

PPA Board Meeting Minutes ~ May 10, 2025 ~ PPA Building

1. Call to Order ~ Shane 8:16 AM

2. Roll

President - Shane Wallace	Vice President- NP (Dan Connell)
Treasurer- Pat Ebetino	Secretary- Linda Minnick
District 1- Lynn Ballentine	District 5A- Marshall Minnick
District 2- NP (Bernie Ebetino)	District 6- Jim Whitehead
District 3- Anthony Serianni	District 7- Sherry Doherty
District 4- NP (Mark Laurent)	District 8&9- Darby Miller
District 5- Steve Wilson	

Guests

- | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| 1.) Paul Erst D6 | 6.) Joanna Miller D9 |
| 2.) Georganna Hart D5 | 7.) Jon Korejwa D6 |
| 3.) Diane/Tad Groff D9 | 8.) Kathy Roman D1 |
| 4.) Jeff Glon D3 | |
| 5.) Dave Arnott D7 | |

3. Guest Comments

- 1.) Tad Groff- project on hold, currently upgrading septic, permits not obtained before starting, 11'6" from Miller property (east line), 92'6" to Lake, septic between house and road **Pat**- asked if permits will be obtained and posted before resuming project? Tad- Yes

****Motion-** that the Groff addition request be approved- **Sherry**

Second- **Jim**

Approved

- 2.) Paul Erst- Apologizes to anyone offended by foul language used at past meeting. States he follows the rules and he's not a liar.

4. Secretary's Report ~ **Linda**

A. Review of April 12, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes

- a. Sherry- page 6 LAPSI spent \$3,00.00 should be \$3,000.00

****Motion to-** Accept April 12, 2025 Minutes with correction.- **Pat**

Second- **Sherry**

Approved

B. Review of April 27, 2025 EX Board Meeting Minutes

****Motion to-** Accept April 27, 2025 EX Board Meeting Minutes, not to be placed on website- **Marshall**

Second- **Steve**

Approved

- a. **Sherry**- Why not on website? **Marshall**- To retain Executive session right to keep private.

5. Treasurer's Report ~ **Pat**

A. As of April 30, 2025

Money Market-	\$	25,927.44
CD-		51,595.21
Checking-		55,511.27
Total Current Assets-	\$	136,385.52
Paid Taxes	\$	7,199.30

- a. **Shane-** Wants to see the tax forms, asked if biannual? **Pat-** Yes, but pays in full in May.
- b. **Pat-** Has question about an extra 1' margin section being billed. May be a reduced amount for wetland, will find out. **Shane-** Asks which lot the extra 1' margin charge? **Pat-** Very end of Promontory Point, was an easement that was given up

****Motion-** Accept the Treasurer's Report- **Sherry**

Second- **Anthony**

Approved

B. CD matures at the end of May. current rates 6 mths.- 3.7%, 9 mths.- 3.4%, 13 mths.- 3.5%

****Motion-** Roll the CD into the best rate available at Lake City- **Pat**

Second- **Steve**

Approved

- a. **Anthony-** at Lake City? **Pat-** Yes **Anthony-** Have Mark research for better rate next time?
- b. **Shane-** Look into if holding the CD conflicts with Nonprofit status? **Pat-** Will check. **Steve-** Related to his church, It's about the purpose of the organization, not if from year to year you have money left over. Expected you would reinvest to capitalize for long term benefit of the organization. **Anthony-** Annual return would have a place for net gain. **Pat-** If expenses were more than 90% no tax owed. She would like to meet with CPA to make sure on the right path. **Sherry-** When she was Treasurer, she was told because of the Dam need to keep money on hand for repair. Slightly different rules. She would also like CPA to be consulted. **Jon-** Line 10 of the 990 Nonprofit form is for investment income.

C. Delinquent Dues

- a. 8 invoices still unpaid
- b. Letters ready to go, adds \$50.00 late fee and 2% interest, if not paid by June add another 2% interest and turn over to attorney, could email, process is to send the letters. **Sherry-** Should send the letters. **Pat-** Will send today.
- c. **Steve-** sees 3 in his district any reason for him to get involved? **Shane-** What would it hurt? Be neighborly. **Sherry-** Made phone calls last month, all but 1 paid.

D. 2026 Budget

- a. Upped Administration Exp. \$1,500.00 to \$2,500.00 includes winter room rental, website hosting, etc. everything else stays the same.
- b. **Shane-** Chemical budget? **Pat-** \$28,500.00 **Shane-** We haven't gone over that? **Pat-** Yes, \$29,235.00 in 2024. In 2024 only \$5,866.00 over budget.

****Motion-** Approve the 2026 Budget- **Marshall**

Second- **Sherry**

Approved

6. Lake Maintenance Report ~ **Marshall & Linda**

A. Dam-

- a. Biennial Inspection week of May 18, Terracon, Kellen Heavin P.E.
 - i. Will discuss cap, what needs done, how it can be achieved
 - ii. Will be interesting to see how quickly he finishes the report, back to us & State
 - iii. **Pat-** still don't have State sign off for 2023 Inspection (they say, on our list)
 - iv. **Shane-** asked if the cap is tied into the 'black belt' underneath? **Marshall-** No
- b. Current along the face of the Dam helps keep the ice open, did well through winter
- c. Stephen Hanford, IKillMoles.com set traps on the West Levee April 29, 2025

- d. -0.32' (3.84") down from 867.5' or from the top of the Box, 12" log in with 6" opening, Level trending down
 - i. Probably no drop for chemicals this year, if no drop required will remove 12" log add in 6" & 9", which leaves the 3" 'safety zone'
 - ii. **Pat**- Mentions positive comments last year about Lake level when maintained at top of box (not 3" down) into June, finds billing July 13 for change to 9" log
 - iii. **Sherry**- Happy with higher winter level (12" opening)
- B. Lake Chemical & Weed Treatment Plan-
- a. **Shane**- Have heard from 3 companies
 - i. Aquatic Control easiest to communicate with, transparent, most impressive response
 - b. **Jim**- Aquatic plant control has a lot of variables, that's why we hire these guys.
 - c. **Anthony**- AC has an interesting perspective on Elodea control, 6 ppb for 1-3 months, we never got close to that
 - i. Do we want systemic chemicals at those levels in the Lake for months? Probably not
 - ii. Looks like they (AC) are leaning toward contact herbicides, much less costly
 - iii. AC has done a thorough job with the Tier II survey and report
 - d. **Jim**- has concerns with Harvester use, spreads the plants, have lost the dump sites, would like to see minimum use this year, could probably sell it for more than we paid
 - e. **Anthony**- We have been trying for years to make those points
 - f. **Marshall**- What about concerns with recommended spot treatment? Copper?
 - g. **Anthony**- Has always had concern about using the same herbicide year after year, 10 years ago potential for resistance discussed. Seems you would want to cycle, not using the same one. **Marshall**- Hydrothol? **Anthony**- not familiar with that, Galleon and Sonar are systemic, costly and need to be in for an extended period of time. If not doing the time dependent assays so you know what your levels of concentration are over the course of those 60 days, you're wasting your money.
 - h. **Marshall**- They want to apply in May then come back June/July for the SSW survey. They should be able to observe if the desired effect has happened.
 - i. **Linda**- 15 acres of SSW at \$600 per acre = \$9,000 x 2 treatments + \$2,800 x 3 (spot treat Curly Leaf) + \$1,500 (SSW survey) = \$27,900
 - j. **Pat**- in the past we stayed with one plan, now a different approach, still going to use the Harvester or see the outcome of just treating?
 - k. **Sherry**- AC recommended not cutting.
 - l. **Anthony**- Copper will end up on the Lake bottom. There are concerns about toxicity. All the literature suggests these copper reagents are the best at this time for SSW. We have to chose; don't treat, use the copper products, or manual removal (which we already ruled out).
 - m. Discussion about barrier mats topped with sand or pea gravel in a 'test area' to smother out SSW.
 - n. **Anthony**- has spoken to Leif on many occasions, he knows a lot, is transparent. The group does a good job. He trusts them and would be willing to let them follow through with their recommendations, with the possible change of doing a small 'mat' study to see the effect on proliferation of SSW. SSW on Wawasee is a serious problem. Worries about it taking over.
 - o. **Shane**- We can't do nothing. We need to keep it at bay.

****Motion-** To allow Aquatic Control to proceed with their treatment recommendations.- **Anthony**

Second- **Lynn**

Approved- Shane will contact.

- p. **Pat-** At the annual meeting Druckmiller had concerns about how bad that bay was and someone else wanted Donahoe to treat her cattails. Will there be concerns from others about their areas? **Jim-** Yes **Pat-** Then what?
- q. **Shane-** There is Spatterdock that could use extra attention in their bay. There may be people who want to throw in on the cost.
- r. **Anthony-** Has also heard of people self treating. Maybe they should be encouraged to come to us about it so at least we know they are planning to do it.
- s. ?? guest- What's the best thing to do for Lily Pads that are getting really thick? **Pat-** Pull them.
- t. **Linda-** Maybe AC would be interested in setting something up ahead of time to treat individual areas at the owner's expense, while they are already on the Lake?
- u. **Sherry-** We need a plan that works with AC's program

7. Old Business

A. Short Term Rental Enforcement Discussion-

- a. **Sherry-** Loss of Lake privileges,
- b. **Marshall-** The motion was to enforce the Feb. '24 Letter. Quotes Article 5 Rules and Regulations Section 2 (pg 11) Asks Shane if his group has put together a Bylaw?
- c. **Shane-** doesn't know if a Bylaw needs to be changed, in their view. Their legal counsel says they're not in violation so no reason to put forth an amendment to change. Is where that's going.
- d. **Marshall-** In other words, it doesn't matter what we do, they are going to continue to do what they want.
- e. **Shane-** I believe so, they will continue to do that. Us, on the other hand, are going to switch gears a little bit and do something different. Because I feel that's what I should do as President. That's my role.
- f. **Marshall-** Basically we're just down to, a legal battle?
- g. **Shane-** I believe that's where that needs to go. That's what I'm hearing.
- h. **Sherry-** Where do we go from here?
- i. **Shane-** I believe this is 'unchartered' waters. **Sherry-** It is. Paul- Give me my dues back.
- j. **Marshall-** That's going to be the problem. All the extended problems that have been created by these activities have created more problems. There's actual hate on this Lake. Real hate, you can not deny it. It's going on. Names are being mentioned. Allowing this to go on, I've said it 100 times, you are authorizing commercializing this Lake. One choice the Board has is, let's advertise it. Let's get 50 of them out there. Let's make some money on this. Because, whatever we do, unless we pursue people legally, they're gonna keep doing it. Maybe it's their right and maybe it's not. Had they stood behind their threats and hate mail they put out originally and sued the Association, this deal would have been done. A court would have handled it. We'd be over with it. All we've got is threats, hate mail put out against the Board and you're never going to heal that. Some people will feel like they've been violated, wrongly billed for dues. Are never going to like the people who are continuing with this operation. I've been talking about this for 2 years. I'm done speaking my piece. After the election last year I told Lou Siri and Jeff Glon, you guys do what you want but do it by the book. We can't have

people following the rules and people not following the rules. But it's happening big time, both with construction & permitting. When you look at the letter and the accumulation of things together from the Book there's a valid reason to put out a cease and desist letter. But I still believe a rule can be changed. I've always believed it should be decided by the people. For some reason we just can't get there. We can vote today that the enforcement will be Section 2 but it doesn't mean anything. It's not like anybody is going to follow the enforcement. They are going to rent their house and people are going to jump in the Lake. Who's going to police that? That's another point. The more you add on, somebody's going to have to manage all of it, keep track of all that. We had a lawyer say we need to compromise with the people who have STR. Morgan early on, it's in the minutes but he was talking about management. If some kind of agreement would be made between the PPA and the people who want to commercialize the Lake somebody has to manage it. It's going to cost the PPA more money. If you're going to vote for enforcement you have to go with what's already written.

- k. **Jim**- We already did. **Pat**- That's what we voted on at the last meeting.
- l. **Jim**- It boils down to how are you going to make that happen? Who's going to do it? We need a sheriff.
- m. **Linda**- and there is another thing the Board is going to have to monitor, take over, orchestrate, maintain. We don't have time. Look how much time has been wasted on it already! It's ridiculous.
- n. **Anthony**- The whole thing is a sad state of affairs. We as a Board have a responsibility, really the inheritors of this Lake and it's protective association of it. That's our whole point of being here. I feel personally responsible for ensuring that we uphold what our forefathers intended for this Lake. When I read the Bylaws and Articles, I've read them countless times. I've written summaries of my thoughts on them that I have shared with some people on the Board. I just can't get my head around the fact that people should be allowed to use the Lake for personal gain and for commercial use. If I try to put myself back 100 years and get into the heads of what they were thinking a century ago, I think the sentiment there was pretty clear. Maybe the language isn't clear because things have changed a lot since then. STR didn't exist 100 years ago. I feel it's our responsibility to protect this Lake. If we would allow STR we've lost it. It will never be the same and you can't go back. Once we go forward and allow them you will never go back. 10, 15 years from now this place will be vastly different and we won't be able to go back. You will have Corporate interests because this Lake is "affordable", that's what attracts people here. You can buy real estate and develop it. Now you're going to have the potential for a substantial amount of development. All of our lives are going to be affected by it. I'm particularly sensitive to the fact that there is a certain portion of people on the Lake who did read these bylaws and understood them for what they meant when they bought their properties. Those are the people who are going to suffer because they did their due diligence and now they would be subject to a very different Lake environment than they bought into. You can always say, well they can sell, sure that's true but ... I want to make the point that this is a PIVOTAL POINT for the Lake, PIVOTAL. Once we go down the STR route, it's over. We are never going back and I want people to know that, especially the people who live here full time. I don't, but the person who lives here, this is their house, their home, their homestead. It's going to be affected. There is no way around it.

- o. **Marshall-** The STR group of people, whoever they are, whoever their lawyer is have never presented 1 thing to the Board or the Members what the advantage is to have these. Nobody ever laid out the pros that are good for the whole Lake, to have STR or Corporate STR on the Lake. It's like they are not owed an explanation. Even me being in the middle, it would be interesting to know, what do they see as helping their community do? Why has nothing been presented? All we see is the evidence of what we are living right now and it's a bad thing. At the executive meeting we were presented a list of guidelines that they would like to follow. If they're not willing to follow THE Rules Who is going to follow those rules?
- p. **Linda-** There is no mistaking that at the point where the first letter came out it did have the effect of keeping them back temporarily. There were people who didn't buy because of the STR debate and that's what they wanted to do and there were people who were only interested in buying if they weren't going to end up with STR next door. If you say come on in to STR, it's going to get crazy. People who don't want to put up with it are going to sell and who do you think they are going to sell to? More STR.
- q. **Anthony-** You can't get a person to understand something when they are paid not to understand it. It's a fact that we are dealing with a monetary gain situation and will preempt every other argument. As long as money and income and the argument that we have a right to do whatever we want to do with our properties then there is no way around this problem. In my mind when we bought properties here we gave up some of those rights. That's the whole point. We are part of an Association and you gave up something in order to be a part of the Association. You don't get to choose everything. We have rules. That's why people don't want to be part of HOAs because they don't want to be subject to that but we are, that's how it is here, for 100 years. The arguments just don't make any sense to me. At the end of the day is money, it's a very powerful motive. My worry is that if we open the flood gates our Lake is going to be very very different and we will have approved it. It's sad because I think only a small number of people at the Lake feel this way but they are going to dictate the outcome of the entire community.
- r. **Sherry-** We've had this discussion. We don't need to go back. We've lost so many of our members now that had to leave early. If we are going to do something about STR what is our next process? Where do we go from here? Do we send another letter? How do we send a letter if we don't know. I have a list at home. **Linda-** I think you'd have to send to everyone. **Shane-** to the whole Association. **Sherry-** I hate this as much as anybody else does. This is not where I wanted to be but it's where we're at. I had hoped in my own mind anybody would have come back with an idea based on these, if you want to change them because we are as a Board looking at it as it's in the Bylaws that you can't have them. With that stated I think we can just send a letter that says that at the bottom and some other pertinent stuff.
- s. **Linda-** At last year's Annual Meeting didn't we tell people that within a couple months they would have a ballot? That we would send out to vote?
- t. **Marshall-** Jim said it. We already approved this at the executive session so it's Section 2 and they lose their Lake rights.
- u. **Pat-** Are you making a motion that we send a letter to all Members stating Section 2 that if you are one of these people you are in violation and you need to pull your piers out?
- v. **Jim-** We need to send a letter saying we are now going to enforce the previous letter, that's the only thing we can do.

- w. **Sherry**- I apologize but I think that's what we have to do. **Jim**- Because they don't know right now. **Sherry**- Correct. Unless we explain where we're at. Shane, you went back and talked to those people of which you knew? **Shane**- Yeah **Sherry**- I would guess that doesn't encompass everybody, I would assume. We had the executive session. We agreed with what we did, now we gotta do something about what the letter was. That's what I understood this to be. **Pat**- Yes

**Motion- We send a letter saying, The Board is enforcing the February 2024 Cease and Desist Letter. The Enforcement is Article V- Rules and Regulations, Section 2, page 11.

Second- **Pat**
Approved

- x. **Sherry**- I feel really bad that half of us have already left. It happens. I would have felt better if we had all been here.
- y. **Darby**- That letter needs to include a time period. Correct? Like enforceable from now or as Tony was saying last meeting, it's been a year and it hasn't been enforced. Should there be another grace period?
- z. **Sherry**- I did have that in mind when I thought about it last night. This may be questionable but I would say, August of 2025.
- aa. **Darby**- Speaking for myself, Our cabin is seasonal and it is rented through the season which is early Fall of this year. Nothing has been rented for next year at this point. **Sherry**- I threw that out there. That's what I came up with.
- bb. **Anthony**- I'm sorry, Darby, What was the point you're making? **Darby**- When is this going to take effect? The cease and desist. **Anthony**- I mean we have already given a 12 month grace period. That is the whole point of sending the letter. **Darby**- If it's from now, that's what it is. **Marshall**- Effective immediately? **Pat**- First, we need a second on the Motion. What the letter says is the discussion.
- cc. **Anthony**- The problem is, in my mind, that puts us back in the same situation we were in a year ago. Am I going to tell Darby, He's already rented the place. He's going to have to tell, ostensibly, he's going to have to tell people, Sorry. That's what we were trying to avoid. That was the whole point of why we had that letter last year. We gave 12 months to avoid the very situation we are in now. **Sherry**- That is true. You are correct.
- dd. **Anthony**- In my mind, that's a dilemma. Either you're a hard ass or you're not. On the other hand, I would say, I'm getting a little hard core here because the group knew what we said last time. You relayed that information to them? **Shane**- Yeah **Anthony**- They are saying, Sorry, we're not listening to you guys. We're going to do whatever we want, so be it and let the chips fall where they may. I was looking for an off ramp that would avoid litigation. I was trying to find a way that would be win/win for everyone. Unfortunately that's not gonna be a possibility. I thought a win/win situation would be, I know Linda might think differently about it, The Board said we are going to support that cease and desist letter and I was expecting that the STR people would look at the Bylaws as they currently exist and say you know what, we can change those bylaws. We could make a try to get the Bylaws changed to make them favorable to STR. Then it would become a Lake Membership decision. I was thinking that would maybe be a reasonable solution to this that at least we could avoid the litigation and we let the Lake weigh in on it. It's a risky thing because the Lake could decide in favor of STR. Well, there you have it, end of story. I was looking for a way to keep everyone happy but it doesn't seem like that's possible.

- ee. **Shane**- I think it's always open for discussion.
- ff. **Anthony**- But we have already had a lot of this discussion. I was looking for some reciprocity on the part of these mysterious STR people that have never come forward to identify themselves. Which I also find distasteful. I'm sitting here vulnerable to the entire community because of the position I take but these people are not. Why is that? It doesn't seem fair. If you think something then you should put your name on it. Personally a very annoying thing, just not right. Also the inability of these people to understand they are in a community and even if they 'win' there are going to be a lot of people who are very unhappy and that is never going away. We're not getting out of this. How do we get around this? Maybe an attempt to make a change in the Bylaws. Then let's say STR are approved by the Membership, at least we did what was the democratically reasonable thing to do. The chips fell where they may and there is the end of it.
- gg. **Sherry**- We as the Board already voted that we believe the ABCs state no STR. In our minds we are not just saying we don't like them. We are saying, we as a Board, we are supporting them, the ABCs. (Articles, Bylaws, Covenants)
- hh. **Pat**- What our rules are saying is, you can't have a financial gain. You can't use PPA property for a financial gain. It's not STR. It's anything. If they are renting their property for financial gain and allowing people to use the Lake they are in violation of the rule.
- ii. **Shane**- That's been part of the conversation, how can you do this and not allow this all on the same platform. All showing the same profit? That's a big problem. I live here. I feel that just as compassionate about keeping this Lake beautiful as it's been. These rentals have been on here for, I don't know, 16 years? Rentals have been around forever and good or bad. I think there is always room for compromise. The whole reason was to try and get the, to not go to court, to be compassionate, to be neighborly, to put this together as a community. The whole idea was to let the people vote.
- jj. **Anthony**- But that's not gonna happen.
- kk. **Shane**- But it can happen. I think that us as a Board can make that amendment to ask for a vote. We don't need the STR to ...
- ll. **Anthony**- The issue here is, I know we have had some internal discussion about this, at the November meeting we had a proposal to change the Bylaws or amend to make them more explicit to ban STR and that was voted down. There are 2 ways to approach it. One is the Board says let's strengthen the ABCs to make them explicit about banning STR. The other option is, as crazy as it sounds is, you can say let's see if we can amend the ABCs to allow STR. 2 different approaches. The Board would never do that because we have already ruled against it. That would be internally inconsistent. The only way it could go that way, and there's even some issues here if you think through it and look at the Bylaws, the only way is that 35 Members would have to appeal to the Board and say, we want a special meeting to talk about this STR business and they would come with their proposal to amend the Bylaws. The Board would then have to decide if they were going to allow that to go forward. If you look at the Bylaws it would be up to the Board to decide if they were going to allow that. There is 2 ways to go about it. Either to allow STR or to ban them. I thought the Board had already made the decision to ban them so the point is moot. I felt the win/win would be the STR people would try to make the ABCs consistent with their interests and let the Membership decide. **Marshall**- Shane is saying their attorney is telling them they don't have to do that. **Anthony**- So they have already preempted that option. We are in a no win

- situation at this point. There is no other compromise out of this. Other than the Board saying to the Membership we want to amend the Bylaws to explicitly ban them. I don't know why we would want to do that because we already interpreted the existing ABCs as saying they're banned. **Marshall-** It would define it. It's a shame because I felt there was a way around this problem without involving paying lawyers.
- mm. **Shane-** I thought I saw in here where we, as the Board members . . .
- nn. **Sherry-** Do we have to put a date in? **Pat-** We didn't put a date in the first one and look where it got us.
- oo. **Anthony-** This is going to come to a head. If we send this letter out and say we are enforcing based on Section 2, the problem will arise at the Annual Meeting. Now we will have to determine if somebody is eligible to run or hold office because that is part of the rights, right? Do we want to go through all that?
- pp. **Pat-** I'm confused about the run for office because if you read the Bylaws the only thing it says for running of the offices is if you haven't paid your dues. As far as the District Rep. they are voted in by the people in their district. Again, they have to pay their dues.
- qq. **Shane-** Everything in the book rolls around dues and fishing
- rr. **Anthony-** You are basically saying, that Lake rights don't include voting privileges and Officership?
- ss. **Marshall-** It does say, it's kinda general.
- tt. **Pat-** I tried to find it. I went to where it talks about Officers and whatever and the only thing they have is dues. **Anthony-** It doesn't have anything explicit. I agree. **Pat-** All I'm saying is, we all have to agree on the wording and and what it is before we can say this or that and my understanding is, the only way you can't be an Officer or you can't be a Director is if you don't pay your dues and the only way you can remove a Director is if the people in that District request that the Director be remove other than voting and that's how I read the Bylaws.
- uu. **Marshall-** Reads Covenant 7, Pat, Shane, Sherry agree that only pertains to fishing. Do you foresee some path to have this solved before the Annual Meeting?
- vv. **Shane-** I would love to figure out some way that we can avoid this at all costs. I don't know what that is. **Marshall-** Because it is really going to effect the election. **Pat-** Vice President, Treasurer, Odd numbered Districts 1, 3, 5, 5A, 7
- ww. **Anthony-** I'm probably not running. My district will be up for grabs.
- xx. **Marshall-** I guess one could assume that they just want to get their people in.
- yy. **Sherry-** The only resolution that is not going to make a fight in your mind is, we vote to allow STR? **Shane-** I don't agree **Sherry-** What do you This is what I see. If we go with Section 2 and we require those people to remove their boats and docks there is going to be a cost. They may remove them on their own or we may have to pay to have them removed and I would certainly hate to see that occur and then in August everybody is switched over to STR owners and now we are going to change it. When you say you don't see it as being the only answer, In your mind as PPA President, what is an answer that is going to work?
- zz. **Shane-** For me personally, I want it to be from the whole Association. I don't want it to be me and the 5 STR people that are left or whatever there is. I said it from day 1. The 13 STR people did not get me elected. Keep that in mind. There's a lot of people that think differently even though they don't want one, they don't care about them. They understand rights and what they own and those are the people that back me as President because I wasn't here just for STR. I was here for rights.

- aaa. **Sherry-** You have a demeanor Shane that is very easy to accept. Yes, you got voted in for STR rights and I believe that but also because of your ability to look at other things and I appreciate that. I truly do. Unfortunately though what I keep hearing from you is that the only way it's going to be resolved, but you said something different this time, is going to a vote from the whole Lake. If I remember right we tried to do that in this last year once or twice already. Send out a questionnaire and say what do you guys want? I don't remember why, it keeps getting knocked down. **Marshall-** It needs to be a hard line vote. We already did the survey. **Shane-** Yeah.
- bbb. Short discussion about how insufficient the survey was.
- ccc. **Shane-** I'm not the answer to everything. **Linda-** The document you brought was signed STR Owners. **Shane-** What was that supposed to reference? What was the meaning of that comment? **Linda-** You say that the STR owners are not the only ones who put you in office and there are all these other people but the document that came was just from the STR owners. As far as we can tell, that's what it says on there.
- ddd. **Shane-** I think that to navigate this for the whole Lake and keep it peaceful, I said the outcome is going to be the outcome. I don't have to STR my property. When we did this, shame on me, I didn't see that in writing in the Covenants. Anyway, we are ready to shift gears. We are going to do something different with the property so we can figure this out and I'm not on that end of the stick all of the time. At the same time, going to a long term rental we are arguing the same problem. You're making profit and that still puts me in the same boat because it's not clear in here. There's leasee and guest so you know, looking at this, you look at it open mindedly when you read this, they've allowed leasees when they did this so that means they rented the property back then and it's in the Covenants. It's not defined as
- eee. **Pat-** There is a bit of a distinction when it says, they reside. When you are renting it those people are living there. They are residing there. Not just in for a couple of days and out or in for a week and out. **Anthony-** It's their permanent legal address. **Linda-** The Federal government defines reside as, where you live and sleep most of the time.
- fff. **Shane-** Conditions of ownership, in the Covenants, Section 3 (reads from the text), "The leasee of the lot shall be deemed the owner while residing thereon and it says a guest. The definition of leasee is a tenant with no distinct guideline as to how long that is. It can be a day, a week, a month. **Linda-** While residing there or while living there most of the time. Now want to go to the Guest comment? **Shane-** yeah, it says the guest is defined to be a visitor at the home of the owner, while residing on the lot or coming to the Lake with the owner. **Jim-** They should have been more specific. **Anthony-** We've been around this so many times. **Linda-** No we haven't actually delved into what do you think this means? **Anthony-** What Shane thinks. **Linda-** How do we understand this? Why is there this passing in the night over the exact same words? **Shane-** Well it says the Leasee of the lot. **Pat-** Again **Linda-** It also says who lives there **Pat-** Section 3 is also about fishing privileges. **Linda-** and what it says is the fishing privilege is not transferable. You can't give it over to someone else. **Pat-** You can't give the fishing privilege over, correct. **Linda-** Ok, so what does that mean? How can they stay at their home and they've got another house down the road and how can they bring in another group of people? The fishing privilege cannot be transferred or divided. **Pat-** Corsons own 6 lots. They have 6 fishing privileges. **Linda-** The privilege does not transfer to the person who does not reside there. **Pat-** I agree with that but it is the fishing privilege that does not transfer. **Linda-** You think they're coming there and

they are not fishing? **Pat-** At this point we have a motion, we have a second, we've had a ton of discussion. We need to vote on the motion at hand. Repeats motion **
ggg. **Shane-** All in favor? **Jim-** We already voted on it. **Shane-** All opposed? Nothing.
hhh. **Linda-** Before you send that letter and you tell them this, you have to have in mind what that means you are going to do. **Jim-** Just include what Section 2 says. **Linda-** and just let everybody decide for themselves what that means? **Jim-** I think that's all you can do. **Marshall-** That's all we can do.

Discussion on the Letter-

- a. **Pat-** Who is writing the letter? Silence
- b. **Sherry-** I'll try. I'll send it out and you all can look at it. Then make all of your changes you think need to be made.
 - i. **Shane-** Do you think it needs to be through an attorney? **Jim-** I'm thinking it's going to be. **Sherry-** It's going to end up but I think we can just send it right out of our book. I think we can just word it ..
 - ii. **Shane-** as the Board **Sherry-** Yes
 - iii. **Sherry-** I'll try to get it done by Monday (5/12) if not, Tuesday (5/13)
- c. **Pat-** My next question, because I agree, my personal opinion is it has to go to the attorney, What attorney are we using? Our attorney is Snyder/Morgan.

Discussion on the attorney-

- d. **Shane-** Doing the attorney thing is the last thing I want personally and the last thing I think the PPA wants. How we figure a way to navigate without doing that is a problem. That's where the hiccup is.
- e. **Anthony-** The reason why the Board has delayed, if you will, and stalled is precisely that reason. None of us want to go down the legal route because none of us win that way. Despite all the rationale and understanding we are still going down that route. **Marshall-** I was hoping it would have happened a year ago and just get it over with. I don't know why you guys didn't. **Anthony-** It may come down to that. **Marshall-** I don't know why you (STR) would threaten something like that and then not do it. **Linda-** Because they don't want to pay for it. **Marshall-** It would have solved it.
- f. Kathy Roman- I can tell you. Because you didn't enforce what you sent out.
- g. **Marshall-** No, you threatened to sue us. Why didn't you do it?
- h. Kathy- Because you didn't do anything after that. For me, because I'm the spearheader the longest, that unfortunately will happen. I don't want to do that. You think you're right and we think we're right and no one is going to be satisfied. I don't dislike anybody. I've never not been nice to anyone, ever. There's no point but . . . I haven't. I can't speak for everybody else. But that doesn't mean I'm not a good person.

Back to the letter-

- a. **Marshall-** Sherry is going to write the letter.
- b. **Shane-** We'll have to review it. Before it goes to the attorney, right?
- c. **Marshall-** Yes. to Morgan? **Pat-** Yes.
- d. **Jim-** When you say review it, when at the next meeting?
- e. **Sherry-** I can email it to you.
- f. **Pat-** Once we get what we think we want, someone needs to go to Morgan. Have an appointment with him. Go through it and here's what we want to do as

opposed to just sending it to him, because that's what we did the last time. All this can happen soon as opposed to later.

- g. Paul Erst- You guys have a lawyer on the Board. I know he doesn't practice in IN but he's still a lawyer. Dan should be able to figure this out.
- h. **Pat-** He's a claims lawyer, a real estate lawyer. Paul- He speaks the same language.
- i. **Marshall-** How long are you going to discuss this?!! How long are you going to drag this out?!!
- j. **Sherry-** I thought I was writing a letter. We were going to approve it and we were going to send it. I misunderstood, because I don't think anywhere in my Motion I said that we were going to an attorney.
- k. **Pat-** That came up in the discussion, is all. If we don't have to go to a lawyer, than don't go to a lawyer. We didn't go to the lawyer the last time. We got criticized for not going. **Sherry-** Oh, ok.
- l. **Shane-** I'm ok if we don't send it to the lawyer. The language is in the book.
- m. **Jim-** The lawyer's going to bring it right back here the next time.
- n. **Sherry-** Any attorney that we go to, depending on how you ask the question, you'll get an answer. **Jim-** You're right. **Pat-** It's just their opinion. **Sherry-** We are doing what we believe is correct so I don't need anybody else to tell me that.
- o. **Shane-** We are going to self draft and mail to all Owners. If anybody has any ideas as far as keeping this thing out of court, I'm all ears. I've said that from day one. I'd chat with anybody about anything. If you know somebody that's got some super idea have them come talk to me or anybody else.

8. New Business-

A. Calendar-

a. Taxes- done

b. Water Quality Testing- **Shane**

- i. Sent email AC response on their testing ability
- i. **Anthony-** About different kits etc.? **Shane-** They would do it all for us or we can do it and submit it to them
- ii. **Anthony-** Thinks it certainly should be done, whether or not we allow them to do it exclusively or we are involved. Couldn't tell from info if the kit contained only 1 test for each parameter? If so that would give very limited information. Those guys might do a good job if we could come to an agreement on what they should be testing. If you do eColi only once that doesn't tell you a whole lot. You should do it multiple times and that can get costly. They have their own laboratory now. It's a good thing if you need a quick test done. Doesn't know the cost. Couldn't tell from the info they sent us. If the systemic herbicide isn't used then doesn't see the need for full range of testing. Concerned about doing some copper assays in relation to the SSW treatments. How long it stays in the Lake. How long it takes to precipitate. Each Lake has different alkalinity. The conditions are going to matter. It would be nice to know what those concentrations were over time, probably a short time span of a couple days.
- iii. **Anthony-** Need a list of products with cost. **Pat-** What tests did LAPSI do? **Anthony-** eColi ourselves, sent phosphates out, we collected samples and sent out for assays. **Pat-** What kits do we need and what is the cost? **Anthony-** We can get the kits, collect the samples and send them in. We need cost lists. It's

an opportunity to get around volunteering. If we need to have it done they can do it.

- iv. **Shane-** Will gather more information from Malena on test kit quantities and costs and costs for them to do the testing with or without our involvement.
- v. **Pat-** \$300 for Fluridone tests in the past and last year \$525

B. Upcoming/June Calendar- **Shane**

- a. Establish nominating committee
- b. Appoint financial review committee
- c. Fiscal year ends end of June
- d. Second Quarter Dam Inspection
 - i. **Pat-** If Terracon does the Biennial do we still need to do the second quarter inspection? All items that are regularly kept track of still need to be done. Terracon 'blessed' our self implemented quarterly inspection. Does it need to be done quarterly or what is their recommendation? 2 of the inspections are done in cold weather conditions.
- e. Send list of delinquent dues property owners to the attorney

C. Election Reform- **Shane**

- a. Anthony has come up with a preliminary draft of new methods. Everybody has a copy.
- b. **Anthony-** We need to do a better job at keeping track. It could be overkill.
 - i. It would be nice to have people who want to run announce their candidacy early so we could make arrangements for carrying out the election properly. It wouldn't preclude nominations from the floor.
- c. **Shane-** Would like to see a sample of how this would work. Talked with Pat about having a ballot box tended by the District Director to check off who is allowed to vote. It needs to be simpler. It's getting more involved. There are a lot more people showing up. It's gotten way out of hand. We are short on time. We need to figure it out before this Board meeting.
- d. **Anthony-** The mechanism is unclear.
- e. **Sherry-** Make it very streamlined and very precise. I like the draft.
- f. **Pat-** wants Anthony to send to everyone on the Board because so many have already left. We can talk about it at the June meeting. The nominating committee could formulate how it will work.

9. Director's Comments

- A. **Shane-** If we can come up with some way to get this solved before the Annual Meeting, as far as STR, whatever it may be, that's what I would love to hear and see. I don't know how we can do that other than sending a vote to the PPA Members across the Board, saying, look, this is out of line, this is what everybody wants to hear, here's our options. It's got to be cut and dry, yes or no, this is this and this what you're accepting if you accept no and this is what you accept if you accept yes.
 - a. **Anthony-** Let's say we did do that. Let's say hypothetically the Lake community says, No, we are not in favor of STR. Do you think the STR people are going to abide by that?
 - b. **Shane-** I would.
 - c. Kathy Roman- I would.
 - d. **Shane-** I mean there are 5 or 6 left. It's the people who are in favor of rights. There is a lot of people who don't want to miss that opportunity when they pass their house down to their kid. 'Cause they may not be able to afford this and this

is a way for them to offset that cost and keep that in their family for 50 years. I work around the Lake with a lot of people. People I just met or people I've known. That conversation always comes up. You know, How's it goin'? I get information from people who have been here from the '50's that still have a house here and you know, she had claimed that they rented twice a week, Hiawatha point in 1955 for 6 years, leased the cabin for 2 weeks. They eventually bought a house right next to Moore's and built a house in '65. You know, and she's like, you know, and they're very good people, you know, they're common sense and they see both sides of the story. You know and those are the things I like to hear. You know, how they feel. What's their take on it. Obviously I don't want to see the Lake commercialized and you know, corporate America owns half of Papakeechee for STR.

- e. **Anthony-** How would you . . . if we allow that how are you going to prevent that evolution from happening?
- f. **Shane-** I can't answer those questions.
- g. **Sherry-** Maybe in a Lake management program.
- h. **Shane-** We don't want to get into all that because ...
- i. **Pat-** One of the recommendations from one of the attorneys is you set a limit, no more than. But yeah, somebody has to manage that. If you look at how many you have today, then there can be no more than, and I'm not saying we are doing that, I'm just saying, You can put things in place that you can limit it. Where anybody who comes and buys can't turn theirs into STR because we have something in place that says they can't.
- j. **Shane-** There is restrictions and things you can do. Dave mentioned that at the last one that they told to do a capped percent or do a if they sell it it doesn't go back. There are options of all those things. I just don't know. This is me personally talking as President and personally involved. I don't like all the demeanor and all the back stabbing and that stuff because I'm in this position. I'm doing it to try to bring peace and figure it out so people can go back and be neighbors and not let this be the dividing thing.
- k. **Jim-** It's too late. 'Cause you already got people that are not paying their dues because they don't get their way.
- l. **Shane-** True
- m. **Pat-** We have a process and the only thing that has held up in court for the PPA is that people didn't pay their dues and every single time when it came to just the dues, we won.
- n. **Jim-** That's the only thing we've got going for us. **Pat-** The only thing we've got going for us. Yes.
- o. **Jim-** But that just started, people not paying their dues because they don't like what we're doing.
- p. **Linda-** Do you really think that they are not paying because they don't like what we're doing? They don't like the idea that we are not upholding the Private part.
- q. **Pat-** They don't like the fact that we are not enforcing the rules.
- r. **Jim-** *** sat right there and said he wants his money back if we don't do this. If we don't go this way he wants his money back. *** is on that same page. They don't like what we are not doing.

- s. **Linda-** Their reasoning is, Why should I pay dues if I no longer live at a private Lake?
- t. **Jim-** That's their excuse now but what happens when there is something else?
- u. **Anthony-** At the end of the day we are all in this with our own good conscience and you'll never get rid of people who don't want to follow the rules. The only recourse we've got is the legal recourse.
- v. **Shane-** We're moving through that. I've got a STR but I'm working with you. I get what you're saying and I'm willing to stand behind that as being on the opposite spectrum so, I'm doing my part like I said to still be bipartisan and understand both sides and work through this. I mean I'm doing everything I can and I hope most people can see that. That, I think, is what my thought of what the solution can be. Hear from the people. Send that ballot so when everybody says to me just make a vote and be done with it. That's the only way this thing is not going to court. I'm not saying it's going to be 100%. You may have somebody that I don't know, that says I don't care, I don't like the way this turned out. I still see it this way. I'm not doing that and I'm assuming the rest of the people on the Board wouldn't do that or on the Association wouldn't do that who have wanted to stand up for rights. I can't speak for everybody. I'm just trying to represent everybody.
- w. **Anthony-** If it comes down to a vote, regardless of what the outcome is, there will always be people who don't like it. At least they can't say we didn't do the democratic thing to deal with it. And that's our job to make sure that it's done properly. We cannot guarantee it.
- x. **Shane-** That's what I've been trying to say, it's out of our hands. We need to move this from our hands and put it into the general Membership.
- y. **Anthony-** One point I want to make and I made it before, if we do go down this road, of voting on something, whatever it is, I want to be sure that we hold at least one or two meetings where we talk about this process and the implications. Even if only two people show, we have done our due diligence to explain the position of the Board, our thinking and the other side can present their issues if they wish and let everybody hear all the arguments. If we can manage such a thing.
- z. **Marshall-** I thought of Anthony making a video that can go on the website. You'll get a lot more attention with something like that than getting people to come to an extra meeting.
- aa. **Shane-** and it beats getting yelled at and the back and forth of all that and the negative comments.
- bb. **Anthony-** The good part about in person is it gives people an opportunity for give and take. It's not just one sided.
- cc. **Marshall-** The crazy thing about all this is probably two thirds of the people who live on this Lake don't give two squats about any of this.
- dd. **Linda-** To Shane's point about what they did in the '50's ... that this is a whole different age. That kind of stuff is big time business now. **Jim-** Air BnB is ruining the world. **Marshall-** We have people at work who live in big condominiums and they are going through the same thing and people who live near Notre Dame.
- ee. **Jim-** Affordable housing is gone.

ff. **Anthony-** Because corporate interests get in there and that's the end of the story. That will definitely have an affect here if it grabs on. If we approve than we have given them the green light. Even say, hopefully we could contain it, it would be hard.

gg. **Shane-** I brought it up. I don't want to ruin this Lake any more than anybody else does. I don't think anybody who lives on this Lake wants to ruin the Lake. That's a hard thing to navigate when you are talking about what your rights are versus who's going to ruin the Lake over it.

hh. **Linda-** I think the State and Kos. County have chimed in with the Innkeepers tax. In the state of Indian it's hard to regulate these things because they've allowed them in residential areas. They've snaked their way around it. They don't call it STR but they call it a business and they are imposing taxes on that income.

B. **Marshall-** Would like to put a pier back, out of the way at the south edge of the lagoon at Holiday Lane. **Sherry-** Have we in the past allowed piers on PPA property?

Marshall- All of the piers are on PPA property.

Motion to Adjourn- **Pat

Second- **Sherry**

Adjourned 11:03 AM

Jon Korejwa- Seems like you are at a point of action. If the point of action is enforcing taking piers out that upsets the corporate world, that's uncertainty. They don't like it. That may be something that helps you. They like easy money. They don't want to do hard stuff.

Next Meeting:

June 14, 2025 ~ 8:15 AM

PPA Building, Hatchery Rd, Syracuse