



**Clark County Park District
Regular Monthly Board Meeting
December 17, 2020
6:00 p.m.**

1. Call To Order

- a. Commissioner Richards called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

- a. Commissioners in attendance were Randy Blankenship, Jeff Trefz, Roy Sweet, Jeff Wallace, Jana Williamson, Joey Ewing, and John Richards. Also in attendance was Executive Director Jeff Tippett.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Approval of Agenda

- a. Wallace motioned to approve the agenda, striking Executive Session. Ewing second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

5. Approval of Minutes

- a. Regular Monthly Board Meeting Minutes 11/19/20
 - i. Trefz motioned to approve the Regular Monthly Board Meeting Minutes dated 011/19/20. Sweet second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion Carried.

6. Public Comment

- a. Liz Brunson stated that tonight they are all there to approve a dock that will go in front of her dock. It was approved at the Dock Committee meeting and most likely, you are just going to stamp it and say sure. She just wanted to say again how wrong she thinks this is, this dock should not go in this close and directly in front of her dock. Once it goes in, her dock will be the only dock on the lake with a dock directly in front of it. At the Dock Committee meeting there was some discussion about some of the coves getting crowded but all of those docks have docks beside them, not directly in front of them. You can see from this picture that her dock will just be boxed in. They are installing a 35' gangway to get that dock all the way over in front of her dock. She will be the only person on the lake to have to zig zag to put their boat up. They are a big family and they live loud and large and get things done as she can see with what they have done with their property. They have forceful personalities and are used to things going their way as evidenced by the way they came in and rocked their point like oh yeah we are getting a dock in here without a permit. They purchased a property where the previous owner was approved for one slip without a roof and somehow parlayed it into a large two slip dock with a swim platform which didn't go into that spot, so now it is directly in front of my dock. He is not the only one who thought that this was wrong. Wyrick told her she better go in and find out about it until he found out that he was going to be selling them the dock. She talked to Mr. Tippett who didn't know if that plan would go in front of



the Board. Dr. Richards came over and he was like it doesn't look good to him but he is only one member of the Board. At the dock committee you could tell that some people didn't think that this was really right, Mr. Wallace she knows was a little reluctant to pass it, but no body stood up to say that it was wrong, so it went ahead and passed. She did get the impression that not everyone was comfortable with it. Her concerns was dismissed when one of the family members said that having their dock in front of hers wasn't important because most of the time is spent out on the boat. This is not the case for her, she spends the majority of the summer sitting on her dock. She can't be out on the lake all day because she already spends all of her time at the dermatologist. She is on her dock every day and would venture to guess that she is on her dock more than anyone else on the lake. She still does not understand why the dock gets to go directly in front of her dock. She was told countless times by Charity and previous Boards, back when they were trying to get her dock out of there so they could lease the lots, that owners of docks on the lake had no right to have their dock on the shoreline correspondent to their property. She was told many times that when the lease lots were leased that her dock would have to be moved to somewhere the Board wanted to put it. It seems to her that this dock could be moved further up the lake anywhere, it is beautiful up there and there is no property owners. The property next to Hunter's property is Park Property and then there is the farm. It seems that it could be moved further up the lake so it will not interfere with her dock. That is all that she has, she just wants to say that she thinks this is terribly wrong to put another dock in front of her dock.

- b. Mr. Williams commented that they are just looking for the same opportunity to and privilege that she was given in that cove. They aren't asking for more. The physical size is the same as hers. They have moved it as far as they can and they have coordinated with the park for the best spot. They are just asking for the same privilege that she was given.
- c. Mr. Hamilton commented that he is just there to follow up from last week. They had a discussion about the concerns and he thinks that they came to the conclusion that there is no alternative. They are here to represent themselves and their dock.
- d. Mr. Allender commented that he is there because their dock got approved for their dock this year in that same cove. They are just here because they have a vested interest in it.

7. Director's Report

- a. Tippet commented that he wanted to bring up the hunter's program that they started this year. He put in some graphs that they created to show them some of the increases that they have seen with opening the park to out of district hunters. In October of last year, we had an average occupancy of 33.38% in our cabins and this year it jumped up to 42.94%. The big one was in November, last



year we were at 18.66% capacity for our cabins in the month of November, and this year we were at 56.4% in occupancy. By opening the park up to out of district hunters, we have increase our revenue right in the area of \$24,000, which he thinks is pretty amazing for the first year.

- b. Tippettt went on to say another thing he wanted to bring up to them is a burglary at the Buechler Shelter during hunting season. It was in the afternoon right at dusk, they popped a window out of a guy's car and took the case to his bow. We have a vehicle description and couldn't get a license plate. It has been seen in the area more than once so they are keeping an eye out for it. That is pretty much all he has for them, everything else is self-explanatory.
- c. Wallace asked Tippettt if he has any projections for the following months as far as cabins, do you have online reservations above where we were last year to which Tippettt responded no, it will be the same as last year.
- d. Sweet asked what the status is of the pipe, the weather is going to get bad soon and the ground is going to freeze, he is just curious as to what his plan with the pipe is. Tippettt commented that as soon as Haws is done putting the water lines in the new cabin, he believes that he is moving on to the pipe. We pulled the rock boat the other day which they felt was a pretty major endeavor to get it out of the water before it started freezing. As they saw, they have the pipe out by the spillway in the back. The road has already been cut so they will just pop it out, and hopefully just pop in a new one. Sweet wondered if the backhoe was going to be big enough to which Tippettt responded that he doesn't know if the backhoe is going to be big enough to pick up the trench bucks or not. He called JJet rentals to get a weight on it and they don't know. Sweet commented that was his concern/

8. Payment of Bills – Discussion and Vote

- a. Ewing motioned to pay the bills in the amount of \$40,699.47. Blankenship second. Blankenship aye, Trefz aye, Sweet aye, Wallace aye, Williamson aye, Ewing aye, Richards aye. 0 nays. Motion carried.

9. Old Business

- a. Discussion presentation of Executive Director reviews to Board President
 - i. Richards asked if anyone had their forms with them and if they would give them to Wallace that would be great. Wallace commented that what he is doing is collecting them. He will keep them and then they will be compiled and averaged out so that by the January meeting they will have that ready for Tippettt and be on schedule for him.

10. New Business

- a. Discussion and Vote New Dock Williams, Hamilton South end of Lake
 - i. Richards commented that they did discuss this in committee, both sides, for and against the proposed dock made their cases like they did this evening. They discussed different ways to move the dock to make it less



obstructing and stuff like that and what it basically comes down to is water and usability of the dock. There were ideas to moving it closer to the rental cabin docks which is appealing, however the water there is quite shallow and without dredging or doing some other major kind of work, it seems that there wouldn't be enough water there for boats and a dock and things like that. You have heard both sides' argument for and against placement. The consensus of the committee after looking at all the options and decided that as it is proposed is the most reasonable place to put it to make it usable as it is currently configured and as they would like to use it. He will just leave it at that.

- ii. Sweet stated that he has a question. As he understands, there was a dock that was going to go in there prior to this one and it was okayed, was it a different size to which Richards commented yes, it was a different size. Trefz asked if the location was the same to which Tippet responded that it was moved less than 10 feet to the east. Richards commented that it is in a similar location. Sweet commented so there must be a dramatic difference in sizes to which Richards responded that there was a difference in size and that one has a roof and the other one did not. There is a difference in the footprint and the vertical. Sweet commented that by listening to Public Comment that in order to get to her dock she will have to zig zag to get to her dock, is that the way you saw it when you went to look at it to which Richards responded that from where her boat slip is, she would have to make a turn to go out around the other dock or if she is coming in she would have to around the other one and turn in. There is about 150' there for her to do it and so if her boat slip was on the other side of her dock it would be more of a straight shot but with where her boat slip is and the jog, it makes it a little more complicated for her he thinks. It is not a straight shot out into the channel for her but it is doable. He thinks that this is more about the dock is larger and more of a visual obstruction than what was previously proposed from what Heighton proposed. Sweet stated that he has another question. According to the last young man who spoke, he will be putting a dock back in that cove also to which Ewing commented that there is a picture of where all three of those docks are located. Wallace commented that he would be the furthest left to which Ewing commented towards the dam, yes. Richards commented it was page 23. Wallace clarified that the one that is in the middle, that is the Brunson dock to which Richards confirmed. Wallace then clarified that the one on the left is where Allender's is going to which Ewing responded yes. Sweet asked if there was a possibility of another one going in that cove to which Richards commented yes, one. The other possible one would be



- between the one that Hamilton and Williams are proposing and the cabin docks, which is also something that they have to consider. They can't put theirs too close to the cabin docks. They can't put theirs too close to the cabin docks eliminating the potential for Mike Hunter to put a dock in.
- iii. Sweet asked if this dock was smaller, would alleviate the problem, if the size was a little bit different, would it make a difference? Ewing commented that where the dock is proposed, even if it was even a little smaller dock, it would still be in front of Brunson's dock. You would still have to navigate. The one picture looks like it is dead in line and another picture looks like it is off to the side, there is 150' between all that. It would still be in front if it was a single slip or a 9 hole slip, it would be in front of her dock. It seems like the biggest argument is the location of that dock and it obstructing the view. Getting a boat in there, there shouldn't be any reason that you couldn't get a pontoon, a ski boat, or anything around there. There is plenty of water that way, the question is the physical view when you are sitting on the dock looking out. You are going to have a dock to your right and a dock to your left out in front of there.
 - iv. Trefz commented in the picture that he has, they have obviously discussed flip flopping the dock around, can you turn this at a 90 degree angle so that it is facing out in the channel to which Richards commented that was the ideal solution, but the way that the point is, and you can't see it on the black and white photos, you could see it on the color photos that we had the other night, it comes out there quite a ways and without a major dredge, you would not be able to do that. And then like he said, the more you move it around more toward the cabin dock, the tighter it gets in there for another dock to come in. They are darned if they do and darned if they don't.
 - v. Ewing stated that the people who are proposing that have gone to great lengths to put together a mock up so that you can see exactly where it is going to go, the visual aid is there.
 - vi. Wallace commented that Brunson stated that Wyrick made a comment about not liking it or something to which Brunson stated yeah, early on he was like you can't let them put there dock in front of yours like that. Wallace commented that he was here at the meeting the other night and didn't say anything like that. Brunson commented that he is now selling them the dock so he is all in. Wallace commented that he was going to say anything that was negative that he had an open forum to bring it to us. Brunson commented that now he is wanting that dock. He keeps telling her that it will be fine. Wallace clarified that in the past he told her this to which Brunson responded yes. She went on to say is that



people are telling her that this is not right but then they aren't really saying that publically in a meeting.

- vii. Richards commented that he would have like to have seen that dock shifted more around toward the cabin docks but it is just not feasible to do that. He wasn't aware of the water depth in there, it just doesn't feasible without a major, he means a major dredge. That point seems like it goes way out into the lake.
- viii. Sweet commented that it's not going to get any better when the 3rd and 4th dock want to go in back there. And then with the other, it is just not going to cure itself. But, he hates to tell these folks that they can't have a dock when this lady has a dock, he wishes there was a remedy. It sounds like they have looked it over and done their due diligence.
- ix. Richards commented to Brunson that he thinks that everyone is trying to be sensitive to her plight, but they are just trying to be as equitable as they possibly can and go through all the permutations and locations and every other thing they are doing to try and make this thing fit. Unfortunately, it is not what she wants. He doesn't know how to get around that, he doesn't know how to make all the parties involved in this happy.
- x. Brunson commented couldn't they move it up the lake a little on the other side of that little cove to which Ewing responded that there is no water there. Richards commented that is going to have them crossing the cabin access and them having an exceedingly long path. Brunson stated that she has been told many many times, and maybe this has changed, when she moved here and they were getting ready to lease out those lots, the policy then was that they didn't care where my house was, they could put my dock anywhere that they wanted. Richards commented that the dock is supposed to be within your property boundaries where it meets up with the park and they are lenient on that in an effort to provide a dock for those lots that don't have the best water. They can say no, you may have property that joins up to the park but the water is too shallow and you are just out of luck but they try very hard not to do that, to be equitable, allow people who own those properties access to the lake. He understands but he also can't see making them walk a quarter mile or more to their dock, it doesn't seem right.
- xi. Ewing motioned to accept the dock proposed by Williams and Hamilton on the south end of the lake as it was presented in the Lake Management Committee Meeting and tonight and to approve that dock to go in there.
 - 1. Sweet asked for further discussion and asked Tippettt if this is what he would recommend to which Tippettt responded yes.



2. Sweet second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion was approved.

b. Discussion and Vote Regulations for New Docks

- i. Richards asked Sweet if this was something that he wanted to discuss to which Sweet responded that he got his answers already. He has some questions and he did a little research and found out what he needed to know.
- ii. Ewing asked what his discussion for regulations on the docks was to which Sweet commented it was about the size of the docks. You go down past Buechler and you go down where the gravel lane goes back where you can bank fish and there's a picnic table back there. If you look down there, and you see docks with platforms above them and affixed chairs all over the place. He guesses that's nice, but how big is too big. It seems to him like it is out of control, the size of these things. From what he understands, he already has his answer. You can walk back there and look over and wonder to yourself, how big do you have to have it. If it keeps going like that, there is going to be more problems than this. It is just going to continue to grow, and then someone is going to come in and say, well if that dock was half the size, then I could have mine here. He knows that there is a lot bigger fish to fry than this right now, but...Richards commented that we do have a limit, it is like 40% of your lake frontage, isn't that correct? So if you have 100 feet of lake frontage, property that abuts the park and it is 100 feet, then you are limited to 40 feet, the longest side of your dock he does believe. There is a limit and that could be addressed in the future if he would like to do something like that, but this is currently how it is.
- iii. Ewing commented that like they discussed in the Lake Management meeting, we discuss the lake and he has mentioned that in a Lake Management Meeting that they need to sit down and look at an aerial view of the lake and figure out and determine where lake docks can go in and where they cannot go now. There are certain areas around the lake where a dock is not able to go in because our docks are already there or our rental docks or there are certain areas of the lake where we need to sit down and look at. Lake docks can go here, here, and here, but this area of the lake whether you buy property here or not, we don't care, this is a non-build lake side. That is something that he thinks we need to look at now moving forward. We are probably averaging two new docks a year, and some of those docks are old docks and people want a newer, better, or bigger dock. You are right, there are some areas that will accommodate a bigger dock and there are some areas that won't. Some of those docks that you are seeing from Buechler at the table, some of those docks have been there a long time. Those docks probably started



off as small docks, and they have added on. That is the nice thing about this, every dock change has to come before the dock for discussion to see if the dock will fit there or if it has to be moved or if that is the spot where a dock can go, not to deny anybody a dock. If you are going to spend the money to have lake park property, how can you tell this guy no and this guy yes. That is why we need to look at that on the map and determine where docks can and can't go for future reference to avoid any, he guesses screaming and yelling. Richards commented that he thinks that this is something that should be addressed and they can take it on in committee and move forward with that.

- iv. Wallace commented that they all have to look back on the park history, he has talked to Richards a little bit about this, our history is important to us. There was a gentleman who came here 40 years ago and told them when they were talking about building lease docks on this lake. He said he went from a lake manager to a dock manager. We have been faced in the past, but not lately, and it has been real troublesome, the things that has went on with docks. Nobody was on the same level, there should have put some forethought into it, maybe they should have had cluster docks instead of individual docks or whatever. Twenty years ago, about the year 2000 when Larry Bender was coming off the Board, there was a committee formed and they actually had a map created and had adopted no-build areas on the lake. He doesn't know what happened, it just got pushed off to the side. He does think that they should address this because they have properties around this lake of 40 acres or whatever that could be sold off, those properties can be bought by an investor or a developer and they need to tell them right up front, don't come in because these are no build zones. He doesn't think that they will have much development on the other side but he does think that they might still have some on this side. Ewing commented that there is still a whole other subdivision over there that could develop and that is why they need to get this out ahead of it. He thinks this needs to be the next couple of meetings to get that map out and get it in front of the Board and get it voted upon, so it is a least in the minutes of the meeting that they actively approached it.

c. Discussion and Vote Implementing of Online Reservations

- i. Tippet commented that he sent everybody a proposal on online reservations, it is pretty forth going and simple. He sent them some emails of some questions that were asked and answered, basically he is trying to attract more business through the cabins and camping. Last year from June through October, the average occupancy was at 82.86% which he feels is pretty good. Our cabins June through November were



at 56.89%, which he thinks we can do better, specifically in the Monday through Thursday range. He would like to move the cabins into more of a destination than a rental, or fishing cabin. The online reservations may seem to do the trick. For a minimum amount of money up front, it is the only one that is capable of interfacing with Campground Master, which is a huge thing. It is on several websites, it will be on our website that you can go on. Everything that we rent or lease on this lake will be on the website online transaction as well as go camp online transactions so that people can be literally making reservations for our boats or our campsites at night when no one is here, we are closed. If you read the proposal that he sent them, they will see that not only can they make the reservation at night, everything has to be paid for, so we aren't doing any collection other than automated collection. We lose 4% if it comes off our website and up to 7% if it comes off of go camping. It doesn't make that much difference, he thinks that is a pretty good tradeoff for the increased business that we could have.

- ii. Williamson asked if it comes off of any of the other reservation sites like Travelocity to which Tippett responded that it can but it is not set up to work with Travelocity or Expedia or anything like that. They can do it but then their percentage of revenue will go up. They are working on it but they don't have it yet.
- iii. Wallace asked if a user goes on it can they look and see what sites are already booked to which Tippett responded yes, any days that are booked and any reservations that are made they gray them out so that you can't use them. It is the same with boats and cabins and shelters and everything else, they gray them out. Let's say that Fowler comes in in the morning and fires up Campground Master, it will show her what was reserved overnight. If she tries to rent a sight that was rented overnight, it will be grayed out and she won't be able to do it.
- iv. Trefz asked if he had any idea as to what the cancellation policy would be to which Tippett responded that the cancellation policy would be whatever we want it to be. The only thing that we are not looking to get back is the 4%. So if you put \$20 down on a campsite and they take their 4% or \$.80 or whatever, if they cancel, it is up to us if we want it to go on as a credit or their credit card. That is all in the set up process of the whole thing. He thinks it is just a progression of what we need to do going forward. Ewing commented that they are not only looking at the campground, this is camping, boating, cabins, anything that we rent or lease. Tippett commented that the only thing that you cannot do is buy gas. Wallace commented so you can rent a pontoon boat to which Tippett responded yes you can. Ewing stated so all of that will go into



this database and will all go there to which Tippett responded yes. Ewing clarified that we will still have control of it in house to make changes, if there is a boat that needs to be fixed then we can pull it where it cannot be rented to which Tippett commented yes we would just gray it out. Ewing clarified that we can do this manually and adjust the site to which Tippett responded yes.

- v. Williamson asked if Tippett had talked to another park to which Tippett responded that he had called and talked to Tom Hintz about his online reservations. His is a totally different system than this, he said when he first came online it was sketchy, they had some issues that they had to work out. He said it took about a year to work it out. What he did was just reserve one spot, he has A, B, and C campgrounds he guesses, he took C and that was for online reservations to see how it would work out. Now he has all of them online for reservation and now the state is going to change them to a completely different system and he is going to have to redo it all anyway. He is not going to be happy. He likes it and he had an increase in business. He keeps trying to ask, if there is an exception to how much percentage that you expect in a normal campground for this to go up and they don't have that expectation for him, but he thinks that this could do nothing but benefit the park.
- vi. Trefz asked how the timeframe would work, how far in advance could you make your reservation to which Tippett responded that we can set that up for any time we want, we can do 2 years, 5 years, but typically it is 2 years in advance. It should not affect our first right of refusal as long as Appendix A is followed. Before they check out, they would put their deposit down and it would stay grayed out, if they don't then it is open to reservations. He doesn't say that he has all the answers because they really haven't talked to anybody, this has all been done via email. Trefz commented that it seems like they can work with the park to create a program for us and it is not just set.
- vii. Wallace motioned to work towards implementing our Campground Master with the Hercules integration with the dollar amounts proposed this evening. Trefz second.
 - 1. Ewing asked for further discussion. He asked what the additional \$320 for 5 year pack support for up to 5 hours, what is that to which Tippett responded that it is if we have questions or problems for the first 5 hours. Ewing clarified that anything over the 5 hours would go to tech support and we would get billed to which Tippett confirmed. Ewing asked if they do provide tech support for this because he knows that in the past with Campground Master there is a number that you can call and they



have been like you guys figure it out. The additional 4% and 7%, will that be on top of the accounting fee or will we just absorb that to which Tippet responded that at this point it is set up that we would absorb it, but we could put on an online booking fee going forward because that is common for that convenience. He wanted to talk to someone and get a demo, but in order to get a demo, you have to pay the money.

2. Wallace clarified that they can go back at some point and assess the fee on it to which Tippet responded yes.
3. Ewing stated that he fills it is really workable as long as we can navigate it.
4. Trefz aye, Sweet aye, Wallace aye, Williamson aye, Ewing aye, Richards aye, Blankenship aye. 0 nays. Motion carried.

d. Discussion and Vote 2020-2021 Levy of Taxes and Certificates

- i. Wallace stated that there is something that he wants to ask of the Board. Right now we are assessing a flat amount that comes out to \$184,036 a year. He doesn't know how long it has been since Dan was there to which Williamson commented that he left in March of 2008. Wallace commented so about 12 or 14 years ago, we were assessing at about \$140,000 and he was off the Board for a period of time and they raised is \$40,000. He feels like the Park District is doing really well because of the work of the Board, and he feels like this Board is working pretty well together. Because of the staff, he feels like the staff has done really well in gelling things together. What he would like to propose this evening, and he has mentioned it in the past, he would like to see the Tax Levy go down just a little bit. We can raise taxes by no more than 5% without going to a public referendum. If we raise it more than that then we have to the public and hold a hearing and all that. What he is asking the Board to do this evening is to cut the Tax Levy by \$7,500. That is less than 5% so if we need to come back next year and really need that \$7,500, we just going ahead and ask for it back. The reason he is asking for this is because the park is doing really well. We are getting ready to add another cabin which he thinks will make up the money they will be losing in the taxation if they forego the \$7,500, he knows that everybody is having a hard time right now. He is privy to a lot of information about what is happening at TRW and he doesn't see that company being there more than 2-3 years. There is 740 employees. It is really easy to raise taxes, but we are doing a really good diligent job here and he thinks that by us doing this, and it is not that much of an amount, but if every government entity was as conscious about their money and everything, we would all be doing good. He just thinks it would be great and that by



doing this we are showing the other government entities what we are doing and to show our constituents what we are doing. 5% of what they are taking would be like \$9,000, he is only asking them for \$7,500 which is well below 5%.

- ii. Ewing commented that he knows that that they can raise and lower per line item, if he remembers correctly. If they lose that 5%, will that underfund IMRF again? Before we have had some issues in the past with IMRF being underfunded and it took a little time to pick up the difference but he thinks that they are right on kilter right now and if we take the 5% overall, will that underfund us in IMRF if they would be better off to take it per line item. Just so that it doesn't get us in trouble 2 or 3 years down the road and we are underfunded again. Wallace commented that he wasn't so concerned about where they took the money from, from which line item and all that, just that they reduce the total amount by \$7,500. Richards clarified that this is about 4% to which Wallace responded approximately. Wallace went on to say that he has brought this up in the past and it has always been that they have a lot of projects going on and he is aware that there are those projects that are going to continue to go on. We have roads that need to be fixed, we have a boat ramp that needs to be repaired, but we have shown over the part 5-6 years, we have shown, our taxpayers should be happy about what is going on out here compared to what has happened in the past.
- iii. Sweet stated that our taxpayers are wondering why they are paying taxes, he doesn't think that they are thankful. They are a percentage of them who never come out here who are sitting there wondering why they are paying taxes for something they never use. He doesn't think that they are going to be real thankful. Wallace commented that this tax wasn't even supposed to last this long. When it was sold to them, that within 20 years it would be self-sufficient. Personally, he doesn't think that they will ever get to the point where we are self-sufficient. He feels like he is trying to do a civic duty here and serve a purpose. Most people won't even miss it on their tax bill.
- iv. Richards asked Ewing to clarify what it is that he is worried about. Ewing commented that in the past, the IMRF from the Levy that we had, we weren't receiving enough for IMRF, which is the retirement to fund our retirees. We weren't receiving enough so either we had to make up the difference ourselves or we could raise that line item to be collected by taxes. He thinks that Steve Turpin was big into that and he got to looking into, they moved line items or something, he cannot remember exactly what happened so don't quote him, but he thinks our IMRF is square now where the amount of money that they are receiving is going to cover the



retirements that they have. Sweet commented well it is \$7,064.00 right now, he supposes you could do the math. Ewing commented that you could probably leave all of that alone for right now, and just take it out of the corporate fund or the recreation fund, because that would leave everything else alone where they would still be the same amount of dollars. He is almost sure that it is per line item, not one lump sum.

- v. Ewing asked when they have to file this to which Tippet responded that it is this month or January.
- vi. Ewing stated that his take on it is that lowering taxes is great, and he thinks they can all agree. He thinks that we are the lowest taxing body in the state, \$7,500 is a lot of money but in the grand scheme of things, it is not that much. Everybody would be saving \$1.50 or \$2 on their tax bill. He knows that his bill is \$38 and you times that by everyone in the county, so you are looking a decrease of a dollar or two. If you did away with the levy, it is going to be real hard to bring back. What he is saying is that wound is healed over, and then you lower it and then the minute you say tax increase, everybody starts filling this room up.
- vii. Sweet commented that he is not just worried about our tax levy. If you look around, that seems to be a "cure all." Like Martinsville Schools wants to raise taxes again, he isn't saying that they don't need it, but that's not the answer. You can't just keep digging into people's pocket when people don't have a lot in their pockets to begin with. Everybody in here knows it is true. The outlook right now is looking fuzzy. It is not just this, it is the whole idea of the taxation, every time something goes awry, you just can't keep raising taxes. Ewing commented that he has said in the past that if they could show a couple years where they were sustaining a substantial grown, then they could entertain a lesser levy. He is all for lowering the taxes, it's just three years down the road, it is going to be harder to get it back and a lot of people are going to be upset.
- viii. Blankenship commented that if you stay below 5%, he won't be any trouble at all to get it back if it doesn't work out. Ewing commented that it can go without a vote, it is just the mindset of the people. Blankenship commented that it will be the same way, they won't even notice \$2 more or less.
- ix. Wallace commented that if they do get in that position, he will make the motion if he is still on the Board at that time, to raise the taxes and he will take the grief for it. Richards commented that they shouldn't get into that position. If we find ourselves in that position, it is our own fault. Wallace commented that they have over \$1 Million in the bank right now and he thinks they can see where they have made good ground in the last couple of years to which Ewing agreed. Wallace continued by saying that



with ZF, TRW, Marshall would be in a world of crap, because their utilities would be just as high as everyone else is outside of town. The City is going to be in a stink.

- x. Wallace motioned to reduce our Tax Levy amount that is currently \$184,036 by the amount of \$7,500. Sweet second.
 - 1. Richards asked for further discussion. Richards commented that if he is going to make that motion, could he make a motion to take it out of one of those numbered columns. Wallace asked Tippet where he would like it taken from.
 - 2. Sweet no, Wallace no, Williamson no, Ewing no Richards no, Blankenship no, Trefz no. 0 ayes. Motion not carried.
- xi. Wallace motioned to reduce the total of our Tax Levy from \$184,036 by \$7,500 with \$3,750 coming out of corporate and \$3,750 coming out of Recreation. Sweet second. Wallace aye, Williamson aye, Ewing aye, Richards aye, Blankenship aye, Trefz aye, Sweet aye. 0 nays. Motion carried.

11. Executive Session

- a. None

12. Committee Reports

- a. Campers
 - i. Ewing commented that campers did not meet but he would like to schedule one. They have the proposal back from Saluki that shot grade in the A section of the campground so he would like to move forward with it and just give them a general overview of what's proposed. He would like to go back to the original first Thursday of the month at 6:30. Richards asked when is that to which Tippet responded January 7th.
- b. Lake Management
 - i. Richards commented that Lake Management met and they basically discussed what was discussed tonight. There was not much else that was discussed at that meeting that he could recall. We typically don't meet the same night as camping to which Tippet responded that Trails usually meets at 6 and then camping at 6:30 on the first Thursday. Richards clarified then Lake Management is the second Thursday to which Tippet responded that it can be. It is where you make it. Richards commented that he would like to get on what Ewing was talking about in kind of looking around the lake and making some areas conservation areas or area that just aren't conducive to building docks and things like that and kind of outline those for that. Would anyone oppose having that on the same night as the campers meeting or would you rather have that on a different night? Ewing commented that you are going to be kind of full because you have trails at 6 and then camping at 6:30 so it going to be a



full night. Wallace commented that he doubts that they will have a trails meeting. Ewing commented that it needs to be a standalone because camping usually runs, it could be an hour or it can be 10 minutes. Richards commented that the second Thursday would be fine at 6, at 6p.m.

- ii. Blankenship asked if they could adjust the audit portion of the Tax Levy to reflect the amount of the audit from like the general fund or we want to just leave it the same and make it up out of our pocket. Tippett commented that he would need to ask the Accountant. Blankenship commented that he knows that the audit is \$12,000 and they are only showing \$4,000.
 - iii. Trefz commented on the new cabin they are building and how purchasing all of the lumber they needed early, because now the prices have doubled and even tripled. It worked out really good for everyone and it is really nice. Sweet stated that he and his wife are out here almost every day walking and these guys are go getters and the ladies too. You don't come out here, and you see them doing it. The work they are doing is great and he appreciates it. Tippett stated that it is a team effort.
- c. Finance
 - i. None
 - d. Policy
 - i. None
 - e. Trails
 - i. None

13. Adjourn

- a. Wallace motioned to adjourn the meeting. Blankenship second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
- b. Meeting was adjourned at 7:06 p.m.