

Cordry-Sweetwater Conservancy District
Board of Directors Meeting
August 19th, 2025

1. **Board Members Present:** Mike Leavitt, Randy Brumfield, Jim Maulden, Aaron Parris, Mark Rasdall, Ted Adolay, and Greg Harper
2. **Board Members Present Virtually:** None
3. **Board Members Absent:** None
4. **Also, Present:**
 - a. **Staff:** Brittany Bay
 - b. **CSCD Attorney:** Roger Young
 - c. Estimated 22 freeholders in attendance & numerous online viewers.
5. **Welcome:** Mr. Leavitt called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM
6. **Agenda Modifications:**
 - a. Mrs. Bay requested to add line item 7.d. Rule Book Update.

MOTION: Mr. Parris moved to approve the agenda modifications as requested, motion seconded by Mr. Harper. Motion passed unanimously.

7. **Approval of Minutes:**

MOTION: Mr. Brumfield motioned to approve July 15th, Board Special Session Minutes, as amended, seconded by Mr. Maulden.

Discussion: Mr. Adolay noted under section H it says the disc went down 19 feet but should be 13 feet.

Motion passed as amended 6-0, Mr. Parris abstained.

MOTION: Mr. Adolay motioned to approve July 15th, Board Minutes, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Harper. Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Brumfield motioned to approve July 21st, Board Executive Session Minutes, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Adolay. Motion passed 6-0, Mr. Parris abstained.

8. **Freeholder Concerns:**

- a. Mrs. Bay read freeholder concerns that were emailed. Mrs. Bay summarized a letter from Sandy and Rick Spence. Mrs. & Mr. Spence noted in their letter they did not feel it was appropriate to sell CSCD property due to parking issues, they also noted they felt that all neighboring lot owners should be able to bid on the property. The Spences noted that if the property is sold the money should be utilized to resurface their road. The Spences noted that they felt if this CSCD property is sold it sets a precedent and could become an issue.
- b. Mrs. Bay summarized a letter from Todd Durham. Mr. Durham noted that the roads commission unanimously voted not to sell the CSCD property on Muskrat Drive. Mr. Durham noted that he believes that CSCD selling this property could set a negative precedent for the community. Mr. Durham then asked if he could make an offer to purchase CSCD properties such as Marina Point. Mr. Durham noted that allowing freeholders to purchase CSCD properties to build larger homes could impact other residents' line of sight.
- c. Mrs. Bay summarized a letter from Todd Robinson. Mr. Robinson wanted to voice his objection to the sale of CSCD property on Muskrat Drive. Mr. Robinson noted he was present at the Roads commission meeting when they voted unanimously to sell the Muskrat Drive property. Mr. Robinson referenced a section of the Roads commission minutes. Mr. Robinson noted he expected some form of notification, this was a topic the Board would be discussing. Mr. Robinson noted he was opposed to selling the Muskrat Drive property for several reasons. Mr. Robinson noted that he utilizes that section of road, he believes it sets a bad precedent, if sold to someone other than the owner of 6937 Muskrat it would create issues to accessing that property, and it would have the potential to allow different setbacks and new structures to be built.
- d. Mrs. Bay summarized a letter from Ted Corman. Mr. Corman noted he believed the sale of CSCD property on Muskrat Drive should not happen. Mr. Corman noted that selling this property so others may profit is ignoring the mission of the Conservancy, preservation. Mr. Corman noted that no member of the Board should have a role in attempting to profit from sales and is acting in a blatant conflict of interest. Mr. Corman noted that if the Board continues to pursue this sale, he will explore every legal avenue to oppose and block it. Mr. Corman noted many residents on Muskrat Drive were united in their opposition to this sale.
- e. Ken Brasseur (7040 Muskrat) introduced himself and his wife Joanne. Mr. Brasseur noted that they have lived here since 2002. Mr. Brasseur noted he has seen a lot of changes in his time here and noted he had spoken with some of the people more directly affected by this. Mr. Brasseur noted he did not understand why the person would want to purchase this property other than to enhance their setbacks, possibly for a bigger structure or to sell it and be able to have a larger house. Mr. Brasseur discussed septic systems on this property. Mr. Brasseur noted this was a dead-end street and had very little parking. Mr. Brasseur noted he had an understanding that the owner of the adjacent property puts up a rope to block about 50 feet and that should not be allowed. Mr. Brasseur noted that if another structure was built it could directly impact some people's views. Mr. Brasseur noted he personally believed that area is already too tight. Mr. Brasseur noted that their road did not get paved this year but it is in very bad condition, however he pays his taxes and doesn't believe the Conservancy should have to sell a portion of the road for this road to get paved.
- f. Amy Sherman (SW 187) introduced herself. Mrs. Sherman noted she had three major concerns, with the first being safety. Mrs. Sherman noted she was scheduled to work at the beach on the July 4th weekend, the busiest weekend of the year, and was never give a name or number for the emergency patrol officer on duty. Mrs. Sherman noted she wanted to know whether anyone was scheduled from the Brown County Sheriff's Office on July 4th as there were several incidents that occurred. Mrs. Sherman noted that a police presence would have ensured those conflicts were directed to the proper authorities and handled appropriately. Mrs.

Sherman noted that they do not do this and their response to her anytime that she has called them is that it is a CSCD issue. Mrs. Sherman noted that due to this inappropriate presence and follow-through her and her family were concerned about her safety as a former beach attendant. Mrs. Sherman noted her next concern was water. Mrs. Sherman noted that being a freeholder for the last 30 years it is clear JB has been successfully operating the infrastructure for well over a decade and it is clear he understands what needs to be addressed. Mrs. Sherman noted she had asked why water leaks have demanded so much of his attention and he had explained the most recent state inspection revealed a substantial deficiency and IDEM has directed them to bring that percentage back to an acceptable threshold. Mrs. Sherman noted that JB is required to follow the directives put forth by IDEM and failing to do so could result in loss of his state issued water license. Mrs. Sherman noted that JB and his team have been taking care of the Conservancy longer than many current Board members have been in office. Mrs. Sherman asked why they seem to be overstepping their position by criticizing the very people and organizational techniques that have improved the paradise they all call home. Mrs. Sherman noted her third question was financial. Mrs. Sherman noted that their constituents voted for a town Marshall several years ago and the District enabled legislature to allow the CSCD to have an active Marshall service to police and protect the community. Mrs. Sherman asked why this had not come to fruition. Mrs. Sherman noted that it appeared in the published budget this Board authorized \$219,000 for part-time presence in the District. Mrs. Sherman asked why the budget is the same and where the money is. Mrs. Sherman noted those were her key questions and thanked the Board.

- g. Judy Wright-Simpson noted that she is the owner of the Muskrat Drive property that Brittany read the freeholder letters about. Mrs. Wright-Simpson requested copies of the letters that were read to take to her attorney and then she will come back next month.

9. Management Reports:

a. Director of Finance & Administrative:

- 1. Mrs. Bay summarized the fund report. The current balance is \$5,306,338.22.

MOTION: Mr. Rasdall motioned to approve the financial report subject to audit, seconded by Mr. Harper. Motion passed unanimously.

- 2. Mrs. Bay summarized the appropriation report and monthly claims list. The monthly claims total is \$370,885.75. The unexpended remaining balance for 2025 is \$1,926,520.62 or 43.14% remaining.

MOTION: Mr. Brumfield motioned to approve the monthly claims subject to audit, seconded by Mr. Parris. Motion passed unanimously.

b. Director of Operations:

- 1. Mrs. Bay summarized Mr. Johann's report.
- 2. Mrs. Bay noted the Cordry Lake normal pool level will be verified by a licensed surveyor prior to project completion.

10. Commission Reports:

a. Building:

1. Mr. Rasdall reviewed the building applications.

MOTION: Mr. Rasdall motioned to approve building applications 25-064, 25-065 and 2-066 for approval from the CSCD Board contingent upon lot owners obtaining all permits required by Brown County and meeting all conditions by the Building Commission, seconded by Mr. Brumfield. Motion passed unanimously.

b. Ecology:

1. Mr. Brumfield summarized the Ecology Commission minutes.
2. Mr. Brumfield noted that they were not satisfied with Aquatic Control pricing.
3. Mr. Brumfield noted the next weed wrangle at the pollinator habitat would be Saturday, September 6th from 9am-11am.
4. Mr. Brumfield gave a shout out to Susie Willuams for decorating the port-o-let surrounding.

c. Roads:

1. Mr. Harper summarized the Roads Commission minutes.

d. Security:

1. Mr. Maulden summarized the Security Commission minutes.
2. Mr. Maulden discussed last month's deputy coverage at 270 hours in the District and noted that it was not regular deputy coverage just the overtime we paid them.
3. Mr. Maulden noted there had been a lot of complaints about speeding. Mr. Maulden noted in 2008 the District was turned into an urban district. Mr. Maulden noted that a lot of deputies had never seen that paper and believed Nashville to be the only urban district in the County. Mr. Maulden noted that security had been working with Lt. Magner and he believed they could ticket for over 25 mph and he had spoken with the deputy prosecutor and they said they would prosecute when tickets are given out. Mr. Maulden noted that hopefully they will start giving out tickets and people will start slowing down.
4. Mr. Maulden noted that there was a July 4th incident, and security gave out 3 tickets for that. Mr. Maulden then gave the floor to Brian Clancy. Mr. Clancy noted that a family member of the freeholder attended the security commission meeting to appeal against the 3 tickets. Mr. Clancy noted after the meeting the office received an email noting the freeholder would not be appealing to the Board. Mr. Clancy noted that today the Board would have to decide on what penalties they see fit for the 3 tickets that were issued. Mr. Clancy noted that they did make a motion at security to issue 4 additional tickets, because they wanted to provide the Board with all

violations they saw from the incident. Mr. Clancy noted that they wanted to give the Board the opportunity to see the 7 different violations and then they could pick from them. Mr. Clancy noted that they did pause on issuing the 4 additional tickets because there was no longer going to be an appeal. Mr. Clancy noted that the security commission had a few options now, they could hold a special session to make a procedural move and strike those 4 additional tickets, or the Board could pass something that would strike the 4 additional tickets. Mr. Young asked if the freeholder was aware of the 4 additional tickets, and Mr. Clancy confirmed they were not aware. Mr. Clancy noted that there was no reason or benefit to issue the 4 additional tickets since the freeholder confirmed they were not going to appeal. Mr. Clancy noted that 2 months ago the commission recommendation was revocation of sticker for 2 years but that was in error because there was a change in language in 2024-20 and no longer includes the language of not limited too. Mr. Clancy noted that their new recommendation was revocation of sticker for 1 year and an additional 1-year limited use. Mr. Clancy noted that in the email Brittany received they were willing to accept the penalty of 1 year's removal of the sticker. Mr. Clancy noted the penalty was up to the Board to decide. Mr. Young asked if there was admission that this watercraft was the watercraft in question. Mr. Clancy noted that the person did not admit they were involved in the event, but the commission had 3 cooperating freeholders that witnessed the event; 1 at the beach with their kids in the water who could identify the boat, another at the beach who identified the boat and lot number, and lastly a highly regarded ex-boat patrol officer who saw the boat on Sweetwater and followed them into their cove. Mr. Young noted that in his legal opinion there was sufficient evidence now to face deposition. Mr. Young discussed decal recommendations. Mr. Clancy noted that their recommendation was only for their motorized decals. Mr. Clancy noted that a security commission wanted him to bring up the replacement of the beach rope costing \$2,000. Mr. Young noted that they did not need a rule to cover cost of damage. Mr. Young noted that it would go against the individual and that amount would be recoverable in civil action, but you are going to have to identify the person operating the watercraft. Mr. Maulden noted the person admitted driving in the security meeting. Mr. Young noted hopefully that is recorded because that would be pretty strong evidence. Mr. Young noted that it would be a separate decision. Mr. Young noted that you could recover damages with civil action and ask them to cover attorney fees, it would depend on the facts of the case if they covered them. There was discussion over the office sending a demand letter. Mr. Parris asked if it should be sent to the operator and the freeholder. Mr. Young noted not in civil action unless you can show the freeholder negligently entrusted that boat to the operator. Mr. Leavitt noted that he would entertain a motion on what the penalty is and if it goes along with the security commission. Mr.

Rasdall asked Mr. Maulden to restate the security commission's recommendation. Mr. Maulden noted the recommendation was for 2 years, but they have had phone conference since then and went to 1 year.

MOTION: Mr. Maulden motioned to approve enforcement of 3 tickets issued, which were for destruction of property, unsafe maneuvering, and entering a restricted boating area, with the penalty of revocation of all motorized watercraft for WS 59 for one year, seconded by Mr. Rasdall.

Discussion: Mr. Young asked if they all understood that boat is now ineligible for decals regardless of who is registering it. Mr. Young noted the suspension goes on the watercraft and on the owner of the watercraft. Mr. Leavitt asked Mr. Clancy if he had anything to add. Mr. Clancy noted that the only thing he would add under the comments is if the Board is willing to, to strike the security commission motion of issuing the 4 additional tickets that would save the commission the procedural move of having a special session. Mr. Rasdall asked if the tickets were issued. Mr. Leavitt noted that they were not issued yet. Mr. Clancy noted that they were not issued but they held a public meeting and people heard that the commission was issuing them, so he felt there needed to be some sort of procedural move. There was discussion about the issuing of the 4 additional tickets. Mr. Leavitt noted that regarding this incident the Board motion would conclude it. Mr. Rasdall asked if they should suspend the tickets. Mr. Young noted that they would have to be issued to be suspended.

Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion: A freeholder asked about the damage. Mr. Leavitt noted that they would pursue that civilly.

e. Water:

1. Mr. Parris summarized the water Commission minutes.
2. Mr. Parris noted in point of reference to the freeholder statement earlier, as it relates to water loss the percentage is currently at 49% according to Josh and it would be at about 33% if the dam project didn't account for that. Mr. Parris noted that based on soil and the age of the water system, water loss is typically about 40% and that is a reasonable amount. Mr. Parris noted that the goal is to get it as low as possible and Josh does a nice job with that.
3. Mr. Parris gave a shout out to Luke the new hire and noted he is doing a great job.

11. Old Business:

a. Public Hearing on Water Rate

1. **Mr. Leavitt opened the Public Hearing on Resolution 2025-10 Water Rate Increase at 7:50pm.**
2. **Mr. Leavitt noted that water rate increase was a pass through of what is being increased to the District on bulk sales. Mr. Leavitt noted this was discussed at the last meeting as well.**
3. **Mr. Leavitt opened the floor to public comment.**
4. **Mr. Parris asked if its Prince's Lake had changed from 18%. Mr. Young noted that they should know that next week. Mr. Young recommended the Board adopt the 18% as presented because the Board can reduce rates without a public hearing, at the next meeting you would amend the Resolution.**
5. **Mr. Leavitt closed the Public Hearing at 7:51pm.**

b. Consider Adoption of Resolution 2025-10 Water Rate Increase

MOTION: Mr. Parris motioned to approve Resolution 2025-10: Water Rates, seconded by Mr. Adolay. Motion passed unanimously.

c. Replat/Sale of Lot Issue on Muskrat

- i. Mr. Parris noted based on the earlier comments about this topic, they should have a brief discussion. Mr. Parris noted he completely agreed with one of the letters from a freeholder as it relates to him. Mr. Parris noted he didn't have a desire to purchase that property until they began discussing it. Mr. Parris noted that he was looking for his future home here on lake to move full-time once his youngest child goes to college. Mr. Parris noted he was looking for a good location so if one becomes available on the market for a reasonable price, he would be a buyer for it. Mr. Parris noted that he was going to recuse himself on voting on this topic. Mr. Parris noted another thing he wanted to address as far as CSCD property being sold this has occurred before and will continue to occur for septic reasons or other valid reasons. Mr. Parris noted he believed it would be irresponsible of the Board not to consider reasonable requests from freeholders. Mr. Parris noted that the freeholder who currently owns the property if she doesn't get granted the road could place large trees that would block line of sight. Mr. Parris noted that this would help this freeholder make her property more valuable. Mr. Parris noted as far as benefits to the Conservancy anytime there are increases in property value it brings in more taxes, and less road to maintain. Mr. Parris discussed septic tanks and holding tanks. Mr. Parris noted that takes out the contamination out the lake.
- ii. Mr. Maulden noted that he wanted to hear from the roads commission since they voted unanimously not to do this. There was discussion whether they should take action tonight or wait until next month. Mr. Maulden noted he didn't believe they should be selling off CSCD property.
- iii. Mr. Rasdall noted before it was inside the property and didn't consider other freeholders having an issue with it but as they do with variances the Board considers the neighbor's input. Mr. Rasdall noted that it should be held to the same caliber as a variance and with the letters read today, he doesn't believe they should get into a lawsuit from a Board action that isn't necessary. Mr. Rasdall noted it was his opinion he did not want to sell it.

MOTION: Mr. Rasdall motioned to not sell the said property, seconded by Mr. Maulden. Mr. Parris abstained. Motion passed 6-0.

d. Rule Book Update

- i. Mr. Leavitt noted that the rule book was in process. Mr. Leavitt noted that he was in agreement with the process Mr. Young has done so far with trying to consolidate and make various resolutions go away, and all available in one rule book. Mr. Young noted he was just looking for the green light to go ahead and extract out his comments from his letter and graph them into the actual rules. Mr. Young noted he had one suggestion that this goes back to Shena and the rules committee. Mr. Young noted he wanted to commend whoever specifically went over Title 14 and identified specific sections of boating laws in the security minutes. Mr. Young noted that identifying specific parts of the statute that the District wants to incorporate into the rules should be done, and suggested the Board have someone go through Title 14 to see what would apply and what wouldn't apply to the lakes. Mr. Young noted that this would give freeholders some fair warning of conduct. Mr. Young noted that this would take a bit of time, but it could go back to ecology and security and maybe Sheena could do it before the rule book is adopted. Mr. Young noted that the Board could adopt it the way it is but saying Title 14 rules apply is a bit vague and doesn't exactly put someone on fair notice. Mr. Brumfield noted when they started redoing this, it wasn't meant to be an actual rule, it was basically one place for everyone to go to see where the rules are at and reference the resolutions, not for this to take place of the resolutions. Mr. Brumfield noted that was their intent. Mr. Young noted that they had incorporated 2024-20 in the book verbatim. Mr. Brumfield noted but not everything from the zebra mussel commission. Mr. Brumfield noted that this was a briefing of the meat and potatoes and then a reference for the resolution. Mr. Brumfield noted that this would be a searchable document that would take you to the resolution, rather than striking them so the rules are not so big, and the book wouldn't be enormous. Mr. Leavitt noted that the rules would be anyways if you printed all of the resolutions. Mr. Brumfield noted that this was a briefing. Mr. Leavitt noted that people are not getting all the information they need. Mr. Brumfield noted that would be why it's linked to the actual resolution. Mr. Young noted the more different documents people must go through to figure out what they should or shouldn't do, the more difficult it is to the freeholder and more likely to cause confusion. Mr. Young noted that he believed in his letter the operative language and resolutions have now been included in the Boards one big, beautiful rule. Mr. Young noted his recommendation is to put them all into one book. Mr. Young noted they could do what Board member Brumfield wanted but at that point they would strike most of the rule book and put in if you want to know about this topic go to this resolution. Mr. Leavitt noted at that point it would just be an index. Mr. young agreed and noted that at that point the Board would essentially have the same rules format as before they started this. Mr. Maulden noted that security thought they were taking all of the resolutions and putting them all in one place. Mr. Rasdall noted that when the Board starts abolishing those resolutions, they need to read the rule carefully and see that everything it contains is included. Mr. Leavitt noted he agreed with Mr. Young this should be a one stop reference versus going back and forth to different documents. Mr. Young discussed someone going through Title 14 and

pulling specifics. Mr. Maulden noted he would like security to look at this. Mr. Young noted that his recommendation would be to specify the code sections they plan on incorporating. Mr. Leavitt noted that this would be an on-going process for a while. Mr. Brumfield noted that the intent was for this to be an actual living breathing document that you could reference in a PDF and click a link to the actual resolution. Mr. Maulden noted that is not what his understanding of this was. Mr. Young noted every year they get pocket supplementals so when something gets amended or a new rule passed, they receive a pocket supplement.

12. New Business:

- a. None

13. Board Members Concerns

- a. Mr. Harper thanked everyone that showed up this evening and was interested and concerned about the discussion.
- b. Mr. Rasdall thanked everyone for showing up and noted it was nice to see everyone come out and put out their opinions and concerns. Mr. Rasdall noted that Mr. Brumfield already mentioned it but the fish art at the Sweetwater parking lot took old plywood and turned it into artwork. Mr. Rasdall noted this took a lot of time and it doesn't look like a port a let enclosure anymore.
- c. Mr. Maulden thanked everyone for coming. Mr. Maulden noted he believed the CSLOA membership dues go up the first of next month and encouraged people to get their membership this month.

14. Adjourn (8:16 PM)

MOTION: Mr. Rasdall moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Harper. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,



Ted Adolay, Board Secretary
Date Submitted: