

PPA Board Meeting Minutes ~ June 13, 2026 ~ PPA Building

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

B. Roll President - Shane Wallace Vice President- NP (Dan Connell)
 Treasurer- NP (Pat Ebetino) Secretary- Linda Minnick
 District 1- Jody Clay District 5A- Vacant
 District 2- NP (Bernie Ebetino) District 6- Jim Whitehead
 District 3- Vacant District 7- Sherry Doherty
 District 4- Mark Laurent District 8&9- Darby Miller
 District 5- Shannon Therriault

Guests-

Jim Bulin D4, Joe Doherty D7, Diane Tulloh D4, Joanna Miller D9, Jon Korejwa D6, Diana Mercer D4

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

a. Review of May 9, 2026 Board Meeting Minutes (sent email 6/1/26)

****Motion-** Accept May 9, 2026 Minutes- **Sherry**

Second- **Mark**

Approved (1 abstain)

D. Treasurer's Report - **Shane**

a. As of May 31, 2026

Money Market-	\$ 68,493.93
CD-	55,362.90
Checking-	9,213.97
Net Income-	42,827.29
Total Current Assets-	135,013.60

b. Paid-

i. Aquatic Control Treatment	\$ 7,750.00
ii. May Bookkeeping	150.00

c. Common Pier Fund 961.44

d. 6 unpaid Dues- June 1 send to attorney, **Shane** would like to offer 1 last chance

****Motion-** Accept May 9, 2026 Treasurer's Report- **Mark**

Second- **Sherry**

Approved

e. CPA update-

i. need 1099 & W9 all on the Board being compensated \$2,000.00+
ii. include in Bylaws update

f. Election items-

i. **Pat** will print Ballots
ii. Nominating Committee- odd District Directors
a. Send email reminder President, Secretary, Even District Directors to be elected, also vacant Districts 3, 5A
b. Not running: **Shane**- President, **Linda**- Secretary, **Jim**- D6
iii. Financial Review Committee- Pat, Shannon, Jon Korejwa, Steve Longstreet
iv. Need to Prepare file room for ballot counting

E. Lake Maintenance Report

a. Dam-

i. 2nd Quarter Inspection will be done before the end of June
1. Anyone could tag along on inspection, it's a good way to see what's involved
2. JW? Was a maybe at May meeting

3. Send out an email
4. Could involve outside management
- ii. Time to seriously delve into sidewalk cap problem
 1. **Shane** doesn't think it sets over the Amorflex, wants to hire concrete leveling company, punch 1" holes along the face and pump it up, then blow the cracks, clean up, pump it full of a flexible seal, level it, would buy time, **Linda**- main concern not that it's crooked but why is it doing that, **Shane**- It's only doing it where the old spillway is because it had caverns on both sides that went way under, it's that section that is failing. You can clearly see that, They probably didn't get all that structure out of the ground. They probably didn't backfill it completely and it's settled. Somebody from the engineering side of the dam needs to look at it. There's probably gonna need permanent structure to hold the cap from wanting to tip. **Linda**- They have looked before and recommended a wall across the front.
 - a. **Sherry** reminds 2 quotes needed
- iii. Riprap needs redressed. **Shane** recommends a community day to add riprap.
- iv. Outlet pipe seams need to be resealed. Contacted one concrete company (not interested) **Shane**- wire wheeling what's there then reseal.
- v. Weeds in the channel, filling into center. Kellen happy to see plants growing May 2025, but not all the way across then. **Shane**- would need to stop the flow and spray. Salyer waiting to spray riprap for no wind.
- vi. **Shane**- Reeds on right side of ramp need sprayed because that's where the dock is going.

F. Building, PPA Grounds, Harvester, Chemical Boat- **Shane**

- a. Changed oil Chemical boat, needed new battery, took from his house along shoreline to near Darby's, blew a hose, called Griffith's can't fix on the Lake, they'll tow to ramp take to Marina **for quote**. Hoses run under the deck want to reroute above. Helm is loose, all hoses bad, pump gauge needs replaced, throttle & choke cables don't work.

G. Lake Chemical, Weed Study/Treatment, Water Testing Discussion- **Shane/Board**

- a. **Shane**- Water clarity- can see the bottom in 5' of water, **Jim & Sherry**- have floating weed complaints, people need to rake, 60' in front of Jim's neighbor, shallow Flat Belly Bay to Holiday Harbor, behind the islands near Shane's- need treatment, **Sherry**- clarity much better
 - i. Proposal from Malena (AC) not in yet for above listed (a.)
 - ii. We approved Fish Survey, Tier II survey & Curly Leaf Pondweed treatment of 6.44 acres,
 - iii. Starry Stonewort survey and treatment will need approved, also above proposal for additional shoreline as described
- b. Pier Quote at Boat Ramp (need additional quotes)
 - i. Salyer- \$1,800/section installed, vinyl slats aluminum stringers
 - ii. **Shane**- no sockets, 2x8 on the bottom w/rods to prevent shifting
 - iii. Common Pier Fund currently \$961.44
 - iv. Maybe deposit refund from Spring CleanUp could be used?

****Motion-** Use Salyer Pier Quote, \$3,600.00 for 2 sections of Aluminum & Vinyl pier + \$1,000.00 Standards, Installed, Utilize Common Pier Fund of \$961.44, not to exceed \$5,000.00.- **Sherry**

Second- **Jim**

Approved

- v. **Shane**- Set the pier right on the ramp, to the right side (East side) easier if you're putting a boat in by yourself if the pier is on the driver's side. Could be 3' or 2' to save real estate on the ramp.

****Motion-** Approve the Aquatic Control Starry Stonewort Survey quote of \$900.00, 3/6/26 Shane email.- **Mark**
Second- **Sherry**
Approved

H. Old Business

a. Review of Proposed Bylaw Changes

- i. Mostly grammar and typos, placement
- ii. Add letter from Pat 1099 & W9 info under Officers
- iii. **Mark-** Membership Sec. 2- sentence 1, resequence- Each Association Member shall pay annual dues for the purpose of ..., Sec. 5 Duties of the Treasurer, #3- instead of \$500.00 1% of the annual budget, a relative number to the current budget so it doesn't have to be changed, **Shannon-** preapproved budget expense does not require approval? **Mark-** Rules & Regulations, Sec. 1A,- move second section of 1A to 1M (group fishing requirements)
- iv. **Shane-** on boundaries, w/Jim Sec.1 G- keep as is, **Mark-** current G moved to F, **Linda -** Article 5 Rules 7 Regulations Sec. 1F & part of 1G be combined (agreed) new F to be- Before constructing or moving a building on any lot the approval of the Board of Directors must be secured as to type and location. No boathouses shall be constructed on the Lakefront.(agreed)- new G- Each District may formulate building restrictions and building lines for such District, and when same are formulated, the Directors shall see that they are enforced.(agreed) **Shannon-** Confused. You're back to to what someone can and can't do with their property. If they're properly permitted with the County who are we to say what they can and can't build if we don't have any governing documents that to speak to that? **Linda-** Because these are our governing documents and that's what they say. Mr. Snyder said, You have the right to enforce these things. **Mark-** The approval of the Board of Directors must be secured before construction.. **Shane-** That was brought up before, as long as they're following County rules and regulations what say does the Board have to say we need more restrictions than that? **Shannon-** That was my question. **Linda-** That's the right of the Association. **Shane-** Yeah, it could be. It is the right of the Association. If we decide the Association feels that... **Sherry-** These are going to Snyder. **Shane-** mhm **Sherry-** So it's what we are reading in our current Bylaws. It goes to him then. **Darby-** When we send stuff to him we may want to highlight some things... **Sherry-** That we have questions on. **Shane-** I believe that's the process we're doing. We're showing as it is written how we feel like it best represents the Board. What is your (Snyder) input on how we facilitate that? **Mark-** Shannon raised the question- Do we want to say the approval of the Board is required? **Shannon-** Really it should be on the Board and not each District. **Shane-** Right. But that gives the District the ability to formulate it's own rules on restrictions for whatever reason. **Shannon-** I mean, I know but I don't know what to say at the moment.
- v. **Sherry-** Article VI- Amendment of Bylaws A.- to allow email notice and change to 30 days instead of 10. (agreed) **Shane-** More time is better. That was the idea, provide more time to get everybody's response. And B.- to allow email and specify timing of when Ballots are to be returned- within 30 days after such Ballots are mailed.
- vi. **Sherry-** need to look at Officer compensation & highlight things for Snyder's attention.
- vii. **Mark-** Required State HOA items
- viii. **Shannon-** We allow 1 vote per Membership regardless of the number of lots. We allow married couples to sit on this Board and cast 2 votes. Something just didn't sit right with me with that. I don't know if there should be some restrictions going forward and how we handle that? Or at least discuss? I don't know. **Sherry-** I wonder if it is because there is such a low pool of people. **Shannon-** This is my opinion and nothing else, a community of this size only needs 5 to 7 Board Members. I think there should be term

limits. I think there should something added to the Bylaws about how and if necessary Board Members can be removed. If you don't attend 3 meetings in a row or something. **Mark-** Put together a list of issues. We are trying to put together... do this with non-material changes so it flies through. **Shannon-** I thought we were going to have an attorney draft the Bylaws so that nothing was left out. Then it was decided we're just gonna clean up what we have and then make changes to the Bylaws. **Mark-** He's still going to review them.

- b. Working on PPA Files from Corson's (Pat & Linda)
 - i. All files/cabinets returned
 - ii. Documentation of the Member vote to approve 1974 Articles of Incorporation updates was found
- c. Short Term Rental Discussion (legal counsel advised, in discussions)
 - i. Letter to Membership (June 12)
 - 1. **Sherry** reads red letter paragraph, quotes Snyder, "in reference to Cov. 3" Pat's reply "actually Cov 5, we simply brought Cov. 3 as additional support." There was additional information in there, can't agree to all of this until we go through what was said about Cov. 5. **Linda** has the Snyder quote, "then again, Cov. 5 could be construed to restrict str." **Shane-** Right. **Sherry-** I think that is something we need to discuss before we say we are going to send this out. **Shane-** I'm perfectly fine with the way the letter is written. It's perfectly stated that we need to have a better specific amendment to facilitate restricting property owner rights. What we have isn't gonna **Linda-** adopt an amendment to clarify. **Sherry-** I agree with that. I do not agree with ... **Linda-** I don't agree with the letter. **Sherry-** Our attorney's advice is there does not appear to be anything prohibiting str. He stated that for Cov. 3 not for all of our Covenants. We simply maybe need to take that out. We can say he suggests that we recommend to the Membership an amendment to our Covenants. Actually not so much the Covenants but he stated it wasn't a rule or regulation. **Shane-** It's a deed restriction. You're restricting deed rights so it's a Covenant. **Shannon-** the thing with the Covenants is, I have no issues with the letter. But you do not have Covenants for this entire Association. They are by plat. Each one separate. **Shane-** Right. **Linda-** They are not by plat. Because they are not on the plats. They are on the Deeds. **Shannon-** Ok. Then by each lot individually. True Covenants and restrictions govern an entire Association and our Association does not have a true governing Covenant only deed restrictions. It's complicated. **Sherry-** With that stated it also says in here that if we go by each District as long as they are on the plat. **Linda-** They are not on the plat. **Shane-** That's puts us into deed searching. **Linda-** Which we have already done. **Shane-** that changes how we can facilitate deed restrictions. It will be broke down to District voting rights. **Sherry-** I still believe that however it goes and we need Snyder and I don't believe that we can say that sentence. Because what that statement says is we don't have the right to do something. Because his statement on that was on Covenant 3 only. **Shannon-** Previously you asked like a thousand times. **Shane-** Right. **Sherry-** but he didn't have all the information. **Shannon-** But he said there's nothing in your Covenants that would... he just said that you're gonna be challenged. He said there's nothing solid in your Covenants 'cause you don't define what a short term rental is. **Sherry-** Part of the problem was Shannon, was in January he didn't have all of the information. He didn't look at all of the information. Then he got side tracked. When you read or listen to this entire thing, he doesn't say in here at any place, that we don't

have the ability to do so. And stating in this letter, based on Cov. 3 is incorrect. I don't have an issue with the rest of the letter. It tells what we've been working on but if they see this then when it comes to a vote they are going to say, but we have no standing. **Shane-** That's the whole reason. (rumbles from the Members in attendance) **Shannon-** We don't have standing. **Sherry-** Yes, we do. **Shane-** Admonishes the Members, This is a Board meeting. We will maintain this as a Board meeting. Here's what it is. We continue to try to wrap our hands and thoughts around how we can control this. We don't have that ability. Those are the reasons I asked those questions in February. What about this, What about that. So we can stop circling back to we have the authority to restrict property owner rights. We don't have that. It may be talked about in there but it's talked about so blatantly that's it's not anything that somebody is gonna stand behind. That's why he's referencing us to provide the Membership with the amendment to move forward for restricting that in the proper way. If we don't come to terms with we don't have enough to enforce restrictions as the way we are written, we are constantly false feeding people into thinking either we're lame duck or dereliction of duties. We're not doing any of that. We're doing it the right way for everybody, every person. If we remove that from there it's almost like it's false reading into the way we want to see something, based on a view that we stand by. I view it as from person on both sides of the aisle that this is the right stance. He's specifically said it in multiple times, we don't have anything that we can enforce by a court of law and win to enforce any deed restrictions on the governing property owner rights. **Sherry-** All I am asking for is that sentence be removed. **Shane-** I understand, but that takes the integrity of what we've been working for out. **Sherry-** What we've been working towards and what we had worked towards until September was restrictions. **Shane-** mhm **Sherry-** Then since September what we've been working towards is making sure that our founding documents are good in standing. They are. They are enforceable. He said that. They're enforceable, they are good. That's what we worked on. I feel really good about that. I think it was a good thing to do. Now we are gonna work on the Bylaws. I do believe that we can do the vote. But what this puts in there though is, we as a Board 2 years ago were wrong and I do not. You guys can shake your heads yes, my str owners... anyway my statement is going to hold upon review of our Articles and Covenants our attorney advises there does not appear to be anything prohibiting str. I would like to move we strike that. If you guys vote to go ahead and keep it then you can go ahead and keep it. **Shane-** I'm just, it's not pointing fingers. I think the previous administration went about this all wrong and it should have started off different. The things that we've done in the past weren't right and it was brought to our attention and we've got to this point. I'm not saying it was done in bad faith or ill will that's just the way the process worked out. What I've tried to do is steer us in a direction with everybody following that same lead. It may not be what everybody agreed with or wanted to follow suite with but that's as President that's what I felt needed to be done for everybody. Not my view not somebody else's view, just being down the middle of the road. That's where we needed to be. **Linda-** It's not down the middle of the road. **Shane-** How is that not down the middle of the road? **Linda-** That's your point of view. You publicly stated that we have no legal recourse. **Shane-** Right **Linda-** That's not right. You know as well as everybody else that the amendment option is there and that's a legal option. For you to say there's no legal recourse makes people think there's nothing you can do that's

legal to take care of str on this Lake. **Shane-** Not until the approved amendment comes through for a Covenant restriction. Is that not what the attorney said? Yes or No? **Linda-** No. **Shane-** He didn't say that in that email I just sent out? **Sherry-** What he said was and I believe him was that depending on how you read Cov. 5 that it's an imposing and expanding condition on the use of that real estate and any time you're encumbering real estate and there's nothing to prevent the PPA from amending the Covenant, I agree with that but what I am stating is, yes, we want to come through and we want to do it in the correct way. We want it to come to a vote and we want to speak about what we are doing. But so much is coming across like the amendment that somebody is going to present here pretty soon, there's so much coming across that says we did it in bad faith. We were trying to control other people's properties. No, we were trying to protect the Lake. That's how we came across the restrictions on str. Not to do anything to your property but dog gone it this is a private Lake and that's what we hear from other people. This is private. We want to keep it private, alright? In here it states that we weren't approaching it in good faith. I can read the Covenants and I feel very strongly that there's a statement that says, no str. That is my interpretation, everybody has a different one. He (Snyder) is stating there could be different ones also. It will strengthen us to do an amendment and I think that is the right thing to do. But saying that there's nothing in there that appears to prohibit str, he looked at Cov. 5 and he said well yeah but it's going to be stronger if you make an amendment. **Linda-** He also previously mentioned, after he rejected the Cov. 3 document saying you can't use that to restrict str, which that's not what we were trying to do with that Cov. 3 document. **Shane-** You were trying to restrict the right of that property to enter upon the Lake and he said, I understand what you're doing and you can't do that. **Linda-** and then later, he changed his mind, well Covenant 3 probably could... **Shane-** In my view this is the problem as a whole. **Sherry-** No it's not the problem as a whole. It's a right for everybody to say .. I'll make a motion, then if it's voted down then it's voted down. I want my voice heard. **Shane-** I'm listening. Again it boils down to this. I can't vote on it per say, you know.. **Linda-** What the attorney is saying is, he actually said, you can enforce all of this stuff. You've got the right. When you guys were talking about the letter that he was going to write, he talked about the Articles and the Covenants give you the authority to enforce all of the stuff. **Sherry-** They're effective and enforceable as written. **Linda-** It's an attorney's opinion that this isn't strong enough to go to court with. It's not that it's not useable. That it doesn't mean this or that. **Sherry-** Linda, that is not what I am trying to say, not at all. The only thing that I don't like in that letter is the first sentence. That's the only thing. **Shane-** I hope people don't reference it as I told you so or you knew you were wrong. **Sherry-** That's exactly what they are going to do. **Shane-** Well, it is what it is. We need to take ownership and move on. That's what we're going to do. If we made mistakes in the past, it's fine. It moved in the best interest of the people sitting on the Board at that time. It may have been the wrong approach but it was the best at the time. Moving forward, here we are. I'm trying to be up front and not pussyfoot around what we need to say. That's my point of view, as President. If the Board decides it's best to remove it, great. **Sherry-** and we can. I just had to put my statement out there. **Shane-** I understand where you're coming from. I don't have a problem understanding where it started and how we got to where we were without pointing fingers and saying this was bad judgement or ill will on

what we've done in the past. To take that away from you .. **Sherry-** Because it wasn't my ill will. **Shane-** That's what I'm saying, it doesn't need to be taken that way. **Sherry-** It's completely different and I think you're right, there's going to be a lot of ill will and finger pointing, a lot of anger and there's going to be let's just get it over with. What's allowed, what's there now and just let them go because they didn't know that there wasn't a rule against them, they didn't look at the rules of the PPA or you can't tell me what to do with my property, whatever it may be. I want it to be a letter that informs them of what we looked at first, was there a concern about legality and enforceability. We've received that. To make it better and more understanding we want to make an amendment or clarify what our str thoughts are and it goes to a vote. That's all I'm trying to say. There's going to be a lot of anger and there's also going to be a lot of people saying, you spent how much for an attorney to find out about str? No we didn't spend it to find out about str. We did that to find out we were legal. That is exactly why we went down that road. Then there was conversations, but the largest part was legality. I want to make sure people know that. **Shane-** Exactly. When we as a Board look at restrictions on private property and legal responsibility on what we're trying to enforce, it's a big responsibility for us to be doing what's right for everybody. Not out of aggression or views, it's based on what we had to work from. That's how I as President interpret the letter, our conversation is we need to move past what what we've done. This is why we are doing what we're doing is because what we found just isn't what we need in order for us to move forward to give you the response you've been asking for for 3 years. Our response is, you have to be provided an amendment to either enforce what is already written with another enforceable restriction married to Cov. 5 or whatever. We need to be more precise and .. **Shannon-** Did he look at this letter? **Shane-** He signed off on it. **Shane-** This has to be written in a way it's enforceable for the next 100 years and they know what it means going forward and that's what we don't have now. That's what's being proposed. I think everybody wants that just to be done with this. **Sherry-** I agree **Shane-** I'm just saying we need to move past this. **Shannon-** I just want to know if the attorney looked at it? **Shane-** Yes. **Mark-** I think this is the paragraph that we took out and it got put back in? It doesn't say, at this time anymore. **Sherry-** Upon review of our Articles & Covenants our attorney advises there does not appear to be anything prohibiting str... **Shane-** It doesn't appear, it isn't written in stone that it is not. It doesn't appear. It's an appearance at this time under his review, we don't have the authority to restrict deed restrictions. That's that statement. **Mark-** I tend to agree with Sherry. I thought this was out. We haven't concluded yet what we're going to amend for short term stuff, whether it's going to be a Covenant amendment or a Bylaw. **Shane-** It can't be a Bylaw. It's a deed restriction. It has to be a Covenant. Bylaws, we can write Bylaws. We can't restrict deeded rights. That has to be a Membership vote. **Mark-** I understand. Our policies that we've come up with for a vote, we haven't even talked about. What that policy's going to be. It's probably going to be a complete prohibition. But it could be a Bylaw regulation. I don't think we've covered that point. **Shane-** It can not be a Bylaw regulation. **Linda-** It could be a restriction of use of PPA private property. You wouldn't even have to go to banning. **Mark-** That's what I'm saying. We haven't talked about that. We haven't included that we're going to amend a Covenant. I still think that it doesn't hurt to have this paragraph out because in terms of, fast forward, the second phase is going to be to modify the documents in terms of policy. We say,

we are going to make a modification, that modification is going to be subject to a vote. That's in the letter. I don't think it needs to be specified here what we're going to amend. I tend to agree with Sherry that to say that nothing can be done doesn't need to be in this paragraph. **Linda-** I think that there's a lot of information that we don't need to include. **Shannon-** Shane's point was just to provide some transparency of what the facts are. I'm not a renter. I don't have a rental. In the beginning I was like oh let's just find a happy medium but after digging into all this my stand point hasn't changed that str fall under deed restrictions and the Covenants. We have nothing at this time that's concrete or solid that would allow the PPA to prohibit them. That's just a fact. That's just a stated fact. We don't have anything specific that would prohibit them in the community. The way I interpret it is we're just providing transparency in what we're doing. **Shane-** Yeah, and not, so again, We can't even come together to bring a letter to the Membership on where we stand. This has been 3 months. This has been my frustration. I am literally, with Pat, going off what the attorney has and what he has given us as a response. He's ok with it, that letter as written, he is ok with. So if he's ok with us stating that that's reassurance from the attorney that I'm not speaking out of line as President. I understand that we all might not feel the same or interpret it the same but if our attorney is saying that's ok then maybe we should fall in line and just move forward. I don't feel it's totally out of line. We need to get something to the Membership. If you guys want to make a vote and scratch it, I'm ok with it. Let's just get it out to the Membership and be transparent as possible and move on. We'll have that conversation at the Annual meeting. When it comes up we'll have that conversation, that's fine.

****Motion** on the Greetings to PPA Members letter, dated 6/12/26, that we remove the sentence that says, Upon review of our Articles & Covenants our attorney advised us there does not appear to be anything prohibiting str. Change he said.. to, Our attorney advised we recommend to the Membership an amendment. -

Sherry

Second-

2. **Sherry-** You're right Mark, the 'since the August meeting' statement had been up above and is now down below. We had talked about that but what was presented to the attorney was this letter. There was a change made since the last time. **Shane-** I think we knew we were making changes before we took it. **Sherry-** Right, but the reason we went to the attorney has to be stated very clearly up front that we went because of our legal definitions, status and compliance issues. We did not go with the intention of spending money for str at this point in time. Yes, that's a question we needed to ask but our first questions were about our legality.
3. **Mark-** In terms of the discussion. I think it's fine without that whole paragraph. The sentence about voting is covered at the end. The definition of str is a minor point. Stating the amendment is to a Covenant may be premature, in my opinion. I think it's fine without that whole paragraph. **Sherry-** agrees with Mark and amends her motion to->

****Motion** on the Greetings to PPA Members letter, dated 6/12/26, that we remove the entire paragraph beginning Upon review of our Articles and Covenants.- **Sherry**

Second- **Mark**

Sherry, Mark, Linda- remove Darby, Jody, Shannon- leave in Jim left before the vote.
Tie Vote broken by the President- The paragraph in question remains in the letter.

4. **Shane-** What our process is moving forward and how to amend? **Sherry-** Right. We can leave we continue to work through this process. That's exactly what we are doing. **Shane-** It's super generic. We know what our process is. That's the transparency. Our process is going to be recommending a Covenant change to the Membership for a vote. Again, we're basing this on transparency. We know what we need to do. We just need to facilitate it as we work through this. Giving them that step is not selling them anything other than the truth. **Mark-** That's covered in the second to last sentence. **Sherry-** True statement. It goes back to fact that the reason we went to the attorney was for the legality of our Association. I want that to be highlighted. It seems like it is all str conversation. I want it to be known that we had a concern and we acted on that concern. Some people will also come in August and ask, You already sent the letter in July about doing something and then you never did it. Why didn't you? It's because we had a question. Right? **Shane-** Yeah. **Sherry-** That's important. It's going to head off some of the frustration of why we didn't do something. Because there's also people who think we should. **Shannon-** You also put the paragraph down there, underneath the path forward. **Sherry-** I think the path forward, is very well written. I don't see any need to put that paragraph in there, in the least. **Shane-** what was your other? **Mark-** When you look at the contents of that Upon on review paragraph, the He suggests that we recommend..., that covers the path forward, the Should include the definition of str, that is a minor point. Follow this process for a vote, that's covered in Our path forward. Everything in there is .. **Shane-** redundant **Mark-** is somewhat redundant to, the path forward. It also eliminates this thing about there does not appear. **Shannon-** It is still a controversial statement. Especially.. This is my take, It's not up to anybody sitting at this table to decide whether they are permitted or not permitted. It needs to be specified and it needs to be voted on by the Membership. They will decide. Not us. The attorney has stated, maybe not in this phone call, I haven't listened to it in it's entirety, but I have listened to the previous calls. I know at the end of maybe the second phone call, you sliced it, diced it, repeated it multiple times, so what you're saying is, we have no authority to restrict them at this time. He said yes. That's what I'm saying. **Shane-** Right. **Shannon-** That's what you're saying in this letter which is a true statement. **Darby-** It's not just him. He has signed off on this but multiple other attorneys state the same thing. I don't know why you keep going around and arguing about it. **Sherry-** I'm not disagreeing. It's more.. **Darby-** It's the same thing. **Shane-** I just don't want to mislead what we know facts to be. I don't care. The letter just needs to go out and we'll explain this on the next step, when we have that conversation with the Membership at the Annual meeting. Because we won't be there to give them a vote yet because were not gonna be that far.

d. Hiawatha Road Repair (up the hill over the top to Lot #18)- **Jim**

- i. Contacted 3 companies for quotes- Michael's (didn't call back), R&R- \$8,550.00, Brooks- \$20,760.00 + additional 400' at the top + \$14,380.00
- ii. \$\$\$ Assessment per lot only lot owners on Hiawatha, would like the PPA to pay half
- iii. **Jim-** to contact lot owners
- iv. **Shane-** to contact Pat on how assessment is orchestrated, thinks not out of line to ask the PPA to pay half
- v. **Sherry-** PPA should pay half because they are a part of the Association.
- vi. **Shannon-** Is there a requirement for the lot owners to vote?

- vii. Jon Korejwa- you have to let everyone (Hiawatha Lot Owners) know ahead of construction so they know what's going on.

****Motion-** that we pay the bill and as long as we can make a special assessment for 50% of the bill on all of the members who live down Hiawatha, Oswalt is excluded - **Sherry**

Second- **Shannon**
Approved

I. New Business

- a. Aquatic Control- Fish Survey \$2,900.00 + Water Quality testing \$110.00 (Approved 5/9/26) will take place July 13-17 will let us know when before coming
 - i. They will bring totes to remove stunned undesirable species
 - ii. We will email Members before

J. Guest Comments-

- a. Diana Mercer D4- Offers her mediation services to the PPA for str issue
 - i. PPA property owner, retired attorney, mediator, mediated divorces
 - ii. Discussion on location, dates & times 10:00-1:00
 - iii. **Shane-** ok with sending Diana definition of str, **Sherry-** offers to pay for supplies, **Linda-** asks Diana about the sample resolution email sent in advance. Refers to neighbors of str property as being annoying for reporting issues. See 3 page document, enclosed
- b. Joanna Miller- D9- Has looked at Shannon's calendar, she won't be able to and there are other people who won't be able to make any meetings that you propose so online would be needed
- c. Jim Bulin D4- Asks- Who owns Nordman Dr.? Kos. County maintained. **Shane-** Stone & Chip last done by the County when they did Koher. Jim B.- New shed placement was approved by the Kos. County APC, new boardwalk to his pier- waiting on County approval.
- d. Diane Tulloh D4- in favor of mediation but PPA property owner probably not unbiased, her attorney stated could ban retroactively (effect str already in use), **Sherry-** part of the reason she didn't want that statement in the letter. (see Motion to remove paragraph from 6/12/26 letter) Diane- Appreciates the work all of the Board Members are contributing to the PPA. Listing the things that have been mentioned that need repair, don't you think it's time to think about raising the dues? Ridiculous to try to manage the Lake on such a small budget. Is the attorney saying anything about how the ABCs should protect the Lake and the Association as a whole? Our job is not to defend individual homeowner's rights. You gave that up when you bought in an Association. You're supposed to be making it a place that is desirable for permanent and summer homes. That's our very first page in our Bylaws, is how we are supposed to be protecting the Lake. Most of us are on septic systems, when you start talking about having so many people in these homes that are not meant for that. I know of 2 of these homes that have leaked into the Lake in the past with just normal use by 1 or 2 people. You start adding a bunch of people in there we're going to run into programs with eColi. Public lakes test for Microcystin and post results. Are we going to have to start doing that? Even if we only allow 10% of the homes to be short term rental properties... 25 rental properties on the Lake could bring almost 2,000 people onto our Lake, into our neighborhoods. I'm just making sure you are thinking about those kinds of things. **Shannon-** Has anyone heard any updates about regional sewer. It was in the works for some areas and they took us off and I haven't heard anything in a long time. **Linda-** They are moving the Lift Station. We know that. **Shane-** They are taking this Lift Station (across the road from the PPA) and putting it down here by the boat ramp entrance. The sewer is in the works. Probably a 10 year turn around. All the hills and the valleys, there's gonna be a lot of places that need force main lift stations. Every household speculating that I've done, hundreds of lift stations. Your out of pocket's gonna be \$30,000.00 a household. But with that comes no building restrictions. So you will see 5' set backs on the house. You will see air conditionings to the property line. You'll see 4 story houses. They're already comin'. In the next 20 years that's all you're gonna see out here because this is gonna be the place to do it on.

That's what's gonna come with sewer. It's gonna take away the charm of what was officially established here. It's good for the environment from a health standard. From the prospective of what Papakeechee is, it's going to be a life changing event for the Lake.

- e. Diane- In this letter are you sending out information about how this is supporting the Lake? How it's supporting the desirability of a place for people to live, for permanent homes? Which is what the purpose of the whole Association is. When I look them (str) up, I don't see that. I see negatives. If somebody on the Board can point out to me how this is going to help. **Shane-** Point out what? What do you mean? Diane- Point out how it's going to increase the disability of the Lake for permanent and summer homes? Which is what we are supposed to be doing. I don't see that so... **Shane-** I guess it just boils down to how you look at it. You have long term rentals, have been here 50 years. Those aren't your desirable ones either and then you have the people who have.. not all references, I'm just saying if you took a percentage, you would probably say those are the least desirable because they're not being invested into for long term or short term rentals. There just there to make money and they use them as they are. The arguments always been same as me, we invested a bunch of money into our short term rental because we wanted to bring that desirability, one for ourself, looks a whole Hell of a lot better then when I got it and that was the original owner from 1950. It was run down, they came in the summer. It was an old fishing cottage. We took it. Put a bunch of money into it and made it beautiful and desirable for everybody in the neighborhood, not just ourself. You have that other side of the spectrum. I get what everybody is sayin' about unwanted people and I guess I see both sides of it. I honestly do. Diane- I didn't expect an answer. I want people to think about it. **Shane-** That's the other conversation. It's a fact, if you have str it brings a beautiful environment. Maybe not the people included in it but the structures and the looks and the upkeep is there. You have pros and cons on either side of it. What best fits our footprint? The Membership gonna have to determine that. It's not up to the Board. It's up to us to facilitate getting that to the Membership to move forward.
- f. Joanna Miller D9- I have a couple of thoughts. You and I come from very different view points. But we kinda have the same thoughts and concerns so I want to counter a couple of things. You were talking about money spent and all the different places that we need to spend. Should we increase dues? I'd like to propose that we should consider, kinda like Mark was saying, a flat dollar amount. A percentage, so from everybody's dues 5% goes to road maintenance, 5% goes to proper treatment, 5% goes to (?) just a thought. You were talking about septic and what rental people have. Let's think about it this way, str summer homes, these are homes that are not occupied but they still have a responsibility to the State and the County where they have to if you have 1 bathroom you have to have this size septic. If you have 2 bathrooms, if you are doing things right and you're paying your taxes and you're registering with the State like we do, I want to say that in case somebody has a question about it, you can't say, I'm going to allow 6 or 8 people in here because I want to make more money. You're not going to make more money anyway. Your fee is based on the presence of somebody at that sight. You're not allowed to over state the capacity restrictions. They belong to everybody whether you're living in a home permanently or you're here for a week. All this about this is supposed to be attractive to summer homes and permanent residences well, some of my renters have been some of my best friends. Some of them are now permanent residents. This is how we attract people. We bring people to our community. I have people who came here to recover from cancer. This summer I had someone who came here to work on a short term project in Milford. They're hunting real estate right now. They loved it so much. They appreciate what they see. I just want you to hear that.

K. Director's Comments-

- a. Shannon- In 1928, when this was created, it was not created for permanent residences. In the beginning and we've modified and that's great. It's just the evolution of how things go.

****Motion** to adjourn- Mark
Second- Sherry
Adjourned 12:05PM

Next meeting-
Saturday, July 11, 2026
Papakeeche Center
8:15 AM