

On Sat, Jan 11, 2020, 1:24 PM Donald Snell wrote:

After several readings of the Ad Hoc Committee Report I, as Volunteer Lake Patrol Coordinator and Lake Committee Member, wish to identify and comment on their recommendations.

1. Moving two buoys #8 & #16 to make the ski area more round. Is the intent here to mitigate the large wave issues at the docks and bulkheads and address the issues of our aggrieved residents? If so, how so?
2. Create a "Wake Surfing Zone" just for the Wake Boats on busy days. I presume that other craft will not be allowed in the wake surfing zone.
3. Limit kayaks and paddle boards to the "no wake zone" areas only. I presume such drastic limitations will not be popular with most kayakers and paddle boarders.
4. Not allow parking/anchoring boats in the ski area. I presume the target lake-users here are fishermen.

The recommendations in this report seem to be heavily on the side of Commercial Interests and Wake Boat Owners. If imposed, these recommendations would negatively impact many more lake users than if we maintained status quo. The Lake Committee motion that is referenced on page 2, was NOT a potential ban on Wake Boats as is stated. This implies that the LC wanted to BAN Wake Boats. This implication may have caused an unfortunate stirring of the community. The motion did imposed upon the BOD, to temporarily end new registration of such craft for a short period of time and give the BOD time to arrive at what the proper carrying capacity (acceptable number of registered wake boats) should be on Lake Auman. Thus, the BOD may not have set a limit any time soon but would have a management mechanism to do so in the future. The motion had absolutely no impact, negative or positive, on presently registered wake boat owners. If we accept the premise there should be no limit to the number of Wake Boats on our 800 acre lake and wake surfing needs no growth limits then we are short term thinkers and long term drinkers, lol.

If these recommendations are imposed upon our lake users, they may be impossible to enforce. Can you see our Volunteer Lake Patrol running around chasing kayaks and paddle boards off the ski area. And what are they going to say to the fishermen who are "parked" in the ski area. Should we push the fisherman closer to the docks where property owners think that their shoreline is sacrosanct and the fish are fed and named. And what about the swimmers (within 75 feet of shoreline)? Some think that that is their "safe swim area". Lastly, where do the sale boats fit in all of these changes?

When the Lake Committee passed the motion to impose a limit on the growth of Wake Boats we took these issues into consideration. Again, the motion that we passed had absolutely no negative impact upon any lake users or stake holders on Lake Auman. It was simple and easy to understand. It would have limited a growing problem of the aggrieved but wouldn't have resolved them completely.

I would be happy to read any objective response/critique to my comments on these issues.

Thank you.

Don Snell (Volunteer Lake Patrol Coordinator)

On Jan 11, 2020, at 8:34 PM, Jason Nowakowski wrote:

Honestly, I think the AHC committee did what they needed to do, and they did not make any drastic changes to the rules. As they stated, the science shows that the damage to bulkheads and docks is not really expected due to surf wakes. Increasing awareness to get fewer people to actually create wakes within 150 feet of shore in the actual no wake zone will have a greater impact on bulkheads and docks. Further, any time spent on the lake last Saturday or today would suggest, again, that nature can and does stir up far worse wave energy than any boat can, and the bulkheads are designed to withstand such.

1 - It has been dually noted in committee that many of the buoys are closer to shore than the initially prescribed 375 feet. Recovering that distance, per the science, will mitigate impact and energy on the bulkheads even further than the current ski zone does. Remember, most first pass mitigation efforts on surfing restrict the activity to 200 feet from shore. We have 375 and are extremely conservative.

2. I'm also opposed to a wake surf zone. I think it would be extremely difficult to identify or manage and would confuse lake traffic on busy days.

3. Kayakers and particularly paddle boarders really don't need to be in the ski zone when the lake is busy, and this has nothing to do with surf boats. Tubers are far faster and far more erratic, making them much more likely to cause an incident with a kayaker or paddle boarder on a busy day. It should be noted that this was an observation and potential future consideration, and that it was not a rule change recommendation.

4. The target here is people who choose to park and swim in the ski zone on a busy, high traffic day, and essentially become roadblocks. By the way, swimming in the ski zone is already against the R&R. I'm not sure I've seen many fishermen in the ski zone as it is, so presuming this targets them is a stretch.

5. Though the members of the sailing club can weigh in separately, I don't see where the AHC recommendations affect them positively or negatively, nor do I see sailors being a negative impact to any other class of vessel.

The motion passed in committee WAS A BAN ON FUTURE REGISTRATION OF WAKE BOATS. You can wordsmith it all you want, or note it as temporary, but there are a significant number of people who could potentially be affected by that motion. It's not about the 25-30 current wake boat owners. It was a far greater reach than that, and the community reaction and exceedingly populated petition should speak for itself.

It should not be taken lightly that a motion was released from committee and not even voted on by the board. This should speak to the general perception of the motion.

We, as a committee, have a responsibility to do right by the majority of the community, regardless as to whether our personal opinions align with that responsibility. That we had discussions in committee where individuals in the room openly expressed an agenda which, as the petition suggested, was contrary to public opinion, is disappointing. We all need to check our personal agendas at the door and consider the community at large. That's not what happened as this motion was pressed, and hard, through committee.

Respectfully,  
Jason

**From:** Donald Snell

**Subject: Re: Ad Hoc Report**

**Date:** January 12, 2020 at 2:11:20 PM EST

**To:** Steve Short, "Cockman, Ed", "Davis, Josh", "Fewkes, Bob" <[chair-lake@7lakeswest.com](mailto:chair-lake@7lakeswest.com)>, "Kirst, Paul", "Lawson, Dan" <[lake-dam-director@7lakeswest.com](mailto:lake-dam-director@7lakeswest.com)>, "Mace, Chris" <[cmace@chatleeboats.com](mailto:cmace@chatleeboats.com)>, "Niedenthal, Brent", "Nowakowski, Jason", "Shepard, Ron", "Smith, Don", "Snell, Don", "Williams, Richard", janesessler

**Cc:** Dave Lamon, Bruce Keyser <[chair-safety-security@7lakeswest.com](mailto:chair-safety-security@7lakeswest.com)>, bert van domselaar

Steve, We have been very hungry for an outside source of scientific/technical information regarding "wake/surf boats" in our Lake Committee. The only technical data that we have been exposed to is that of the boating industry. You are right, if Lake Auman is to accommodate increasing numbers of all these types of water craft including wake/surf boats, we must compromise on lake use and amend the rules accordingly. You're also right that the Volunteer Lake Patrol is not equipped at present defend our lake, real estate and residents from an increasing number of law/rule violators. I have been informed that the BOD has taken a step budgetwise to support enforcement . Thank you for your important input. I will study it closely.

Don Snell (VLP Coordinator)

---

**From:** "Steve Short"

**To:** "Jason Nowakowski"

**Cc:** "Don Snell", "Ed Cockman", "Ron Shepard", "Paul Kirst", "Don Smith", "Richard Williams", "janesessler", "Dan Lawson" <[lake-dam-director@7lakeswest.com](mailto:lake-dam-director@7lakeswest.com)>, "cmace"

<[cmace@chatleeboats.com](mailto:cmace@chatleeboats.com)>, "Brent Niedenthal", "Josh Davis", "Dave Lamon", "bert van domselaar", "Bob Fewkes", "Bruce Keyser" <[chair-safety-security@7lakeswest.com](mailto:chair-safety-security@7lakeswest.com)>

**Sent:** Sunday, January 12, 2020 1:06:52 PM

**Subject:** Re: Ad Hoc Report

On occasions pertaining to email chains, I tend to read and refrain from replying. But there are occasions when fact needs to be interjected into a discussion without opinion nor pontification. Regarding the term "science" put forward by those in this community who hold a certain opinion, it is important to note that a paid advertisement containing measurements of any kind is absolutely not equivalent to data from articles published in peer-review, scientific journals that demand rigor, attention to detail, reproducibility, and lack of bias in thought or funding. This is the situation currently at hand and it does all a disservice and produces no positive outcomes. Below I have attached my submission to the AHC for anyone to read. What I wrote was based on data from the peer-reviewed scientific literature, written by university researchers whose areas of expertise encompass the topic at hand, and the reports from the ocean engineer Goudey et al., commissioned by WSIA. Every Seven Lakes West landowner should be allowed to enjoy the lake but in a manner that does not diminish or infringe upon the enjoyment experienced by any other landowner. I would like to think that this is a view/goal held by all.

Below is my submission to the AHC. If anyone has thoughts or comments, I would be more than willing to discuss the facts.

Steve