

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Date: March 11, 2020

Attendance

Present: Dave Decker, Ali DeVries, Tony Harris, Anthony Harrell, Steve Yates and Matt Ressler

Excused Absence: Shaun Diltz

Others Present

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

Holishor Members Present: 7

Proceedings

Meeting called to order at 7:30 PM

Pledge of Allegiance recited

Meeting Minutes of February 26, 2020

Anthony Harrell – Motions to approve the minutes as amended.

Steve Yates – Seconds.

All in Favor.

Motion Carries.

Transfers of Property

There are five transfers of property. There are four houses and one lot with three triggered initiation fees.

Bills & Salaries

Steve Yates – Motions to approve Bills & Salaries as submitted.

Anthony Harrell – 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

2020 Road Plan/Ditching

Rob Clarkson – Basically, the engineer met with Rob Frey and I and we walked phase two of the ditching plan. He is pretty optimistic that we could have bid packets and plans by the end of the summer. **Anthony Harrell** – Thank you, Rob.

Shoreline Erosion Prevention

Dave Decker – You have a copy of the revised version. **Ali DeVries** – Yes, these are the changes we made at the last meeting. I do see one change to make, it's just a repeated word under the first paragraph. **Anthony Harrell** – That is the only thing I saw also. **Dave Decker** – Does anyone else see any concerns with the rewrite? What we will do is table this until the next meeting. If the Lake Committee runs into any questions or thoughts, we will come back to it.

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Correspondence

Letter from Linda Campbell, 325 and Sue Johnson, 1371 – Welcome Wagon

We would like to restart the Holiday Shores Welcome Wagon to welcome new members to our unique and beautiful lake community. Welcome baskets would include such items as information on our community, HSSD and HSVFD, social organizations and clubs, local business and restaurants, local churches, etc. We would like your approval to have the new owners' names and address released to us when they purchase a new home or lot in Holiday Shores. We are aware this information is published in the Holiday Times, but not for one-two months. We would like to welcome newcomers within the first week or two of arrival at Holiday Shores, so we are asking for your approval to receive that information right away from the Holishor Office for the sole purpose of delivering a Welcome Wagon basket and welcoming new arrivals to Holiday Shores. We are members of the Holishor Association and live in Holiday Shores.

Ali DeVries – Motions to approve the notice to Linda and Sue of when new homeowners join the Association after closing.

Tony Harris – Seconds.

All in Favor.

Motion Carries.

Open Floor

By-Lot Assessment

Dave Decker – We received some information in regard to by-lot assessment project report. A committee was created a while back to look into going through a by-lot assessment rather than by membership. **Jerry Allen, 1024** – We have submitted a by-lot assessment project report along with a spreadsheet. A committee was created, that is Matt Ressler, Jane Unsell, Kay Slayden, Patti Brown, Susie Rives and myself. Based on the previous minutes from the previous Board meetings, Patti Brown had sent a letter to the Board which started this process. Some of the questions that came out that we wanted to answer was if multiple lot owners should be responsible for the upkeep of the road surfaces and ditching around their properties, how much revenue would be gained to benefit the community, how this affects the voting process to be fair to all owners, how many multiple lot owners we have, how many properties does this affect and do we review by lot number or parcel ID from Madison County. These are all questions that were asked at the Board meeting when this was brought up last September. We have gathered information from multiple resources, like this spreadsheet with information on parcels and ownership of parcels from the office. We also used the Madison County Tax Inquiry website to verify this information on multiple lot owners. The project report we submitted shows all the data we collected which I will summarize the best I can so you can understand what we are looking at. If you look at the spreadsheet, it shows general information at the top showing we have 1,261 memberships, 2,000 parcels reviewed and current assessment charge which is \$660.00, 22 miles of road, which Rob mentioned that may be a bit short. Some of this other data is what we used to get our calculations. From reviewing all of this data, we found that there are 266 people who own multiple lots. That could be two lots, three lots, all the way up to thirty-five lots. Out of those 266 people, they own 689 different parcels and out of those 689 parcels there are 416 vacant lots. That was one of the questions of how many lot owners can we could perhaps charge a fee to who are not paying to help with the roads. Out of those 416 vacant lots, there is 314 lots that touch each other that could be joined together. Out of the rest of them, there is 102 lots that are not. On the spreadsheet shows the number of improved joined lots. Improved is on here because that is what Madison County lists it as. Of those parcels on that list, you have 362 that are parcels that have been joined together, a majority of those are two lots joined together. There are also several with three or four lots. If you want to just look to see if it is just two lots together, there would be 181 joined properties out of those parcels. Then next one is a conjoined lot, basically those are lots with no improvement on them, but they have been joined according to Madison County. There are four improved partially joined are ones that been joined next to a partial piece of the lot next to it or even with an out lot. There is some farmland along with the Association that owns 104 parcels according to this spreadsheet. The Holiday Shores Sanitary District has two. The single owned parcels are one with one owner of one parcel, we did not look at those. We wanted to only look at multiple lot owners. There are 864 single owned parcels out here. The last on this list, we found three renter noted properties. This give us our grand total of

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

2,000 parcels. From that data, the question is how much money or revenue the Association could potentially have if we charged assessments for those vacant lots? For an annual basis, that would make a total of \$247,560.00 in addition to what we are currently receiving. The only problem with that is most of those lot owners have continuous lots that they could join together, so that number would decrease year over year so the income would decrease as well. Another scenario we came up with is incorporation. We do not know what the status was on incorporation but looking at the website for property taxes that we pay to the road and bridge fund to the different townships we are all part of. I used the number of \$200, there is some out here that are just lots and those lots may pay only \$40 or \$50 to the road and bridge fund. We have a lot of homes out here that are paying several hundreds of dollars. The \$200 was just an average, we could plug in whatever number we wanted to come up with an idea of what kind of money we could see. We multiplied that \$200 to 1,894 parcels minus the ones the Association and the Sanitary District owns, which totals to 1,894. That number is probably too high. It should probably be lower because there are joined properties out here, which would total to a lower number around 1,500. That is to give you an idea of what kind of numbers we are talking about, but we did not know what the status was of incorporation as far as where the Village Committee was at as far as that goes. This scenario would have less out of pocket expense for property owners out here because they are already paying that money to Madison County if we were to incorporate. The third scenario we have here is maybe charge a percentage of the budget for the roads basically meaning if we pay \$660.00 and 60% of that goes toward the road fund. We would charge the lot owners 60% of \$660.00 which would be \$396.00 and multiply that by 416 which is the total of vacant lot owners. That would give us a total of \$164,736.00 of potential revenue. Another scenario is to charge a flat fee to vacant lot owners. We use 250 in here as a number, you could change that number but multiple 250 to 416 to receive a total of \$104,000 of additional revenue. Those four scenarios I just described; you could modify the variables to change the numbers year to year. The last scenario we came up with was to charge by lineal foot of front of the property that touches the road. I've heard several times in meetings in the past that we have twenty-two miles of road, that may not be correct, but we used that as an example. There is twenty-two miles of road and we have properties on both sides of the road. We doubled that to get 44 miles of road, multiplying that by 5,280 feet per mile equaling to 232,320 lineal feet. There are some roads out here that do not have property on both sides like St. James for example, but that's a county road I believe. All of these numbers can be played with to get more of an accurate number. Most of the lots out here are 75 feet in the front, that is \$150 a year for that owner to pay. That doesn't sound unreasonable to me as far as a fee goes, or at least a starting point for a fee to charge. This is all lot owners. It doesn't matter if they are joined or not. Obviously, our roads out here are not in the best shape and need serious attention. Quite frankly, if we don't do something about them, our property values go down. Since a few committee members and I are here, we would be happy to answer any questions. **Dave Decker** – I was just working on the nomenclature between lot owners and parcels. Looking at your report, the third line down of the numbers, it says multiple lot owners. For example, my wife and I own our house. Does that mean we are multiple lot owners or the fact that we own more than one lot as a multiple lot owner. I am just working on that definition. **Jerry Allen, 1024** – Sure. Parcels and lots are something that could be easily intertwined. What that means is we went through all 2,000 lines of data and looked at it by individual owner. For you for example, I think you had four. **Dave Decker** – Yes. **Jerry Allen, 1024** – You have also joined a property, so you could have five, but you only have four. The multiple lot owners were counted only for people who have not joined their properties but have multiple lots. **Dave Decker** – The definition of multiple lot owners means somebody who owns multiple lots, not a lot owned by multiple people? **Jerry Allen, 1024** – Correct. If your name is on the Madison County as owner of that parcel or that lot. **Dave Decker** – For the example you gave, right now I have two lots joined together so they show up as one parcel. Like I said, the first line talks about parcels versus lots. Would that show up in this 2,000 as one or two? **Jerry Allen, 1024** – If you joined them, it would show as two but only counted once. The way this spreadsheet was provided to us, it is listed as per parcel. If you joined them and the parcel ID with Madison County is the same, it is still one. **Dave Decker** – That's where I was going. Using that as an example, I have two lots joined as one parcel, so it is one tax ID when they bill it. **Jerry Allen, 1024** – Correct. **Dave Decker** – This 2,000 number you started with for parcels is really a low number in regard to number of lots. **Jerry Allen, 1024** – This is the number of properties that they have listed in alphabetical order by owner. I believe you were on there five times; one lot had someone else's name as part owner, so that wasn't counted towards you. **Dave Decker** – I am half owner with someone on a lot. Technically, I own four and a half lots. **Jerry Allen, 1024** – There could be 2,100 but this is going off of the data

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

we received. **Dave Decker** – I'm not trying to give you a hard time, I'm just trying to understand the number. **Kay Slayden, 1785** – The sheet we got, your name for example, you have your house with the lot joined behind you. That was counted as one. **Dave Decker** – That means you counted my parcel. Back to my statement of this 2,000 number is low. I'm not challenging you on this, I'm just trying to understand the numbers. You referred to the one line for improved joined lots. Again, using me as an example, my house and an empty lot were joined together as one parcel. Is that what you are referring to? **Jerry Allen, 1024** – Yes. **Tony Harris** – That is counted as one or two in that number of 362? **Jerry Allen, 1024** – That is counted as two because those are actual lots. **Dave Decker** – I haven't had a chance to go over this because it was just handed to us tonight. **Matt Ressler** – Would the Board want to go through the spreadsheet tonight since we have part of the committee here? **Jerry Allen, 1024** – This spreadsheet can be played with, but we went through a detailed process. **Dave Decker** – What you have done is very good. Thank you very much for that work and research. I should have said that from the very beginning, and I apologize. **Jerry Allen, 1024** – When discussing with Rob and Matt before presenting this to you guys, I mentioned \$2 per lineal foot and he says the cost is \$2.41 per lineal foot so we were close. This does give the Association a lot more money up front. We also noted that what we thought would be a great idea is to include a line for a road fund on our statements for dues and assessments. That was just our idea. **Ali DeVries** – What are you looking for as an action from us? **Matt Ressler** – Well, what does the Board want to do? It was brought to us from a member to look into and that is what we did. We have all this data, so now the question is what does the Board want to do moving forward? Do we want to table this? Considering this information was just given to us tonight. **Anthony Harrell** – I want time to review it and stew on it for a little bit. This is excellent work. **Matt Ressler** – Yes, they did a fabulous job. **Tony Harris** – Rob, the number you used for roads. Is \$2.41 just straight lineal feet for the whole road width? **Rob Clarkson** – That is what it costs us last year to do per lineal foot. **Dave Decker** – When you say that, you mean chip and seal? **Rob Clarkson** – Yes. **Matt Ressler** – What is everyone's thoughts? **Ali DeVries** – Regardless, this has to go to vote anyway, right? **Matt Ressler** – Correct. It obviously would not go to this year's Annual Meeting. **Ali DeVries** – It wouldn't hurt to allow people to digest this information. **Dave Decker** – If you decide to change this, what other things do you need to focus on? All the by-laws that affect this. If you're going to, potentially going to, start a road assessment charge based upon our rules, you would still have to change the by-laws. The way our bylaws are set up is you charge based upon membership and you are looking to charge differently. That is my opinion. **Tony Harris** – That makes sense to me. **Anthony Harrell** – Looking at option five which is charge my lineal foot. If someone has two lots one side of the streets and two lots on the other side of the street, would they pay for both sides of the street? **Ali DeVries** – You would be charged both sides of the street in that case. **Dave Decker** – I'd be really challenged to charge someone based on their lineal foot because you have people who live on cul-de-sacs who do not have lineal foot, but they drive on the roads a lot farther to get to their home. Are you charging based upon how much footage they have in front of their home or how much they actually use the roads? **Matt Ressler** – That is something we would have to look into if we were to go that route. **Dave Decker** – The reality of that is if someone lives within one block of the community and only drives on St. James, that is a different scenario to the folks who lives further into the community and drives on the roads more regardless of how much road frontage they have. **Tony Harrell** – I am not for or against either proposal here, but the lineal foot option is something we would really have to look at because there are many points to consider. **Matt Ressler** – I am looking at the overall situation of what would be most beneficial to our community. Like it states here in their report, people are going to be joining their lots and basically losing that revenue. **Ali DeVries** – Between all these proposals we were given tonight, wouldn't we let the membership decide? **Dave Decker** – Well, are you going to propose all options or just one? How would that work with an absentee ballot process? **Tony Harris** – There is plenty of time for discussion. We as a Board have to decide on what we have to take to the membership. I need time to review and evaluate the data. **Matt Ressler** – We could go back and forth on this all evening. I say let's table this. **Anthony Harrell** – I would like to get a better look at the numbers and play around with this. **Tony Harris** – This is great information to have. Thank you.

Tony Harris – Motions to adjourn to Executive Session.

Steve Yates – Seconds.

Meeting adjourned to Executive Session at 8:32 PM

Meeting Minutes submitted by Megan Jackson

Holiday Shores
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Returning back to Regular Session at 9:21 PM

2021 Budget Revision

Dave Decker – After reviewing the budget documentation, it was identified that the line on the spreadsheet for the Madison County Patrols did not add up in the calculations. The proposal is to obviously add that into the expense side and remove the same amount from the road line. That would be the revision to the budget that is going to the Annual Meeting.

Steve Yates – Motions to approve the revised budget for the Annual Meeting.

Tony Harris – Seconds.

All in Favor.

Motion Carries.

Steve Yates – Motions to adjourn to exit the regular Board Meeting Part 2.

Anthony Harrell – Seconds.

All in Favor.

Regular Board Meeting Part 2 adjourned at 9:24 PM