



**Clark County Park District  
Regular Monthly Board Meeting  
July 16, 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 Roy Sweet, Jeff Trefz, Jana Williamson, Jeff Wallace, Joey Ewing, Randy Blankenship, and John Richards. Also in attendance were Executive Director Jeff Tippett, Office Manager Danielle Brown, and Maintenance Supervisor Deke Haws.
- 3. Pledge of Allegiance**
- 4. Approval of Agenda**
  - a. Blankenship motioned to approve the agenda with switching the last two items of New Business around. Wallace second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
- 5. Approval of Minutes**
  - a. Regular Monthly Board Meeting 6/18/20
    - i. Sweet motioned to approve the Regular Monthly Board Meeting Minutes dated 6/18/20. Blankenship second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
- 6. Public Comment**
  - a. None
- 7. Director's Report**
  - a. Tippett stated that we purchased two trucks, a 2012 Dodge and a 2007 Ford. Both are what they would consider to be in good shape and they should get a lot of miles out of them. The diesel has 150,000 mile on it and the gas engine has 120,000. There is a brand new transmission in the Dodge.
  - b. Tippett commented that they bought a John Deere 450 Bulldozer which has less than 3,000 hours on it. It is in really good shape, it has brand new tracks on it and gears. It is doing a fine job out at OHV.
  - c. Tippett stated that our first quarter OHV has been submitted for the bulldozer, the excavator, the chainsaws, any small equipment we purchased under the OHV grant. We don't expect payment until September, just so that they are aware of this.
  - d. Tippett commented that he just showed everyone the thruster that will be going on the rock boat. They are planning on two weeks from now having the rock boat in the water and working.
- 8. Payment of Bills**
  - a. Ewing asked what the Global Tech Systems was for to which Brown responded it was for radios.



- b. Wallace motioned to approve the payment of bills as presented. Ewing second. Trefz aye, Williamson aye, Wallace aye, Ewing aye, Blankenship aye, Richards aye, Sweet aye. 0 nays. Motion carried.

## 9. Old Business

- a. Discussion and Vote Committee Chairpersons
  - i. Richards commented that those are outlined in their packet.
  - ii. Wallace commented that one question that he has about it is that he thinks that on some committees they have like 5 people. To have a meeting you have to have 3 of those people in attendance. Tippet commented that policy has 4, Finance has 4. Williamson asked don't they have to have a minimum of 3 to which Blankenship responded you only have to have 2. Blankenship commented that you have to have 2 people here to have a meeting, but if you have 3 then 2 still works. If you have 4, you have to have 3. 3 should be the maximum. Wallace commented that is what happened at the trails meeting. He is not trying to throw people off of it, he just thinks that the people on the committee know that it is real important for them to inform them if they are not going to be there so they can make sure there is enough in attendance. Sweet commented so the policy committee has more people than they should have in there. Brown stated that policy has 5. Sweet volunteered to drop from policy.
  - iii. Richards went through them one by one. Blankenship volunteered to come off of trails. Richards asked Wallace if he would be willing to chair that committee to which Wallace confirmed.
  - iv. Richards confirmed that Campers Committee they left alone, Trails committee we are going to change with Jeff Wallace as chair and removing Blankenship. Finance Committee/Master Plan, Wallace recommended leaving it alone. Richards went on with Lake Management Committee there are only 3, so they will leave that one alone, Policy/Community Parks, they will leave Williamson as the chair and remove Sweet and he will also take himself off of that. That leaves three. Williamson as the chair, Blankenship, and Wallace. The Third of July Committee has three persons on it and he thinks that will be ok.
- b. Discussion and Vote of Approval of Treasurer's Report
  - i. Richards commented that they went over this and discussed this at the Finance Meeting and everything looked fine.
  - ii. Trefz motioned to approve the Treasurer's Report. Blankenship second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
- c. Discussion and Vote repaving parking lot front of office
  - i. Tippet stated that in the budget they have put aside \$57,000 for the paving and lighting and he thinks they have it on there for in front of the office. If they are going to do this they are going to have to let Dallas



know so he can pencil us in. He is looking for an approval vote. Richards asked if he had an estimated cost to which Tippet responded \$57,000 was his estimate. That would make the office square and punch it out a few feet and then the road that leads out to the main road. Wallace asked if it includes the back to which Tippet responded it is only the front. Sweet asked how many loads of asphalt does that constitute to which Tippet responded he doesn't know. He wrote all of the estimates down several months back. The front office was \$57,000 and the Board had indicated to put that into the budget. He needs to give him some notice. Wallace asked if there was any recourse to bidding that out to which Tippet responded that we have an intergovernmental agreement so that is what he went by. Wallace commented that he was just wondering if there was a way to get it done any cheaper. Blankenship commented that he doubts that we are going to find anyone cheaper than the Clark County Highway Department, but do we want to spend that money here or out there in the park. Wallace commented that they can't really do much in the campground if you are still running water lines or grading anything back there. He doesn't know if they have any other areas that, Tippet commented that they are more expensive.

- ii. Sweet commented that he remembers them being high estimates. Wallace commented that he thinks that the total for the entire park was going to be over \$900,000. Williamson commented that at least it would be a start, how long has it been since it was done. Sweet commented that he isn't arguing that, he just thinks it would be nice to know how many loads.
- iii. Ewing commented that \$50,000 seems a little high for sweeping it and overlaying it. Blankenship commented that they don't know how much he is going to use, if he makes it 4". Richards commented that he thinks the last time there were some specs for what he is going to do.
- iv. Tippet stated this is for the overlay and seal coat at the office entrance road and the parking area. Expand lot by 1222 square, \$57,000. We have boat loads of other, we have a \$42,000 estimate for in front of the dump station, but he would not recommend doing that at this point. We are probably going to lay a pipe there.
- v. Sweet commented that they know that it is not going to get any better, it is not good for people to get out and step in a hole, they might break an ankle. Richards stated that it seems to hold water. We can't do it all at once, we have to take it at bite sized chunks.
- vi. Ewing clarified that we have \$57,000 in paving and lighting right now to which Tippet responded yes. The couple of hundred missing out if it was for some cold patching that we did. We paid for it out of roads so he will



be going over a little. We need to do some more cold patching so we may have to add \$1,000 to it after 6 months. Ewing asked how much cold patching he is wanting to do later on? If we do this now it is going to pretty much exhaust our budget as far as cold patch. Tippet commented he put out 4 tons this spring and there are a few holes that have popped up so we will need another 4 tons. He thinks it was \$300 and something for the cold patch.

- vii. Blankenship motioned to approve the repaving of the office road and the parking lot. Sweet second. Williamson aye, Wallace aye, Ewing aye, Blankenship aye, Richards aye, Sweet aye Trefz aye. 0 nays. Motion carried.

## 10. New Business

- a. Discussion and Vote Silt Removal Northlake Subdivision
  - i. Tippet commented that they have had several discussions as to whether they are going to spend some time and erosion money to help people with the silt removal as it comes along. Northlake Subdivision, they have already had it done, and I told him to save his bills per our conversation. They seem to be open and told him to bring it to the Board on whether we would, as we do for Parks and Recreation, we set up a little fund for Silt Control. We have a little application which they saw, and example of an application that he gave them, if they want to go ahead and start that. JD Wyman and the Northlake Subdivision, if he could reimburse him up to the maximum amount that they set if he gives them the bills. The money would come out of erosion.
  - ii. Blankenship commented that he doesn't think that they can set it up like the park thing. You can put money up for it, but you cannot do it like the park thing. Tippet commented so you wouldn't want me to take an application or anything. Blankenship commented an application to fix something, yes, to have it like community parks no. Tippet commented that it is the same thing with the parks except they enter into an intergovernmental agreement, it is the same idea.
  - iii. Wallace commented that this would be like a clearing permit. Tippet commented yes, and we would take applications in January and February so we could put it on the budget who or what has applied. They can decide who is awarded.
  - iv. Sweet commented that before you do this, don't you have to create a policy that it is coming out of the erosion fund before you can entertain a vote, because you don't know where the money is coming from? Tippet responded that this he is not sure about, he doesn't know that other than it being in the minutes and the motion. Sweet stated that the Erosion



und is set up, he guesses you could call that erosion, that is how the silt is getting in there. He just wants to make sure.

- v. Wallace clarified that it has already been done to which Tippet responded that they should've finished it today. They had a small backhoe down there today doing some of the finish work. It is quite a bit. Wallace stated that this is for the discussion and vote of silt removal and he has already done it. Tippet commented right, his schedule and our schedule wouldn't match up, he couldn't wait for us. He had to go ahead and get it done. Wallace commented that this for Northlake Subdivision. Tippet commented that this man came here and asked and that is why he is asking. Wallace commented that he understand that they need to make a vote on this application and if we are going to allow it. The way it is worded it is the discussion and vote on the silt removal at Northlake Subdivision.
- vi. Williamson stated that she feels that they need a discussion before they get into it. She doesn't quite understand how this is all set up. She is not opposed to the idea, she is making sure that they have enough discussion to know exactly the steps that they are going to take because it is always going to be different. Tippet commented that they would have to have a cap on our spending and it would be a 50/50 deal. So if they have a \$10,000 project, there is the possibility with a Board vote that we could give them \$5,000 of it. Personally he feels this would be the max that we would give them for silt removal.
- vii. Sweet commented that he doesn't what to equate it to the parks because the small parks provide a service, the possibility of service, to the people where this project would work to 8 or 10 people back there. He just doesn't think that you can compare this to the parks.
- viii. Wallace commented that he has voiced his concern and he thinks that everyone is aware of it, he knows that in this spot particularly, that this is the third time silt has been removed from there. Blankenship asked in how much time to which Wallace responded that he is not sure when Monk sold his house and Slipher started on it, let say 15 years ago, so about every 5 years. Tippet commented no, it hasn't been done in about 14 years, it was done the year before he started coming down here when his brother bought the house. Wallace commented that his concern is that they are getting areas that are silted in, we are spending money that is coming out of our funds, out of user fees and all this, to fix a problem that is occurring at all of the watershed structures, how many are there 8 or 9 of these. He is not really for helping out on projects like that.



- ix. Richards commented that he would be for this plan if there was a plan, and maybe it is part of this application, for remediation of the silting in. There are structures that can be put up in the hollows and everything that can prevent the silt from coming so that this isn't an every 10-15 year problem. If that was part of the projects, or a necessary part of the project being how to prevent it from happening again as part of the application, that may be helpful.
- x. Ewing commented as to what came out of the Lake Management Committee Meeting where we discussed this, there are grants out there that go to dry dams and erosion, he knows that they discussed that at the meeting about looking into that. If we fix this problem now, how do we slow it down and looking further down the line. There were some grants out there and he knows that we are behind the time now to get it. This is something that is going to have to happen next year if we get the grants for silt traps and dry dams to keep it from coming in. He doesn't think that it is the erosion from the boating on the lake, he thinks it is the tributaries coming into the lake. Tippett commented that this is Morgan's pond, the levee broke and flooded that whole area with water. That is how we got so much silt in such a little bit of time. Wallace asked if that was back there behind the buildings to which Tippett responded no.
- xi. Wallace commented that he would just throw this out there. Like Richards was saying if we would say, your lake property, this gets done but we only do it every so many years. Richards clarified that what he was saying is that they hire or look for ways to mitigate the problem first before we would invest in digging something out again. Otherwise this could be some recurrent thing. If they found a way to mitigate the problem or hire an engineer or something, and as part of the project that was done. He thinks they could make some headway on that. That would get the land owners to assist us in getting that done. They would be paying some of the freight on that. He doesn't think that it is a great idea to dig it out and do nothing, that doesn't seem like a very good plan to him. Blankenship commented that he agrees, you have to fix the problem before you fix the water.
- xii. Wallace asked that for the next time, maybe if the Board is comfortable with it, maybe approve the application process of it. Richards commented that on that application it doesn't mention a mitigation effort or anything like that which he wants put into this form as a part of this. Someone has to come out and look at this so it doesn't happen again and it has to be a part of the project.



- xiii. Richards suggested to table that and kick it back to committee to which all agreed.
- b. Discussion and Vote Selling by Bid Old Dock Sections
  - i. Richards commented that these are the old docks from the c docks and the cabins.
  - ii. Wallace clarified that Tippet has no use for them, right to which Tippet responded that he thinks he is going to keep one section and a few of the floats. Other than that everything goes.
  - iii. Wallace motioned to bid the old dock sections out. Ewing second. Wallace aye, Ewing aye, Blankenship aye, Richards aye, Sweet aye, Trefz aye, Williamson aye. 0 nays. Motion carried.
- c. Discussion and vote application for New Dock Installment Hammer Road
  - i. Tippet commented that he has two of them, Allender and Ogle. Mr. Allender has submitted all of his paperwork, he is still waiting on Mr. Ogle's. He recommends yes on Allender's and we are going to have to say no to Mr. Ogle's until he has turned in all of his paperwork.
  - ii. Wallace clarified that these properties are adjoining park district property to which Tippet responded no, Hammer Road is between them. Richards commented that they discussed this at length at the committee meeting. To his knowledge, there is currently two docks that have been approved across that road. Ewing commented that would be Brunson and Heighton in that area. Richards continued by saying that the consensus at the Committee Meeting was that as long as the proper paperwork was submitted, the sites were approved, and things were done in accordance to the parks regulations for docks and structures that these people be granted the opportunity to build docks there, because for better or worse, it was done previously. Wallace asked when they did Heighton's, he doesn't think he was on the Board then to which Blankenship commented that it was about the time they were trying to lease Liz the property. Richards commented that it was right before he came onto the Board, he was the meeting. Ewing stated that it was two, maybe three years ago at the most. Richards commented that there is not currently a dock there, but there is an approval.
  - iii. Wallace stated that he has a couple of concerns. What you have created is a worm by them allowing the Brunson's to do what they did. Well they didn't do it, they had a person on the Board at the time who did a personal favor, a family member allowed a commercial application created for a rental and then he came in and found out that it had been transferred from a commercial to a rental. He just doesn't want them to get into a situation, not only for them, but for other Board members down the road, they have people like him that get a mean streak up their



ass and say their property doesn't adjoin to the park, I live in Marshall, my property doesn't adjoin to the park. He wants them to be very sure that they don't get themselves into anything that is going to set them up or the future Boards for problems.

- iv. Williamson asked if there are any other areas that would be an issue to which Tippet responded that there could be any area, there are so many areas that touch the park. A farmer could come in and apply for a dock.
- v. Ewing stated that being back there where those two are at, Brunson has already got a dock, Heighton already has a dock, we have already approved it. How can we deny the other people who live there access when we have already approved them access. You are right, not this Board, that door has been opened and in his mind, there is no way to close that door. If they have the proper applications in and we do approve their docks size, then those docks, there are 4 different properties along there, those 4 properties could have dock access to him. Whatever they put on paper, their footprint, their size, whatever access and that, those properties, in his mind, should be able to have a dock being that they have already let others that live there with the same issue with the road, even though our policy states that if your property borders the park without an abutment he believes is how it reads. The township road would be an abutment, but they have already let certain people have access to the lake and to him these people are no different at this time.
- vi. Wallace commented that he understands that when they own the property or when they bought it, they get this idea that you have an opportunity to do that so they would be at a loss on the value of the property. Maybe if the Board would please consider, put some forethought into the future and looking around here at how this property can be developed. We can see down here that someone can sell a big parcel of property and turn into a subdivision then they want to do something here, they should have some talk about that. Richards stated that it needs to be reaffirmed at a later date. Wallace stated like at our Master Plan meetings, that needs to be discussed. Richards stated this is an exception, there is precedent to the exception, he is not saying that it is right or wrong, but they should go back and reaffirm that if there is an abutment or any other problem with a piece of property, there is no guarantee that there will be dock access granted.
- vii. Ewing stated that maybe they can revisit this at Lake Management. He would like to see them go through and label some areas of the park as no residential docks developed from here to there. Case in point would be this field right here, they would have to access our driveway to the



maintenance buildings to get to their docks, that's probably not going to work. We need to look at areas like that around the park and have an idea. Richards commented that he doesn't know how to word that, we are making an exception to the rules to allow this so we wouldn't necessarily have to revisit this, but reaffirm it in some capacity to say this has been done in this certain area as an exception and that will not happen again.

- viii. Sweet clarified that the policy says that your ground has to touch park property, but in the past there have been a couple who have been let do things. The current policy states what we just talked about. So before we do that, is the consensus before we approve these that we have a policy. He thinks that what Wallace is saying is right. How are we going to keep people from Marshall saying that your policy states this and you let them do this, this is what I want to do. Wouldn't it be prudent to create something, and he is not opposed to them getting their dock, but we need something in writing so that we don't get into these problems. It's coming, and he knows that it is coming. Richards commented it is in writing and that policy now states that you cannot cross an abutment. We are not changing that policy, but in this instance we are making an exception to that policy for this specific area for these specific things and he realizes it is a slippery slope. Sweet asked but does it make it right to which Richards responded it does not make it right.
- ix. Ewing commented that this is also why they took that away from the director and put it back on the Board is so that they could have this discussion. Before, a few years ago, the Board gave the director the sole authority to approve docks. That created a huge mess with the track hoes and digging out banks and everything. They quit that and put it back to the Board to approve very dock application like they are doing right now. There is no perfect law out there, they cannot write a perfect policy that would cover everything because there is going to be certain situations or maybe just a step outside of the norm such as cases like this. This door has been opened. Around the lake are there other areas, probably. There are other areas for subdivisions that are plotted around this lake that hasn't come to development yet and 10 years down the road, it may have 20 houses on it. We do need to affirm the application but we also need to take a look at the lake and get these areas on the table an in writing where we can have docks here and here and no docks here, here and here and put it down and vote on it.
- x. Wallace commented that most of them were gone from there for 6-8 years and another Board came in and people do have special interests or whatever, but different people come in and things can get changed. At



one time they had a no build zone. He just wanted this brought up because he doesn't want it to get out of hand.

- xi. Trefz commented about the current spot, there are basically 2 going in is that right to which Ewing commented these two and the only other one he can think of would be Connerton that own another 8.6 acres south of that from the bike trails that would be in question. He thinks that the park owns the property to the north, we own a section on the north side of the road. We need to look at that because if he sells that in 5 separate tracts, that's 5 different docks. We need to have that discussion about where we build because now you are getting into the other side of the dam and that is not going to work. Do we have a copy of the dock application, footprint wise as to what they are suggesting.
- xii. Wallace commented that this is why he got on the Board, because Paul Rienart, he read in the newspaper back in 2000, was selling his property and the Park District was not going to allow, once the property was sold, they were not going to allow the new person buying the house to get the dock that went with it. He read that in the paper and he was appauled. There were 75 people out here, Channel 2 news was out here, and he sat and watched Terry Monk, he was sitting all the way down there, and he went across the table and about had somebody by the throat. It is a long history of things out here not being done in the best interest of the park.
- xiii. Ewing asked if what he is proposing footprint wise, will it fit to which Tippett responded it will, one common path and split it into two areas. Ewing clarified that they have one gentleman who has submitted with the footprint and one who has one with them. Ogle stated that he has his footprint with him but he was hoping to have the dock committee meeting. He needs to find out more about pricing. He is not going to go into a bunch of pricing. He is trying to get his own dealerships with a couple of different places that will have to be approved through the committee. If he has to go with Wahoo probably what he is going to build, if he can buy the old docks and repurpose them, rebuild them, what my footprint is going to be. He has talked to Polydocks, he has talked to a couple of other dock companies similar to the docks at the ramp, the all plastic docks. He just feels that they take a bunch of abuse from everyone pulling up on them and they are still in good shape. He thought that maybe that would be an option down the road where they could approve that so there is more than one option for dock building on the lake. That's why he doesn't have a footprint. They have walked down there after the dock committee meeting, Jeff, Deke, and Cody and they got an idea of what they would like to do down there. If it makes a difference he is just looking at a single slip, it may just be a pier out to his



lift or it may just be a u, he is not going double decker with a roof over it or anything like that.

- xiv. Wallace commented then you have seen what the specifications of the dock are to which Ogle responded yes. Wallace commented that it is pretty substantial. Ogle commented that the specifications for the dock, yes he knows what they are, it's pretty much c channel wahoo style dock on floats. He is already a self-contractor, he has to call his insurance after all this gets approved and try to get approved as someone who can put in docks on the lake. He lives here and if he could put in docks over the summer, that beats driving to Paris to work.
- xv. Ewing motioned to approve the two new dock applications, provided that they have the documentation that we require to our office prior to the start of building the dock.
- xvi. Richards called for further discussion on that. He stated that we have one dock application that is complete and ready to go. He would prefer to approve them separately if that is possible. Ewing stated then they will let his motion die without a second. Richards commented that before they approve it, he wants to see what is going to happen.
- xvii. Wallace asked who has their dock application complete to which Tippet responded Cody Allender.
- xviii. Wallace motioned to approve the application for a new dock installation to a Cody Allender as long as the final paperwork has been finalized as to the clearing request and the dock request. Richards second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
- xix. Ewing commented that we still have the question of the other application now. Blankenship commented that they are going to have a policy meeting and Richards stated that the other application needs to be submitted in full before they make a decision on that.
- xx. Ogle clarified that all of his application is in except for the footprint of the dock to which Tippet responded no, there is a little more than that and he will take to him later about it and they will get it done.

#### **11. Executive Session 5ILCS 120/2 C-1, C-3, C-11, C-21**

- a. Wallace motioned to table Executive Session. Richards second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

#### **12. Vote to Open/Close Discussed/Approved Executive Session Minutes 3/19/20**

- a. Wallace motioned to table. Ewing second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

#### **13. Committee Reports**

- a. Campers
  - i. Ewing commented that Campers did not meet.
- b. Lake Management
  - i. No report



- c. Finance – 7/13/20
  - i. Wallace commented that Finance met and once again Brown did a great job of leading them through this. We were \$65 shy of having \$1,000,000. Right now for the first time ever, we have account balances of \$1,000,000. So we weathered this storm, we are still down in some areas, we are really down in the cabins, there was some talk about ideas to generate a revenue stream there. He talked about the fact, if you look at where we are at last year at this time, we had about \$30,000 more in cash last year at this time it was about \$969,000. We are really doing well for what we went through.
- d. Policy
  - i. None
- e. Trails
  - i. Wallace commented that there were not enough people to have a meeting. There was just some general discussion between the members.

#### **14. Adjourn**

- a. Ewing motioned to adjourn. Blankenship second. 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
- b. Meeting was adjourned at 6:56 p.m.