule to align more with community standards, aiming to increase revenue.
- **SCEC Fund Balance Policy:** Jeanne noted that there is no existing policy for the SCEC fund balance, but there are notations suggesting a goal of having 50% of next year's expenses and 100% of next year's capital expenses in fund balance reserve. They proposed creating fund balance policies for all funding sources.
 - **Current Status:** Jeanne stated that there is no existing policy for the SCEC fund balance, but notations suggest a goal of having 50% of next year's expenses and 100% of next year's capital expenses in reserve.
 - **Strategic Goal:** Jeanne proposed creating fund balance policies for all funding sources, emphasizing the strategic goal of maintaining reserves to cover future expenses and capital needs. She explained that a lot of the revenue for the SCEC comes in later in the season, making it logical to have reserves to cover early-year expenses. It is important to have 100% of the subsequent year's capital needs in reserve, as these needs often arise at the beginning of the year.

- **Personnel Services and Expenses:** Jeanne detailed the personnel services and expenses for the SCEC, including the allocation of staff and the maintenance and custodial services provided by public works. They emphasized the need to discuss the sustainability of the facility.
 - **Staff Allocation:** Jeanne detailed the allocation of staff, including the Park and Rec manager, who is allocated 60% to the SCEC and 40% to the General Fund recreation, and the part-time attendants whose expenses are charged to the SCEC. She explained that Public Works provides some maintenance and custodial services for the SCEC, including snow plowing and changing light bulbs, which are not fully captured in the expenses.
 - **In-Kind Contributions:** the city is providing in-kind contributions to the SCEC, such as staffing resources and maintenance services, in addition to the 66% levy support. Jeanne provided a breakdown of expenses, including \$98,000 for personnel services and additional costs for maintenance and custodial services, emphasizing the need to discuss the facility's sustainability.
- **Levy Support and Budget:** Jeanne discussed the levy support for the SCEC and the need to maintain a balanced budget. She highlighted the projected levy increases and the importance of determining the future direction of the facility. Jeanne discussed the levy support for the SCEC, noting a 66% levy increase for 2025 to maintain a balanced budget. The projected levy increases over the next 10 years, totaling \$1.8 million in levy support for the SCEC, and questioned if this is the best use of funds. She mentioned the 10-year CIP approved by the City Council, which includes \$243,000 in expenditure for the SCEC to stay status quo, with additional capital needs expected. Jeanne pointed out the declining fund balance, projected to fall below 20% over the next few years, even with the levy increases, indicating the current model is not sustainable.

Discussion

- **Utilization and Revenue Generation:** Participants discussed the underutilization of the SCEC and potential ways to increase revenue, such as raising rates, increasing users, and exploring new programming ideas. They suggested forming a committee to brainstorm ideas. Advertising and promotion was also discussed.
- **Partnerships and Marketing:** Participants discussed potential partnerships with organizations like Minnetonka Community Ed and the importance of marketing the SCEC to increase utilization. They emphasized the need to explore new opportunities and partnerships.
- **Future Plans and Community Input:** Participants discussed the need to gather community input and explore various options for the future of the SCEC, including potential changes to the facility, new programming ideas, and the possibility of selling or repurposing the building.
- **Decision-Making Process:** Participants emphasized the importance of making a data-driven decision regarding the future of the SCEC, as well as various forms of community engagement to gather input and make an informed decision.

- **Timeline and Next Steps:** Participants proposed having data and numbers by July and making a final determination by December to incorporate into the decision into the 2026 budget process.

Follow-up

- **Community Engagement:** Engage the community about the use and future of the SCEC.
- **Consultant Engagement:** Consider hiring a consultant to analyze the SCEC's financial sustainability and provide recommendations.
- **Task Force Formation:** Consider forming a task force to brainstorm and evaluate potential new uses and revenue streams for the SCEC.
- **Partnership Exploration:** Reach out to the new Minnetonka Community Ed Director to explore potential partnerships for utilizing the SCEC.
- **Marketing Strategy:** Evaluate and enhance the current marketing and advertising strategies for the SCEC to increase utilization.
- **Senior Program Review:** Review the current senior programming and assess its impact on the SCEC's overall utilization and revenue.
- **Budget Planning:** Prepare and present budget projections for the SCEC, including potential changes in revenue streams and expenses, for the 2026 budget process.

CAPITAL FUNDS

- **Capital Project Funds Overview:** Jeanne explained the purpose of capital project funds, which is to manage big acquisitions like improvement of parks, infrastructure, roads, equipment replacement, and public facility needs. She emphasized the importance of long-term planning and projections for these funds.
 - **Governmental Accounting:** Jeanne compared governmental accounting to a household checkbook, where revenues and expenses are tracked separately from large acquisitions like mortgages. Capital project funds function similarly by setting aside money for big acquisitions or issuing debt, which is then managed through a debt service account.
 - **Long-Term Planning:** Jeanne emphasized the importance of long-term planning and projections for managing capital project funds. This involves making projections and planning for future expenses and potential revenues to ensure financial stability and sustainability.
- **Park Capital Improvement Fund:** Jeanne discussed the Park Capital Improvement Fund, which is used for parkland dedication and supplemented by tax levies and other contributions. She highlighted the need for strategic planning to ensure sustainability and address shortfalls in the future.
- **Equipment Replacement Fund:** Jeanne introduced the Equipment Replacement Fund, which covers capital acquisitions for various city governmental activities. The capital needs for the Equipment Replacement Fund over the next ten years are projected to be \$3.7

million and the current levy support of \$165,000 is not sufficient. She noted the need for realistic projections and discussions about the fund's sustainability and future needs.

- **Street Reconstruction Fund:** Jeanne outlined the Street Reconstruction Fund, which finances various street activities, like maintenance and overlays. The capital needs for the next ten years are projected to be \$18.6 million. She emphasized the need for sustainable funding and the impact of debt service on the levy. The fund faces significant expenditures and requires careful planning. Jeanne highlighted that the fund's sustainability is impacted by debt service, with \$17 million in debt service projected over the next ten years. This will have a significant impact on the levy and requires careful planning to manage. Current funding is not sufficient. Future planning for the Street Reconstruction Fund needs to include decisions on how to finance street activities sustainably, whether through debt issuance, levy increases, or other funding mechanisms.
- **Debt Service Fund:** Jeanne explained the Debt Service Fund, which utilizes the levy to cover debt obligations. She highlighted the importance of maintaining a consistent level of debt and the impact of past decisions on the current financial situation. The city has projected debt issuances for the next five years, ranging from \$1 million to \$4.5 million. It is important to maintaining a consistent level of debt and avoid fluctuations to ensure financial stability and predictability. It was noted the City does have a history of issuing debt.
- **Community Infrastructure Fund:** Jeanne discussed the Community Infrastructure Fund, which has been underutilized and lacks revenue sources. She stressed the need for planning and levying for facility needs to avoid falling behind on maintenance and improvements. Public Works has run out of space.

Discussion

- **Bonding and Referendums:** Participants debated the use of bonding for financing large projects. They discussed the pros and cons of issuing debt versus saving for projects and the impact on taxpayers, and the need to balance immediate needs with long-term financial sustainability.
- **Philosophy on Financing:** Jeanne emphasized the need for a clear philosophy on financing infrastructure and equipment needs. She stressed the importance of defining policies to guide future decisions and ensure sustainable funding.
- **Special Assessments:** Participants discussed the use of special assessments for street projects and the challenges associated with implementing them. They considered the impact on residents and the need for a consistent policy.
- **Franchise Fees:** Participants considered the potential of increasing franchise fees to supplement street funding. They discussed the current allocation of franchise fees and the possibility of reallocating them to address other needs.
- **Predictability in Budgeting:** Participants expressed the importance of maintaining predictability and stability in budgeting. They discussed the need for a consistent approach to financing projects and the impact on residents' taxes.

- **Future Projections:** Jeanne presented future projections for the city's levy increases based on current needs and funding strategies. She highlighted the importance of planning and maintaining a sustainable approach to financing.
- **Public Safety Funding:** Participants discussed the challenges of funding public safety and the impact on the overall budget. They considered the need for separate policies for public safety funding to ensure adequate resources without affecting other areas.
- **Growth Projections:** Participants considered the impact of growth on the city's levy and the importance of accurate projections. They discussed the need to account for new housing units and other factors in future planning.

Follow-up

- **Capital Project Funds Philosophy:** Define the philosophy for managing capital project funds to ensure sustainable financing and clear communication.
- **Park Capital Improvement Fund:** Review and confirm the strategic plan for park activities and amenities to align with the existing CIP and future projections.
- **Equipment Replacement Fund:** Discuss and establish a realistic vision for the equipment replacement fund to address the projected shortfall and sustainability.
- **Street Reconstruction Fund:** Develop a strategy for financing street reconstruction projects
- **Community Infrastructure Fund:** Evaluate and plan for the facility needs and maintenance of public works and other city facilities.
- **Public Works Facility Needs:** Review the space and maintenance needs of the public works department and consider options for short-term and long-term solutions.
- **Debt Issuance Strategy:** Determine the city's philosophy on debt issuance versus tax levy support for financing infrastructure and equipment needs.

ENTERPRISE FUNDS

- **Enterprise Funds Overview:** Jeanne provided an overview of enterprise funds, also known as proprietary funds, explaining that they rely on user fees and are meant to be self-supporting. She discussed the operating costs, capital outlay, and debt service associated with these funds. Capital outlay and debt service expenses are recorded as balance sheet activities. Jeanne emphasized the importance of cash balances in enterprise funds, as opposed to fund balance reserves in other types of funds. Cash flow is crucial for the sustainability of these funds.
- **Water Fund Challenges:** Jeanne highlighted the challenges faced by the water fund, including the need for revenue sufficiency and the unsustainable user rate structure. She mentioned the infrastructure and connections within the city and the need to optimize the timing of capital improvements. She highlighted the need for revenue sufficiency in the water fund, noting that the current user rate structure has not been sustainable over time. She discussed the water area connection fee, which has been \$10,000 for several years.

She mentioned that there have been discussions about increasing the fee, as the actual cost is been around \$17,000. Various options, such as base and infrastructure fees, for generating revenue, and incentivizing connections to maintain such as deferred payments, financing programs, and incremental fee increases.

- **Infrastructure and Connection Issues:** Jeanne and other participants discussed the challenges of maintaining and expanding water infrastructure, including the need for new connections and the financial burden on the city. They considered
- **Cash Flow Projections:** Jeanne emphasized the need to address the cash flow issues and consider changes to the infrastructure projects and user rates as the fund is projected to go negative by 2030.

Discussion

- **Base Water Fee:** Participants discussed the possibility of implementing a base water fee or infrastructure fee for all residents, regardless of whether they are connected to the water system. They considered the potential revenue generation, including additional consumption fees and the impact on residents.
- **Point of Sale:** A point of sale hook-up requirement was discussed.
- **Financing and Incentives:** Participants explored various financing options and incentives for residents to connect to the water system, including deferred payments, financing programs, and incremental fee increases. They aimed to make the process more manageable for residents, perhaps with a city lead connection and financing program.
- **Communication and Marketing:** Participants emphasized the importance of effective communication and marketing to educate residents about the benefits of connecting to the water system and the available financing options. They discussed the need for a coordinated effort to address misinformation and engage the community.
- **Sanitary Sewer Fund Overview:** Jeanne provided an overview of the sanitary sewer fund, including the infrastructure and the role of the Met Council in sewage treatment. She discussed the challenges of managing the fund and the need for a balanced budget.
- **Storm Water Management Fund Overview:** Jeanne discussed the storm water management fund, including the infrastructure and the use of franchise fees to supplement the fund. She highlighted the need to reconsider the allocation of franchise fees and the fund's financial health.
- **Recycling Fund and RFP:** Jeanne provided an overview of the recycling fund and the upcoming RFP process. Participants discussed the potential for consolidated collection, the inclusion of organics, and the strategic goals for the fund.

Follow-up

- **Water Fund Projections:** Review and update the water fund projections to include the 10% rate increases and assess the impact on cash flow and infrastructure needs.

- **Base Water Fee:** Develop a proposal for implementing a base water fee or infrastructure fee for all residents, including those not currently connected to the water system.
- **Point of Sale Policy:** Create a policy for mandating water hookups at the point of sale for properties, including potential financing options for residents.
- **Water Fund Sustainability:** Prepare a detailed report on the sustainability of the water fund, including potential revenue generation methods and their impacts.
- **Sanitary Sewer Fund:** Maintain the status quo for the sanitary sewer fund and ensure it has a balanced budget for 2025 and beyond.
- **Storm Water Management Fund:** Reevaluate the allocation of franchise fees currently going to the storm water management fund and consider redirecting them to the general fund or street fund.
- **Recycling Fund RFP:** Develop an RFP for recycling services, including considerations for consolidated collection and organics collection.

PART III. CONCLUSION

Participants agreed on the need for regular meetings to review progress on strategic goals and address emerging issues. They discussed the importance of aligning the budget with strategic priorities and maintaining ongoing communication. Discussion was continued to the February 24, 2025 Council work session.

Motion to adjourn was made by Councilmember Sanschagrin and seconded by Councilmember Maddy; Motion approved.

Adjourn at 4:48 p.m.

ATTEST:

Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

Sandie Thone, City Clerk

**CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2025**

**5755 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
6:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

1. CONVENE CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING

Mayor Labadie called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M.

A. Roll Call

Present. Mayor Labadie; Councilmembers Labadie, Maddy, Gorham, and DiGruttolo; City Attorney Shepherd; City Administrator Nevinski; City Clerk/HR Director Thone; Finance Director Schmuck; City Planner Griffiths; Director of Public Works Morreim; and City Engineer Budde

Absent: Councilmember Sanschagrin

B. Review Agenda

Maddy moved, DiGruttolo seconded, approving the agenda as presented. Motion passed 4/0.

2. RETREAT DISCUSSION CONTINUED

Mayor Labadie noted that the Council held their annual retreat on February 18, 2025, and due to time constraints, had decided to conclude their discussion during tonight's Work Session meeting.

City Administrator Nevinski distributed a document that summarized all the cards that the Council had worked with which included details on the ideas generated. He explained that he had taken this information and attempted to modify their strategic priorities in a way that articulated what he thought he had heard from the Council. He stated another long discussion that the Council had at the retreat was related to their various Funds. He explained that for Strategic Priorities and Funds, staff were planning to come back to the Council in a Work Session with more action oriented details such as clear goals and action steps that could be taken. He explained that what they had not had time for during their initial retreat discussion was essentially a concluding discussion, which is what was the intent of tonight's meeting.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he and Councilmember DiGruttolo had been discussing this earlier and noted that they both felt it was a really productive retreat and was time well spent for the Council.

Mayor Labadie stated that she had participated in numerous retreats and agreed that this one was probably her favorites. She explained that she felt it had laid out a lot of questions, concerns of the community, gave the Council an opportunity to address them as a group along with City staff, and also allowed them to start some long-range goals for the City. She noted that last year there was a working document of potential Work Sessions and assumed that many of the unanswered questions and topics would be discussed during Work Sessions throughout the year.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD WORK SESSION COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 24, 2025
Page 2 of 6

City Administrator Nevinski asked if the Council would want to start the Work Sessions earlier in order to allow for enough time to conduct those discussions. He noted that many of these topics would culminate within the budgeting process and suggested that staff develop a schedule which would show when they think they will be ready to hit the various topics of discussion.

Councilmember Gorham asked if there were other Work Session topics that, prior to the retreat discussion, were in line for the next few months that would end up being jockeyed because of this.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that the majority of the Work Sessions would be on the topics discussed at the retreat, but noted that there were some other things such as, the Bylaws or Green Step City that they still may want to discuss. He explained that he would try to pull together an overall list and encouraged the Council to add other topics that they would like included and will work to prioritize the overall Work Session topics. He stated that he felt much of their work would end up being focused on getting the budget together and also getting policies in place in order to assist with the budget.

Mayor Labadie stated that from the list of topics for Work Session topics from last year had not all been discussed to completion, but felt that they all rolled into to these topics. She noted that even if they did not hit every single point throughout the year, but she felt this was a really good framework for both the Council and City staff and reminded the Council that this was a fluid document.

Councilmember Gorham stated that one of the things the Council had discussed prior to the retreat was meeting with the Park Commission and explained that he wanted to be mindful of the timing of their work products.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that he felt there was a desire from both the Council and the Park Commission for some type of collaborative meeting in order to talk about the overall direction and desires for the Park Commission. He noted that he expected that by March or April they would be seating the new Park Commission.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that there were two things that she would like to see happen concurrently with the process of developing their Strategic Priorities. She noted that the first was the development of the Strategic Plan, and that each thing that they have identified as a priority becomes its own chapter of the Strategic Plan. She noted that in some ways she felt that the City was doing this backwards. She stated that the other thing she would like to see put on the calendar, in conjunction with these topics, were some townhalls at the Work Sessions where they could encourage resident input, for example when they discuss environmental stewardship, so if that was a topic they were interested in, they could come to the meeting and be part of the planning process and the policy making.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that he felt the Council needed to establish some objectives which would give them direction to move out to residents, communicate what they are thinking, and ask for their input at that point. He stated that, generally, Work Sessions were Council discussions and should be based on data and feedback that they had received but noted that the City could look at other formats or options. He explained that his thought was that the Council would set the overall direction and then they can do more engagement to see if there was alignment within the community about that direction. He noted that without this initial direction he felt the discussion could get too broad and lack focus.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she felt predictability helped the process and suggested that residents be able to know, in advance, what the Council would be discussing on certain dates. She noted that she felt that these sessions just needed to be scheduled on a regular basis, for example, quarterly, so residents could anticipate that they were coming up and would establish a battle rhythm for the City.

Mayor Labadie referenced the amount of Public Works staff time that ended up working on buckthorn removal that had not been anticipated a year ago. She stated that moving forward, it would help both the Council and the Park Commission to know how many hours Public Works had put in and noted that there had also been two large volunteer opportunities for the buckthorn removal and would also like to know the total number of volunteer hours that were dedicated to buckthorn removal. She reiterated that, moving forward, she felt the man hours that had been put in towards removal of buckthorn should be taken into account.

Public Works Director Morreim stated that he had put together a park update, in December, that included that information and noted that it was around three hundred hours for Public Works staff time for removing debris, another eighty hours of volunteer time, and during the fall/winter, another three hundred hours between the City and Hennepin County. He agreed that with any decisions they wanted to have an understanding of what it would actually entail before they go down that path.

Mayor Labadie stated that she would like to have those numbers in front of them when the Council and the Park Commission meet jointly, in order to have a discussion about it because she felt that should be a huge factor in their decision making. She asked if the Council had any other points to bring up related to the retreat discussions

Councilmember Maddy stated that one thing that has come up falls under Safe and Secure Community, which was the intersection of Eureka South and Highway 7 and whether or not there may be some options for a temporary fix before the State finishes their analysis. He asked if they could perhaps do something like restrict left-hand turns from the City's property.

Mayor Labadie stated that her understanding was that would be the only thing the City could do at this intersection, but cautioned that it would end up pushing it to a neighboring street which would also be an uncontrolled intersection. She noted that they had also had discussions about the Galpin Lake Road entrance from the south side of the City onto Highway 7 and noted that there were many problematic intersections.

Public Works Director Morreim stated that the corridor study was currently happening, but as far as what they have seen for possible options on the west side of the City, it looked like many of the options would include access control, but was not sure how well that would be received. He stated that many of the issues are left-hand turns and doing that on City streets before they get to Highway 7 would not be a great option. He understood that it was hard to be patient when it involved safety issues and considerations for what could be done in the short-term. He noted that the understanding of 'short-term' was different for the public than it was within MNDot.

Councilmember Gorham noted that MNDot was planning for 2029, which most likely meant that it would actually be done around 2031.

Public Works Director Morreim explained that right now, the project was just to resurface Highway 7 in 2029, but the hope was for the project to actually turn out to be more than just resurfacing. He stated that for some of the things discussed, such as a roundabout that would not stretch out too long, but there are others that could stretch out over many years.

Councilmember DiGruttolo suggested that they add, under Safety a point about highway safety as a priority. She stated that she would also like them to consider putting these priorities in order for the Council to address in 2025.

Mayor Labadie suggested that rather than saying 'highway safety' that it be changed to 'City Street Safety' because the City cannot touch Highway 7 because she did not want to give the community any false hope.

Councilmember Maddy stated that he felt the problem with this line of thought was that the City was not prioritizing the easy wins. He explained that he felt restricting left-hand turns was an easy win because that was essentially why people were dying at that intersection.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if the City had leveraged lobbying.

Councilmember Maddy noted that everything with the State would end up taking up five years or more and suggested that they not waste their time with those guys who were fast as molasses.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she felt the City had to because even though they are slow, that is the process.

Councilmember Maddy stated that was the process for Highway 7, but not the process for the City's roadways, so if they wanted to make changes to the City's roads, they can. He suggested that they also go ahead and tell the State that they were too slow and the City was literally losing lives because of this dangerous intersection. He noted that the City seemed to be diluting that they could fix it by restricting left-hand turns. He stated that the engineers have to work with MNDot and there may need to be involvement of the County or a TMO and referenced the bridge collapse in Philadelphia a few years ago when everyone involved was saying, 'yeah, this needs to be fixed', but nobody took responsibility because there were so many regulatory authorities overseeing it. He reiterated that if the City can get an easy win, he felt that they should bump it up in priority and then go back to the ones that were vague and would take years to achieve.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he was not sure Councilmember Maddy's suggestion was actually an easy win and would like to understand it a bit more because there may be other implications that need to be considered. He agreed that he felt it was worth exploring, but reiterated that he would not necessarily call it 'easy' at this point.

Mayor Labadie stated that if this movement was restricted, all of those cars would have to be able to get to Highway 7 on a different street. She stated that they could hope that they would choose to access Highway 7 from Yellowstone, which had a controlled intersection but noted that the stoplight there cannot even handle the current amount of traffic. She stated that the light near Excelsior Elementary school, during school start and end times, also could not handle the current amount of traffic.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD WORK SESSION COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 24, 2025

Page 5 of 6

Councilmember DiGruttolo noted that there were other road safety issues within the City that they could address and shared examples of issues throughout the City and suggested that the Council dedicate a Work Session discussion to some of those issues.

Councilmember Gorham stated that when he thought of 'low hanging fruit', he thought of things like visibility at the Eureka and Highway 7 intersection and reiterated that he was not sure that restricting traffic movement would actually be a low hanging fruit.

Mayor Labadie stated that what had been done in the past, for large-scale sporting events, was restrict turns out of Freeman Park, but that would also involve enforcement in order to make it work.

Public Works Director Morreim stated that he felt they all supported low hanging fruit, but warned the Council that this was not an easy fix because if they restrict left-hand turns there will be other implications. He stated that the City can take a look at the option described by Councilmember Maddy, but reiterated that it was not an easy fix. He noted that the City would absolutely need MNDot, because there were no easy solutions that would not involve them.

Councilmember Gorham suggested talking to Metro Traffic about something simpler for right now.

City Administrator Nevinski noted that this could be a conversation that comes out of some of the public engagement for Highway 7 and suggested that this topic could be part of the conversations at those events. He stated that they could communicate to MNDot that they understood this was a five-year plan, but the City was very worried about what might be able to be done now and ask them to collaborate with the City. He stated that MNDot may just tell the City 'no', but at least they would be trying something and explained that he agreed with Public Works Director Morreim that there were lots of implications up and down the corridor that would need to be considered.

Mayor Labadie stated that they were running out of time before the regular Council meeting and asked if anyone had any other pressing issues that they wanted to raise.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she did not have any pressing issues but wanted to answer some of the questions outlined by City Administrator Nevinski in the packet. She stated that she felt that the City should proceed with starting to draft some goals and actions, based on the Strategic Priorities developed at the retreat, and begin to get things put into their Work Session calendars. She suggested that the Council take time at their next Work Session to start putting together some of the overall prioritization of the first things they want to tackle.

Mayor Labadie asked about the possibility of the Council meeting earlier for their Work Session meetings or if they would prefer scheduling a half-day Work Session instead of starting earlier.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that her schedule was fairly flexible, so either option would work for her.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he could meet at 5:30 p.m.

Councilmember Maddy stated that he could meet at 5:30 p.m., but not any earlier.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD WORK SESSION COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 24, 2025
Page 6 of 6

Mayor Labadie suggested that staff start getting some 5:30 p.m. start times on the books and noted that if there were certain topics that they felt warranted a half-day Work Session, they could schedule them later.

Councilmember Maddy asked what the next actual step was because right now they had a vague list of what they wanted the City to look like, other than starting the meetings at 5:30 p.m. He asked if staff was going to choose which of the priorities they started on.

Councilmember DiGruttolo explained that her understanding was that staff was going to develop them into goals and action steps and the Council would solidify and prioritize them.

Councilmember Maddy asked if she meant goals for priorities or goals for actual decisions to be made.

Mayor Labadie stated that she felt it would end up being a little bit of both.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that he felt that they wanted to look at what goals they needed to accomplish and what were the actions that they felt needed to be taken and, if Council agreed, then they can discuss what the priorities should be.

Mayor Labadie stated that she felt that they had come up with a good overview and now needed to develop it further, make action, timeline, and budgetary steps and reminded the Council that this was a work in progress.

Councilmember DiGruttolo explained that was why she felt that starting at 5:30 p.m. would be helpful.

Mayor Labadie asked the Council to let staff know if they had any vacations or times that they would not be available.

3. ADJOURN

DiGruttolo moved, Gorham seconded, Adjourning the City Council Work Session Meeting of February 24, 2025, at 6:50 P.M. Motion passed 4/0.

ATTEST:

Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

Sandie Thone, City Clerk

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2025

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

MINUTES

1. CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

Mayor Labadie called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

A. Roll Call

B. Pledge of Allegiance

Present. Mayor Labadie; Councilmembers Maddy, Gorham, and DiGruttolo; City Attorney Shepherd; City Administrator Nevinski; City Clerk/HR Director Thone; City Planner Griffiths; Director of Public Works Morreim; Finance Director Schmuck, and, City Engineer Budde

Absent: Councilmember Sanschagrin

C. Review Agenda

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

Motion passed.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Labadie reviewed the items on the Consent Agenda.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked to remove item 2.C., the minutes from the February 10, 2025 retreat and explained that she had concerns that the minutes were only 1 page long from an 8 hour meeting. She stated that the Council had essentially finished the Council retreat during tonight's Work Session and felt it may also make sense to consolidate the minutes from both meetings.

Mayor Labadie stated that item 2.C. would be moved to item 8.A. under General/New Business

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

A. City Council Work Session Minutes of February 10, 2025

B. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes of February 10, 2025

~~C. City Council Retreat Minutes of February 18, 2025 (moved to item 8.A)~~

D. Approval of the Verified Claims List

- E. **Park Commission Meeting Update, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 25-021, “A Resolution Approving a Meeting Schedule Change for the Shorewood Park Commission.”**
- F. **2025 Open Book Meeting**
- G. **Request for Additional Time to Correct a Code Violation located at 4845 Enchanted Lane for applicant: Lisa Holt, on Behalf of Mary C. Zinsholt Rev. Liv. Trust, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 25-022, “A Resolution Approving a Request for a Second Extension to Correct Code Violations for Property Located at 4845 Enchanted Lane.”**
- H. **Seasonal Public Works Position**

Motion passed.

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

4. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

- A. **Outgoing Commissioner Acknowledgement**

City Clerk/HR Director Thone explained that on an annual basis, the Council recognizes outgoing Commissioners for the Planning and Park Commissions and tonight they were officially recognizing Planning Commissioner/Vice Chair Nat Gorham; Planning Commissioner Mary Johnson; and Park Commissioner Michelle DiGruttolo.

Mayor Labadie thanked the outgoing Commissioners for their service to the City.

There was a round of applause for the outgoing Commissioners.

5. PARKS

- A. **Report by Commissioner Bahneman on February 11, 2025 Park Commission Meeting**

Park Commissioner Bahneman gave a brief overview of the discussion and recommendations from the February 11, 2025 Park Commission meeting.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if there were any issues or stumbling blocks with the Master Plan or the Comprehensive Plan.

Park Commissioner Bahneman stated that there were no issues with either plan. She noted that there had been some discussion about having Park Commissioners more involved in the process.

Mayor Labadie asked if there was a date set for the Movie in the Park event.

Park Commissioner Bahneman stated that she did not have the date in front of her.

Mayor Labadie suggested that the City post the details on the City's website.

6. PLANNING

A. Report by City Planner Griffiths on February 4, 2025 meeting

City Planner Griffiths gave a brief overview of the discussion and recommendations from the February 4, 2025 Planning Commission meeting.

B. Variance to Redevelopment a Non-Conforming Lot

Location: 20175 Manor Road

Applicant: Edward Zaret

City Planner Griffiths reviewed the variance request for property located at 20175 Manor Road to redevelop a non-conforming lot. He explained that the reason a variance was needed was because the lot was undersized for the zoning district it was located within. He stated that the applicant would like to demolish the current home and construct a new home in the center of the property where it would meet setbacks and reiterated that the reason the variance was needed was because the lot was undersized. He explained that a public hearing was held at the Planning Commission, but no residents had provided any feedback on this application. He noted that the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the variance request.

Councilmember Gorham noted that the impervious surface coverage would be less with this application than it was with the existing home. He stated that it seemed like this lot was a bit larger than some others within the vicinity and noted that he felt this was just an area of the City that had some awkward lots and explained that he did not see any issues with the request.

Councilmember Maddy stated that he felt the applicant definitely met the definition of practical difficulty and noted that he felt that their proposal would make the property less non-conforming.

Gorham moved, DiGruttolo seconded, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 25-023, "A Resolution Approving a Variance to Redevelop a Non-Conforming Lot on Property Located at 20175 Manor Road."

Motion passed.

C. Preliminary & Final Plat for Shorewood Meadow

Location: 25480 and 25560 Smithtown Road

Applicant: McDonald Construction Partners

City Planner Griffiths reviewed the Preliminary and Final Plat details for Shorewood Meadow located at 25480 and 25560 Smithtown Road for McDonald Construction Partners. He stated that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Preliminary Plat but there were no residents that had addressed the Commission. He noted that the Planning Commission had recommended approval with the conditions included in the staff report.

Mayor Labadie asked if the City had received any e-mails or communication from the public related to this application in opposition.

City Planner Griffiths stated that they had not received any communication from residents opposing this request.

Councilmember Maddy noted that he had seen a reference to a 7-foot retaining walls, but could not find them in the drawings.

City Engineer Budde stated that the retaining walls would be located along the southwest corner of the lot on the left and pointed them out on the drawings.

Councilmember Maddy asked if this would make it so the taller part would be on the Smithtown Road side or the bike trail side.

The applicants, Harold Worrell, 3878 Augustin Trail, Chanhassen, and David Remmick, 5027 Woodale Lane, Edina, stated that the taller portion would be on the Smithtown Road side. Mr. Worrell explained that there would be a wing wall off of the western most property coming off the front porch which would ideally be under four feet tall.

Councilmember Maddy asked about adding another curb cut at Smithtown Road and if there were any safety concerns about having a third driveway in this general location.

City Engineer Budde stated that, from an engineering perspective, he was not concerned because Smithtown Road already had curb cuts all along it.

Councilmember Maddy asked if the applicants were familiar with the competition-sized pumpkins that used to grow on this lot in the very black dirt.

Mr. Remmick stated that they did not know about the dirt or the pumpkins.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if the applicants expected to need to close any portion of the trail in order to build their project.

City Engineer Budde stated that they will not have to do anything with the trail, but would have to close Smithtown Road in order for them to be able to install some of their utility services. He noted that if the Council approves this request, staff intended to work through the details of that with their contractor.

Councilmember Gorham stated that it seemed like this proposal was a lot, but noted that it followed the City's Comprehensive Plan guidance.

Councilmember Maddy agreed and noted that he did not see any reason the Council would not approve this request.

Gorham moved, Maddy seconded, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 25-024, "A Resolution Approving a Preliminary and Final Plat for Shorewood Meadow Located at 25480 and 25560 Smithtown Road."

Motion passed.

D. Amendments to Zoning Regulations to Implement the Comprehensive Plan for Medium Density Land Uses

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 24, 2025

Page 5 of 14

City Planner Griffiths noted that what was before the Council tonight was the result of discussion from several Planning Commission meetings. He gave an overview of the proposed amendments to the zoning regulations in order to implement the Comprehensive Plan for medium density land uses. He noted that while there were a lot of amendments within the ordinance, a fair amount of them were housekeeping/administrative type changes. He explained that if the amendments were approved by the Council, the next step in this process would be to rezone the properties. He reiterated that the Planning Commission had reviewed the proposed amendments at multiple meetings and had held a public hearing where there was no resident feedback received. He stated that the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if the properties being referred to included the garden shop property.

City Planner Griffiths stated that this was different and noted that the garden shop property was addressed earlier as part of a different process related to high density housing.

Councilmember Maddy stated that the City had one project that has gone through the planning process and asked how this would effect approvals the City had already given to that project.

City Planner Griffiths stated that it would not effect the approvals that had already been given and explained that the applicant of the project mentioned by Councilmember Maddy was aware that this change was happening, but reiterated that it would not impact any of their previous approvals, which was for a Concept Plan.

Councilmember Gorham stated that his understanding was that townhomes could have a maximum of eight units and the Code allows six to eight per acre. He gave the example of someone owning one-point nine acres and asked if that meant that they would only put one townhome on the property.

City Planner Griffiths explained that the way the density would be calculated would be based on the total, net acreage, so in Councilmember Gorham's example, they would still get credit for the point nine acres.

Councilmember Gorham asked why townhomes were limited to a maximum of eight homes.

City Planner Griffiths explained that this was just the current requirement in the City Code, but noted that the Council could look at changing that number.

Councilmember Gorham asked about a scenario where someone had one and one-half acres and wanted to put in fourteen units in one building, because it would be more cost effective than having two townhome structures.

City Planner Griffiths explained that they would be able to apply for a Planned Unit Development.

Councilmember Gorham noted that he had been in attendance when the high-density was discussed and he felt the larger issue here was the Met Council's position on these requirements, but also the need for greater density. He stated that he was here for the Comprehensive Plan and would like to have more density as well as a variety of housing, but there was a commercial property here that the City would be losing. He suggested that the Council be a bit wary because

they would be losing this commercial parcel, and had also lost three others for the high-density and expressed concern about the City's commercial future.

Mayor Labadie stated that for the three commercial parcels just mentioned by Councilmember Gorham for the high-density, her understanding was that the City had not 'lost' them because they could operate, in perpetuity, in the current business mode, and was only upon its sale that the new owner could choose to turn it into housing. She clarified that, at the moment, the City was not forcing these businesses out.

City Planner Griffiths stated that the items under discussion tonight were not rezoning any properties and was just looking at the text of the Zoning Ordinance. He explained that whenever the City rezoned a property, the existing use on the property may continue to operate as long as they want, as long as it essentially continues the way they are, but they would have the opportunity in the future to develop with housing.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if that meant that they 'can' in the future, but it was not a 'must' situation.

City Planner Griffiths confirmed that was correct and noted that the timeline was dependent on the property owner.

Mayor Labadie noted that she shared Councilmember Gorham's concerns, but stressed that these were requirements that the City must meet.

Councilmember Maddy stated that if the City was lucky enough to get some industrial or commercial investment in town, he asked if the fiscal disparities would take a cut off of any gains the City could make off of that.

City Administrator Nevinski explained that fiscal disparities was a program within the metro area that tried to help communities that have high residential base with low commercial/industrial base. He explained that it was essentially a redistribution of property taxes to try to balance that out and noted that it was a controversial issue that he would suggest that the Council not get into it tonight.

Councilmember Maddy explained that the point he was trying to make was that if the City was trying to leave the door open for commercial/industrial investments, the City would not get the full revenue out of it and if it was sitting vacant for commercial use for this long, the City could probably fill it with residential use, so he felt the City may be better off making that choice. He noted that he did not think the City needed to be too worried about losing opportunities for commercial investment.

Maddy moved, DiGruttolo seconded, Adopting Ordinance 616, Amending Shorewood City Code Chapter 1201 to Implement the Comprehensive Plan Direction for Medium Density Residential Uses; AND, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 25-025, "A Resolution Approving the Publication of Ordinance 616 Regarding Zoning Regulations to Implement the Comprehensive Plan Direction for Medium Density Residential Uses."

Motion passed.

7. ENGINEERING/PUBLIC WORKS

A. Pavement Management Plan

City Engineer Budde gave a presentation that outlined details within the proposed Pavement Management Plan. He explained that the Pavement Management Plan was a living document which meant it would be updated periodically and would need Council approval.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that some of the things that the Council had discussed in their strategy planning retreat, she would like to see addressed somewhere within the Pavement Management Plan. She stated that some of the things they had discussed was the possibility that the pavement may degrade more quickly from having multiple garbage and recycling trucks and forecasting for the effect of climate change as they become more extreme, for example, their use of salt on the roads. She stated that she had a question about the financing, where it says that the City would potentially take funding in relation to the City-wide pavement and referenced the Sewer Fund, the Water Fund, and the Stormwater Fund. She stated that after their conversation, she did not feel that those would be the appropriate places to consider for this plan. She noted that she did not see anything within the Pavement Management Plan related to rights-of-way and the City reclaiming them and explained that she was bringing it up because it had come up at least twice during her canvassing process. She noted that she felt that the City should address this so they can have equitable enforcement.

Public Works Director Morreim stated that the amount of salt use varied depending on the location, but noted that they try to use the lowest possible amount. He noted that he felt that as they update their equipment, they will get better and explained that this year, they had been able to reduce the amount used compared to a few years ago.

City Engineer Budde stated that the issue of having multiple garbage haulers was something that could be added to the Plan, but felt that would be getting pretty granular and would be more detailed than some of his assumptions. He suggested that, in a future iteration, the City could look at getting into some of that kind of discussion. He stated that he would have to think a bit about the issue raised related to forecasting for climate change and extreme heat. He gave the example that many times it was the oils chosen within the pavement that would help either deal with thermal expansion in the heat, or thermal contraction in the cold, and would typically end up costing more. He stated that financing options, as it related to utilities, at this point, a very small amount was assumed to be going towards mill and overlay projects. He explained that their intent was really to go with mill and overlay projects until there was a need to do underlying utility work. He noted that he felt the issue related to reclaiming the right-of-way management would be outside of the context of what they were trying to do with the Pavement Management Plan. He explained that this issue was really a complaint-based process for the City and was written into Code.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she felt the questions she was asking should be grouped together, because it was all related to extending the life of the pavement as long as possible and she felt it would be logical to address them within the Pavement Management Plan. She asked if City Engineer Budde felt that the AI technology they had used was working pretty well for this process.

Public Works Director Morreim noted that the City had been using the AI technology for the last two years and explained that the AI technology helped take away the subjectivity of evaluating the road surfaces, which had been a valuable tool for the City.

Councilmember Maddy thanked City staff for this information because it meant that the City could actually claim that they have data-driven prioritization on their roadways. He noted that the pavement condition ratings came out of the AI technology and asked how staff had chosen the maintenance effort, road use, and the formula of $PC+30ME+10RU$.

City Engineer Budde stated that the low scores were the roadways that needed the most attention so when they looked at maintenance, if Public Works Director Morreim had crews going out to do patching a few times per year or was getting called out to do a lot of manual labor, then it got a ranking of 'one'.

Councilmember Maddy asked if they had split it into thirds per staff surveys or work orders.

Public Works Director Morreim explained that it was mostly from the supervisor who was generally the one putting together this information and assured the Council that he was on top of it.

Councilmember Maddy asked if they had taken traffic counts into their road use figures.

City Engineer Budde stated that the City had limited traffic counts throughout the City and explained that they had broken it down into thirds for the major roadways and mostly, the roads that were used the most ended up with a ranking of 'one'.

Councilmember Maddy stated that the pavement condition and the maintenance effort were about equally influential within the algorithm, but the road use was one-third of that and asked about the rationale behind that choice.

City Engineer Budde explained that they had looked at a couple of different scenarios on how to weight things and felt that maintenance effort from Public Works was the biggest priority for the City because if they are not doing maintenance on the roadways, it freed them up to do other tasks. He stated that after some trial and error, staff felt that this seemed like the right fit based on the information that they had, but understood that it was subjective. He noted that they also went into this with the thought that it could be changed over time in future iterations of the Pavement Management Plan.

Public Works Director Morreim noted that in one of their iterations, they looked at things with roadway usage weighted equally and it essentially bumped all the high usage roads up to the top of the list which staff felt was not the best way to manage the whole system.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he had similar questions and noted that when you look at the weighted ranking, the maintenance was so heavily weighted that all the numbers at the bottom were ones. He stated that one thing that stuck out was Wild Rose Lane that had a ninety-percent score for street condition but had a one in maintenance.

Public Works Director Morreim explained that was one of the things mentioned by City Engineer Budde about breaking them into different segments, which meant that part of Wild Rose Lane was probably one-hundred and part could be around forty.

Councilmember Gorham stated that it was really neat to get a three-hundred sixty degree view of everything and asked where SeeClickFix factored into all of this.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 24, 2025

Page 9 of 14

Public Works Director Morreim noted that the City looked at every single complaint regardless of how it comes to the City and action usually takes place within a day or so and was built into the process.

Councilmember Gorham asked how often the Council would be seeing the Pavement Management Plan and this data.

Public Works Director Morreim stated that he would anticipate them seeing it every one to two years. He explained that they were not set on that because they want it to be a fluid document.

Councilmember Gorham stated that whatever the actual schedule turned out to be, he felt it would be nice to have some visibility on SeeClickFix.

Public Works Director Morreim stated that the majority of complaints do not come through that avenue, which meant that they would have to enter them back into the system in order to track all of that. He explained that he would estimate that only twenty percent of the complaints come through that, and the other eighty percent come through e-mails or phone calls, but noted that they could look at putting something together.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that they could try to track that data but noted that they currently did not have a work order type of system, for example, if someone called in a complaint. He stated that they could track the calls, but would also have to consider how much time they were spending doing the tracking as opposed to working on the actual problem and asked what they would be chasing.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she felt that they were chasing accountability and suggested that they could do something as simple as having a spreadsheet that would track this information.

Councilmember Gorham noted that he would want the tracking to work with their process as well.

Councilmember Gorham suggested that if there was more information available through SeeClickFix and people see this kind of reporting, they may be more inclined to use it. He stated that, in the past, there was a lot of frustration from the community with regard to reporting methods.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that he felt that the calls that are coming into the City were being addressed and suggested that they may want to look at the output rather than the input.

Mayor Labadie asked what the new reporting program was called because she did not believe it was still SeeClickFix.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that it was called Citizen Request Tracker.

Mayor Labadie suggested that it may be helpful for the Council to get updates every six months or so on information from the logs from Citizen Request Tracker. She explained that she did not believe that it would be necessary to use a large amount of man hours creating logs because the program already did that.

City Administrator Nevinski agreed, but reminded the Council that it would only capture people who used that program and not the ones who contacted the City via e-mail or phone calls.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she did not want to add a lot of work for staff, but felt having a spreadsheet that tracked everything would be a useful tool.

Councilmember Maddy asked if the Council could just direct City staff to look into the possibility of tracking all the calls and e-mails and see what they come up with.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he would be fine with a report of whatever was entered into Citizen Request Tracker and not ask staff to also input the information from the calls and e-mails.

Mayor Labadie noted that several roads were listed as private roads and asked for confirmation that the City was not responsible for maintaining those roadways. She stated that if the City was not responsible for their maintenance, she asked why they had been included in the Pavement Management Plan. She noted that one of them was probably the worst road in the City and asked if the City would put pressure on those responsible to take care of their streets.

City Engineer Budde explained that the City was not responsible for the private roadways and were just driven as part of the data collection. He stated that they had noted them because sometimes the City got calls on the condition of the private roads, so when those calls come in they will be able to look at this and inform them that it was a private road.

Mayor Labadie asked if Island View Road was included in the Pavement Management Plan and if not, she would suggest that in their motion that they approve the Pavement Management Plan with the insertion of Island View Road. She expressed her appreciation to staff for all the work they had done to put together the Pavement Management Plan.

Gorham moved, Maddy seconded, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 25-026, “A Resolution to Approve the Pavement Management Plan and Implement its Recommendations into Future Budgets and Capital Improvement Planning”, with the insertion of Island View Road.

Motion passed.

8. GENERAL/NEW BUSINESS

A. City Council Retreat Minutes of February 18, 2025 (formerly Consent Agenda item 2.C.)

Councilmember DiGruttolo reiterated that she felt that there should be more meat to the retreat minutes in order to more clearly inform the residents about what was discussed. She stated that she personally used a transcription service called ‘Rev’ but there were others such as “Otter AI” and suggested that they use some sort of software to make things easier to document their discussion and then run it through a different AI service in order to capture the main points. She felt that residents deserved to know what was discussed at an eight-hour meeting about strategies and priorities for the City. She stated that she also felt that they should include what had been discussed at the Work Session earlier this evening.

City Administrator Nevinski acknowledged that the City had been experimenting with some AI software.

Mayor Labadie asked if the League of Minnesota Cities had issued an opinion on the use of AI.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that he was not aware that the League of Minnesota Cities had issued an opinion on this.

City Attorney Shepherd stated that he was not aware of anything from the League of Minnesota Cities either and noted that it could be a tool that was employed in order to try to get accurate minutes, but the minutes were just a snapshot of what happened. He noted that the most accurate reflection of any meeting would be a video, which they do have, and reiterated that minutes were intended to be a general summary of what occurred and not the entire discussion whether AI was used or not.

DiGruttolo moved, Gorham seconded, to bring the minutes of the City Council Retreat Minutes of February 18, 2025 back in a more robust manner in combination with the February 24, 2025 Work Session minutes.

Councilmember Maddy stated that he did not want to complicate minutes from one date versus minutes from tonight's Work Session meeting. He stated that he felt the retreat and the Work Session were two different meetings, even though they covered some of the same material.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he had thought the same thing, but felt it would be confusing if the information was found in two different places.

Mayor Labadie agreed with Councilmember Maddy and explained that was historically how the City had handled things when they have discussed something at multiple meetings.

Councilmember Maddy explained that he was just trying to simplify things and would be the same information written down and wanted to make sure that the City was consistent in their approach.

Mayor Labadie asked if there was interest in modifying the motion on the table.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she did not want to make things more difficult and if the procedure and the policy was that the minutes be separated, then she could amend her motion, but if it was not a policy, she would like to keep her existing motion.

Mayor Labadie stated that staff was nodding their heads about the point raised about keeping the minutes with the meeting that was held on a specific date. She stated that with regard to their archives, it would be more accurate if they kept it with the actual meeting date.

DiGruttolo withdrew her original motion and made a new motion to publish more robust meeting minutes for the February 18, 2025 Council Retreat meeting based on the document presented to the Council tonight.

Councilmember Maddy noted that there was a motion on the floor.

City Attorney Shepherd agreed and reminded the Council that there had already been a motion and a second for the original motion.

Councilmember Maddy moved, Labadie seconded, to postpone the motion on the floor, indefinitely.

Motion passed.

DiGruttolo moved, Gorham seconded, to publish a more robust version of the minutes from the February 18, 2025 Council Retreat meeting based on the Strategic Priorities Development document presented to the Council tonight.

Motion passed.

9. STAFF AND COUNCIL REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Staff

1. Matters from the Floor Responses: Mike Hirner, 19360 McKindley Court – Aircraft Flight Paths

City Administrator Nevinski explained that he had contacted someone at the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) and found out that there was generally a flight path over the area described by Mr. Hirner and that they tended to fly at about 10,000 feet. He noted that he had supplied Mr. Hirner with this information as well as the contact at the MAC if he wanted to discuss it any further with them. He noted that there was information and links related to the flight activity included in the packet that he felt was quite interesting.

Councilmember Gorham asked if this flight path had always been this way.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that from his conversation with MAC, that was his understanding.

2. Highway 7 Corridor Study Update

Public Works Director Morreim read aloud the purpose of the Highway 7 Corridor Study and gave an overview on what had been happening with the Study and outlined some of the options that had been proposed. He noted that there would continue to be public engagement opportunities for the public to weigh in on the options.

Mayor Labadie asked staff to make sure that the information about the public engagement opportunities published on the City's website.

Councilmember DiGruttolo asked if MNDot had been pretty responsive to questions.

Public Works Director Morreim stated that MNDot had been answering their current questions but noted that right now they were just waiting for the next step. He stated that they had a meeting with MNDot in December and felt that they were pretty responsive to some of the City's feedback that they did not really have enough information to make any substantive conversation about it and they came back in about a month and had held a meeting which he felt was far more productive, so he would say that MNDot had been listening to them. He reminded the Council that the study was a larger study that involved more than just Shorewood.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 24, 2025
Page 13 of 14

Councilmember Gorham stated that he felt this project would be made or broken, based on funding. He explained that this was a planning study and worried that people would see this information and get excited for a project that had not actually been funded.

City Engineer Budde stated that they had made it very clear to MNDot that the City's intent is that the outcome that they should be providing would be implementable items that can be done with their 2029 project. He noted that this Corridor Study was supposed to summarize how the projects will be funded and if local agencies needed to also secure the funding.

Mayor Labadie stated that one good thing was that all the mayors, councils, and political representatives were all in agreement that the Highway 7 corridor needed to change and be improved.

Other

Public Works Director Morreim stated that Public Works has been dealing with a drainage issue near Grant Lorenz and cautioned residents to be careful in the area.

Finance Director Schmuck stated that they had implemented an RFP for banking services and awarded it to their existing bank, but were in the process of making a few improvements.

City Clerk/HR Director Thone stated that they have scheduled the first round interviews for the open Planning Director position. She noted that they were continuing some painting projects at City Hall that had begun last year.

City Planner Griffiths stated that there will be a Planning Commission meeting next week and noted that the City was continuing to work with their consultant on updating the Subdivision Ordinance. He noted that the Planning Department had a busy week with applications coming in now that the snow has begun to melt.

City Administrator Nevinski stated that there were five applicants for the Planning Director position and planned to begin the interview process later this week. He asked if the Council wanted to be involved in the interview process as they had been in the past for Department Head positions.

Mayor Labadie noted that both Councilmember Maddy and Councilmember Gorham had served as chair of the Planning Commission and had served on the Commission for a lengthy amount of time and would not be opposed to their involvement in the interview process, if they were interested.

Councilmember Gorham stated that he would be happy to be part of the interview process if it worked in his schedule and noted that he had vacation plans beginning March 7, 2025.

Councilmember DiGruttolo stated that she would also be willing to be part of the interview process.

Councilmember Maddy asked if they wanted to have one or two members of the Council involved in the process.

City Administrator Nevinski noted that it would be easier to schedule if they only had to coordinate with one Councilmember, but deciding the number to be involved would be up to the Council. He explained that staff would be handling the initial first interview with the candidates.

Councilmember Maddy stated that he did not want to slow down the process and explained that he had recently sat through about sixteen fire district interviews recently and was a bit burnt out. He stated that he would be content with either Councilmember Gorham or Councilmember DiGruttolo being involved in the interview process for the Planning Director.

B. Mayor and City Council

Councilmember Gorham stated that he would not be in attendance for the next Council meeting. He noted that he attended the recent LMCC meeting, as an alternate, where they had presentations from Midco and Comcast about bringing fiber and other technology to the area. He stated that their proposals were favorably received by the LMCC and they voted to approve additional negotiations with them. He noted that the sale of the LMCC building had not been going well and explained that if it was not sold by May, the LMCC was planning to come to the member cities with some options moving forward.

Mayor Labadie stated that the warming houses were closed for the season and cautioned that the ice was not safe anywhere on Lake Minnetonka and encouraged people to get their ice houses off of the lake. She stated that there would be a Mayor's Forum on February 27, 2025 at the Shorewood Community and Event Center. She noted that she had attended the West Hennepin County Drug Task Force annual luncheon meeting, where they received the various stats from the area such as the amount of weapons, the weight of the different drugs that they had gotten off the streets. She stated that she felt the City was in good hands and felt that when it was a wise decision that the City chose to join the Task Force.

10. ADJOURN

Maddy moved, Gorham seconded, Adjourning the City Council Regular Meeting of February 24, 2025, at 9:10 P.M.

Motion passed.

ATTEST:

Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

Sandie Thone, City Clerk



City of Shorewood

City Council Meeting Item

Title/Subject: **Verified Claims**
Meeting Date: March 10, 2025
Prepared by: Michelle Nguyen, Senior Accountant
Reviewed by: Jeanne Schmuck, Finance Director
Attachments: **Claims Lists**

Item
2D

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-02-24-2025-ACH	\$60,170.43
Payroll-02-24-2025-AP	\$78,129.18
Council-03-10-2025	\$145,754.94

Total Claims: Checks & ACH	\$284,054.55
---------------------------------------	---------------------

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: jschmuck@ci.shorewood.mn.us
Printed: 02/24/2025 - 2:02PM
Batch: 00024.02.2025



Account Number	Debit	Credit	Account Description
700-00-1010-0000	0.00	60,170.43	CASH AND INVESTMENTS
700-00-2170-0000	60,170.43	0.00	GROSS PAYROLL CLEARING
	60,170.43	60,170.43	
Report Totals:	60,170.43	60,170.43	

Accounts Payable

Computer Check Proof List by Vendor

User: mnguyen
 Printed: 02/24/2025 - 3:30PM
 Batch: 00006.02.2025 - Payroll-02-24-2025



Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 12	AFSCME MN COUNCIL 5 - UNION DUES			Check Sequence: 1	ACH Enabled: True
PR-02-10-2025	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Union Dues-Tim Kosel	239.44	02/10/2025	700-00-2182-0000	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Union Dues
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Union Dues-Include Ti	209.51	02/24/2025	700-00-2182-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Union Dues
	Check Total:	448.95			
Vendor: 5	EFTPS - FEDERAL W/H			Check Sequence: 2	ACH Enabled: True
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Medicare Employer Po	1,280.52	02/24/2025	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Medicare Employ
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Federal Income Tax	9,591.11	02/24/2025	700-00-2172-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Federal Income T
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 FICA Employer Portion	5,475.33	02/24/2025	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 FICA Employer I
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Medicare Employee Pc	1,280.52	02/24/2025	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Medicare Employ
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 FICA Employee Portio	5,475.33	02/24/2025	700-00-2174-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 FICA Employee I
	Check Total:	23,102.81			
Vendor: 6	HEALTH PARTNERS-MEDICAL			Check Sequence: 3	ACH Enabled: True
February-2025	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Health Insurance-HSA	18,153.44	02/10/2025	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Health Insurance
February-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Health Insurance-HSA	1,326.31	02/24/2025	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Health Insurance
February-2025	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Health Insurance - CoP	351.73	02/10/2025	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Health Insurance
February-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Health Insurance - CoP	1,703.87	02/24/2025	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Health Insurance
February-2025	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Health Insurance-HSA	1,326.31	02/10/2025	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Health Insurance
February-2025	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Health Insurance-CoPa	5,732.45	02/10/2025	700-00-2171-0000	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Health Insurance
	Check Total:	28,594.11			
Vendor: 1166	HEALTHPARTNER-DENTAL			Check Sequence: 4	ACH Enabled: True
February-2025	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Dental-Non Union Ben	2,046.70	02/10/2025	700-00-2184-0000	PR Batch 00001.02.2025 Dental-Non Unio
	Check Total:	2,046.70			

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 2	ICMA RETIREMENT TRUST-302131-457			Check Sequence: 5	ACH Enabled: True
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Deferred-MissionSq-Fl	1,896.20	02/24/2025	700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Deferred-Missior
	Check Total:	1,896.20			
Vendor: 11	MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE			Check Sequence: 6	ACH Enabled: True
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 State Income Tax	4,251.44	02/24/2025	700-00-2173-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 State Income Tax
	Check Total:	4,251.44			
Vendor: 1091	MSRS-MN DEFERRED COMP PLAN 457			Check Sequence: 7	ACH Enabled: True
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Deferred Comp-MSRS	25.00	02/24/2025	700-00-2176-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 Deferred Comp-1
	Check Total:	25.00			
Vendor: 665	OPTUM BANK			Check Sequence: 8	ACH Enabled: True
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 HSA-Optum Bank-Em	2,779.16	02/24/2025	700-00-2183-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 HSA-Optum Ban
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 HSA-Optum Bank-Ber	1,178.82	02/24/2025	700-00-2183-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 HSA-Optum Ban
	Check Total:	3,957.98			
Vendor: 9	PERA			Check Sequence: 9	ACH Enabled: True
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 MN PERA Benefit Em	6,660.24	02/24/2025	700-00-2175-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 MN PERA Benef
PR-02-24-2025	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 MN-PERA Deduction	5,772.22	02/24/2025	700-00-2175-0000	PR Batch 00002.02.2025 MN-PERA Dedu
	Check Total:	12,432.46			
	Total for Check Run:	76,755.65			
	Total of Number of Checks:	9			

Accounts Payable

Computer Check Proof List by Vendor

User: mnguyen
Printed: 02/25/2025 - 1:15PM
Batch: 00007.02.2025 - PR-02-24-2025-HealthPartner



Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 6	HEALTH PARTNERS-MEDICAL			Check Sequence: 1	ACH Enabled: True
Feb-2025-Addtl	Feb-CoPay for Tim Kosek	1,373.53	02/24/2025	700-00-2171-0000	
	Check Total:	1,373.53			
	Total for Check Run:	1,373.53			
	Total of Number of Checks:	1			

Accounts Payable

Computer Check Proof List by Vendor

User: mnguyen
 Printed: 03/05/2025 - 12:09PM
 Batch: 00001.03.2025 - Council-03-10-2025



Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 1529 poshoreall225	ALL SEASONS SPORTS, LLC PW Clothing	5,119.51	03/10/2025	Check Sequence: 1 101-32-4245-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	5,119.51			
Vendor: 817 14841	ARCPOINT LABS OF EDINA FMCSA Employees Drug Testing	197.85	03/10/2025	Check Sequence: 2 101-32-4305-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	197.85			
Vendor: 136 02-21-2025 02-21-2025 02-27-2025 02-27-2025 02-27-2025 02-27-2025 02-27-2025	CENTERPOINT ENERGY-GAS 20630 Manor Rd 5735 Country Club Rd-SCEC 28125 Boulder Bridge 20405 Knightsbridge Rd 5755 Country Club Rd 6000 Eureka Road 24200 Smithtown Rd	134.16 532.64 381.12 148.60 521.07 404.00 1,491.76	03/10/2025 03/10/2025 03/10/2025 03/10/2025 03/10/2025 03/10/2025 03/10/2025	Check Sequence: 3 101-52-4380-0000 201-00-4380-0000 601-00-4396-0000 601-00-4394-0000 101-19-4380-0000 101-52-4380-0000 101-32-4380-0000	ACH Enabled: True
	Check Total:	3,613.35			
Vendor: 137 02-25-2025 02-25-2025 02-25-2025	CENTURY LINK Acct#333778780-PWs-952-470-2294 Acct#334037388-C.H.-952-470-6340 Acct#333532729-SCEC-952-470-7819	70.16 123.59 131.32	03/10/2025 03/10/2025 03/10/2025	Check Sequence: 4 101-32-4321-0000 101-19-4321-0000 201-00-4321-0000	ACH Enabled: True 952-470-2294-642-PWs 952-474-6340-989-C.H. 952-470-7819-261-SCEC
	Check Total:	325.07			
Vendor: 915 5255063808	CINTAS PWs-First Aid Supplies	95.97	03/10/2025	Check Sequence: 5 101-32-4400-0000	ACH Enabled: False

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
5255775903	City Hall-First Aid Supplies	69.18	03/10/2025	101-19-4223-0000	
	Check Total:	165.15			
Vendor: 1096	DAVEY RESOURCE GROUP, INC.			Check Sequence: 6	ACH Enabled: True
9000099006	Forestry Consulting-Tree Plan	2,860.00	03/10/2025	101-32-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	2,860.00			
Vendor: 1514	FURY FORD WACONIA			Check Sequence: 7	ACH Enabled: False
82000	Utility Truck MTCE	249.90	03/10/2025	601-00-4221-0000	
	Check Total:	249.90			
Vendor: 1060	GENERAL SECURITY SERVICES CORPORATION			Check Sequence: 8	ACH Enabled: True
50039533	GSSC Security Service	389.85	03/10/2025	101-52-4400-0000	
50039533	GSSC Security Service	105.00	03/10/2025	201-00-4400-0000	
50039533	GSSC Security Service	278.85	03/10/2025	101-19-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	773.70			
Vendor: 200	GOPHER STATE ONE CALL			Check Sequence: 9	ACH Enabled: True
5020750	Monthly Rental	25.20	03/10/2025	601-00-4400-0000	
5020750	Monthly Rental	25.20	03/10/2025	631-00-4400-0000	
5020750	Monthly Rental	25.20	03/10/2025	611-00-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	75.60			
Vendor: 896	HUEBSCH SERVICES			Check Sequence: 10	ACH Enabled: True
20389000	SCEC - Mats	70.67	03/10/2025	201-00-4223-0000	
	Check Total:	70.67			
Vendor: 1197	IWORQ			Check Sequence: 11	ACH Enabled: False
211533	Iworq Annual Subscription --Apr-Dec/2025	6,500.00	03/10/2025	101-18-4433-0000	
	Check Total:	6,500.00			
Vendor: 13	LEAGUE OF MINNESOTA CITIES INSURANCE TRUST (0049)			Check Sequence: 12	ACH Enabled: False
9428	Claim #205417-Alan Yelsey	2,500.00	03/10/2025	101-19-4361-0000	Acct#40003090

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
	Check Total:	2,500.00			
Vendor: 436	MARK HODGES MEDIA PRODUCTIONS			Check Sequence: 13	ACH Enabled: True
2025-002	Work Session - Council Recording-02/10 & 02/2	150.00	03/10/2025	101-11-4400-0000	
	Check Total:	150.00			
Vendor: 279	METROPOLITAN COUNCIL (WASTEWATER)			Check Sequence: 14	ACH Enabled: True
1184814	Monthly Waste Water Svc	89,535.36	03/10/2025	611-00-4385-0000	
	Check Total:	89,535.36			
Vendor: 1528	MGX EQUIPMENT SERVICES LLC			Check Sequence: 15	ACH Enabled: False
SWO045720-1	Plow for F350	10,633.00	03/10/2025	403-00-4620-0000	
	Check Total:	10,633.00			
Vendor: 1079	MINNESOTA CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION			Check Sequence: 16	ACH Enabled: False
2025-Nevinski	2025 Membership for Marc Nevinski	211.20	03/10/2025	101-13-4433-0000	
	Check Total:	211.20			
Vendor: 336	PITNEY BOWES BANK INC PURCHASE POWER			Check Sequence: 17	ACH Enabled: True
3107112630	2nd Qtr Lease-Postage Machine	195.00	03/10/2025	101-19-4221-0000	
	Check Total:	195.00			
Vendor: 1530	JEFFREY SEYBOLD			Check Sequence: 18	ACH Enabled: False
5840RidgRd	Escrow Refund - 5840 Ridge Road	360.80	03/10/2025	880-00-2200-0000	
	Check Total:	360.80			
Vendor: 355	SHRED-N-GO _446138			Check Sequence: 19	ACH Enabled: True
179576	Shredded Svc	78.93	03/10/2025	101-19-4223-0000	
	Check Total:	78.93			
Vendor: 1181	SPLIT ROCK MANAGEMENT, INC.			Check Sequence: 20	ACH Enabled: True
96263	Custodial Service-CH Building	487.00	03/10/2025	101-19-4223-0000	
	Check Total:	487.00			

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
Vendor: 386 21778	TWIN CITY WATER CLINIC Monthly Water Testing	120.00	03/10/2025	Check Sequence: 21 601-00-4400-0000	ACH Enabled: True
	Check Total:	120.00			
Vendor: 1083 1562857-Feb-2025	UNIFIRST CORPORATION Account#1562857 - Uniforms Services	470.79	03/10/2025	Check Sequence: 22 101-32-4400-0000	ACH Enabled: True
	Check Total:	470.79			
Vendor: 392 34245	VALLEY-RICH CO. INC. Watermain Break-26675 Smithtown Road	6,175.69	03/10/2025	Check Sequence: 23 601-00-4400-0000	ACH Enabled: False
	Check Total:	6,175.69			
Vendor: 411 915842434	XCEL ENERGY, INC. Parks	1,050.52	03/10/2025	Check Sequence: 24 101-52-4380-0000	ACH Enabled: True Parks
915842434	S.E. Area Svc	2,109.23	03/10/2025	601-00-4398-0000	S.E. Area Svc
915842434	Amesbury	1,467.83	03/10/2025	601-00-4394-0000	Amesbury
915842434	C.H. Svcs	698.82	03/10/2025	101-19-4380-0000	C.H. Svcs
915842434	P.W. Bldg Svc	316.18	03/10/2025	101-32-4380-0000	P.W. Bldg Svc
915842434	Lift Station Street Lights	656.12	03/10/2025	611-00-4380-0000	L.S. Street Lights
915842434	P.W. Street Lights Svc	4,307.72	03/10/2025	101-32-4399-0000	P.W. Street Lights Svc
915842434	Boulder Bridge	34.72	03/10/2025	601-00-4396-0000	Boulder Bridge
916465648	5735 Country Club Rd	883.18	03/10/2025	201-00-4380-0000	5735 Country Club Rd
916478134	24253 Smithtown Rd	911.08	03/10/2025	601-00-4395-0000	24253 Smithtown Rd
916480657	5755 Country Club Rd	336.07	03/10/2025	101-19-4380-0000	5755 Country Club Rd
916611710	5700 County Rd 19	70.37	03/10/2025	101-32-4399-0000	5700 County Rd 19
916611710	5700 County Rd 19 - Unit Light	222.66	03/10/2025	101-32-4399-0000	5700 County Rd 19 - Unit Light
916908475	28125 Boulder Bridge Drive	1,772.19	03/10/2025	601-00-4396-0000	28125 Boulder Bridge Drive
916922907	4931 Shady Isalnd Road	49.68	03/10/2025	611-00-4380-0000	4931 Shady Isalnd Road
	Check Total:	14,886.37			

Invoice No	Description	Amount	Pmt Date	Acct Number	Reference
	Total for Check Run:	145,754.94			
	Total of Number of Checks:	24			



City Council Meeting Item

Item
2E

Title/Subject: Service Agreement with Barr Engineering
Meeting Date: March 10, 2025
Prepared by: Jake Griffiths, City Planner
Reviewed by: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator
Attachments: Service Agreement

Background

The City has received an application for preliminary plat and development phase planned unit development (PUD) review for the property at 24560 Smithtown Rd. This site has concept plan approval for a detached townhouse development.

As was the case with previous reviews for this developer, the City Engineer has a conflict of interest reviewing any submittal from this applicant. In response, City staff proposes to authorize the attached service agreement with Barr Engineering to conduct professional engineering review of this project. Barr Engineering has reviewed previous applications at this site and is familiar with the project. The attached estimate to provide these services avoids any conflict of interest from the development review process.

Financial Considerations

The proposal includes hourly rates for the consulting professionals plus costs for additional reimbursable expenses. With the type of applications being submitted, the developer bears the responsibility to pay the cost of engineering and legal services.

Action Requested

The City Council is requested to approve the attached service agreement with Barr Engineering. Action requires a simple majority vote.



February 26, 2025

Mr. Marc Nevinski
City Administrator
City of Shorewood
5755 Country Club Road
Shorewood, MN 55331

Re: Agreement for Development Review Assistance

Dear Mr. Nevinski:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide professional engineering services and development review assistance to the City of Shorewood for the development parcel at 24560 Smithtown Rd. We understand the development includes a proposal for the construction of six residential homes. This letter is in direct response to email correspondence with Jake Griffiths (City Planner) on 2/19/2025 and subsequent correspondence. This letter, together with our Standard Terms (attached) sets forth the Agreement between the City of Shorewood (Client) and Barr Engineering Co., its affiliates and subsidiaries (Barr). For your project, the scope of professional consulting services Barr will provide includes:

Task 1: Preliminary Plat/PUD Application Review

For this task, we assume the City will 1) provide all preliminary plat/PUD submittal items from the developer at least three weeks prior to when the review needs to be complete; and 2) provide a clear schedule outlining what Barr needs to provide and when. Barr will review the proposal from an engineering standpoint and will consider the various engineering related items including water main, sanitary sewer, traffic, stormwater management, floodplains, and wetland buffers as outlined in current city code, the current city comprehensive plan, the local Surface Water Management Plan, and the city standard specifications/standard details (dated 2018) as provided by city staff. We assume all Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) work is performed by the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, as they are the local government unit (LGU) responsible for WCA permitting, if needed. We will provide comments in a draft memorandum (in PDF format). We assume we will attend up to two (2) virtual meetings to discuss the development and our comments with City staff and will finalize the review memorandum. We assume we will not need to attend any city council meetings related to this project.

Task 2: Final Plat/PUD Application Review

For this task, we assume the City will 1) provide all final plat/PUD submittal items from the developer at least three weeks prior to when the review needs to be complete; and 2) provide a clear schedule outlining what Barr needs to provide and when. Barr will review the proposal from an engineering standpoint (similar focus as listed in task 1 above) and will provide comments in a draft memorandum (in PDF format). We assume we will attend up to two (2) virtual meetings to discuss the development and our comments with City staff and will finalize the review memorandum. We will also prepare a stormwater management agreement for the development and assume the City can provide an example or template for the typical stormwater management agreement used by the city for similar projects. We assume we will not need to attend any city council meetings related to this project.

This Agreement will be effective for the duration of the services unless terminated earlier by either Client or Barr. Barr's Proposal, if any, is not a part of this Agreement except as specifically indicated or referred to in this letter Agreement. Barr will commence work upon receipt of a copy of this letter signed by Client.

For the services provided, Client will pay Barr according to the attached Standard Terms. Barr will bill Client monthly. The cost of the services will not exceed \$12,300 (USD) without prior approval by you.

We understand you have the authority to direct us. We will direct communications to you or Jake Griffiths at the address on this letter. Direction should be provided to me or Jennifer Koehler at 4300 MarketPointe Drive, Suite 200, Minneapolis, MN 55435.

During the term of this Agreement, Barr agrees to maintain with a company or companies lawfully authorized to do business in the jurisdiction in which the project is located, the type of insurance and policy limits as set forth below (USD):

Workers' Compensation and Employers' Liability

- | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Coverage A: | Per State Statute |
| 2. Coverage B: | \$500,000 Each Accident |
| | \$500,000 Disease – Policy Limit |
| | \$500,000 Disease – Each Employee |

Commercial General Liability

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 1. \$2,000,000 | General Aggregate |
| 2. \$2,000,000 | Products – Completed Operations Aggregate |
| 3. \$1,000,000 | Each Occurrence |
| 4. \$1,000,000 | Personal Injury |

Commercial Automobile Liability

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 1. \$1,000,000 | Combined Single Limit Bodily Injury and Property Damage |
|----------------|---|

The Commercial Automobile Liability shall provide coverage for the following automobiles:

1. All Owned Automobiles
2. All Non-Owned Automobiles
3. All Hired Automobiles

Umbrella Liability

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 1. \$10,000,000 | Each Claim |
| \$10,000,000 | Annual Aggregate |
| 2. | The Umbrella Liability provides excess limits for the Commercial General Liability, Employers' Liability, and Commercial Automobile Liability policies. |

Professional and Pollution Incident Liability

Professional Liability insurance including Pollution Incident Liability coverage with limits of not less than \$5,000,000 Per Claim / \$5,000,000 Annual Aggregate.

Certificates of Insurance

Certificates of Insurance will be provided upon request.

Barr and Client waive all rights, including their insurers' subrogation rights, against each other, their subcontractors, agents, and employees, and the other's consultants, separate contractors, and their subcontractors, agents, and employees for losses or damages covered by their respective property or

casualty insurance, commercial general liability, or Builder's Risk insurance. This waiver of subrogation is effective notwithstanding any duty of indemnity.

If this Agreement is satisfactory, please sign the enclosed copy of this letter in the space provided, and return it to Barr.

Sincerely yours,

BARR ENGINEERING CO.



Karen Chandler, PE

Its Vice President

Accepted this _____ day of _____, 20____

CITY OF SHOREWOOD

By _____

Its _____

Attachments

Standard Terms—Professional Services

Fee Schedule

Barr's Agreement with Client consists of the accompanying letter or other authorization, Work Orders, and these Standard Terms – Professional Services.

Section 1: Barr's Responsibilities

- 1.1 Barr will provide the professional services ("Services") described in this Agreement. Barr will use that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised under similar circumstances by reputable members of Barr's profession practicing in the same locality.
- 1.2 Barr will select the means, methods, techniques, sequences, or procedures used in providing its Services. If Client directs Barr to deviate from Barr selections, Client agrees to hold Barr harmless from claims, damages, and expenses arising out of Client direction.
- 1.3 Barr will acquire all licenses applicable to its Services and will comply with applicable law.
- 1.4 Barr duties do not include supervising Client contractors or commenting on, supervising, or providing the means and methods of their work unless Barr accepts any such duty in writing. Barr will not be responsible for the failure of Client contractors to perform in accordance with their undertakings.
- 1.5 Barr will provide a health and safety program for Barr employees, but will not be responsible for contractor, job, or site health or safety unless Barr accepts that duty in writing.
- 1.6 Estimates of Barr's fees or other project costs will be based on information available to Barr and on Barr's experience and knowledge. Such estimates are an exercise of Barr's professional judgment and are not guaranteed or warranted. Actual costs may vary. Client should add a contingency to the budgeted fees and costs to account for unexpected costs.
- 1.7 The information Client provides to Barr will be maintained in confidence except as required by law.

Section 2: Client Responsibilities

- 2.1 Client will provide access to property.
- 2.2 Client will provide Barr with prior reports, specifications, plans, changes in plans, and other information about the project that may affect the delivery of Barr's Services. Client will hold Barr harmless from claims, damages, and related expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, involving information not timely called to Barr's attention or not correctly shown on documents Client furnishes to Barr.
- 2.3 Client agree to provide Barr with information on contamination and dangerous and hazardous substances and processes Barr may encounter in performing the Services and related emergency procedure information.
- 2.4 Client agree to hold Barr harmless as to claims that Barr is an owner, operator, generator, transporter, treater, storer, or a disposal facility within the meaning of any law governing the handling, treatment, storage, or disposal of dangerous or hazardous materials.
- 2.5 Site remediation services may involve risk of contamination of previously uncontaminated air, soil, or water. If Client is requesting that Barr provide services that include this risk, Client agrees to hold Barr harmless from such contamination claims, damages, and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, unless and to the extent the loss is caused by Barr negligence.

- 2.6 Monitoring wells are Client property and Client is responsible for their permitting, maintenance and abandonment unless Barr accepts that duty in writing. Samples remaining after tests are conducted and field and laboratory equipment that cannot be adequately cleansed of contaminants are Client property. They will be discarded or returned to Client, at Barr's discretion, unless within 15 days of the report date Client gives written direction to store or transfer the materials at Client expense.
- 2.7 Client agrees to make disclosures required by law. If Barr is required by law or legal process to make such disclosures, Client agrees to hold Barr harmless and indemnify Barr from related claims and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees.

Section 3: Digital Files, Reports and Work Product

- 3.1 Barr's digital files, including but not limited to models, executable data, source code, and all other digital files, remain the property of Barr and shall be provided to the Client only if expressly provided for in this Agreement. Any digital files not containing a seal are provided for the convenience of the Client only, and use by Client or others to whom Client provides the digital files is at the Client's sole risk and without liability to Barr.
- 3.2 Barr will retain all data relating to the Services for a minimum of seven years and financial data for three years.
- 3.3 Barr reports, notes, calculations, and other documents, and computer software, programs, models, and data developed by Barr are instruments of Barr Services, and they remain Barr property, subject to a license to Client for Client's use in the related project for the purposes disclosed to Barr. At Barr's request, Client will execute Barr's standard digital data and conditional use agreement prior to receiving any digital data files. Further, Client may not use or transfer such information and documents to others for a purpose for which they were not prepared without Barr's written approval. Client agrees to indemnify and hold Barr harmless from claims, damages, and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, arising out of any unauthorized transfer or use.
- 3.4 Because electronic documents may be modified intentionally or inadvertently, Client agrees that Barr will not be liable for damages resulting from change in an electronic document occurring after Barr's transmittal to Client. In case of any difference or ambiguity between an electronic and a paper document, the paper document shall govern. When accepting document transfer in electronic format, Client accepts exclusive risk relating to long-term capability, usability, and readability of documents, software application packages, operating systems, and computer hardware.
- 3.5 If Client does not pay for the Services in full as agreed, Barr may retain reports and work not yet delivered to Client and Client agrees to return to Barr our reports and other work in Client's possession or under Client's control. Client agrees not to use or rely upon Barr Services or work for any purpose until it is paid for in full.

Section 4: Compensation

- 4.1 Client will pay for the Services as agreed or according to the current fee schedules if there is no other written agreement as to price. An estimated cost is not a firm figure unless stated as such and Client should allow for a contingency in addition to estimated costs.
- 4.2 Client will pay each invoice within 30 days after receipt as to all undisputed amounts. Payments not made within 60 days of invoice date will bear interest from the date that is 30 days after the date of the invoice at a rate equal to the lesser of 18 percent per annum or the highest rate allowed by law. Client agrees to pay all Barr costs of collection, including reasonable attorney fees
- 4.3 If Client directs Barr to invoice another, Barr will do so, but Client agrees to be responsible for Barr compensation unless Client provides Barr with that person's written acceptance of the terms of Barr's Agreement and Barr agrees to extend credit to that person.
- 4.4 Client agrees to compensate Barr in accordance with Barr's fee schedule if Barr is asked or required to respond to legal process arising out of a proceeding to which Barr is not a party.
- 4.5 If Barr is delayed by factors beyond Barr's control, or if the project conditions or the scope of work change, or if the standards change, Barr will receive an equitable adjustment of our compensation.
- 4.6 In consideration of Barr providing insurance to cover claims made by Client, Client hereby waives any right of offset as to payment otherwise due to Barr.

Section 5: Disputes, Damage, and Risk Allocation

- 5.1 Barr and Client will exercise good faith efforts to resolve disputes without litigation. Such efforts will include a meeting attended by each party's representative empowered to resolve the dispute. Disputes (except collections) will be submitted to mediation as a condition precedent to litigation.
- 5.2 Barr will not be liable for special, incidental, consequential, or punitive damages, including but not limited to those arising from delay, loss of use, loss of profits or revenue, loss of financing commitments or fees, or the cost of capital. Barr and Client waives against the other and its subcontractors, agents, and employees all rights to recover for losses covered by our respective property/casualty or auto insurance policies.
- 5.3 Barr will not be liable for damages unless Client has notified Barr of Client's claim within 30 days of the date of Client discovery of it and unless Client has given Barr an opportunity to investigate and to recommend ways of mitigating damages, and unless suit is commenced within two years of the earlier of the date of injury or loss and the date of completion of the Services.
- 5.4 For Client to obtain the benefit of a fee which includes a reasonable allowance for risks, Client agrees that Barr's aggregate liability will not exceed the fee paid for Barr's Services, but not less than \$50,000, and Client agrees to indemnify Barr from all liability to others in excess of that amount. If Client is unwilling to accept this allocation of risk, Barr will increase Barr's aggregate liability to \$100,000 provided that, within 10 days of the date of this Agreement, Client provides payment in an amount that will increase Barr fees by 10%, but not less than \$500, to compensate Barr for the greater risk undertaken. This increased fee is not the purchase of insurance.

- 5.5 If Client fails to pay Barr within 60 days following invoice date, Barr may consider the default a total breach of this Agreement and, at Barr's option, Barr may terminate all of Barr's duties without liability to Client or to others.
- 5.6 If Barr is involved in legal action to collect compensation, Client agrees to pay Barr's collection expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees.
- 5.7 The law of the state of Minnesota will govern all disputes. Barr and Client hereby agree to submit to the exclusive jurisdiction of the State Courts sitting in Hennepin County, Minnesota, for all claims relating to the contract of the services performed by Barr and waive any objections to such location based on jurisdiction, venue or inconvenient forum. Barr and Client waives trial by jury. No employee acting within the scope of employment will have any individual liability for his or her acts or omissions and Client agrees not to make any claim against individual employees.

Section 6: Miscellaneous Provisions

- 6.1 Barr will provide a certificate of insurance to Client upon request. Any claim as an Additional Insured will be limited to losses caused by Barr's sole negligence.
- 6.2 This Agreement is Barr's entire agreement, and it supersedes prior agreements. Only a writing signed by an authorized representative for Barr and Client making specific reference to the provision modified may modify it.
- 6.3 Neither Barr nor Client will assign this Agreement without the written approval of the other. No other person has any rights under this Agreement.
- 6.4 Only a writing may terminate this Agreement. Barr will receive an equitable adjustment of Barr's compensation as well as Barr's earned fees and expenses if Barr's work is terminated prior to completion.
- 6.5 Barr will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, creed, ancestry, national origin, sex, religion, age, marital status, affectional preference, disability, status with regard to public assistance, membership or activity in a local human-rights commission, or status as a specially disabled, Vietnam-era, or other eligible veteran. Barr will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are considered, and employees are treated during their employment, without regard to those factors. Barr actions will include, but are not limited to notifications, hiring, promotion or employment upgrading, demotion, transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoffs or terminations, rates of pay and other forms of compensation, and selection for training or apprenticeship.
- 6.6 Neither Barr nor Client, including Barr officers, employees, and agents, are agents of the other, except as agreed in writing. Except as agreed in writing, nothing in this Agreement creates in either party any right or authority to incur any obligations on behalf of, or to bind in any respect, the other party. Nothing contained herein will prevent either party from procuring or providing the same or similar products or services from or to any third person, provided that there is no breach of any obligations pertaining to confidentiality.

End of Standard Terms

Description	Rate* (U.S. dollars)
Vice President	\$180-350
Consultant/Advisor	\$210-325
Engineer/Scientist/Specialist IV	\$185-205
Engineer/Scientist/Specialist III	\$155-180
Engineer/Scientist/Specialist II	\$130-150
Engineer/Scientist/Specialist I	\$85-125
Technician IV	\$155-205
Technician III	\$125-150
Technician II	\$95-120
Technician I	\$60-90
Support Personnel III	\$155-205
Support Personnel II	\$95-150
Support Personnel I	\$60-90

Rates for litigation support services will include a 30% surcharge.

A ten percent (10%) markup will be added to subcontracts for professional support and construction services to cover overhead and insurance surcharge expenses.

Invoices are payable within 30 days of the date of the invoice. Any amount not paid within 30 days shall bear interest from the date 10 days after the date of the invoice at a rate equal to the lesser of 18 percent per annum or the highest rate allowed by applicable law.

For travel destinations within the continental U.S. (CONUS) and Canada, meals will be reimbursed on a per diem basis. The per diem rate will be as published by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) based on the High-Low method. Full-day per diem rates will be pro-rated on travel days. For travel destinations outside the continental U.S. (CONUS) and Canada, meals will be reimbursed based on actual expenses incurred.

All other reimbursable expenses, including but not limited to costs of transportation, lodging, parking, postage, shipping, and incidental charges, will be billed at actual reasonable cost. Mileage will be billed at the IRS-allowable rate.

Materials and supplies charges, printing charges, and equipment rental charges will be billed in accordance with Barr's standard rate schedules.

Vice President category includes consultants, advisors, engineers, scientists, and specialists who are officers of the company.

Consultant/Advisor category includes experienced personnel in a variety of fields. These professionals typically have advanced background in their areas of practice and include engineers, engineering specialists, scientists, related technical professionals, and professionals in complementary service areas such as communications and public affairs.

Engineer/Scientist/Specialist categories include registered professionals and professionals in training (e.g., engineers, geologists, and landscape architects) and graduates of engineering and science degree programs.

Technician category includes CADD operators, construction observers, cost estimators, data management technicians, designers, drafters, engineering technicians, interns, safety technicians, surveyors, and water, air, and waste samplers.

Support Personnel category includes information management, project accounting, report production, word processing, and other project support personnel.

*Rates do not include sales tax on services that may be required in some jurisdictions.



City Council Meeting Item

Title/Subject: Agenda Management Software
Meeting Date: March 10, 2025
Prepared by: Sandie Thone, City Clerk/Human Resources Director
Reviewed by: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator
Attachments: CivicPlus AMM Select: Pro Premium Quote

Background

City staff are continually seeking methods to increase efficiency, reduce waste, streamline operations, and enhance residents' access to local government services. One approach identified is the utilization of technology. In 2023 the city council approved NEOGOV Insight as a recruitment tool and the result has been a significant increase in efficiency and a marked uptick in well-qualified candidates for city staff vacancies. In 2024 the city council approved a new website that has allowed us to streamline many of our manual processes, save money on paying for extra add-on applications that the new website inherently offers, and communicate effectively and transparently with the public. Using innovative and integrative technology solutions, we can save money and time while increasing access and trust among residents and the public.

Agenda management software was added to the preliminary 2025 budget and garnered unanimous support among the city council. The software is the most effective way to streamline the entire agenda management process. It is capable of creating agenda items to managing live meetings. In addition, the software allows for a more user-friendly way to store and find public documents. The City of Shorewood currently has approximately twenty-four city council meetings, 12 planning commission meetings, and 12 park commission meetings per year which creates a significant number of agendas, agenda packet items, meeting minutes, and transparency documents to manage. In 2024, staff performed a cost-analysis of the time and cost for city employees to create and manage one city council agenda packet process. The results are as follows:

Packet Process Step	Time (Hours)	Actual Costs	Potential Savings in Time with Agenda Software	Potential Savings in Costs with Agenda Software
Packet Prep	12 hours	\$528	8 hours	\$352
Printing/Publish	4 hours	\$176	3.5 hours	\$154
Packet Delivery	1 hour	\$44	1 hour	\$44
Printing Costs (15 copies)		\$128		\$118
Delivery Costs		\$10		\$10
Total	17 hours	\$886	12.5 hours	\$678

The above represents anticipated savings of approximately 12.5 hours of staff time and approximately \$678 per packet of savings by automating this process with Agenda Software. The staff time delineated above does not include the time staff members work on their agenda items – this strictly represents support staffs’ time in pulling together, printing, and delivering one city council meeting agenda packet.

Staff performed research on top agenda management software programs for local governments in both 2023 and 2024. We have been provided demos and received quotes from the top two companies most often used in local city government.

CivicPlus Agenda and Meeting Management (AMM) Select Pro

Initial Term (Year 1 plus Implementation)	\$7,875.00
Annual Recurring Services (Year 2)	\$5,300.00

Granicus Peak Agenda Management Software

Initial Term (Year 1 plus one-time fees)	\$9,591.26
Future Year Pricing	\$4,798.57

The staff’s recommendation is to enter into a contract with CivicPlus for Agenda Meeting Management Software. The following represents justification for the recommendation.

- CivicPlus has been in business for over 25 years with an excellent reputation and high standards serving over 10,000 customers. They were a GovTech Top 100 Company in

2024 and have been an Inc. 5000 11-time honoree. They have been recommended highly by local government entities in MN.

- Shorewood has first-hand experience with CivicPlus as it hosts both our current website and recreation management software (see Chart below of innovative and integrated technology solutions offered. We have had excellent experience with both in the way of implementation, training, and continual support and can attest to the superiority of the products.
- CivicPlus provided the city with a more competitive price than the competitor Granicus and with some negotiation on staff's part, they were able to beat their price from their previous quote in 2023, proving their eagerness to collaborate with us on this initiative.
- CivicPlus Select AMM software will streamline the entire agenda meeting process for not only city council meetings but commission meetings as well. If needed in the future it also has the capability of adding on a module to manage live meetings. It has customized workflows, version tracking, and built-in communication tools.
- The cloud-based software has unlimited storage, is user friendly and easily interfaces with Laserfiche, One Drive, Zoom, etc.
- It allows the city to manage packets of any size, which has traditionally been an issue with sending packets via email.
- It allows for an automated process that compiles all items into a book-marked PDF quickly and easily, which is a process that manually is laborious and takes several hours to complete. Last-minute changes are incorporated with minimal effort and automatically updates renumbering on the entire agenda packet. Manually this can present a daunting task.
- Administrators can choose what is published to the public, or internal users, which is helpful with non-public data or closed meetings.
- The software allows staff to create agenda items and staff reports in little time with configurable field types, an embedded text editor and the automated PDF builder.
- Tasks are assigned automatically and item statuses (approved, in-progress, tabled, etc.) notify others when comments are left, or changes are made.
- The approval process is automated giving full transparency to collaborators as it passes through the approval process and tracks revisions.
- Custom tags can be used for improving searchability and reporting.
- The "Board Portal" provides access to council and commissioners and efficiently delivers packets of any size to the Board Portal. It is optimized for all devices, including desktops, laptops, and tablets and no separate application is required.
- A personal and secure meeting repository is provided to city officials to review and take notes on all meeting content, including agendas, supporting documents, minutes, etc.

- AMM Select automatically indexes and publishes meeting content with Board Portal functionality, so it is easy for city officials to find information quickly. It comes with a full-text search tool to locate content by a key word, date range, and more. It also includes an intuitive display of an item summary (which shows the motions, votes, or comments on a particular item) so there is no need to scroll through the entire document manually.
- It includes a Public Resident Portal on the website which provides public access to all meeting content on a single page. The public can easily download PDFs of all documents and have full-text search and filtering options. This portal offers email notifications within the software – which is now an added manual step. The Portal is also mobile responsive. The public can easily jump to past, current, upcoming events with an embedded calendar and continuous scrolls. Access to fully searchable meeting content meets transparency requirements and keeps residents engaged and informed.
- It includes an automated minutes module with a single click set-up from agenda to minutes. This can be explored more in the future as an alternative to the current minute taking process but could be useful in work sessions and shorter meetings.
- There is an optional Live Meeting Manager module that enhances live meetings by integrating the board portal with audience display pages, electronic voting, and allows for easy display of speaker details, board requests, and chairperson controls for managing the meeting.
- There is an optional CivicPlus Media module that allows cities to live stream meetings with on-demand video. It allows the city to stream up to three concurrent live proceedings and seamlessly integrate all video content directly into the meeting agenda.
- There is also an optional Boards & Committees Module that could be added in the future to track vacancies, applications, and appointments.

Project Timeline

It is expected the full implementation and integration of the Agenda Management software to take approximately 6 months from start to finish and look like the following (except for the Live meeting manager/Media streaming that we are not opting into currently):

PHASE 1: INITIATE	• Project Kickoff and communication including timeline, deliverables, and an implementation questionnaire to capture details for your configuration
PHASE 2: ANALYZE	• Design Review meeting to review and discuss needs for proposed Agenda, Minutes, and Item/Staff Report designs • Obtain internal approvals on proposed designs and send in final approval
PHASE 3: DESIGN & CONFIGURE	• Configuration of designs • Configuration of up to 10 boards • Configuration of up to 10 meeting types • Configuration of up to 10 approval workflows • Configuration of up to 1 item/staff report
PHASE 4: OPTIMIZE	• Virtual consulting session(s) to review current processes and documents and discuss desired goals, best practices, and configuration options • Configuration is completed and handed off for review, testing, and feedback • Configuration adjustments made per submitted feedback
PHASE 5: EDUCATE	• Live, virtual training sessions are conducted within configured site
PHASE 6: LAUNCH	• First Live Meeting and System Launch • Access to live chat features, Technical Support and introduction to Live Care

Staff did include some budget dollars in the 2025 IT budget to purchase electronic devices for the city council. We plan to explore options and bring back a recommendation at a later date. At that time, we can discuss further the process and the budget for the commissions as well.

Financial or Budget Impact

The cost of agenda management software was included in the 2025 budget as approved by the City Council in December of 2024.

Action Requested

Motion to approve the purchase of Agenda Meeting Management Software (AMM) and enter into an agreement with CivicPlus for \$7,875.00 for year one which includes implementation and training and the option to have annual recurring services at a rate of \$5,300 (subject to uplift). Second and simple majority vote required.

**CivicPlus**

302 South 4th St. Suite 500
Manhattan, KS 66502
US

Quote #:**Date:****Expires On:**

Statement of Work

Q-88589-1

12/10/2024 1:29 PM

3/31/2025

Client:

City of Shorewood, MN

Bill To:

SHOREWOOD CITY, MINNESOTA

SALESPERSON	Phone	EMAIL	DELIVERY METHOD	PAYMENT METHOD
Megan Poole		megan.poole@civicplus.com		Net 30

Discount(s)

QTY	PRODUCT NAME	DESCRIPTION
1.00	AMM: Year 1 Annual Fee Discount	Year 1 Annual Fee Discount

One-time(s)

QTY	PRODUCT NAME	DESCRIPTION
1.00	AMM Select: Pro Premium Implementation	Pro Premium Implementation; Includes config. of up to 10 meeting types, up to 10 boards, 1 approval workflow per meeting type, 4 hrs of training, and 2 hrs of consulting; Includes 1 original agenda, 1 original minutes, and 1 original staff report design

Recurring Service(s)

QTY	PRODUCT NAME	DESCRIPTION
1.00	AMM Select: Pro Annual Fee	AMM Select: Pro Annual Fee

List Price - Initial Term Total	USD 9,200.00
Total Investment - Initial Term	USD 7,875.00
Annual Recurring Services (Subject to Uplift)	USD 5,300.00

Initial Term	12 Months
Initial Term Invoice Schedule	100% Invoiced upon Signature Date

Renewal Procedure	Automatic 1 year renewal term, unless 60 days notice provided prior to renewal date
Annual Uplift	5% to be applied in year 2

This Statement of Work ("SOW") shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the CivicPlus Master Services Agreement and the applicable Solution and Services terms and conditions located at <https://www.civicplus.help/hc/en-us/p/legal-stuff> (collectively, the "Binding Terms"), By signing this SOW, Client expressly agrees to the terms and conditions of the Binding Terms throughout the term of this SOW.

Please note that this document is a SOW and not an invoice. Upon signing and submitting this SOW, Client will receive the applicable invoice according to the terms of the invoicing schedule outlined herein.

Acceptance of Quote # Q-88589-1

The undersigned has read and agrees to the Binding Terms, which are incorporated into this SOW, and have caused this SOW to be executed as of the date signed by the Customer which will be the Effective Date:

For CivicPlus Billing Information, please visit <https://www.civicplus.com/verify/>

Authorized Client Signature

CivicPlus

By (please sign):

By (please sign):

Printed Name:

Printed Name:

Title:

Title:

Date:

Date:

Organization Legal Name:

Billing Contact:

Title:

Billing Phone Number:

Billing Email:

Billing Address:

Mailing Address: (If different from above)

PO Number: (Info needed on Invoice (PO or Job#) if required)



Item
4A

City Council Meeting Item

Title/Subject: Presentation by Excelsior Lion's Club
Meeting Date: March 10, 2025
Prepared by: Marc Nevinski, City Administrator
Attachments: None

Josh Radziej from the Excelsior Lion's club will make a presentation to the Council.



City Council Meeting Item

Title/Subject: 2025 Mill & Overlay & Eureka Road-Final Plans & Specifications
City Project 24-10, 23-01

Meeting Date: Monday, March 10, 2025

Prepared by: Andrew Budde, City Engineer

Reviewed by: Matt Morreim, Director of Public Works

Attachments: Overview Maps, Plans & Specifications, and Resolution

Background:

The City of Shorewood authorized the preparation of plans & specification of the 2025 Mill & Overlay on December 9, 2024. The project is identified in the CIP for maintaining and extending the longevity of the existing roadway infrastructure throughout the city. The mill & overlay project includes streets that have poor pavement ratings and implement recommendations from the pavement management plan.

The following roadways are included in the 2025 mill & overlay project:

- Orchard Circle
- Portion of Wild Rose Lane
- Sylvan Lane
- Smithtown Circle
- Eureka Road-north of Smithtown
- Portion of Country Club Rd
- Portion of Yellowstone Trail
- Shorewood Oaks Drive
- Oak Leaf Trail
- Maple Leaf Circle
- Burlwood Court
- Boulder Bridge Drive
- Boulder Bridge Lane

Staff have reviewed the mill and overlay areas and incorporated the typical items such as adjust watermain valves, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer castings, replacement of curb, and replacement of drainage structures that need repair. Some additional items included in the project are:

1. Relocation of the driveway at 25620 Smithtown Road to follow city code 1201.03; Subd 5; d.8.e requiring driveways to be 40 feet from an intersection. The driveway would be relocated to Eureka Road, which will improve safety at this intersection. Staff will secure a right of entry agreement prior to this work occurring.
2. Addition of curb/pedestrian ramps in the northeast quadrant of Eureka Road/Smithtown Road intersection. Three Rivers Park District has agreed to contribute \$5000 towards the cost of the pedestrian ramp construction and an agreement will be provided for approval in the future.
3. Drainage improvements near Nelsine Drive by the addition of concrete curb & gutter and added catch basins.

Eureka Road, Country Club Trail, and Yellowstone Trail are Municipal State Aid (MSA) Streets and the city plans to utilize MSA funds. These streets are included in a separate plan set that will require approval to MnDOT State Aid prior to bid opening. The plans are currently at MnDOT State Aid for review and approval. Staff are also in the process of securing permits from Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority, Three Rivers Park District, Minnehaha Creek Watershed, and the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

If plans are approved tonight, bids are planned to be opened in early April, and the award of the contract is planned for the April 28th council meeting.

Plans can be viewed here:

<https://shorewoodmn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1157/Shorewood-2025-Mill-Overlay-Draft-Plans-PDF>

Financial or Budget Considerations:

Costs for this work have been budgeted for in the Capital Improvement Plan and would utilize a combination of Street Reconstruction Fund, Water Fund, Stormwater Management Fund, and Municipal State Aid (MSA) Construction Funds. The city has budgeted the following for the project:

Fund:	CIP Budget Item:	Code:	Amount:
404-Street	2025 M&O and Striping	LR-99-100	\$735,000.00
404-Street	Eureka Rd-north	ST-23-03	\$63,000.00
404-Street	Pavement Maintenance	LR-99-099	\$160,000.00 (of \$310,000)
601-Water	2025 M&O and Striping	LR-99-100	\$52,500.00
631-Storm	Catch Basin Reconstruction	STM-99-01	\$53,000.00
Subtotal:			\$1,063,500.00
<u>405-MSA</u>	<u>Eureka Rd-north</u>	<u>ST-23-03</u>	<u>\$567,000.00</u>
Subtotal:			\$567,000.00

Overall Budget Total: \$1,630,500.00

Based on the final design the estimated total project cost is \$1,593,000, or \$37,500 under the overall budget. However, the project plans to utilize local funds and MSA Construction Funds and needs to look at their budgets independently. The locally funded portion is estimated to be \$942,000, or \$121,500 under budget. The MSA Construction Fund, which includes Eureka Road, portions of Yellowstone Road, and Country Club Road, is anticipated to be \$650,000, or \$85,000 over budget. The city can plan to fund the potential overage of the MSA portion of the project with the MSA Construction Funds as it has a balance of nearly \$2 million, or it could plan to utilize local funds. The decision does not need to be made at this time and can be evaluated once bids are received for the project.

Action Requested:

Motion to adopt the attached resolution approving the final plans and authorize bidding for the 2025 Mill & Overlay, City Project 24-10, and Eureka Road project, City Project 23-01.
Simple majority vote required.

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

RESOLUTION 25-027

**A RESOLUTION APPROVING FINAL PLANS & SPECIFICATIONS & AUTHORIZING BIDDING
FOR THE 2025 MILL & OVERLAY AND EUREKA ROAD PROJECT
CITY PROJECT 24-10, 23-01**

WHEREAS, the current Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) identifies a mill & overlay project for 2025 on various streets throughout the city and includes improvements to Eureka Road, City Projects 24-10, 23-01; and

WHEREAS, the city has had several discussion on the improvements related to Eureka Road and has determined to compete a mill & overlay with limited addition of curb & gutter; and

WHEREAS, the mill & overlay in all areas will help to maintain and extend the longevity of the roadway infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, staff have prepared the final plans and specifications as directed by council and are ready to bid the project; and

WHEREAS, the project will be funded through the combination of Street Reconstruction Fund, Water Fund, Stormwater Management Fund, and Municipal State Aid Construction Fund.

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

1. Hereby approves the Final Plans & Specifications and Authorizes Bidding for the 2025 Mill & Overlay and Eureka Road project, City Projects 24-10 and 23-01.

Adopted by the City Council of Shorewood, Minnesota this 10th day of March 2025.

Jennifer Labadie, Mayor

Attest:

Sandie Thone, City Clerk