

PPA Board Meeting Minutes ~ June 14, 2025 ~ PPA Building

1. Call to Order ~ Shane 8:15 AM

2. Roll

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

Guests

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1.) Joe Doherty D7 | 6.) Joanna Miller D9 |
| 2.) Rebecca Smith D4 | 7.) Malena Ryan- Aquatic Control |
| 3.) Paul Erst D6 | 8.) Kent Renner D7 |
| 4.) Jeff Glon D3 | 9.) Jon Korejwa D6 |
| 5.) Georganna Hart D5 | |

3. Guest Comments

A. Malena Ryan- Aquatic Control brings 3 Lake weed treatment proposals:

- a.) #424560- One time Weed Treatment- \$18,283.03
includes 40 acres of submersed vegetation, entire shoreline minus the earth embankment & spillway, using Aquastrike (broad spectrum and fast acting)
- b.) #424590- One time Weed Treatment- \$17,484.66
includes 40 acres of submersed vegetation, entire shoreline minus the earth embankment & spillway, using Reward + Komeen (a DiQuat + Chelated copper complex (algaecide))

Pat- also treat Elodea and ? Malena- yes

Bernie- the only difference between these two are the chemicals used?

Malena- yes, AquaStrike includes a few more plants on the label, main concern around docks Elodea and Large Leaf Pondweed

Bernie- not all plants are listed on the label?

Malena- if it is an EPA registered product it must state what vegetation is and is not included

Bernie- if you go to the website it says 'and more'. If you google Clipper (flumioxazin) states that those with that base will control Elodea and Large Leaf Pondweed, all kinds of articles that state they are using Clipper to control those two, not able to find anything that says it won't.

Malena- consulted with Leif on these chemicals, if you want she can provide citations for them.

- c.) #424583- One Time Weed/Starry Treatment- \$20,963.44

Includes 40 acres shoreline + apx 20 acres SSW, using Clipper SC + AquaStrike
Still recommending SSW survey to determine acreage and location of SSW

Bernie- Would these prices have been higher had we not already treated the Curly Leaf?

Malena- a few areas that would be past the 'shoreline'. Treatment of invasive needed to be done during that temperature window.

Bernie- If we go with one of these will there be need to treat again this year?

Malena- My hope is no, that this program will take care of it.

Bernie- If we go with one of these this year, will we still need to do both (early Curly Leaf + one of these) next year?

Malena- recommends a survey, some things won't grow back. The costs might be lower each year. Not trying to eradicate all native vegetation. Elodea and Large Leaf are considered native but we understand that it can get out of control. We want to meet your goals and keep your Lake as healthy as possible.

Mark- What was the second chemical in the third proposal? AquaStrike plus what?

Malena- Clipper SC

Mark- and that's the copper? Clipper SC is the flumioxazin product that we talked about. It is used in the GLRI Grants for SSW and has proven pretty successful for keeping macrophytic algae down.

Linda- When you said 1 treatment were you including the SSW in that or do you expect to have to treat twice in the SSW areas?

Malena- expected to not treat again.

Mark- That's what I thought that the coppers were primarily for SSW but this Clipper does similar to what the coppers do?

Malena- Yes, for SSW

Mark- and the Komeen, you said was a copper?

Malena- It's a chelated copper combination. Asked Leif about it's affect on SSW and it will have some affect but not enough to burn it back and keep it at bay at the rates we are using for everything else. For the Clipper and AquaStrike treatment proposal we have to go at a much higher rate with Clipper in order for it to affect SSW.

Mark- Most of the stuff on SSW talked about 2 treatments and you are talking about we could get by with 1?

Malena- With the third proposal (#424583), yes. That's why it has the higher price tag because I have to go at higher rate, with Clipper in order for it to work on SSW and it also includes 40 acres of shoreline management.

Linda- At one point in time I was on the Lake with the other guy and he said that there was a maximum amount that the State won't let you go over, as far as treatment, that the State won't let you go over percentage wise for the whole lake. It was way below 40 acres. I wonder if that is still in effect or something you're not considering?

Malena- Because you guys are private, correct? **Linda-** Yes Malena- so I can double check on that but we've done private lakes, we treated Pretty Lake in Plymouth and we treated 40 acres plus, not Pretty Lake, Watonka, maybe? We didn't have to acquire permits or anything like that from the DNR. We only have to acquire permits and permission from the Aquatic Vegetation permitting biologists if it's a public lake and then we have to get permitting rights. I can double check on that just to make sure.

Linda- My concern isn't whether we can or cannot do it but whether we should or should not do it, based on percentage of total treatment. You know why they do that?

Malena- Yeah, I've not heard anything like that but I can double check for sure before we go ahead and do anything. I have good contacts with the L.A.R.E. biologists and stuff like that so I can check with the DNR on that.

Sherry- When we vote on this today, How soon can you get in the Lake? You'll do your weed study, will you bring the chemicals with you?

Malena- Could do both in the same week.

Mark- We aren't too early for SSW? Malena- No

Pat- Looking at the restrictions, on all of them swimming is at least a day.

Malena- It's a maximum of 24 hours that's something to make sure we are covering our butts on that really. There's not technically, according to the labels, a swimming restriction but we

want to make sure everybody stays safe and sound. Dogs, kids everything like that. We know it's summer so we typically tell people, I've not personally seen anybody be like, all right you're going to put the treatment in and then they jump into the Lake where we just did it so we typically tell them maybe wait a day. Technically there is no swimming or drinking restrictions. I don't think you guys are going out there and getting a cup and drinking it.

Linda- Do you post? **Malena-** Yes, same as for the Curly Leaf treatment. You get a yellow sign in the yard. Shoreline treatment most if not all houses will get a sign, stating the

restrictions. **Linda-** Once the timing is up those can be removed by the owner? **Malena-** Yes

Pat- The reason I ask is with the Curly Leaf treatment we got a lot of inquiries because they didn't see the buoys out this year. We had to explain we were doing something different this year. Everybody remembers what was done in the past. It didn't make sense to put the buoys out for 1 day and then have to pick them up.

Shane- All these shoreline treatments, they are going to target the Spatterdock, Water Lily, in our bay which is in District 2 & 3 not targeting the islands and the lily pads not on the shoreline and also the bay of Flat Belly, where it's overrun with Elodea & Spatterdock. You can see when you drive by on the road. It'll be full in another month, that whole thing, we're going to try and treat that. Get a lot of that knocked back. **Linda-** the full length of the road, nobody is going to

try to access that. **Shane-** There are houses on both sides. **Pat-** We had a complaint about that at last years Annual Meeting. **Jim-** Every meeting. **Shane-** Those are the areas we looked at that are of concern. Especially with Elodea. We went in there and got stuck and that was a month ago. That was my thoughts and I wanted everybody to know that. ??guest-

Could you point those out on the map? **Shane-** points to Flat Belly Bay, says you can see it from the road, we can't do anything about the cattails. Then points to the the bay behind the 2 islands, starts from Larson's place (last house on the point) gets choked out all the way to Rosalee's place, starting to come all the way along the shore to about Cloud 9. Spatterdock & Lilies are moving out. Those are the top water vegetation areas that I think are a problem and haven't been addressed. Those will be included in the shoreline treatment. I couldn't think of another place that had that problem.

Sherry- The only other place, **Shane-** possibly Hiawatha in the back side. **Sherry-** Where the houses are really high, District 2. **Shane-** We looked in there and it looked pretty decent.

Sherry- I think the higher water level is making a difference. **Shane-** The shoreline will take care of that and get those places.

Linda- You're not talking about going around the whole Lake and do the shoreline?

Shane- Yeah, only places we're not doing is this spillway (Dam) and the earth embankment (indicates the West Levee) where there's no Lakefront, per say. Those are the places that are not gonna be shoreline treated. **Pat-** Not the East Dam or the West Levee? **Shane-** Correct

Linda- The last 3 houses on the west end? **Malena-** Yes, then stop where the shepherd hook is and start again where the houses start (on Circle Dr.)

Shane- Not into Red Head bay with the Lily Pads, where all the water comes out of RedHead pond, Hiawatha. We're not going to get back in there. There's no reason to touch that. It kind of helps retain some of the runoff, that was my thought. Something different but I feel it's a good approach.

Linda- Because that's a whole turn around from what they've always ...

Shane- I agree. It's 100% different.

Linda- They've always said anything from your pier in is your responsibility.

Sherry- I don't think it's going to take care of all of our piers, I mean

Shane- I do. That's the thought, is to clean the shore for the people and let them ...

Sherry- But it's also gonna go out 20 feet. It doesn't kill right there because, I really hope we clear farther out because my family would use that whole section. **Linda-** You keep your area clean so then you would be better benefitted from a farther out treatment? **Sherry-** I want to do what everybody else is, I get that. But the water is much higher so I don't think we are going to have that issue. This is the year to try it. I'm not opposed to it. But you're right. We've always said, clean your own beach. I get that. **Shane-** uhmm **Sherry-** I guess, in my mind though shoreline, I didn't think you were going to... are you going to come right up to the end of the piers?

Shane- Yes, so the goal is from the shore out to maybe 30 yards from the shore would be the contact area before it would dilute itself.

Malena- Typically in that shoreline treatment, what we've done on other lakes before is any public lake the DNR only permits us to do 625 sq. ft., so a little bit past your pier before it starts dropping off in most lakes. In your Lake actually has some deeper points than others so ideally right up next to your shorelines is the idea behind that and around your piers and all that. Obviously we wouldn't spray your boats or your docks. We're pretty good about not doing that. Then it would come a little bit farther out. That way Shane had the idea that people can come out and swim, fish without any obstructions.

Shane- This is all gonna be injection or will this be top water spraying? Little bit of both? Spraying will be the Lily Pads and everything else will be injection?

Malena- Typically, what I want for Lily Pads is spray them to burn those back. I try to do a top water spray on those and then if it gets to be around 5 ft., I know some of you have deeper shorelines compared to others on the Lake, I would do injection based on that just because it will get down to the roots of the plant a little bit better.

Sherry- Some of ours go out and you can jump off the end of my pier. Dive. I mean it's deep enough.

Malena- I have both options. I have 2 injectors on the back of my boat and a person on the front who sprays.

Sherry- We gotta try something different. It's no big deal.

Jeff Glon- When you spray, this will kill them so there will be a lot of debris in the water that will need to be raked up and gotten out?

Shane- Yeah, right. You're still gonna have to clean it. But the idea is to get it cleaned out and try to be done with it before it grows all summer and then have that problem. You know, if it works great then next year maybe we can try a little bit earlier so that we don't have that extra vegetation in the water to clean up.

Malena- and some of the vegetation too will float to the surface like Curly Leaf Pondweed, but the watermilfoil will drop to the bottom and die, Spatterdock will typically die and then some of those ugly roots will come up and they won't go away unless you fish them out.

??- Would it make sense to go down and rake before you do that to get a bunch of that crap out of there?

Malena- I would refrain from doing that until after. Elodea is good for fragmentation so it could spread before I get there. I would wait until it dies then rake it out.

Mark- If we have to do a second SSW treatment that would be a fair amount less than these?

Malena- yes, not \$20,000 or something like that. The \$20,000 is because I included the SSW and with Clipper I have to go at a higher rate for SSW. I would come out, do the survey, see how much SSW acreage there is then treat only the SSW.

Shane- The SSW is a fast growing algae so it could be that they'd have to come back and do it again.

Pat- Then you would have to do a second survey? To know where to treat the second time?
Malena- If people are reporting they are seeing it. We ask for pictures that sort of a thing. Then we can go in and survey it to make sure that's what it is. It's not really an official survey. We'll come out and throw a rake to see if it is SSW or not.

Pat- When you sent us the original, your thing, it basically said in June/July we would do a survey for SSW that is \$1,500.00 then in July/August you would do the treatment and that was \$475.00 - \$600.00 maximum per acre. So we would be looking at, besides the \$20,000.00 a potential of another \$1,500.00 plus the \$475-\$600 per acre.

Malena- The \$1,500.00 was already accepted so you wouldn't be billed for that until afterward.

Pat- so besides the \$20,000.00 if we had to do a second treatment it would just be the \$400.00 - \$600.00 per acre extra. We could be looking at what we spent so far plus \$20,000.00 plus the \$400.00 - \$600.00 per acre if a second SSW treatment is needed.

Malena- Yes, ideally you wouldn't have to (second SSW), with the \$20,000.00 that would take care of it for the whole year. SSW is a sneaky invasive so you never know if it might pop up since you are directly connected to Wawasee and they have a ton of it.

Pat- The good news is we flow to them they don't flow to us.

Shane- asks if Paul has any questions?

Paul- What about upstream? **Shane-** Flat Belly? **Paul-** Flat Belly and Redhead. Are we getting anything from them? **Shane-** Oh I'm sure. I mean that thing flows when it gets high water you see all that duckweed and stuff coming through there. I mean it's always gonna be a problem. It's just that we might have to do a better job maintaining that problem because we've let it go for so long. Redhead he's pretty much trying to dry that out so it can break down and go back to a pond instead of a slurry. Back behind Flat Belly I'm not sure they've got beaver issues so they have a huge influx of water so I guess we're just gonna have to learn as we go how this works. I assume it's gonna come back like weeds do but doing nothing is probably not a good option. That's my opinion. So obviously we need to vote on it.

??- Wouldn't it make sense to target there at Flat Belly because that's where things are flowing through. Basically nip it in the bud as it's going out. That seems like it would be a great place to try because that's the source coming out of TriCounty, to put the most emphasis on that area.

Shane- Yes. If nobody has any questions. I appreciate your time and all your due diligence.

****Motion-** Accept proposal #424583, #3, does SSW plus the shoreline. Total cost with tax \$20,963.44- **Mark**
Second- **Bernie**
Approved

Bernie- The reason I'm going along with Mark is, I think we should hit it hard the first time. If we hit it hard and do this proposal, it may effect next year. If we don't hit it hard this year we maybe have to hit it hard again next year. It's not that much extra, a couple thousand bucks.

Pat- the budget this year for chemicals is \$28,500.00

Shane- I would say we would probably have to do a second SSW treatment, would just be my guess. I don't foresee it lasting all ... **Bernie-** It depends on how bad it gets. We are going to have some. People are going to see it. But has it become a nuisance? Or can we hit it again next year?

Pat- Another thing you have to remember is we are not going to be running this thing. (Harvester) so not spreading it around and that will save money on fuel and wages.

Shane- Lynn, what do you think? **Lynn-** I think we should vote. I think everybody is on the same page.

B. Jon Korejwa- Does Aquatic Control give any kind of success assessment? How do they measure? Compared to others around the area? How do they know they did what they were

supposed to do? **Sherry***- When she presented before she gave stories of how they did well. Jon- But there is no permanent metric for something like this?

Mark*- When they do this they are going to do another survey. They should be able to tell if the Curly Leaf treatment was successful. **Shane***- It's based on their view the next time they survey the Lake. Is how they feel they have done as far as the job they did. It states in there that if it's inadequate in certain places it's on them to come back and treat it again at their cost. If we find places that it just wasn't as effective as we wanted it to be, that's part of their proposal, with proof, of course.

Joanna Miller- I just want to restate that there is an offer of cooperation from rental owners to provide guidelines and contact information if the Board decides to pursue it. The offer's never been rescinded. **Sherry***- Ok
Name*- Board Member

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

A. Review of May 10, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes

a. **Sherry**- page 8 ?? ABC's? Yes.

b. **Mark**- page 1 foul language should be foul. Asks if the CD got reinvested? **Pat**- Yes

Motion to- Accept May 10, 2025 Minutes with corrections.- **Sherry

Second- **Mark**

Approved

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

A. As of May 31, 2025

Money Market-	\$	25,965.75
CD-		51,595.21
Checking-		54,299.10
Total Current Assets-	\$	133,531.76
Paid Taxes	\$	7,199.30

a. Rolled over CD \$53,408.96, new rate- 3.70, matures Thanksgiving 2025

b. **Mark**- Anthony questioned about search for a better rate-

i. 6 month eTrade @ 4.40

ii. 12 month Lake City @ 3.50, eTrade @ 4.30

iii. 3 month Lake City @ 4.00, eTrade @ 4.40

Motion- Accept May 31, 2025 Treasurer's Report- **Sherry

Second- **Lynn**

Approved

B. Delinquent Dues- **Pat**

a. 7 invoices still unpaid

b. Typically would be turning over to Attorney. He will send a letter giving to, usually, the end of June. Last year fee \$150.00

c. 1 returned, has email & phone will try to reach, never returned before

d. Still questions asked about original homestead no dues, explained when lot split and new home added incurs dues. Informed could be pursued with the County. Asks every year.

e. All names on list very familiar.

f. **Shane** asks for the list to be emailed to him.

6. Lake Maintenance Report ~ **Linda**

A. Dam/Levee

a. May 11, 2025- pulled 12" log, added 6" & 9"

i. **Shane**- Are we overflowing at the outlet box? **Linda**- The 9" log leaves 3", we are down -1.92", flow won't stop until we reach -3.0" **Shane**- The benchmark isn't the top of the box where the grate is? It's actually 3" below that? **Linda**- right now, yes. **Shane**- We're just not putting the log back in? **Linda**- We have the 9" log in. That gives us a 3" cushion from the top of the box. So far it's working out. No complaints that it's too low and no panic log pulling because, oh my gosh, it's too high! We did have a day of, my gauge said 2.6" of rain and Shane said TriCounty had 3.25", the day before we were down -5.04" after that rain we were -2.40", a gain of 2.64" in 24 hrs! **Lynn**- The Lake looks great. Thank you. :-)

b. Lake level -1.92" this morning, water temp 70 degrees at the riprap

c. Aquatic Control here 5/22, Shane rode along

d. Biennial Inspection 5/23

i. Kellen Heavin w/assistant Jerrid, Marshall, Pat, Linda

ii. 5 areas on South edge of cap needing added riprap, have been repositioning some, need to bring a small load over, there is a stash in the woods at the West Levee

iii. Kellen checked inside the outlet pipe, not much to say

iv. Checked the "piezo" groundwater wells (one at the Dam, one on the West Levee) both measured at 19', good with that

v. Checked all toe drains

vi. **Pat**- He didn't really point out any area of major concern? **Linda**- a stump area on the west Levee? maybe, it looks dead (probably Terry got a good spray there) I've added riprap in that area.

vii. **Sherry**- At the last meeting, we talked about the Cap. What was wrong and what could be done. Is that something he talked about? **Linda**- He looked at it. We have photos of blocks with cracks. He said they are assuming that the north edge of the Cap has attached itself to the Armor Flex Mat. He does not want to see us rip into that because of the potential for disturbing other things. **Sherry**- That makes sense because the Flex goes clear across and if you tear it up you could tear up the other structure. **Linda**- He's watching it and I think we will learn more when the report comes back. **Pat**- He did say hopefully we will get the report back a lot sooner than in 2023. **Linda**- We are still waiting to hear from the State on that report!

viii. Kellen was here 2 - 2.5 hours

B. Algae Bloom

i. 5/30 noticed a thin film over the Lake

ii. 6/2 heavy coat all the way across, didn't know what it was, Shane called Malena

iii. 6/3 I put up signs because Malena said small children and pets should stay out

iv. 6/5 Shane at the Dam and we took the signs down

v. **Mark**- Diane told him we can get Microcystin test kits. 5 for \$200.00. **Linda**- Yes. I talked to Anthony about them. **Mark**- Did you want to order some so if we get another bloom we could test? **Linda**- As I understood it in relation to that is setting up a set of standards. If you have to do that to read the test then that gets

involved. I could do it but I don't think I want to. **Sherry-** You are saying there is a testing kit? **Mark-** Yes. There are different kinds of Algae and the green may or may not have the microcystins and the tests test for the microcystins. **Sherry-** I wonder how long those are good for? I think it would be a good thing to have on hand. **Shane-** It's possible. **Mark-** Isn't there an under \$500.00 that the Board doesn't have to vote? **Shane-** Yeah. **Mark-** I can check on expirations and things. **Sherry-** That way we wouldn't have to do a reagent. That's not a reagent that's a coloration and that's difficult. We can look into it and see. If that's not what it is I would say it would be nice to have them.

Bernie- If you run a test like that, how often do you have to test? **Shane-** When you get a bloom. **Bernie-** When you see it. **Linda-** If we had them the first day we noticed you might have known ahead but I don't know what you would do about it. **Pat-** In years past Terry would just say, it's cold out, it will go away.

Bernie- We don't know if that was the same thing. **Shane-** It will dissipate eventually. It's just making sure everybody knows what it is.

Bernie- We don't know if that was the same thing. **Shane-** It will dissipate eventually. It's just making sure everybody knows what it is.

C. Wetland Tree Removal

- i. With Paul's help I've been trying to remove willow. He brought his saw over and took down some things I couldn't nip with lopping shears and he cut up the log that we pulled out of the Lake, that was blocking the ramp.
- ii. There is a big pile that could be burned.

1. **Shane-** Are you planning on burning the wetland with Dericke this year?

Linda- That happens in the Spring. The weather was not cooperative and he didn't find time to get here.

D. Chemical treatment of riprap at the spillway and the earth embankment- **Shane**

- i. Malena provided me cost of the chemicals and ratio they would need to be mixed
- ii. 2.5 gallons Aqua Neat \$94.13 & 2.5 gallons Cide-Kick II \$101.65
- iii. We would provide the Chemicals and mixing ratio to Salyer (mowing contractor). He would use his sprayer. I don't think we need to spray yet. I don't think it looks terrible. **Pat-** You are saying to spray the riprap at both the Dam and the Levee? **Shane-** Yes. I thought it was best to let them provide us with what they feel is good to use. That way we know who is putting what on where and how much. **Sherry-** Also you know it's going to wash into the water. **Shane-** We know how much we are giving him so we know how much he is applying. We control the whole thing. **Pat-** It comes in 2.5 gallon containers. We wouldn't necessarily use 5 gallons. **Shane-** \$195.78 before tax total for the 5 gallons. **Bernie-** We don't know how much we are going to use so is there a life limit? **Shane-** We might have that for 4 years. **Pat-** cost plus the application? **Shane-** Yes, he is also going to send an itemized cost to maintain the spillway. **Pat-** Weed whacking not included in original price? **Shane-** No **Linda-** We asked Kellen about the plant growth in the channel and he said it's just aesthetics, didn't have a problem with it. I had asked Terry. He was concerned it would force the water to the outside edges and cause erosion.

E. Maintenance Plan?- **Pat**

- i. We don't have a process in place for who will take care of this stuff. We knew in the past that Terry just did it. I think we need to come up with a maintenance program. During the Inspection noticed that the east end of the West Levee is a

mess. There is a log there and the dock needs some repair. We don't have a plan for taking care of these types of things.

- ii. **Bernie-** Is the pier the common pier? Yes **Bernie-** That is supposed to be up to the non-lakefront people who use those piers. The agreement was, if they didn't take care of it, it would be removed.
- iii. **Pat-** When Ron Shug was President we would have work days where we would come over and pull weeds, worked at cleaning up the wetland. It shouldn't fall to one person or whatever. If we could come up with a plan. Today's is not the day to talk about that. Maybe we could put that on a future agenda. We keep hearing people say, we'll help but we never doing anything with that. We need to do a better job at that. **Bernie-** 99% of that stuff fell on the Board members. They came to meetings and said we'll help, let us know but when the day came, it was the Board members who showed up.
- iv. **Sherry-** When we hire somebody to do the mowing maybe that person could also, if we instructed them. I get it. He's probably afraid to mow in certain areas. Maybe come up with a plan for that person if that person could handle that. Now we are looking at giving him spraying duties why can't we enlarge that? I think we should hire somebody.
- v. **Linda-** The area between the guardrail and the wetland is not getting done. **Shane-** He's got a zero turn. Terry had a tractor with a bushhog on it. **Sherry-** Maybe we just need to sit down and talk with him instead of complaining about it. **Shane-** I see him everyday.

7. Old Business

A. Short Term Rental Enforcement Discussion- (Letter Draft & Approval)

- a. **Sherry-** Has 2 drafts, most people had approved the earlier, longer version then some people came back with other questions, most recent version- June 4th, did not put Shane's changes, What did we state in the original letter? It does not state Short Term Rentals. Your concern was we should be using the wording in Dan's motion, a description of Short Term Rentals?
Shane- The other one was 'typically' defined as rentals... Typically should not be in there. It should say, 'defined as rentals of less than 30 days'. Typically needs to be removed. **Sherry-** Dan, I tried real hard to find what you described. Then I went to the State and I looked at what they said. Can you tell me what your motion was? **Dan-** I think you are referring to the special meeting we had? **Sherry-** Yes **Dan-** I think what came about was when I brought the motion I said Short Term Rental as defined under the homeowners association act. They have a definition, in the code. **Shane-** The state's definition. **Dan-** If you need the citation, I believe it's called ... **Shane-** I have a copy here. **Sherry-** I have it on my computer but, let me take your copy, I didn't know what to pull to put in it. Then this shorter letter guys. Do you need a copy of it? **Shane-** Yeah **Linda-** It was the EX meeting, the motion, where there was 3 different versions? **Dan-** This is what I was referring too. **Sherry-** Because I didn't know what exactly to put in. Because I couldn't find ... **Linda-** This wasn't even in reference to Short Term Rentals. It was about Conflict of Interest. **Shane-** Right, but it was associated to the movement that we're doing. **Linda-** and the vote was turned down. **Shane-** To what? **Linda-** the motion. **Sherry-** The Motion of what was turned down? **Linda-** Those on the Board who are Short Term Rental Owners as defined in the 2024 Indiana Code

36-1-24-6 are in breach of their fiduciary duty of loyalty as a conflict does exist. They stand to make personal economic gain on this matter therefore they should recuse themselves from any further discussion on the Short Term Rental issue. That was the amended version of the first Motion. That was the final Motion. Then there was a little more discussion. We took the vote, it was tied 6-6, Shane said, "Obviously I'm gonna vote to turn it down. And so it did not, was not approved. **Sherry-** That was for the fiduciary responsibility. I do understand how it represents into this. **Linda-** But there was no vote on what the definition of STR would be. **Shane-** I see what you're saying. **Linda-** Approved or not approved. **Shane-** Gotcha **Sherry-** It's up to you guys. I could put all of this in here but it's going to add a lot more verbiage, as a description. We can do that. **Dan-** No. I'm just, if we agree to amend the definition and if we agree to include that statute, perhaps we just say, as defined by Indiana Code so & so. And then somebody could, I don't know, they could just Goggle it. If it's a question of length ... **Sherry-** It's not a question of length. It's a question of readability. Maybe you could help me to define it. When I look at, I don't understand what the big difference of Short Term Rentals but if you want, I can put, as defined in Indiana Code IC 36-1-24-6 right? That's all I need to put? Right? **Dan-** There is a sub part for the definition. I don't ... **Sherry-** Ok **Dan-** I know it's a lot. **Linda-** Do we want to use that? **Dan-** That is the question. **Linda-** Because the original letter does not say Short Term Rentals. **Sherry-** No, it does not. **Linda-** Do we want to tie our definition to some trendy moniker that may not even be in use in ten years? Or that the state could pile on more requirements or restrictions or not restrictions? Do we want the PPA stuck being connected to what somebody else defines? **Dan-** I see your point. We have no control over how that definition is going to change over time and to cite to it ... is that what you mean? **Linda-** Yes **Dan-** We are relying on another to make the definition for us which can change. **Sherry-** Which can change. That's where I was .. I didn't want to put something in there that, that Code in time could change to something else. I felt uncomfortable with that. I know that some people don't like the term Short Term Rental. I don't know what that rationale is. For me it defines for everybody it's a rental and then we define it as less than thirty (30) days. I think to me, that's a good definition. I don't think I need to put in this. That could change. But if you tie yourself to the Code it doesn't matter if you quote it or not. **Bernie-** If you want to put something in and you're afraid it's going to change, just put in as defined by such and such a date. **Sherry-** That's a true statement. **Bernie-** And then they can go back to that date and see how it was written. **Linda-** Why don't we just use the words that are our definition? That's one of the things that people say about the Covenants and the Bylaws, is that they're hard to understand. They're not precise enough. So why don't we just use the exact words of what we mean without tying it to somebody else's words? **Sherry-** Are you talking about using Short Term Rentals or are you talking about using something else? **Linda-** I'm talking about using what we used in the original letter. That's what we are talking about enforcing. **Shane-** Look the Article 5 which was originally written? **Linda-** No, not the Covenant, the definition of what we're talking about. Temporary accommodations provided in exchange for monetary gain. They're very precise words. **Sherry-** They are. **Dan-** That is the verbiage in the governing documents. Do we create ambiguity or confusion by not using different terms? **Dan-** That's the language in the governing documents. **Linda-** That's the original letter. **Sherry-** The one thing we can say is just do that first paragraph of the Notice which is attached for your reference and under those conditions

and skip the second paragraph completely under conditions of ownership and covenants, Section 2 then and then, Was there anything wrong with the Compliance request? There wasn't. I don't think anybody said anything. **Dan-** No. I don't remember seeing anything wrong with it. **Sherry-** There's so many things guys, I'm trying to remember all the different ... and it's ok that's the whole process. If I just get rid of the second paragraph. Under the conditions of ownership, Covenants Section 2, Board of Directors may revoke any member's privileges for nonpayment of dues or if he violates ... it's that whole section 2 and then the compliance, I don't think there are any words in there that would be incorrect and then we did Sincerely, the Board of Directors of the Papakeechee Protective Association. Would that be a correct statement? **Shane-** u hmm **Sherry-** Ok, I think that takes care of it. **Linda-** Right there it mentions Short Term Rentals. **Sherry-** Right where? **Linda-** Under compliance. In the first sentence. **Sherry-** aaa shoot. **Shane-** She's saying it's still referencing Short Term Rentals. Where it says, we respectfully request, all members who are currently operating Short Term Rentals, cease this activity immediately. **Pat-** Would that go back to where we talked about the monetary gain? Maybe replace it with that ... **Dan-** I think that would be repeating the same language 2 times, but ... at least it's clear. I know it's redundant but at least it's consistent. **Mark-** Under compliance, you could just call them noncompliant rentals. **Sherry-** Oh **Bernie-** Yeah **Sherry-** I like that. **Dan-** Good job, Mark. **Sherry-** Thank you, Mark. **Sherry-** Cease this activity immediately. Then we got rid of those words. Then we also send this letter with it. **Shane-** uhmm **Sherry-** I'll get this finished up. Who's going to send it? **Bernie-** The secretary. **Sherry-** I will keep the first paragraph, get rid of the second, under compliance request: We respectfully request that all noncompliant rentals cease this activity immediately. Correct? **Bernie-** Sounds about right. **Shane-** You'll send us that draft? **Sherry-** Yes

B. PPA Building WiFi & Camera Update & Info- **Dan**

- a. Nothing's changed on the the previous proposals
- b. Cottage Watchman
 - i. has a presence on the Lake
 - ii. 1/2 what the other proposal is
 - iii. Can ask 'Jody' to attend meeting for questions
 - iv. Dan has copies of the other proposals, if you need

8. New Business-

A. PPA Calendar-

- a. Establish Nominating Committee- **Shane**
 - i. Even District Directors run the election for Odd District Directors
 - ii. Odd Districts- (1) Lynn ?, (3) Anthony ?, (5) Steve- no, (5A) Marshall ?, (7) Sherry- yes, V.P.- Dan ?, Treasurer- Pat- yes
 - iii. Bernie will conduct the election.
- b. Financial Review Committee- **Shane**
 - i. Jon Korewja, Sally Whitehead, Shannon Therriault
 - ii. **Pat-** after close of books for June, she will cont

B. Election Procedure-

- a. Anthony's thoughts on improvements that could be made (handout)

- b. 2024 colored paper voting a good first step, could be used with fine tuning
- c. **Linda-** Each owner has a number from the mailing list, could be used
 - i. **Sherry-** thinks that would be difficult to manage
 - ii. May need other than Directors to oversee
- d. Joanna Miller- could use mailing labels on 3 cards (3 votes) each owner
- e. **Shane-** Would need different cards for nominations from the floor
- f. **Sherry-** Each owner gets a card with VP & Treasurer lines (can write in choice) and their District Number line (write in choice) instead of multiple cards
- g. **Lynn-** If allowing to vote need to check that they are 'in good standing'

C. UnKempt Property Discussion- **Shane**

- a. Received copy of the letter regarding problem properties on Hiawatha
 - i. **Jim-** it's unenforceable, ridiculous to spend any time on it
 - ii. **Sherry-** this rule is clearly laid out
 - iii. **Pat-** tried previously, County says they have no requirement for that
 - iv. Injunction? PPA brings a petition to enforce to the Court for a specific action (could also ask that attorney and court fees be paid), if the Court agrees, the person must appear, the Court sets time for when action must happen, can set penalties if it doesn't happen
 - v. **Pat-** Court previously didn't require pier removal be reimbursed
 - vi. **Sherry-** It's in the Bylaws, should be supported, there are others that refuse to clean up, should also be notified
 - vii. **Bernie-** The rule says 'nuisance' but no clear definition of what is expected. Concerning this letter, should list all problem properties belonging to that owner. If animals are accessing an open building you can win.
 - viii. **Jim-** The weeds are so tall you can't see the buildings!
 - ix. **Shane-** will reach out, asks for contact info

9. Director's Comments

- A. **Shane-** Good to get something accomplished.
- B. **Lynn-** Beaver shot out of season, pets being shot, What are we going to do about guns being used?
- C. **Darby-** People are coming on the Lake killing swans. Is a beaver more important?
- D. **Dan-** the ABCs say, no firearms, it could be addressed
- E. **Shane-** When I forward the signed proposal to Malena she will forward the specifications on how they are going to apply the products and what the requirements are for us. I want to email that to everybody. We will rely on them to do the signage at every house.
- F. **Linda-** A problem with building projects on the Lake that are not coming to the Board or obtaining County permits. **Shane-** Do we have certain people that are doing that? **Linda-** I know of 3 recently **Shane-** Stuff they needed permits for? **Linda-** Yes. Any building or moving any building they are required to come to the Board first. **Jim-** The property next to me has no permit posted. **Bernie-** I can see if they are going to build something they should bring the plans to the Board. As far as the permits, that's between them and the County. Why is it up to us? **Linda-** It's not up to us but it protects us if they go to the County and get the required permits. In a recent project where they hadn't obtained the county permits once the county got involved the Health Department required revision of the septic. That protects the Lake! **Sherry-** What's the solution? **Linda-** We need to be more observant of what's going on to protect the

Association. **Mark-** Call the County, ask if there's a permit, give your name, pictures are helpful, they file a report, if a permit is needed they send someone out. **Linda-** Yes. But that doesn't get them following the ABCs that they have to come to the Board. **Shane-** There's just certain guidelines. Building structures, obviously that should be approved, houses, stuff like that but doing retention walls and septic all that stuff is out of the realm, I think, of the Board's view, in my opinion. **Linda-** They have to go by the Bylaw, just go by the Bylaw. **Sherry-** So if I change the flooring in my family room do I have to come here? No. **Sherry-** I guess that's the thing, people don't always know if they have to come. **Shane-** I don't want to get the Board into a position where we're going around and watching everybody. I don't like that idea one bit. I think we've gotten this far and it's not by happenstance, we let people do what people need to do because people understand what we're doing. Most people are investing into their backyard. I don't feel like everybody needs oversight. I feel like less oversight is good. I get it, there's places that probably need permits and things. I'm assuming those people are following those guidelines because they're gonna get in trouble by the County. **Linda-** You can't pick and choose. You have to apply the rules fairly to everyone. So it's not up to us to decide this one's ok that ones not ok. They have to come to the Board. That what it says you have to do. **Mark-** Put something in next years Pow Wow. This is what you should bring to the Board if you plan to modify your property. **Sherry-** Like we did with the seawalls. **Linda-** Which got put on the website without the changes being seen first, just sayin'. **Pat-** It says construction, these things were written 94 years ago they were worried about people putting up a house. The word construction means different things to different people. I think we have to understand what we're really saying because I agree, somebody that's adding on to their house or whatever that needs to come to the Board. I 100% agree with that. When we put the garage up we came to the Board. **Sherry-** When I put my shed up I came to the Board.

- G. Jon Korewja- You're going to send this letter out. What's the Membership's exposure to a lawsuit coming back from those people? Would you run the PPA into bankruptcy if you had to defend it that much? **Shane-** There is discussion on what the outcome of taking things to Court, what that could snowball into and that is not a good place to want to get yourself injected into. I don't know. I'm personally not going to sue the Board and I don't know everybody else. We'll see what happens. **Linda-** It could be the other side too. Jon- Would it stop at the bankruptcy of the PPA is the membership not responsible too? **Shane-** I don't foresee us going down those paths, to be honest. **Dan-** They can sue whoever they please but the likelihood of you personally being responsible, it doesn't even make sense. **Sherry-** It could also go the other way. If we don't do anything, will we be sued by those members who think we should?

Motion to Adjourn- **Bernie

Second- **Sherry**

Adjourned 10:35 AM

Next Meeting:

July 12, 2025 ~ 8:15 AM

PPA Building, Hatchery Rd, Syracuse