

PPA Board Meeting Minutes ~ February 14, 2026 ~ North Webster Community Center

1. Call to Order ~ **Shane** 8:15 AM

2. Roll
President- Shane Wallace
Treasurer- Pat Ebetino
District 1- Alysia Hammel
District 2- Bernie Ebetino
District 3- Jeff Glon
District 4- Mark Laurent
District 5- ~ NP ~ Shannon Therriault
Vice President- Dan Connell
Secretary- Linda Minnick
District 5A- Marshall Minnick
District 6- Jim Whitehead
District 7- Sherry Doherty
District 8&9- ~ NP ~ Darby Miller

Guests

- 1.) Paul Erst D6
- 2.) J. Bullin D4
- 3.) Rio/Loretta Dingillo D2
- 4.) Rita Schnedler D7
- 5.) Joseph Doherty D7
- 6.) Stacy Hammel D1

3. Secretary's Report- **Linda**

A. September Minutes review

- a. **Shane** requests his exact words (he doesn't know his exact words) from the meeting recording be used in reference to str enforcement.

****Motion** to remove Shannon as District 5 Director (had already been done), add the comment Shane asked be put in (as above 3. A. a.), accept the rest as stated. - **Pat**

Second- **Sherry**

Approved

B. Review of November 8, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes

****Motion** to Accept November 8, 2025 Minutes. - **Pat**

Second- **Bernie**

Approved

4. Treasurer's Report - **Pat**

A. As of November 30, 2025

Money Market-	\$	26,183.75
CD (May 2025)-		53,408.96
Checking-		13,839.38
Total Current Assets-	\$	93,423.69
a. Mowing	\$	1,020.00
b. Insurance	\$	633.00

B. As of December 31, 2025

As of December 31, 2025		
Money Market-	\$	26,215.16
CD (May 2025)-		53,408.96
Checking-		11,574.40
Total Current Assets-	\$	91,190.12
a. Snow Plowing	\$	1,125.00
b. 4th Qtr 2025 Dam Inspection	\$	950.00
c. Cincinnati Insurance (late fee)	\$	25.00

C. As of January 31, 2026

Money Market-	\$	26,244.99
CD (May 2025)-		53,408.96

Checking-	16,999.42
Total Current Assets-	\$ 156,987.47 (includes 2026 pending Dues invoices)
a. Snow Plowing	\$ 1,125.00
b. Snyder	\$ 735.00

D. Dues invoices sent January 9, 2026, 39% received, on par with past years

****Motion to Accept November 2025, December 2025 & January 2026 Financial Statements. - Marshall**
 Second - **Jeff**
Approved

5. Lake Maintenance

A. Dam/Levee- **Linda**

- a. Received IDNR letter on Biennial Inspection
 - i. Does not include rating (similar to engineers *Satisfactory) as in past years
 - ii. Requests notice when engineer recommendations are complete
 - 1. Cap (sidewalk) repair known since 2015, seal cracks, move toward a more permanent solution
 - 2. Riprap migration, replace lost riprap (some has been replaced)
 - 3. Seal outlet pipe seams as needed
 - 4. Remove maple seedlings W end W embankment (sprayed and cut)
 - 5. Monitor damp area N side W embankment, low spots in those yards
 - 6. Monitor dropbox quarterly for cracking, spalling (part of our quarterly Inspec.) report immediately any issue
 - 7. Moles W embankment, fill tunnels & seed (some done, more needed)

B. Lake Chemicals & Weed Treatment & Testing- **Shane**

- a. Has follow-up responses from Malena (Aquatic Control) & Jeremy (Lilly Center)
- b. Will compile into 1 email for discussion at the March meeting

C. Building/ Grounds/ Harvester/ Chemical Boat- **Shane**

- a. Hasn't removed fence posts
- b. Chemical boat- helm is falling off, needs attention
- c. Possibly install pier at ramp for both PPA boats and to aid in launch of Member boats
- d. Paint the building? Probably not this year.

6. Short Term Rental discussion (paused for legal counsel advice)

A. **Sherry**- When was the pause? Eagles EX session 10/26/2025 no Motion or Vote, a 'decision'

B. **Linda**- I may have a way of having something done for this season's rentals.

- a. Hands out Cov. 3 Document
- b. Covenant 3 Document. Referring to Shannon's document Hierarchy of Documents, Covenants take precedence over Articles. Collection of Dues is allowed reasoning that the Articles are in effect. If the Articles are in effect and the Covenants take precedence over the Articles then we should be able to enforce Covenant 3.
- c. Reads handout out loud. See attached document.
- d. **Mark**- talk to Snyder, get validity of the ABC's out of the way, step 2 how do the ABC's apply to the str, discussion was 'act' as if the ABC's are valid
- e. **Linda**- I'm saying we have the right to enforce this now so we can have this in effect for this season's rentals. Take it to Snyder. Do this first.
- f. **Bernie**- step 1 are we a legal entity? We are a legal entity. Step 2 are our Bylaws Articles Covenants enforceable? That's where we're at now.

- g. **Dan-** the question is, What is the current status? Get on sound footing to precede with future action which would include enforcement. Are you presenting, that while Snyder is in that process that we should proceed with enforcement under Covenant 3 to prevent str from using the Lake? **Linda-** Yes, I think Mr. Snyder should give his opinion on this. We already took the step to collect people's money without any qualms, since Covenants take precedence over Articles we shouldn't have a problem with enforcing a Covenant. **Dan-** You want this to have top priority with Mr. Snyder? **Linda-** Yes.
- h. **Shane-** I don't feel this is in the best interest of everybody in the Association, that's been my statement since day one.
- i. **Jeff-** this should be in Snyder's due diligence. He knows the direction we are trying to go. I don't have any problem with giving him this. If it's valid he should already have this in his response.
- j. **Alysia-** I make a

****Motion** to give it to the attorney.

- k. **Sherry-** currently under the assumption that we are a workable PPA. It is our job to apply ABC's consistently. We are not doing consistency. To not enforce because someone might threaten a lawsuit. We have issued notices twice in the last 2 years. To continue non-enforcement only encourages more violation. It puts the PPA in a weaker position. If a Member doesn't believe the PPA has a right to restrict an str from lake use the appropriate thing for them to do is formally challenge the rule or propose a new amendment. That hasn't happened. Until that happens the default is enforcement of the existing rules not delaying enforcement indefinitely. Threat of a lawsuit is not a governance standard. Following the ABC's (Covenants) is the standard. We keep pushing it back because somebody might do something, that's fear mongering. With the Code of Ethics it was fear of 'did we do it right'. We took the CoE to the attorney and yes it was right.
- l. **Dan-** When do we expect a response from Snyder? A week, a month, 6 months?
- m. **Shane-** I have no idea. I expect this is going to be a process. He has 100 years worth of documents to find it's going to take time.
- n. **Mark-** We haven't asked for Snyder's opinion on str?
- o. **Shane-** No We gave him every document we had plus the conversations with str.
- p. **Mark-** We should have a letter on ABC validity and a second letter on str applicability of those rules. Then with those opinions we can make an informed decision on str enforcement.
- q. **Shane-** The last conversation we had was what does enforcement look like and that's where it ended.
- r. **Dan-** look at the time frame. There was a motion to enforce. The next step was how to enforce. Information was provided to the Board that raised questions as to the validity of a lot of things. Somebody has raised red flags that believes this should be looked at more closely prior to proceeding with enforcement. The question is, does the Board have a responsibility to look into if there is any truth to what these questions have raised? Which is why we sought legal advice, because one concern could be, because somebody has said, there might be a problem here do we have a responsibility to look into that before we proceed? I think there's a more probable than not chance this is going to end up in a lawsuit. The question could be, You Board , the question has been raised about the validity, you did not look into those, you chose to proceed to litigation, you spent money of the Membership to do this not knowing the answers to these questions. You Board acted in bad faith.

- s. **Alysia-** You can be in bad Faith on the other side too because there's a group coming to me saying they are going to sue because you are not enforcing what the Board has voted on.
- t. **Dan-** that's fair. So it's a question of, Where do you fall on that? In terms of the putting it off. There was time in deciding which attorney, there was a difference of opinions on that. Then it had to be decided exactly what to ask. The questions had to be prepared, then to the Attorney.
- u. **Sherry-** As long as our ABC's are up to snuff then why do we have to go back to ask the Attorney now can we enforce? We already made the decision. Are we afraid of getting sued? As long as we enforce consistently. **Dan-** That is a good point.
- v. **Bernie-** We need an opinion on whether or not the Board decision was valid. **Sherry-** No we don't. We did it in good faith. We can always take it to an attorney but not necessary. The Board made a decision. If the ABC's are good then we move forward.
- w. **Dan-** We went to Snyder to address everything. This is where we are. He's addressing that and he will come to a conclusion. To Linda's point. He did respond during our meeting that those original Covenants are enforceable and that the Indiana Marketable Title Act does not extinguish the original 7 Covenants that are in the original Deeds. Her point is that he has answered that question with regard to Covenant 3. Linda is saying Snyder said that's valid. Now the question is, Does Covenant 3 apply to str? That is what she wants an answer on. Regardless of everything else he's looking at, during our meeting he said yes, these 7 Covenants are valid. At least he said that.
- x. **Linda-** It's not really controlling str. It's saying this particular type of user does not have the right to use the Lake. Let's bring Mr. Keiper's letters into this. You, Shane, wanted to give that stuff to Snyder right now. No problem. **Shane-** I already did that. **Linda-** Then what's the problem with this? **Shane-** That is the power of the President, to be able to do things of that nature. It's not just a Board Member who can go and do whatever they want. I represent the Association. I emailed you guys and said, this is what I was going to do. You guys gave me input, great.
- y. **Alysia-** I made a ****Motion** to take it.
- z. **Mark-** There are 3 sections of language. hotel/motel, personal gain, licensee vs leasee We haven't got a legal opinion on any of those 3 as to which is the strongest argument to regulate str and how it applies to Lake access. **Linda-** You know what Cov 3 says about the definition of a guest. **Mark-** I agree that str renters are not guests under that language. Whether str are licensees vs leasees is a legal question. I haven't seen Snyder's opinion on that. I haven't seen Snyder say whether hotel/restaurant language which is the basis of the letter which you are trying to enforce, applies. I think the personal gain language is a fairly strong argument. I'm hoping for a letter from Snyder with which one of these is the best language to apply to str. I think it's worth waiting for that letter so we don't try to enforce something that's going to get tossed on it's ass if it gets in front of a Judge. Is str a licensee or leasee they would have different rights. Is str personal gain from using the Lake or is it from renting your house?
- aa. **Dan-** One answer had been answered during our meeting. It addressed the Original 7 Covenants. He said, those original 7 Covenants are enforceable. If you are going to give him Cov. 3 you might as well give him all 7 and ask, which of these do apply to the str issue with regard to enforcement? No personal gain seems to be a good argument but it's not one of the original 7 Covenants.
- bb. **Pat-** wanted the Keiper letter to go to Snyder mostly concerned with the ADA mention, is Snyder looking at 1928 Articles or current amended Articles? Proof of amendments were sent to him. Did he get the current version of the entire ABC's?

- cc. **Shane-** I'm ok if the Association wants to give this to him as the basis for the Membership to move around the str, great. I don't know that that's the direction he wants to take. Alysia made a Motion, is there a Second? For this to take to Snyder to have him review this to see if we can get a response regarding the str thing much faster?
- dd. **Bernie-** I'll **Second** it.
- ee. **Alysia-** I made a ****Motion** to let the attorney at least have this and consider it with everything else.
- ff. **Linda-** it would be nice if that could happen before this summer. Otherwise we are looking at our third summer with nothing happening.
- gg. **Jeff-** That's not entirely true. This has been going on for the 40 years I've been on the Lake. These last 3 years has not made a bit of difference. The Lake has not dried up and blown away. There's been no serious consequence to what's going on right now. We've made good progress. I want to include those. We need to keep moving forward. You're right the sooner the better. But it's not these last 3 years that the situation has been created.... **Linda-** 3 years since they came to the Board and asked the Board to do something.
- hh. **Mark-** I'm not opposed to giving that to him. I think we should give it to him as part of the general question of how our documents apply to str's. Have we asked him that?
- ii. **Shane-** He knows that's on his plate. Where he's starting and where we end up is to be determined. That's why we hired legal counsel. To give us a place to start so we know where to end up so we can move forward.
- jj. **Marshall-** Cautions it could take a long time to get an opinion.
- kk. **Bernie-** If Snyder gives an opinion on Cov. 3 it would be on str use of the Lake.
- ll. **Dan-** The Motion is the stapled document? Just for clarity? Or just so he gets it? Or do we want his opinion as well?
- mm. **Bernie-** To give his opinion if we can use this to force them staying off the Lake.
- nn. **Alysia-** a lot of us agree he should have it to look at and consider it. **Dan-** so we are providing this to him? **Alysia-** Yes. Just like we did the other people who gave us, that's all I'm asking. I'd like to get an opinion on it now. Ok so I'll restate it. My new ****Motion** is

****Motion** That we would give this (Covenant 3 document) to Snyder and get a legal opinion on it.

Second- **Bernie**

Approved- 9 No- 1

- oo. **Bernie-** What this thing aims to do is to keep these people off the Lake for now. We can get an opinion on that. We will still need an opinion on if str are legal or not and what we can do with them. But we can get an opinion if we can keep them off the Lake, fairly quick I would think, with this.
- pp. **Alysia-** Would it make you (Mark) happier if I said, and continue to look at the others to see where their validity is?
- qq. **Mark-** I think you are asking for an opinion of how the rules apply to str. Your motion is more constrictive than that. He's looking at the validity of the documents. The next step is how those documents apply to str.
- rr. **Shane-** That would be a fair assumption. He's starting at a base level and building from there. He's not even worried about str at this rate. I wouldn't think, in his research.
- ss. **Mark-** I think this language is fine to include but to me you've made a very limited motion.
- tt. **Pat-** We haven't gotten a second

- uu. **Bernie**- We are looking for a limited opinion right now, not the whole picture. We are looking for a limited opinion. Does Cov. 3 prohibit people, who are not Members, their family or their guests, from using the Lake?
 - vv. **Shane**- I'm ending the discussion. We had a motion. Bernie seconded that. Let's vote. (vote to Approve- 9 No- 1) I will be giving this to Mr. Snyder as soon as I, well probably Monday. I'll just drop it off to the Secretary and say, here's my sticky note, here's what we're after ... I'll leave him a note stating what our intent is with this and what our direction is. Fair enough? **Alysia**- He's still going through all the other stuff **Shane**- He's not going to stop going through, this is just fast tracking what we need at this very second.
- C. Second appointment with Snyder
- a. **Pat**- We had discussed a retainer. Did he give any information on that?
 - b. **Shane**-
 - i. I handed him the documents.
 - ii. He said Shelly (Metropolitan Title Co.) has all the needed documents essentially pulled. Should be less than initially suggested.
 - iii. 'Steve' said he would get on it right away and give us his legal opinion first on the CoE and Enforcement of the CoE.
 - iv. Doesn't do retainers. \$350 per hour

7. Old Business

A. Dam Manager Successor/Dam Committee

- a. **Jeff**- has been doing some daily record keeping, assisted in the toe drain & cleanouts check for 4th Quarter Inspection (Marshall)
- b. Jeff foresees needing help with toe drain flushing, quarterly inspections, instruction on quarterly inspection reports, could need a couple people for 'on call' things
 - i. a committee or 'pool' of 2-4 people to draw from if help is needed
 - ii. Asks Paul Erst for help, Paul- You can ask.
 - iii. No interest at all in being paid
- c. **Linda**- daily record keeping, all components of the 4th Quarter Inspection & compilation of the Report
 - i. A committee is nice but there needs to be a single person who is the Manager, responsible for decision making, document signatures, etc.
- d. **Marshall**- We will not let PPA obligation to the IDNR slide in the transition.
 - 1. We need to stay on course with them
 - 2. Get correspondence with IDNR straightened out
 - 3. Look for an Engineer
 - 4. Get Jeff 'indoctrinated'
- e. 2 responses to Dam Manager position search, not suitable

B. Wetland needs a controlled burn this year, contact Derricke

- a. Historical Content- **Linda**- Arleen Corson was good at calling work groups together. We showed up once a month and she would work our butts off, removal of invasive plants (cattail, loosestrife, phragmites, etc.) & planting. The pay was a nice tan!

C. Code of Ethics (CoE) & Enforcement of the CoE- Discussion

- a. Reply from Snyder ->

From: **Snyder, Steve**

Date: Fri, Feb 13, 2026 at 2:23 PM

Subject: RE: Code of Ethics & Enforcement

To: Shane Wallace via email

Shane,

If a motion to adopt the ethics rules was made at the annual meeting and there was a quorum present and a majority of those present voted in favor of the motion, it is valid.

The terms of the Code of Ethics do not create any duties or obligations on the directors that don't already exist by law. The only thing that isn't already required is the method for resolving disputes, but that is probably a reasonable way to solve those issues.

Let me know if this answers your questions.

Steve

b. Enforcement of the Code of Ethics (see final approved version attached)

***Motion** The Board Members of the PPA will use the Enforcement of the Code of Ethics (to include the PPA will pay the attorney fee).- **Sherry**

Second- **Alysia**

Not approved Yay-4 Nay-6

***Motion** The document Enforcement of the Code of Ethics be changed to state, (If the majority of the Board agrees) ...change "feels" to (decides)

Revised to-

***Motion** The document Enforcement of the Code of Ethics will be changed to state; If 2 or more PPA Board Members feel ... and to add; The PPA will pay the attorney fee.- **Sherry**

Second- **Alysia**

Approved

8. Guest Comments

- 1) J Bulin D4- Do I have the right to say NO not on my property (to the chemical treatment)? **Shane-** Absolutely. He has the right to tell us what he would like done in front of his property. We own the water so we may say, you know, that's not up to you. But we'll take that into consideration, is what I'm saying. No set plan as of yet. J Bulin- The problem I have with that, it destroyed all the Lilypads. It destroyed all the vegetation I had. You say you fish Bluegill at the end of your pier. I did too but not last year. There's nothing there but muck. **Jeff-** I think he's saying that last year we did what we thought needed done along the shoreline, I think he's saying that people can opt out of that? J Bulin- Next door to me they did not treat that. My neighbor there does not care about the Lake or anything there. You didn't treat over there. If I moved my pier over 100 feet I could catch Bluegill. Not where you sprayed because the chemicals killed everything. **Shane-** Honestly people wanted to maintain from the shore out fishing and swimming. They don't want to rake weeds out on a regular basis cause we're treating the center of the Lake. In treating the shoreline we're able to help homeowners control what they want to do with their shoreline as far as weed control. There's people that had called me and said, hey don't spray my Lily pads. Don't do this and we did that. I'm pretty sure we sent an email saying if you didn't want something treated in your area let me know. **Multiple Board Members-** That was after the initial application. **Shane-** This is how this is gonna go in my mind, once we get through our weed discussion and how we're gonna treat the Lake I was gonna do a Presidential email to the PPA Members asking what their thoughts was in front of their property for people such as you that don't want a Lilypad kill or don't want anything. J Bulin- I was here for the presentation by the weed company. They said in some areas the weed chemical didn't do it's trick so you were still gonna have to use the Harvester within those areas? **Pat-** At this time, we don't know what we're gonna do this year. Because we haven't talked about it yet. Until

we know what we're going to do we can't say? Are we going to use the Harvester? Perhaps J Bulin- Is there a water or Lake consultant that can look at all of this stuff? **Shane-** That's who we hire, is a weed professional to help us ... J Bulin- No. You hire a chemical company. **Shane-** Right and their job is...J Bulin- I was here for their presentation. **Shane-** I get it. But their profession is water quality and weed control. J Bulin- Their profession is to sell chemicals. **Jeff-** To answer your original question, if there is shore application and you don't want it in front of your house certainly we can not do that. J Bulin- Ok. For me, that's settled. Thank you. **Bernie-** That's for the Lilypads. As for other types of vegetation in the Lake if for some reason there's Starry Stonewort or something like that in that area, yes we would put a chemical in there but it wouldn't bother the Lilypads. We may use chemical in that area but not to irradiate the Lilypads. Does that make sense? J Bulin- Was that the intent last year? **Jeff-** No **Bernie-** The intent was to only, if somebody didn't want their Lilypads destroyed, the intent was that we wouldn't spray them. **Pat-** That isn't what we did at first. **Bernie-** But the intent was, we sent out an email and said if anybody doesn't want, let us know. **Jeff-** That was for the second application. **Bernie-** That was for the second application. Yes. **Pat-** But I want to be able to say, when the first application was done is when the Lilypads were destroyed. **Jeff-** You didn't get the chance to opt out. **Marshall-** I would put him down as a firm NO right now. **Jeff-** We don't know if there is going to be shoreline treatment this time around. If there is there's something as simple as a colored stick that you stick in your... **Shane-** No it's not. It's me going in and pinning their GPS on lot properties. They do everything GPS. I ride in the boat. I go through and say this person doesn't want this, this person doesn't want that. This person does want everything we're doin'. It's just time in the boat and getting all these people on the map of you know what they want. I've heard that complaint before and I get it. If you don't want we'll do our best to ... J Bulin- Either that or I'll go to your pier for my Bluegill. **Shane-** It's open water. There's not much I can do about it. I used to catch fish right there under that rosebush when I was a kid. J Bulin- I know about that. **Shane-** They're not there anymore. They haven't been there for a long time.

- 2) Rita Schnedler D7- Getting dragged into the 21st century screaming and yelling about it and there's nothing I can do. Has the Board considered bill pay for routine bills like insurance so you don't get a late fee? How much was the late fee? **Pat-** \$25.00 Rita- But have you considered bill pay because then it will be paid on time and it won't really matter. **Shane-** I think you had that conversation with Candace and it didn't ... **Pat-** We do bill pay some. I have not done it for the insurance. Rita- The other thing though is on the minutes I think the standards for minutes and I think Linda has done an excellent job with that, minutes should be accurate and they should be detailed and anybody who makes a statement in a meeting should stand behind it and have your name attached to it. If you don't want your name attached to it you shouldn't be saying it. **Marshall-** Thank you, Rita.
- 3) Joe Doherty- Two quick things on the Code of Ethics you guys might want to clarify on. It says 2 members can, it doesn't say you have to be present at the time of the vote. Typically that's included in a Code of Ethics. You guys said, legal expenses, I would say it should say, arbitration cost. If I hire a lawyer that would be legal expenses. **Sherry-** We'll talk about that. **Pat-** I understand what he's saying but typically you have to be present on anything to vote. **Sherry-** On our Board you have to be present. Joe- But that's not what you said. You said two people feel, that's not a vote. That could be seen as I could put that in weeks, months, years later. And retroactively ask for the vote to be first. Typically you put in language that says, at time of vote. Just three little words.

Sherry- Ok. I'm just going to put a note down. I'm not changing it. **Joe-** It basically says, if you are going to ask someone to recuse themselves you have to do it at that meeting. You can't come back retroactively and say, you should have done this. **Shane-** Makes sense. **Sherry-** He's in law. **Bernie-** Is he talking about a vote to get 2 people to say that they think they should recuse themselves? **Dan-** Hypothetically, if we were voting on bids for the signs and 2 people said, you shouldn't be here, you gotta go for this vote, if those 2 people vote he shouldn't be here and he says, no I have every right to be here and he won't go, then we go to the attorney and the attorney goes, nope he shouldn't have been there or he goes, he can be there. Then we vote after that. **Bernie-** Do we really need a vote to determine if 2 people decide they don't ... **Sherry-** No, they just feel...He didn't say that. Two or more Papakeechee Board Members who are present feel... Joseph, you said something and I have a question...sorry Rita, PPA would pay arbitration fee.

9. Directors Comments-

- 1) **Pow Wow** coming up. Like to get it out sometime in March. I need some input for that. We probably need something on the Biennial Inspection. I'd like to get something on the effectiveness or not of the weed maintenance from last year. I want to put in something about this year's plans for weed maintenance, probably won't get that until the March meeting. Because that's when we're going to discuss that so right after I'm going to need something. Current status of the str issue. We probably need to put something, some kind of a blurb in the Pow Wow. If I can get some volunteers...**Linda-** We did agree not to use the moniker STR-> temporary accommodations provided in exchange for money. **Bernie-** because I'm not going to put the whole thing together myself. **Linda-** We voted on it. **Bernie-** By the March meeting I'd like to have all the input from people. It can be a rough draft. Give me some talking points. I may have to make it a bit shorter to fit or something like that. Then I'll send the draft out to Board Members for any input. Then I'll make the changes and send it out. Out by the end of March.
- 2) **Shane-** Some of my information will stem from the March meeting. I'll have my Presidential address done, maybe, some of that will curtail on what we decide to do with some of the chemical stuff too.
- 3) **Sherry-** If we choose to use the Harvester, does the Holiday Harbor comment stem from that? **Mark-** No **Marshall-** That little ditch at Holiday Lane requires a chain saw. **Sherry-** In the past we cleaned that area with a backhoe so we could dump weeds. **Marshall-** Moore would do a little bit when he was picking up weeds. Linda and I did stuff with our backhoe when we cleaned out the weeds in 2024. **Linda-** Mark is talking about brush removal along the creek.
- 4) **Shane-** I reached out to the Swan elimination guy. He's retired. They don't have a USDA approved replacement yet. I have the permit to do it.
- 5) **Jeff-** The snowmobile on the Lake came right through where the fence was. Should we put the new fence up? **Shane-** I don't think we should do a bunch of work for 1 snowmobile. **Jeff-** It's not just for 1 snowmobile. There is summer traffic and it's only been down for a little bit. When the fireworks go people park...**Bernie-** They just go right around that. They went through that guy's property. If we move the posts out farther they'll go farther onto that guys property. It's PPA property. A fence shows it's PPA property. No fence shows free reign. I'm not talking around the lake just around the building. When the 4th of July comes up that's a lot more open space. People potentially will just be parking there. It's a simple fence. I don't think it's a big money thing. **Linda-** There was a motion and a vote and they voted to take it down. I was the only No. **Jeff-** That's because it was broken, to take it down. Because it was an

eyesore. **Marshall-** It's just a matter of getting posts. We've got the wire. **Jeff-** I just thought I would bring it up. And I did see those tracks down Holiday Lane. I saw someone parked across on the gravel pile. 2 sleds filled with gear to go out onto the Lake. **Shane-** I assume they give family permission to drive down there and go fishing. **Linda-** Jim didn't you used to have trouble on Hiawatha with people pulling in down there? **Jim-** ?? Allen county police ...**Jeff-** What I was going to suggest was just 2 posts and put a chain across that. It doesn't have to have a lock on it. **Linda-** Do you ever put notes on the cars like Terry used to do? **Jim-** No. I don't want to get shot. Had to laugh last year. They had their sleds so full of stuff they had a 20# LP tank on it. What? Are they cooking the fish? That's another thing, the red shanty left on the ice? **Jeff-** People are asking about the shanty. Obviously they don't ice fish. When you go out it's a pain in the butt to have to get everything set up. Many people leave their shanties on the Lake all season long whether they don't even visit the shanty for 2 or 3 weeks. They still leave it there so they don't have to haul it back and forth. It's perfectly legal to do that as long as it 1) they're residents of the Lake which we do not know and I didn't go down and ask them about that. There's been nobody down there. As long as they've got their name on it they're perfectly legal to do...leave it on the Lake as long as they want. **Pat-** Does that have a name on it? **Jeff-** I don't know. I didn't go down there. **Linda-** That's a DNR requirement. That has nothing to do with Papakeechee. **Jeff-** That's what I'm saying, it's a State requirement. If somebody wants to go down and ask them if they're a resident. I didn't do that. I mean **Linda-** There's nobody there to ask. **Sherry-** I'm sure there is?? **Jeff-** I can't even see it from my house even though it's close to my house. I couldn't see it until I was clear down to the Dam looking out. The people that are complaining about it did just that, complain about it. But the shanty has every right to be there that's all I wanted to say. If they're a resident. If you're concerned that they're not a resident then go down and check it out. **Linda-** Isn't that why they made those tents instead of the wooden shanties? I thought the whole idea with the fabric tents was so they were easy to get off. **Jeff-** It takes something to do it if you want to go out and fish everyday and you don't want to take your tent down everyday you just leave it out. **Linda-** They're going to have to get off of there now. Rita- If you're worried about parking for the Fireworks, we used to charge people to park there. It was the easiest money we ever made for the PPA. **Shane-** If people wanted to give up their 4th of July to stand out there and do that. That's where the problem lies. **Jeff-** If you don't do that then people will park there. If you have a fence there they can't. Rita- We charged \$5 then we could easily charge \$10 now.

****Motion to Adjourn- Sherry**

Second- **Dan**

Adjourn 11:21AM

Next Meetings:

Saturday

March 14, 2026

8:15AM

North Webster Community Center

10:30AM

North Webster Public Library