

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Date: July 10, 2019

Attendance

Board Members

Present: Dave Decker, Ali DeVries, Monica O'Brien, Tony Harris, Anthony Harrell and Matt Ressler

Excused Absence: Steve Yates Jr.

Quorum Present: Yes

Others Present

Rob Clarkson, Rob Frey and Megan Jackson from the Holishor Office.

Holishor Members Present: 9

Proceedings

Meeting called to order at 7:30 PM

Pledge of Allegiance Recited

Minutes of June 26, 2019

Ali DeVries – Motions to approve the minutes as amended.

Anthony Harrell – Seconds.

All in Favor.

Motion Carries.

Transfers of Property

There are five property transfers. There are five houses and zero lots. All triggered initiation fees.

Bills & Salaries

Tony Harris – Motions to approve Bills & Salaries as submitted.

Monica O'Brien – Seconds.

All in Favor.

Motion Carries.

Profit & Loss

Submitted for Review

Manager's Report

Read by Rob Clarkson

Public Safety Report

Read by Rob Frey

Old Business

PWC Proposed Rule

Dave Decker – At the last meeting we came to a consensus on what the new proposed rule is going to be. We have it written in front of us. Any comments or corrections at this point? **Patrick Johnston, 362** – I have a

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

couple of comments I would like to make. A little history about myself, I am a former Board member for five years. I was here during the Clubhouse fire and I was also here at the time when the jet ski issue was brought up whether or not to ban all jet skis or allow them. I was the chair on the committee when we decided to keep the jet ski limit what it was back then and the theory being that this would come up again. Our concern was safety, numbers of jet skis and hours of operation. For those who don't know, I practice Law for a living, I do injury work and have been involved in cases involving boats and jet skis on this lake, so I was very concerned about our insurance. My wife, who I have been married to for thirty-one years, she has been a member since 1973. I am also a father to triplet boys now that are going to be twenty-four next month who rode jet skis on our lake. The reason I give that information is there have been different issues rather than whether or not we should allow jet skis. They were going to be banned from this lake and I am one of the main reasons why we kept them. My concern then is still my concern now. I am in favor of allowing jet skis in Holiday Shores. I am not in favor of raising the limit to 150 horsepower, I think the original proposal of 110 horsepower was more fair. I am also concerned that the number of jet skis allowed on this lake is a price point where people can pick up once you raise the horsepower limit. You are going to increase the number of jet skis. If you do not have some cap to control that, it's the price point of the cheapest product to buy to have access to the lake. I would advise the Board on multiple levels. One, raising the horsepower limit to 150 horsepower is too high. Two, there has to be some control of the number of jet skis that are allowed to be registered here. I am pro jet ski, I have one myself. We have had problems with jet skis out here where their model does not meet our lake requirements, so we have made mistakes. I have personally made mistakes on the Board, there are things on the lake that shouldn't be. I am just trying to look out for the future of our community. **Anthony Harrell** – I have two comments based on what you said. Safety, the 110 horsepower jet skis that we could find were entry level PWC's that do not have the safety features versus 150 horsepower that do have the safety features. The number of jet skis, I don't know how we would address that. That can definitely be a discussion. You've mentioned the models out here that do not meet our stats. One of the things we were talking about was physically bringing by the jet ski by boat, trailer, or by water so we can compare the VIN number to the registration. I'm not sure if we included that or not. **Patrick Johnston, 362** – It's a great idea. **Dave Decker** - We did not. **David Maibaum, 2088** – I also agree that safety is a fair amount of importance on our lake. However, it's the operator of the vessel that makes the safe choice of the operation, not the vessel itself. I can go through many analogies, I think the one that is most understandable to everyone is a fifteen-year-old can drive automobiles. There is no horsepower limit in Illinois, we have roads out here that are 55 mph and a combined speed of 110 mph. Those individuals either follow the rules of the road or accept the consequences when they don't. We are a private lake and the rules are quite clear. The individuals that are twelve years old may take a boater's safety course to operate a vessel with any horsepower without any supervision, it's not just personal watercraft. There are large boats out here that are greater than 300 horsepower that certainly go more than 55 mph, but we are not regulating that. There is no reason why we cannot place additional restrictions to be safe in operation of PWC's on this lake. The horsepower limit that I believe should be unlimited. We are making something very difficult for future Boards to try to work with. As far as numbers of PWCs, we have operations for sail boats and coves that are restricted to weekends, it's in our rules. We understand we want separation of particular craft. As far as training, I am in support of more training. I've been boating out here for ten years, the watercraft that are out here do comply with the rules as PWC. They're still violating one of our most common rules such as traffic pattern. Those are very identifiable to our Public Safety officers to fine for. I would like to see this investigation go to a proposal with the previous watercraft rule restricting horsepower go to unlimited or limiting the horsepower of safety. I would also consider increasing the age to sixteen years old or be accompanied by a parent or guardian over eighteen to

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

be on the PWC while someone younger than sixteen years old regardless if they have taken a Boater's Safety Course. Thank you. **Bill Vorachek, 43** – I agree with Patrick regarding PWC's. My concern is not so much the horsepower just like David had mentioned, it's the person operating the craft. I was out on the lake this past weekend and saw the large pontoon with high horsepower, they complied with our rules and did nothing wrong, speed wise. Again, it's the operator, not the watercraft. My second concern is that I have two young daughters who I take wakeboarding and tubing. Currently, the PWC's that are on the lake follow my tubers way too close. I suppose there are rules that are not being enforced right now or maybe we need more training for personal watercraft operators. Does anyone know how many boats we have registered on our lake currently? **Dave Decker** – I would put the number around 2,000. It is a lot higher than you would expect. **Bill Vorachek, 43** – I've only been here two seasons and my family and I love it here. We have great neighbors. My concern is the amount of jet skis that are going to hit this lake without any kind of time limit is really going to cause issues. **Monica O'Brien** – What time limit do you suggest? **Bill Vorachek, 43** – Something around 7-10AM on the weekends or Monday, Wednesday and Friday to be used on the lake or not. My wife and kids are chomping at the bit for me to buy a PWC's but I don't. It's all about safety to me. Both of my daughters are great shooters, my fifteen-year-old has her driver's permit and is already a safe driver. It is not my kids I am worried about, it's other kids. I was told if you have an issue with another boater, you get the lot number off of their boat call it in to Public Safety. I did that this weekend and I didn't hear back from anybody. Are we supposed to do that or are we going to have enough Public Safety officers on the lake to enforce the rules? If you limit the certain days or hours for PWC's to be on the lake then I know not to take my children tubing during that time frame. **Anthony Harrell** - You and Mr. Maibaum both mentioned you witnessed current violations on the lake. If that is the case, then why would you want to not limit horsepower? Why would we want to open ourselves to the risk to unlimited horsepower? **Bill Vorachek, 43** – I could care less about horsepower to be honest. Like we have mentioned, it's about the operator. I couldn't get a tail number on it even when they go by me. I am not going to drag my kids around the lake just to find them. **David Maibaum, 2088** – I would like to address safety enforcement and speed. 55mph is fast, I've done that on my jet ski. They do not have seat belts, nor do you wear a helmet. Point being, 55mph is too fast for any vessel on this lake, in my opinion. It is up to the operator that they boat in a safe manner. It appears that enforcement is in the question, it should be valid enough over the phone to take a picture or video of the operation and send it to Public Safety. That way it can at least be backed up for a word or two to that individual by the Association staff. To the matters of hours of operation, we have a young girl who loves to water ski, 7AM is prime to water skiers. I think the Ski Club would agree with that. I cannot justify any operation at or above 55 mph on this small of a lake. As far as training goes, I will gladly offer some type of clinic in the beginning of summer to allow those individuals to understand the rules and so forth. I don't think I mentioned that I would like to review the fines structure. In some cases, \$25.00 - \$50.00 is just way too low. Somebody would look at that and not even blink. **Dave Decker** – We briefly discussed fines structure last meeting. **Matt Ressler** – Dave, can we put that on the agenda for next meeting? **Dave Decker** – Sure. **Patrick Johnston, 362** – What is your plan after this rule is passed when there are many more PWC's on our lake? What is our fallback? That is why we set the limit of 85 horsepower so there are only select models to be out here. **David Maibaum, 2088** – Horsepower does not equate to safety. In fact, I spoke with two major manufactures of the four that are out here. In those brochures specifically they a recommended minimum age of sixteen years old. I believe that is important. That even backs up a previous statement about liability. My point is horsepower has no relevance to safety. The age of the operator must have the ability to comprehend, understand and do what is necessary for safety. **Ali DeVries** – How does everyone feel about the number of jet skis that are going to hit the lake? **Tony Harris** – We will definitely have more. We do not limit the number of boats. I think we need to treat this

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

situation in an equal fashion. If we limit jet skis, then maybe we need to limit boats. I agree, if there are too many on the lake then something needs to be done about it, but I believe each type of watercraft needs to be treated equally. If we have approximately 1,200 members in the community, we cannot prohibit anyone from enjoying the lake. We need to have some kind of limit for everyone to enjoy the lake. All of those factors need to be weighed out. **Rich Schwartz, 700** – I do everything dangerous. I ride motorcycles, I fly gliders, scuba dive, competition ski and as a trade, I am a professional pilot. All of those things that I do are not done without training. I have never had problems with children on gliders or anything like that. I have lived on lakes before and have seen a problem related to this before. Horsepower is not going to make a difference it goes back to the attitude of the driver. That can be easily solved with mandatory training. If you want to operate a personal watercraft and need to retrieve your sticker, you must have completed that mandatory training. I have a real concern with two stroke jet skis on the lake, you're using an oil mixture just like you would in your car. This whole thing is a solution looking for a problem, not solving it by what you think is safety. It should be solved in a more constructive manner not a limiting way. I hope that makes sense in a way. It is just like gun safety. This gentlemen said his daughters are good with guns. That is because they have been trained and are growing up in a safety culture. If I were to patrol the lake and see a kid mis operating a PWC is to go talk to his/her parents. We do not want limits, we want mandatory safety. **Monica O'Brien** – How do you feel about age limits? **Rich Schwartz, 700** – It is kind of the same, I have been teaching people how to fly for forty-five years and I love to teach kids. I have never had a problem with a fourteen-year-old in a glider or a sixteen-year-old learning how to fly. I started to learn how to fly when I was sixteen myself. If we want safety, then let's have a safety culture. **Anthony Harrell** – I would like to dig a little deeper into this mandatory safety course. **Ali DeVries** – I like that idea. **Matt Ressler** – As do I. **Anthony Harrell** – In order to operate a jet ski at twelve years old, they take the course one time and they have their certification. Should we make that a yearly course? **Matt Ressler** – I think that is a great idea. **Ali DeVries** – It should be required for a certain age. **Matt Ressler** – If they are under eighteen then they need to take the course yearly. **Ali DeVries** – I also think the parents should attend with the child. **Tony Harris** – My kids are older now but if they haven't been on the water in a while, I have them ride around with me. That way they have a refresher and I know they are being safe then I will let them drive it. **Matt Ressler** – I definitely think it should be mandatory to take the course yearly. Not just jet skis but for any watercraft in general. **Bill Vorachek, 43** – What about the adults? When I was out this past weekend, I saw kids on jet skis who did nothing wrong. However, I did see grown adults in their pontoons violating our boating rules. Those issues need to be addressed as well. **Anthony Harrell** – You mentioned you would offer a training course. What kind of training would that be exactly? Is there specific training for PWC's? **David Maibaum, 2088** – Specific PWC training because that is our current issue. I would direct that the twelve to sixteen-year-olds to carry that on. Anyone who wants to attend can of course but as far as setting up a course. They would have to start with a Boater's Safety Course to understand the rules and incorporating rules that are just on this lake. **Rich Schwartz, 700** – There are about thirty or forty PWC safety courses that are available online. It is not something that we have to invent, it is definitely out there. **Patrick Johnston, 362** – There are also courses offered by the state, IDNR is one. **Ali DeVries** - Like Tony said, if we are going to mandate a course for PWC's then we have to do that for boats as well. **Matt Ressler** – I think if we look at this fine structure and have someone who has a violation on the water then they should take the class to get their sticker the following year also. That is just my opinion. **Ali DeVries** – Or the online class. **Matt Ressler** – I agree, you cannot single out the PWC's. **Anthony Harrell** – Since we are talking about fines structure next meeting, we should also discuss this mandatory course. In the meantime, we can do some research on the online courses.

2019 Road Plan

Dave Decker – We have a revised proposal in our packet. With this proposal, we are looking at doing some oil and chipping on seven roads? **Anthony Harrell** – It looks like seven oil and chips and two roads for continued repairs from last year. **Dave Decker** – The two oil and chips is Tampico and Sextant from the rebuilds last year? I would hope we do not have repairs to be done on those. There are seven roads for repairs and then we would oil and chip over the top of them? **Rob Frey** – That is correct. **Dave Decker** – It looks like we are doing that on the three roads that we will be ditching. **Rob Frey** – Yes. **Rob Clarkson** – I would like to add that the three roads for ditching will most likely not get oiled and chipped this year. That is dependent on when the ditching stops. We need the ditching done before we start that. We will do some repairs, but the oil and chip will probably be pushed back because of the timeline and weather. **Dave Decker** – The ditching is on the side of the road and we are doing the repairs on the road. **Rob Clarkson** – My concern is elevation. **Dave Decker** – If the only thing we are doing is oil and chipping, we are not really changing the elevation of the road. **Rob Clarkson** – There are repairs on those roads that are very extent. **Dave Decker** – So we are looking at changing road height when doing those repairs? **Rob Frey** – Yes, quite a few of those roads have sink holes. Those will come up which will change water drainage. **Tony Harris** – It will come back up to what it was before they sank? **Rob Frey** – Yes. **Dave Decker** – We are going to do the repairs, right? **Rob Frey** – Yes. **Dave Decker** – So the drainage is going to change? Why wouldn't we oil and chip them? **Rob Frey** – Typically, we would do all of our dirt work first that way if you do tear up the road, you do not want to tear up the work we just did. Especially with heavy equipment driving on it. **Dave Decker** – We are not going to do the repairs until the ditching is done? **Rob Frey** – We do the ditching, the repairs and then we oil and chip. That is normally the cycle that it runs. **Monica O'Brien** – If they are held off until next year, is that going to be in next year's budget? **Dave Decker** – What you would do is carry over what you are not doing and specifically allocate it into next year's budget. Does the Board have any further questions or concerns? **Ali DeVries** – I think it sounds like a good plan. **Monica O'Brien** – I think it is reasonable as well. **Dave Decker** – We have already approved the ditching and the repair of the roads. We have already approved the oil and chipping of the two roads that were rebuilt last year.

Ditching: *Clover, Tamarach and Westview*

Oil and Chip: *Bahamas, Jamaica, Nassau, Deep Cove, Deep Water, Dubloon, Blvd De Cannes*

Finishing 2018 Project: *Sextant and Tampico*

Overflow Roads: *Waikiki, Gilbert and Cross Street*

Ali DeVries – Motions to approve the road plan as submitted.

Monica O'Brien – Seconds.

All in Favor.

Motion Carries.

Buoy Replacement/Repositioning Status

Rob Frey – Not much has changed on that. The buoys have been ordered and the delivery date for those is the 30th of this month. **Dave Decker** – Thank you.

Social Media and Website Updates

Ali DeVries – Megan has been posting daily updates. She has posted the upcoming movie night, Su Twan dam updates, PWC proposed rule and etc. It looks like we have had good engagement especially on the PWC rule. We are clearly reaching people whether they react to the post or not. I think the communication is going well.

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

She is going to continue with these patterns as close as possible and time permitting. You should see something every day of the work week.

Su Twan Dam Update

Rob Clarkson – Su Twan is complete, filled, the pump has been returned and finished under budget. One thing we have to complete is seeding and then we will be done. We just do not have the manpower to put it down.

Meeting with Sheriff's Department

Dave Decker – Matt, you had mentioned you had a meeting lined up with the Sheriff's Department and said we were going to get an update. **Matt Ressler** – We are still waiting on that meeting to occur with the recent holiday and busy schedules. Hopefully we will have that meeting here in the next few weeks.

New Business

Variance Request for Culvert, 44 Willow

Joe Seemiller, 44 – The details are on the request. I was hoping my contractor would be here. The culvert is not functioning. The water drainage is flowing on the sides of the culvert. What I am requesting to do is remove the culvert and regrade the elevation. **Dave Decker** – So the variance request is to not require a culvert. The Building Committee has their recommendations is as follows: we recommend the variance with homeowner's agreement to pay for the culvert if/when ditching is done. That is a standard thing we have done when we are asked for variances on culverts.

Monica O'Brien – Motions to approve the variance for culvert on 44 Willow Court.

Matt Ressler – Seconds.

All in Favor.

Motion Carries.

Correspondence

Monica O'Brien – We have a letter here from Gary and Peggy Lang. They are requesting repair needed on their street, Blvd De Cannes. Where the street meets their driveway, the street droops approximately five inches so every time they enter or exit their driveway, they have a huge bump. Both Maintenance and the Association Manager have taken a look two years ago. They were then told that it would have to be dug up and have the road rebuilt. At that time, that street was not on the budget but could be added later. They have been waiting two years but luckily that road was just approved for oil, chipping and repairs. **Matt Ressler** – That definitely solves their issue. We need to follow up with these folks that their street is on the list to be repaired. **Rob Clarkson** – I will do that.

Open Floor

Nothing discussed

Tony Harris – Motions to adjourn the meeting.

Ali DeVries – Seconds.

All in Favor.

Meeting adjourned at 8:41 PM.

Meeting Minutes submitted by Megan Jackson.