



# Cordry-Sweetwater Conservancy District

8377 CORDRY DRIVE NINEVEH, IN 46164  
PHONE: 317-933-2893 FAX: 317-933-3628

## Board of Directors Meeting Agenda

June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025, 7:00 PM @ CSLOA

Also available online live at [www.cscd-in.org](http://www.cscd-in.org)

1. Welcome & Pledge of Allegiance
2. Agenda Modifications
3. Approval of Minutes:
  - a. May 20<sup>th</sup> Special Session Minutes
  - b. May 20<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting Minutes
4. Freeholder Concerns: (Please limit time to three minutes)
5. Staff Reports:
  - a. Director of Finance & Administration: Brittany Bay
    - i. Approval of Financial Reports
    - ii. Approval of Claims
  - b. Director of Operations & BCO: Nick Johann's Report
    - i. Road Paving Bids
6. Commission/Committee Reports:
  - a. Building- Mark Rasdall
    - i. Building Applications
    - ii. Dredging Applications
    - iii. Variance Requests
  - b. Ecology- Randy Brumfield
  - c. Roads -Greg Harper – meeting canceled
  - d. Security -Jim Maulden
  - e. Water- Aaron Parris – meeting canceled
7. Old Business
  - a. None
8. New Business
  - a. Voting Procedures
9. Board Member Concerns/Comments
10. Adjourn

**Cordry-Sweetwater Conservancy District**  
**Board of Directors Special Meeting**  
May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025

**"DRAFT MINUTES UNTIL APPROVED"**

1. **Board Members Present:** Mike Leavitt, Randy Brumfield, Aaron Parris, Ted Adolay, Greg Harper, Jim Maulden, and Mark Rasdall
2. **Board Members Absent:** None
3. **Also, Present:**
  - a. **Staff:** Brittany Bay
  - b. 7 Freeholders in attendance
4. **Call to order at 6:06 PM**
5. **Proposed Green Rule Book:**
  - a. Mr. Leavitt opened discussion about the proposed Green Rule Book. Mr. Leavitt noted that this was an updated compilation of the rules. Mr. Maulden noted that they had gone over all the minutes and resolutions for the last 20 years and what has been changed but not updated in the rule book. Mr. Leavitt noted they were not going to take public comments during this meeting but would in the Board Meeting to follow. Mr. Leavitt asked if anyone had specific sections to discuss.
  - b. There was discussion over the interpretation for speedboat and fishing boat lengths and if it should be clarified. There was discussion over any fishing boat over 40HP being considered a class 1 power/speed boat and them falling under class 1 watercraft lengths. There was discussion over changing verbiage to state less than 21'.
  - c. Mr. Parris asked who had the electronic version of this document. Mr. Leavitt noted he believed Mrs. Bay had the electronic version. Mr. Brumfield noted that Sheena made the document, and Mrs. Bay had a copy of the electronic version. Mr. Parris noted he believed somebody should be updating changes as it is settled.
  - d. There was discussion over the fishing rules. Mr. Adolay noted the way it is written it is up to one person to modify the fishing rules. Mr. Adolay recited that the head of ecology appointed by the Board gets to determine what size the fish are and noted it did not say anything about requiring Board approval. Mr. Adolay noted that the fishing rules should still be approved by the Board. Mr. Brumfield noted that a 2019 resolution gave the ecology commission the power to modify the fishing rules. Mr. Rasdall noted that there is a state statute that says the Board cannot give a commission the power to change rules. Mr. Brumfield noted that it did give the commission the power in the resolution. Mr. Parris noted this could be modified so that the ecology commission makes the recommendation and then the Board approves it. Mr. Leavitt noted they would need to amend the resolution. Mr. Parris asked if they should just rescind that resolution. Mr. Maulden noted that this proposed rule book will supersede the previous resolutions, because this will be the rule book after being approved. Mr. Leavitt noted that he didn't believe that was true because there are conflicting resolutions so they would need to be brought in conformance to what the rule book states. Mr. Brumfield noted the rule book is just a compilation of Board actions, resolutions and things like that.

- e. Mr. Maulden asked if everyone had already read the proposed rules, because he was expecting the rest of the Board members to ask questions to Mr. Brumfield and himself because they had already approved all of it. Mr. Brumfield noted that Shena did not change anything, and it was mostly just copied, and noted Shena even left the spelling errors so everything was included.
- f. Mr. Leavitt noted that in the document it isn't defined that CSCD is the acronym for Cordry Sweetwater Conservancy District, and it should be put in parentheses after the first mention. Mr. Parris asked Mrs. Bay if she was taking notes to make the adjustments to the document. Mrs. Bay noted she was taking notes and could make the adjustments if that is what the Board wanted.
- g. Mr. Leavitt noted throughout the document the verbiage of "will" and "should" needed to be changed to "shall".
- h. Mr. Brumfield noted that it's all compiled together, ecology and security have looked at it and now Mrs. Bay can amend the document before it goes to legal counsel and pay Mr. Young to look through it.
- i. Mr. Leavitt noted that under the dredging section there is an approval process so instead of using the verbiage "coordinate" it should be changed to "approved".
- j. A freeholder asked the Board to refer to the section being discussed not the page number.
- k. Mr. Brumfield asked if the Board wanted to keep the fine of \$500 + cost included. Mr. Leavitt noted if something is done that is not approved the Board wants them to restore it. Mr. Parris noted that he didn't see a reason to remove it and asked how many of the items included in the document are not enforceable. Mr. Parris noted he believed it should be left in the document as a potential deterrent.
- l. Mr. Brumfield noted in section 1-1-1-3 the definition of freehold is one person and asked if they should add the freehold definition for voting too. Mr. Leavitt asked if the definition met the Indiana Code and CSCD resolutions because it should be the same definition used through the voting resolution or other processes. Mr. Parris noted that he didn't believe the voting resolution is consistent with the state's definition of freehold. Mr. Parris noted that the voting resolution is based on the number of ditch taxes and per the guidelines there should be a vote for the number of lots that the person has. Mr. Rasdall noted that a person becomes a separate freehold on each property that they pay a ditch tax on and noted that they would still be able to vote by the number of properties. Mr. Rasdall gave an example of if Mr. Parris owned four properties and each were deeded differently. Mr. Parris noted that if someone has two properties in the exact same name it would be one freehold and one ditch tax and mentioned according to the state it would still be considered two freeholds. Mr. Parris noted that property taxes would still have to be paid on both properties regardless of the ditch tax and conservancy fees. Mr. Parris noted that the Board passed a resolution that the one ditch tax equals one vote but doesn't believe that it meets the actual state definition of a freehold. Mr. Rasdall noted that would be a question for Mr. Young. Mr. Maulden asked why Mr. Young wasn't present. Mrs. Bay noted that Mr. Young attends Board Meetings and Executive Sessions not Special Sessions, unless he is asked to attend.
- m. Mr. Brumfield noted under 1-1-4-2 parking and discussed right-of-way easements. Mr. Leavitt noted there were actual easements in some areas. There was discussion over easements by the roads. Mr. Leavitt noted the original plats show all Conservancy property. Mr. Leavitt noted that county roads typically don't have an actual right of way.
- n. Mr. Leavitt noted the acronym DNR should be listed the first time as Department of Natural Resources with DNR in parentheses after it.
- o. Mr. Maulden noted that security changed the off-road vehicles and snowmobiles. Mr. Maulden noted that off-road vehicles used to be allowed across from the beach and no longer

are so that was removed and the Brown County Ordinance regarding this type of vehicles was added. Mr. Parris asked if in the older version of the rule books it was allowed to take a snowmobile on the natural trails. Mr. Maulden noted that there was Conservancy property that snowmobiles could be ridden on if they had a sticker. Mr. Maulden noted that now this type of vehicle can be on the roads not off road on Conservancy property. Mr. Parris asked if this was about safety or tearing up the property. Mr. Maulden noted it was about tearing up the property. Mr. Parris asked if it was about tearing up the property, maybe off-road vehicles should not be allowed but maybe snowmobiles should. Mr. Maulden noted that snowmobiles can now be ridden on the road. There was discussion over snowmobiles and safety. A freeholder noted a possible safety issue of the driving range being out there having markers set out in rebar, being a hazard. There was discussion of off-road vehicles and snowmobiles driving on frozen water. There was discussion over the roads being Conservancy property but public access.

- p. Mr. Brumfield noted that in 1-1-6-2 it says water foul is not permitted and asked if farm animals are allowed. Mr. Brumfield noted that he believed the green rule said no farm animals. Mr. Parris noted that it was not in the rule book, but Mrs. Bay mentioned it might be in the covenants. Mr. Leavitt agreed he believed it was in the covenants. Mr. Rasdall read the farm animal section of the covenants.
- q. Mr. Adolay asked for clarification of what would be considered a state approved sanitary facility under camping. Mr. Maulden noted that it was through the Brown County Board of Health. There was discussion over septic systems and holding tanks.
- r. Mr. Maulden noted under powered watercraft is the resolution approved in the previous year. Mr. Leavitt noted the only thing that he saw in this section was changing the verbiage of "must" to "shall". Mr. Adolay asked if someone was buying a property with a grandfathered pontoon if they had to sell the pontoon and they couldn't title it with the house. Mr. Leavitt noted that is correct and mentioned that is the way it is with any grandfathered watercraft.
- s. Mr. Leavitt noted in section 3-1-1-1 where the document references diagram of where decals should be placed that should be defined. Mr. Brumfield noted the intent of having this document as a pdf is so that links could be added for resolutions and documents.
- t. Mr. Leavitt noted that under prerequisites for obtaining decals the insurance requirement was listed twice, and the second one should be stricken as it is redundant.
- u. Mr. Maulden noted under grandfathered decals that it used to say that you had to renew by June 15<sup>th</sup> and if you didn't you lost your privileges and then it was changed to three months and security changed it to thirty days. Mr. Parris noted that the grace period would be cut by two-thirds, and he did not agree with that. Mr. Parris asked what the harm was in allowing the extra sixty days. Mr. Maulden noted that the grandfathered boats they don't want on the lakes, and they are letting freeholders keep them because they are grandfathered but now, they are allowing them three months to get it decaled after they expire. Mr. Parris noted that they do not know what extenuating circumstances someone may have, and he believed thirty days is a tight window. Mr. Maulden noted that decals are available in March. Mr. Parris noted that ninety days was put in the rule to afford people with extenuating circumstances. Mr. Rasdall noted that before when the sticker expired, if the owner of the grandfathered watercraft hadn't been renewed, they had zero extra days to get decals. Mr. Parris noted that the Board voted on ninety days when the resolution was passed, and now the security commission is wanting to cut that time by two thirds. Mr. Parris noted he believed ninety days the Board voted on should remain, unless there is another vote. Mr. Adolay noted that since the resolution was voted on that resolution would have to be amended, they can't just change the rule. Mr. Brumfield noted that this should reflect what the rules are. Mr. Rasdall noted technically it should be moved back to ninety days until at such time the Board decides to vote and change

- that resolution to thirty days. Mr. Parris noted he believed the whole idea of updating the rule book was to get on board with what the Board has made the rules.
- v. Mr. Leavitt noted under lake traffic it says that watercraft must travel in a counterclockwise pattern, and this is only during green light hours so it should include “except during idle hours”.
  - w. Mr. Leavitt noted under power loading he believed it should be worded as “shall not be performed” not just “not recommended”.
  - x. Mr. Maulden noted on page 17 it used to say, “competent person as a spotter” and the security commission wanted to have a number there for the competent spotter.
  - y. Mr. Maulden discussed the next topic of the red or orange flag. Mr. Maulden noted that there are new automatic flags, and they just pop up. Mr. Maulden noted that the commission wanted to make it to where the driver could not operate the flag. Mr. Maulden noted that boat patrol had issue with the automatic flag, and mentioned last year they made everyone have the flag high, to be seen, because he believed the most dangerous time on the lake is when a skier is down in the water. Mr. Maulden noted that boat patrol relayed to the commission it’s hard to see the automatic flags. Mr. Maulden noted that security did not recommend automatic flags.
  - z. Mr. Rasdall noted that the document said all fishing laws are adopted by the CSCD and that is not true. Mr. Rasdall reviewed the different bag limits. Mr. Parris noted it also mentioned more restrictive regulations may be enacted by the CSCD. Mr. Rasdall noted that ecology has reviews this and the lake is overrun with small bass and that is why the CSCD rules are less restrictive. Mr. Rasdall noted he believed it should say all CSCD fishing regulations must be adhered to, and the CSCD should have those published. Mr. Rasdall noted that the CSCD is not bound by state laws because it is a private lake. Mr. Maulden noted regarding fishing in the past, if boat patrol wrote a ticket for fishing it would go to security and now, they would go in front of ecology, because ecology has the right to change the rules for fishing.
  - aa. Mr. Maulden noted that security clarified the floating platform rule to include buoys. Mr. Maulden noted security was also recommending freeholders to be able to pull the buoys back to not extend past the dock instead of the ground.
  - bb. Mr. Brumfield noted that a freeholder had to appeal a fishing violation withing 30 days of citation issuance and asked if it should be the same for boating. Mr. Parris asked where in the document it showed appeals for boat citations. Mr. Leavitt noted it didn’t discuss that at all.
  - cc. Mr. Maulden noted that under enforcement it is now highlighted in bold stating each freeholder is responsible for informing their guests of the rules and will be held accountable for their guests actions.

**6. Adjourn (7:01 PM)**

**MOTION: Mr. Parris moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Brumfield. Motion passed unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

---

Ted Adolay, Board Secretary

Date Submitted:





**Cordry-Sweetwater Conservancy District  
Board of Directors Meeting**

May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025

**"DRAFT MINUTES"**

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 & Nick Johann
  - b. **CSCD Attorney:** Roger Young
  - c. Estimated 14 freeholders in attendance & numerous online viewers.
5. **Welcome:** Mr. Leavitt called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM
6. **Agenda Modifications:**
  - a. Mr. Leavitt requested to add line item 5bi. Change Order #2 Millennium.

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

7. **Approval of Minutes:**

**MOTION: Mr. Parris motioned to approve April 15<sup>th</sup>, Board Minutes, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Adolay. Motion passed unanimously.**

8. **Freeholder Concerns:**

- a. None

9. **Management Reports:**

a. **Director of Finance & Administrative:**

1. Mrs. Bay summarized the fund report. The current balance is \$4,960,610.48.

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

2. Mrs. Bay summarized the appropriation report and monthly claims list. The monthly claims total is \$874,112.11. The unexpended remaining balance for 2025 is \$2,544,358.56 or 59.86% remaining.



**MOTION: Mr. Rasdall motioned to approve the monthly claims subject to audit, seconded by Mr. Harper. Motion passed unanimously.**

**b. Director of Operations:**

1. Mr. Johann summarized his report.
2. Mr. Johann thanked freeholders Chris Buckman and John Zimmer who donated the new Sweetwater gate and installed it.
3. Mr. Johann reviewed Change Order #2 to Millennium for the Cordry Spillway Project.

**Discussion: Mr. Leavitt discussed the breakdown of the Change Order and noted that there was concrete that was not included in the original plans, revisions to the boat ramp extensions, and the gates and bollards. There was discussion over the bollards. There was discussion about going with decorative instead of bollards. Mr. Leavitt noted that there cannot be anything that would impede the path of the emergency spillway. Mr. Rasdall asked if the bollards were necessary. Mr. Leavitt noted that he didn't believe them to be necessary and that he had spoken to Mr. Johann and it could be something they do after the fact. Mr. Brumfield noted that the bollards should be struck from the change order.**

**MOTION: Mr. Parris motioned to approve the Millennium Change Order without the bollards included, seconded by Mr. Brumfield. Motion passed unanimously.**

**10. Commission Reports:**

**a. Building:**

1. Mr. Johann reviewed the variance requests for Kern at 6240 Cardinal Drive. Mr. Johann noted there were no remonstrators. Mr. Young asked if they had received the consents to encroach. Mr. Young noted he needed to review them. Mr. Rasdall asked if they could approve the variance by the Board subject to Mr. Young's approval of the legal documents for encroachment. Mr. Young noted that the project should not begin until all conditions have been satisfied, but that could happen prior to the next Board meeting, and this would allow the freeholder to start sooner.

**MOTION: Mr. Rasdall motioned to approve the Variance Request at 6240 Cardinal Drive (Kern) for approval from the CSCD Board subject to Mr. Young's approval of encroachment documents from both neighbors being satisfied and construction cannot begin until the Board receives word back from Mr. Young they satisfied their legal obligations.**

**Discussion: Mr. Young discussed the importance of recorded documents. Mr. Young noted that once the documents were recorded, he would present them to the Board. Mr. Parris asked if any remonstrators were present. There was discussion over the centerline rule and the free open water rule. The freeholder spoke**

about the safety concern of why they were asking for the variance.

**MOTION: Motion seconded by Mr. Parris. Motion passed unanimously.**

2. Mr. Johann reviewed the variance requests for Jarvis at 7459 Haw Drive. Mr. Johann noted the Variance was needed because the freeholders completed party deck exceeds the 14' rule by 9". Mr. Johann noted that the contractor, Mark Dowty was present. Mr. Maulden asked if there are other docks on the lake that are too tall. Mr. Johann noted there are grandfathered ones. Mr. Rasdall asked if there were any remonstrators. Mr. Johann noted there were no remonstrators. Mr. Johann noted a neighbor called prior to the variance request being mailed out because their renter called them and they were concerned about the passageway through the cove and the view. Mr. Johann noted he let the owner know they would be getting a variance request in the mail.
3. Mike Dowty introduced himself. Mr. Dowty noted they completed the project over the winter, and the lake was iced over. Mr. Dowty noted that he was unsure if that was the issue or if he just miscalculated and noted either way this was his fault. Mr. Dowty noted the deck was 9" to high and if they were to knock it off it would make it unsafe, and that he was hoping to get leniency for the 9" instead of tearing the whole top off. Mr. Dowty noted that it was a big project. Mr. Leavitt asked Mr. Johann if the approved plans showed the correct height. Mr. Johann confirmed. Mr. Parris noted he could not in good conscience tell them to tear the top off and rebuild this, a mistake was made and there should be potential consequences for that. Mr. Parris suggested a consequence of if the contractor builds something over 14' again they lose their ability to build on the lakes. Mr. Leavitt agreed and noted that it was a good approach. Mr. Parris asked Mr. Young for his thoughts. Mr. Rasdall noted this had been done before with the contractor who had zebra mussels on his boats. Mr. Young noted that the Board could approve the variance request with the qualification they had stated but the problem would be another contractor violates a rule in some way, and someone will say they can't in good conscience make them do this. Mr. Parris noted that the barrier that would hopefully prevent a future contractor from breaking the rules is taking this market away. Mr. Rasdall noted that Mr. Dowty came to the building commission meeting and admitted his mistake, but it also penalizes the freeholders for his mistake. Mr. Young noted this put the Board in a terrible position and that was his concerns, he sympathized with the freeholders, but he represents the Board's interests. Mr. Young noted that the Board is the administrative body and acts as the administrative judicatory body, and they have a lot of discretion but can't be arbitrary. Mr. Young noted that the issue they could run into in the future is similar circumstances, a contractor makes a mistake, and they ask for the same courtesy given to this contractor

and if you don't the court could say that is an arbitrary decision based on past practice. Mr. Parris suggested using the verbiage since it was less than a foot. Mr. Young advised against that verbiage as it would create a standard. Mr. Rasdall noted to prevent this in the future the Board could require a validation inspection once the posts are up. Mr. Young noted that it would not require a rule change, just a procedure inspection.

**MOTION: Mr. Parris motioned to approve the Variance Request at 7459 Haw (Jarvis) for approval from the CSCD Board with the stipulation that should this contractor Mike Dowty make the same mistake again they would be barred from building on Cordry Sweetwater Conservancy District, seconded by Mr. Rasdall. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Discussion: Mr. Young noted that non-conforming use may be rebuilt as long as no more than 51% of the original structure has been damaged. Mr. Young suggested tightening that percentage down in this case. There was discussion on adding this to the motion. Mr. Rasdall suggested 20% for this case.**

**MOTION: Mr. Parris motioned to approve the Variance Request at 7459 Haw (Jarvis) for approval from the CSCD Board with the stipulation that should this contractor Mike Dowty make the same mistake again they would be barred from building on Cordry Sweetwater Conservancy District and the stipulation of non-conforming use may be rebuilt as long as no more than 20% of the original structure has been damaged, seconded by Mr. Rasdall.**

**Discussion: Mr. Johann asked if this should be recorded with the property. Mr. Young noted that variances do not get recorded. Mr. Young noted that it would be Conservancy record. Mr. Parris noted that anything more than 20% damage would require a new rebuild and gave to meet the original requirements of 14'.**

**MOTION: Motion passed unanimously.**

4. Mr. Johann reviewed the building applications.

**MOTION: Mr. Rasdall motioned to approve building applications 25-027, 25-037 and 2-038 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. Harper. Motion passed unanimously.**

5. Mr. Johann reviewed the dredging applications.

**MOTION: Mr. Rasdall motioned to approve the dredging applications D25-008, D25-009, and D25-010 contingent on**

**meeting all conditions by the Building Commission, seconded by Mr. Parris. Motion passed unanimously.**

**b. Ecology:**

1. Mr. Brumfield summarized the Ecology Commission minutes.

**c. Roads:**

1. Meeting canceled.

**d. Security:**

1. Mr. Maulden summarized the Security Commission minutes.

**e. Water:**

1. Meeting canceled.

**11. Old Business:**

**a. Entry Sign Quotes**

1. Mr. Parris reviewed the quotes received to repair the entry wall. There was discussion over the sealer warranty and no warranty for stonework. Mr. Parris noted that the quote for the \$7,230 would be the one he would personally choose. Mr. Leavitt noted he believed based on the work they're doing on the wall that repair would last longer. Mr. Leavitt noted that this was not something that was budgeted for either and Mr. Parris agreed. Mr. Parris noted there was a freeholder interested in helping. Mr. Parris noted they could have this partially paid for by the Conservancy and then do a fundraiser in conjunction with the CSLOA or someone. Mr. Rasdall asked if they could do a GoFundMe page, to allow people to donate what they feel comfortable with if they want too. Mr. Rasdall noted there may be some businesses that would like to donate and have a write-off. Mr. Parris noted he was willing to create the GoFundMe page and post it to social media. Mr. Parris asked if this could be approved then whatever the GoFundMe page doesn't cover the Conservancy could cover the rest of the cost. Mr. Jarret asked when the work would be done. Mr. Jarrett suggested waiting until after Labor Day to complete the work because he has plants and bushes growing against the wall. Mr. Jarret noted that the area has gravel a few inches down and that it should be dug up. Mr. Rasdall asked if the Conservancy had a small tractor. It was noted that the Conservancy has a mini. Mr. Rasdall noted that would be something they could take care of in house they would not need to hire that out. Mr. Maulden asked how this would fit into the budget. There was discussion about contingencies. Mr. Brumfield noted that ecology has \$52,000 that they are not going to use on a grant for the invasives so that could be reappropriated for the \$7,230 for the wall. Mrs. Maulden noted as long as native plants are used in that area.

**MOTION: Mr. Parris motioned to approve the Hillock Masonry bid for \$7,230 paid out of the ecology grant money and plants picked by Brenda Maulden that are native to Indiana minus funding raised from GoFundMe, seconded by Mr. Maulden. Motion passed unanimously.**

**12. New Business:**

**a. Resolution 2025-5 Amending Resolution 2008-15**

1. Mr. Rasdall noted that the intent of this Resolution is to have the same building qualifications for docks and structures on the water, regardless of whether it's occupied by a home it's a vacant lot. Mr. Rasdall noted that when the equal assessment came out, he was asked the question of why this was. Mr. Rasdall noted that boat houses were previously allowed, and they no longer are. Mr. Rasdall noted that they were afraid of people living in boat houses. Mr. Rasdall noted he brought this to the building commission, and they agreed to have the rules the same for all freeholders. Mr. Adolay asked what brought this issue up. Mr. Leavitt noted it was brought up during variance requests. Mr. Rasdall noted that when he built his dock, he felt discriminated against because he didn't have a house, but he paid his taxes and everything else there; but because he didn't have a house he was restricted. Mr. Rasdall noted he no longer had the restriction because he built his house, so he was able to build whatever he wanted too. Mr. Rasdall noted that the Tribbles brought a variance to the Board for the same reason they have a house, but it is across the street from their property, and they were bound by that rule. Mr. Rasdall noted he didn't believe it was a fair rule. Mr. Rasdall noted that this is how it was brought up and he asked why the rule was ever involved in the first place. Mr. Young noted that docks and boathouses are two different plans. Mr. Young noted he believed he sent a letter out mentioning the reason party decks and boathouses were prohibited in 2008-15 was because the Board felt that allowing a boathouse on a vacant lot would violate covenant #1 which prohibits ancillary structures from being built on lots that do not have residence. Mr. Young noted that if the resolution is read that was what the rationale was, and it didn't necessarily apply to docks. Mr. Rasdall noted that boat houses are prohibited totally now. Mr. Young noted that was the reason boat houses were prohibited, not because people were living in them, for the reason that was set out in the resolution. Mr. Young noted that covenant #1 only applies to lots and typically a boat house doesn't sit on a freeholder's lawn, it sits on the District's lawn to which covenant #1 does not apply. Mr. Young noted now whatever could be built on an improved lot could now be built on an unimproved lot. There was discussion on the number of boats and docks. Mr. Rasdall noted this was strictly about not discriminating against people who don't have a house on their property and allowing them to build the same docks. Mr. Maulden noted the problem he had with this is there will be bigger party decks, which could mean bigger parties and there would be no sanitation facilities. Mr. Rasdall noted this already happens. There was discussion over holding tanks.

**MOTION: Mr. Rasdall motioned to approve Resolution 2025-5 Amending Resolution 2008-15, seconded by Mr. Brumfield. Motion passed unanimously.**

**b. Resolution 2025-6 Amending Resolution 2024-20**

1. Mr. Leavitt noted they took the pontoon length down to 24' but didn't define which part was 24'. Mr. Leavitt noted that the intent of this Resolution is to clarify pontoons can be 24'. Mr. Brumfield noted the problem that is happening is a pontoon that is marketed as a 22' model has an overall length over 24'. Mr. Rasdall noted that the pontoons were only 21'7". Mr. Adolay asked if pontoons were going to be measured. Mr. Rasdall noted that they do not want to measure anything. Mr. Brumfield noted that if it's marketed or advertised as a 24' model or less it is good to go. Mr. Rasdall noted the intent was not to restrict the 22' models it was to get the 26' or 28' off the lake. Mr. Rasdall noted that if something was added there that it is designated by JDPower or the manufacturer as a 24' model it takes out the measuring, and that was the whole point in making it easier on the office. Mr. Young noted that it is not how he amended the resolution he revised it to be based off what the manufacturer represented its length to be. Mr. Leavitt noted that what they ran into was the overall length being listed beyond the requirements, but it was only a 22' model.
2. Freeholder Shane Pennington noted that his pontoon boat was a 22' model but the manufacturer stated length as 24'3". Mr. Rasdall noted that Mr. Pennington's boat brought light to the error made in what the rule actually meant to what they intended it to mean. Mr. Pennington noted he felt comfortable purchasing the boat because the toon length and deck length were under, but the manufacturer length showed 24'3". Mr. Young noted this proposed resolution did not accommodate that and he would have to rewrite the Resolution based on what the Board comes up with. Mr. Pennington asked if a freeholder was in this situation and they could request a measurement. Mr. Rasdall noted that with what they were trying to pass it would take that out because it would be a 24' model or less. Mr. Rasdall noted that Mr. Pennington's boat was a 22' model so he would be good.
3. Mr. Young noted that he had written rules and legislation for the last 50 years. Mr. Young noted the boat length rule has been amended for now the 4<sup>th</sup> time in a year. Mr. Young noted that this tells him this is either a bad rule if it must be amended 4 times or it's not a rule at all. Mr. Leavitt noted most of that is because of the continual change on the speedboat side. Mr. Young suggested that they could consider crafting a rule that works in most cases and reserving the right to grant waivers from the strict application of the rule under circumstances where the strict application will result in unreasonable hardship to a freehold. Mr. Young noted if this was done the Board wouldn't have to change the rule 4 times in 8 months to accommodate a unique situation. Mr. Young noted the Board would have a good rule of general application that would work in most situations and the right to grant waivers for the unique circumstances. Mr. Rasdall noted if they changed the rule to model length it would take care of this unique situation. Mr. Young noted that it would take care of this situation until the next unique situation comes up. Mr. Adolay discussed 21' model speed boats.

Mr. Maulden noted that it would be 20' they do not want 21'. Mr. Parris discussed using toon length not the model number. There was discussion over toon length. A freeholder had discussion with the Board.

**MOTION: Mr. Parris motioned to approve Resolution 2025-6 Amending Resolution 2024-20 as amended by Mr. Young to stipulate toon length of 24' or less, seconded by Mr. Rasdall. Motion passed unanimously.**

**13. Board Members Concerns**

- a. Mr. Maulden noted boating season really starts this weekend and he wanted everyone to have a safe and fun boating season.

**14. Adjourn (8:36 PM)**

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

Respectfully submitted,

---

Ted Adolay, Board Secretary  
Date Submitted:

**Cordry Sweetwater Conservancy**

**\*\*DRAFT\*\* Building Commission Minutes**  
**June 6, 2025**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present: Mark Rasdall (Board), Dennis Cameron, Cully Kinnick, Luke Johnson, Kathy Wood (CSLOA), and Nick Johann BCO.

Absent:

Guests: Morris Nahmias

**Acceptance of December minutes**

*Mr. Cameron made a motion to accept the May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2025, minutes. Mrs. Wood seconded. Motion passed.*

Freeholder Comments: *None*

New Business:

Dredging Applications:

D25-011 – Johann – 6373 Sweetwater Dr

*Mr. Kinnick made a motion to recommend the approval of the dredging application. Mr. Johnson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

New Applications:

25-039 – OES 114 – Duxbury – 7695 Elk Dr.

This project is to install an 8' X 12' shed and a 96' linear fence.

*Mrs. Wood made a motion to approve application 25-039 subject to the fence not exceeding 48" in height. Mr. Kinnick seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-040 - Grueninger – SW 473 – 6385 Buffalo Dr.

This project is to remove and replace upper, lower decks, and dock. Rebuild dock with party deck.

*Mr. Kinnick made a motion to recommend approval of application 25-040 pending updated drawings to determine shoreline vs property line. Mrs. Cameron seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-041 - Rasche – CD 41D – 7499 Honeylocust Dr.

This project is to build a patio and retaining wall.

*Mrs. Wood made a motion to approve application 25-041. Mrs. Wood seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-042 – Copeland – WS509 – 7947 Duck Dr.

This project is to build a retaining wall and landscaping.

*Mr. Kinnick made a motion to approve application 25-029 pending updated pictures and a site visit. Mrs. Wood seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*



25-043 - Roth – SW 257 – 7607 Grizzly Dr.

This project is to build a 40' X 40' garage.

*Mrs. Wood made a motion to approve application 25-043. Mr. Cameron seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-044 - Cecil – OES 14 - Lion Ct.

This project is to build a barn.

*Mr. Cameron made a motion to TABLE application 25-044 pending review of application by CSCD Attorney as it pertains to covenants 1 & 6 and an updated floor plan on the barn. Mr. Rasdall seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-045 - Spahr – CE 23 & CE 24– 7442 Hemlock Dr.

This project is to build a retaining wall and parking area.

*Mr. Kinnick made a motion to approve application 25-045 pending a scope of work. Mr. Cameron seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-046 – Nahamias – WS 25 – 6409 Robin Dr.

This project is to remove and replace the upper and lower attached decks. Remove the dock and build a new dock and party deck.

*Mr. Kinnick made a motion to recommend approval of application. Mr. Cameron seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-047 - Cross – WS 232-233 - 6793 Eagle Dr.

This project is to remove the existing dock and party deck and build new.

*Mr. Kinnick made a motion to recommend approval of application 25-047. Mr. Kinnick seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-048 - Sharp – CC 63 – 7712 Heather Dr.

This project is to install a boat lift.

*Mrs. Wood made a motion to approve application 24-048. Mr. Rasdall seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-049 - Corbett – SW 377 – 6734 Gopher Dr.

This project is to extend the deck and enclose it.

*Mr. Kinnick made a motion to approve application 25-049 pending Brown County permit. Mr. Cameron seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-050 - Johann – WS 18-19 – 6373 Sweetwater Dr.

This project is to build a dock and install a boat lift.

*Mrs. Wood made a motion to recommend approval of application 25-050. Mr. Johnson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-051 - Traycoff – SW 170 – 6947 Leopard Dr.

This project is to build a deck, covered entry, and screened in porch.

*Mr. Rasdall made a motion to approve application 25-051 subject to Brown County permit. Mr. Cameron seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-052 - Huffman – SW 407-408 – 6475 Chipmunk CT.

This project is to build a new dock and party deck.

*Mrs. Wood made a motion to recommend approval of application 25-052 pending Board approval of the variance request. Mr. Johnson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-053 - Sheets – SW 98 – 7030 Opossum Dr.

This project is to build a deck, rear patio, detached garage, boat lift, and dock.

*Mr. Kinnick made a motion to approve application and recommend application 25-053 pending Brown County permit and setback verification. Mr. Wood seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

25-054 - Zajac – SW 122 – 7118 Muskrat Dr.

This project is to build a 24' X 32' garage.

*Mrs. Wood made a motion to approve application 24-054. Mr. Rasdall seconded. Mr. Cameron abstained. The motion passed.*

25-055 - Dan – SW 122 – 7507 Hummingbird Dr.

This project is to build a 4' X 20' dock finger.

*The commission determined this was a repair.*

**Variance Requests:**

Huffman – 6475 Chipmunk Ct.

**Old Business:**

25-033 - Lind/Vidal – CE68 - 7420 Ginko Dr.

**Postponed Applications:** None

**Old Applications:**

**Stop Work Orders:** None

**Complaints:** None

**Freeholder Comments:** None

**Building Commissioners Comments:**

As there was no other business before the Commission, Mr. Rasdall motioned to adjourn, Mr. Kinnick seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

The next Building Commission meeting will be June 7, at 5:30 p.m. at the CSCD Office.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Nick Johann BCO

\*Note these minutes are not official until voted on at the July meeting.



# Cordry-Sweetwater Conservancy District

8377 CORDRY DRIVE NINEVEH, IN 46164  
PHONE: 317-933-2893 FAX: 317-933-3628

**\*DRAFT\*** Roads Commission Meeting  
June 5, 2025

Present: Nick Johann, Greg Harper (Board), Larry Trueblood, and Emily Bruns.

Absent: Dave Jarrett & Eric Vonhoven (CSLOA)

Guests: None

Mr. Harper called the meeting to order at 5:00

## **Freeholder Comments**

None

## **Director of Operations Report**

- 1) Mr. Johann discussed the bid notice and the areas to be patched on Sweetwater Dr, Centerlake Rd, and Sunset Dr.

## **New Business**

- 1) Mr. Harper did a site visit at a commercial lot with speeds humps. Mr. Harper indicated the speeds humps were too big and didn't think they would be a good solution on the CSCD roads. Mrs. Bruns asked about the origin of the speed humps and asked if there was any information or evidence that indicated a necessity of the speed humps. There was discussion on the speed humps and the commission unanimously decided they weren't necessary.
- 2) Mrs. Bruns presented the spreadsheets she put together. This will be a working document that the commission can use to discuss future paving projects.
- 3) Mr. Trueblood inquired about chip and seal vs. paving roads. Mr. Johann would look into the price of it.

## **Commission Members Comments**

None

As there was no other business before the Commission Mr. Harper made a motion to adjourn, Mr. Trueblood seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

**Cordry-Sweetwater Conservancy District**  
**Security Commission Meeting**  
June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2025

1. **Members Present:** Brian Clancy, Jim Maulden, Steve Burke, Tom Quill, and Cathie Brown
2. **Members Present Virtually:** None
3. **Members Absent:** Carrie Vavul & Matt Murtha
4. **Also, Present:**
  - a. **Staff:** Brittany Bay
  - b. **Freeholders:** Nancy Quill, Susie Cowen, Jake Cowen, and Amy Sherman
5. **Welcome:** Mr. Clancy called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM.
6. **Agenda Modifications:**
  - a. Mr. Maulden asked to add line item 10.g Personal Buoys.

**MOTION: Mr. Burke motioned to approve agenda modifications as requested, seconded by Mrs. Brown. Motion passed 5-0.**

7. **Approval of Minutes:**
  - a. The Commission reviewed the May Commission Meeting Minutes.

**MOTION: Mr. Burke motioned to approve May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2025, Security Commission Minutes, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Maulden. Motion passed 5-0.**

8. **Freeholder Concerns:**
  - a. Susie Cowen (G 49B) introduced herself and her son Jake. Amy Sherman noted that Jake likes to help her at the beach when she is working. Mrs. Cowen noted that when they came to the beach this year, they noticed there was not any handicap parking. Mrs. Cowen noted that she had to park far away and walk her son through the rocks. Mrs. Cowen noted that her son is currently ambulatory but sometimes he is not, and he is in a stroller. Mrs. Cowen asked why there isn't any handicapped parking anymore. Mr. Clancy noted that he couldn't answer that question but from his knowledge he didn't believe there was ever truly permanent handicap parking there. Mrs. Cowen noted that it was painted on the rocks and there were signs before. Mrs. Sherman noted that there needs to be something to block people from parking in front of the sidewalks because when people park there a wheelchair cannot access the sidewalks. Mr. Maulden noted that he started researching this last year because of the dock and he did not realize there weren't any signs out there but the reason he heard as to why is because you can get into ada compliance issues if there is a sign up. Mr. Maulden noted that

the commission discussed this last year. Mr. Maulden asked if there was a parking area put there designated CSCD parking would that satisfy her. Mr. Maulden noted the beach attendant could let her park there and it would always be available. Mr. Maulden noted then it wouldn't be a designated area and they wouldn't have to get into everything. Mrs. Cowen noted she did her research and made phone calls and the excuse she heard was its private property and we do not have to provide handicapped parking. Mrs. Cowen noted that if it is private property and you provide a service to the public, shelter house rentals, then you are required to have handicapped parking. Mrs. Cowen noted that they look at the number of spots and if there are over 20 spots you must have 1 spot with van accessibility, and she believes with the number of spots at the beach it would be required to have 2 spots, one for van accessibility and a normal spot. Mrs. Cowen noted she called the US Department of Justice, and they gave her the number for the state of Indiana and took all the information. Mr. Maulden noted it was something they needed to investigate and speak with the CSCD attorney about it. Mrs. Cowen noted that she believed what is being done now is illegal. Mrs. Cowen noted that they may be required to pave that area. There was discussion over signs being there last year. Mr. Maulden noted he went down and specifically looked there was not any. There was discussion over temporary signs being there at the big events and possibly being left there longer. Mr. Burke noted he did not recall seeing signs last year. Mr. Clancy noted this was something that they needed to push towards the CSCD Board and see what needs to be done to make sure they are in compliance. Mr. Maulden noted and not just for compliance they want people to be able to go to the beach. Mr. Clancy thanked Mrs. Cowen for coming and bringing this to their attention. There was discussion over the beach mat.

#### **9. Freeholder Violation Concerns:**

- a. Mrs. Bay noted all the violations were updated in their packets. Mr. Clancy noted that the tickets that had fallen off because it had been 365 days had been grayed out and thanked Mrs. Bay for doing that.
- b. Mr. Clancy asked Mrs. Bay to add ADA parking to the agenda for July.
- c. Mrs. Bay noted there was a letter sent to her about personal buoys she included in the commission packets. Mr. Clancy reviewed the letter from the freeholder to the commission. Mr. Maulden noted that they could discuss this under personal buoys.
- d. Mr. Clancy noted that he was glad Brent, boat patrol, was out on the lake when a 12-passenger boat had 20 occupants on it.

#### **10. Director of Finance & Admin Report:**

- a. Mrs. Bay reviewed her report.
- b. Mrs. Bay noted that the seasonal staff attended the CPR first-aid class.
- c. Amy Sherman noted that she was very happy with the stationary cameras at the beach house. Mr. Clancy noted that the cameras are there for everyone's protection. Mrs. Sherman noted that she enjoyed the body cameras and thought they were helpful. Mrs. Brown noted that a lot of

boat patrol does not like wearing the body cameras, because they move around, but understands why the commission wants them. Mr. Burke noted the cameras that give physical evidence make a difference. There was discussion on harnesses for the body cameras. Mr. Clancy noted the body cameras are still in the test phase and once through the season the commission can reconvene on them. Mrs. Sherman noted that she felt the cameras act as a deterrent.

## **11. Old Business:**

### **a. Boat Patrol Body Cam Review**

1. Mr. Clancy noted this was discussed under Mrs. Bay's report. Mr. Clancy thanked Mrs. Sherman for being there and reviewing her experience with utilizing the body cameras.

### **b. Buoy Numbers/Tape Review**

1. Mr. Clancy noted that the office numbered the buoys, and the maintenance staff would be placing them in the water. Mr. Maulden volunteered himself and Mr. Quill to help place buoys if the maintenance staff needed. There was discussion of how the buoys already on the lake would be numbered. Mrs. Bay noted that she and Rebecca would be going out on the lake and placing the numbers on the buoys. Mr. Clancy noted that he liked the placement of the numbers on the buoys.

### **c. Budget Review**

1. Mrs. Bay reviewed a preliminary security budget and noted anything else that security wanted to add in would be added to this. Mrs. Bay noted that she would need all of the commission's budget prior to the July Board meeting to compile all the information. Mr. Maulden noted he would like to have something in the budget for ada items at the beach. There was discussion about making the beach more accessible for everyone. Mr. Maulden noted that they wanted to include everyone. Mr. Maulden noted that they may not need to make it ada compliant just make it more accessible to everyone. Mrs. Bay noted that Josh Bryant did research on this last year when they were discussing the docks so they may want to reach out to him. Mr. Burke noted that they needed to be cautious with this, because the Federal Government could say that the District is making things ada, calling it something else and not being fully compliant. There was discussion over the rhib boat. Mrs. Brown noted that she called around and it would be close to impossible to get a used rhib boat from search and rescue. Mr. Clancy asked about buoys. Mrs. Bay noted that the current amount covers 25 buoys. Mr. Maulden asked if there were local places that had buoys. Mrs. Bay noted that she is not aware of a place but could investigate it.

### **d. Temporary Speed Bumps**

1. Mr. Maulden noted that he spoke with Greg Harper and their last meeting was canceled but Nick Johann and Greg were looking at measurements for what they needed. Mr. Burke asked if the pavers were just going to create the speed bumps while paving the roads. Mr. Maulden noted that they were not sure how they were going to do it yet.

**e. Updated Boat Safety Test**

1. Mr. Clancy noted that they all had a copy of the test which has been adjusted to follow Resolution 2024-20. Mr. Clancy noted the only question that changed was number 12 which related to pfd's. Mr. Maulden asked if everyone had to take the test again. Mr. Clancy noted that his motion would be to just make freeholders who have not taken the test take it.

**MOTION: Mr. Burke motioned to approve recommending to the Board to make an amendment to Resolution 2024-7 Requirements to Obtain Boat Decals (safety test) to be compliant with Resolution 2024-20 and only require it for freeholders who have not taken the safety test, seconded by Mr. Clancy. Motion passed 5-0.**

**f. Beach Shelter Rental Policy & Fees**

1. Mr. Clancy noted he was happy Mrs. Sherman was still present at the meeting to give input on this topic. Mr. Clancy asked Mrs. Sherman if she felt the current fee structure is enough to cover the costs. Mrs. Sherman noted she believed that it has certainly been better since there is now a fee and deposit. Mrs. Sherman noted when it was previously free a lot of people did not respect the property. Mrs. Sherman noted that now that there is a fee, things operate better, and she does not have a problem with the fee. Mr. Maulden asked Mrs. Sherman if she saw a problem with too many people being in a party renting. Mrs. Sherman noted she doesn't really see that as a problem, and that occasionally there will be a big wedding but normally that is later hours, and most people have left the beach at that point. There was discussion over the current fee structure. There was discussion over when the District asked for more deputies to help cover the area. Mrs. Bay noted she normally informed the deputies of larger parties like the Fireworks at the beach and asked for deputies to pick up shifts to patrol the area.
2. There was discussion over the Ox Roast/ Fireworks night not being charged fees because they are put on by a non-profit, the CSLOA. Mrs. Bay noted that she had already spoken with them about volunteers for the trailer parking area and beach clean-up for this year. Mrs. Sherman noted that she came early to her shift last year and ended up trying to keep people out of

the trailer parking lot. There was discussion about freeholders being upset they couldn't park their trailers after launching their boats or not being able to launch at all because the boat trailer parking lot was full of beach goers. Mr. Quill asked if they wanted to launch their boats on the day of the Ox Roast. Mrs. Bay explained that many freeholders who do not live directly on the lake launch their boats that day to watch the fireworks. Mrs. Sherman noted that she and another beach attendant stayed late and came in earlier to clean up the beach. Mr. Maulden noted that this should be on the CSLOA. Mrs. Sherman noted that they do not have volunteers. Mrs. Sherman noted she loved seeing all the people and the combination of the Ox Roast with the Fireworks. Mr. Maulden noted that he understands they do not have the volunteers, but it is still their responsibility. Mr. Burke asked who was bringing the trash, the people watching the fireworks or non-freeholders. Mr. Maulden noted a lot of this is people coming from outside because they advertise everywhere. Mr. Clancy noted that he believed that it is odd they open the private beach up every year on one of the busiest days of the year. Mr. Maulden noted he spoke with another beach attendant, and they said after they open it to the public on fireworks day, they start getting people coming in thinking they can use the beach. Mrs. Sherman noted that it happens often. Mr. Burke noted if the District is being generous and opening the beach up to the public one day and they are coming in and destroying the beach then maybe it should not be open to the public that day. Mr. Clancy noted that it is the parking too, and that there are so many people coming and parking here that freeholders can't. Mrs. Sherman noted that parking is going to be a huge issue. Mr. Clancy asked if the CSLOA were going to have shuttles to the beach like last year. Mrs. Bay noted she believed they would be. Mrs. Sherman noted that they would have to because there are 100 less parking spaces. Mr. Clancy asked if this was because there wouldn't be any parking in the trailer parking lot. Mrs. Sherman noted it was because of the pollinator habitat. Mrs. Bay noted they are not allowed to park in the trailer parking lot, and what Mrs. Sherman is referring to is the across from the beach. Mrs. Brown noted that there is a lot less parking. Mrs. Sherman noted that she has worked the fireworks the last few years and they have been doable but last year was crazy. Mrs. Sherman noted that it wasn't just the food trash, there was fireworks trash. Mrs. Bay noted that maybe the Board needed to look into setting requirements. Mr. Maulden noted that they don't have the volunteers; when he was the clubhouse manager, he saw the number of volunteers decreasing. Mr. Maulden noted he told them every time they sell a house to a weekender they lose a volunteer. Mr. Maulden noted that there are so many weekend people here that they just want to come down and



have fun and they don't volunteer. Mr. Burke noted he did not believe it was reasonable to expect the beach attendants to clean up that mess. Mr. Burke noted it was great, it gives them exposure, but we don't need exposure here. Mr. Maulden noted that they want the outside coming in and spending money. Mr. Clancy asked what money was used to buy the fireworks. Mr. Maulden noted the CSLOA events throughout the year fund the fireworks. Mr. Clancy noted that the people coming to watch fireworks are not paying anything. Mr. Maulden noted that they are purchasing food and clothing. Mr. Maulden noted that it seemed the CSLOA was putting the event on, but we are paying staff to clean it up. Mr. Burke noted that there should be a professional crew that comes in and cleans up after the event. Mr. Burke noted what attracted him to this lake is you had to own property to be on this lake, and they have invested in this area, and they will respect it and each other. Mr. Maulden noted that they have allowed people in for this event for a long time; but it's so big now the District is getting swamped. Mr. Burke noted that it is a nice fireworks display and it's free.

3. Mr. Clancy asked if anyone thought it was unreasonable to investigate adjusting the fee for larger parties. Mr. Maulden asked if they wanted to come up with a fee structure and present it to ecology or give this topic to ecology. Mr. Clancy noted that he believed the security commission should come up with a fee structure and submit it to ecology and explain the fee structure and how they arose at those amounts. Mr. Maulden asked if Nick had anything to do with the beach staff. Mr. Clancy noted that the beach staff fell under Brittany. Mr. Maulden noted that he believed himself, Brian, and Brittany should attend ecology to discuss the proposed fee structure. There was discussion over charging more if there were more than 100 people in attendance. Mr. Clancy asked the commission to do homework on this topic and bring their ideas to the next meeting to formulate a fee structure.

#### **g. Personal Buoys**

1. Mr. Clancy noted that they had a letter from a freeholder about personal buoys. Mr. Maulden noted he believed this letter is just someone who is mad. The commission agreed. Mr. Maulden noted that he mentioned a buoy in his cove a few times, and the reason he did was because he didn't want people to see theirs out and have others think they could leave theirs out. Mr. Maulden noted if they are replacing the buoy after it is pulled, he believes that should be a ticketable offense. Mr. Maulden noted he spoke with boat patrol, and they believed they had probably removed 100 buoys. Mr. Clancy asked if they were only removing them if they were more than 25 feet. Mr. Maulden noted the current rule states when not in use, so they are removing all that is left out unattended. Mr. Burke

noted that in the letter it says that since the buoys have been removed there have been boats within 5 feet of his dock and noted that people think that they own the water and they do not own the water. Mr. Burke noted that he believed a lot of the buoy stuff came from people not wanting fisherman coming in and fishing their docks. Mr. Maulden noted he had no idea what started the buoys. Mr. Maulden noted he could understand people who are on the main water wanting a buoy out there while they're swimming but he sees them everywhere.

2. Mr. Maulden discussed the volleyball nets on the lakes. Mr. Maulden noted that he would like them to be able to use it but can they come up with something that is temporary. Mr. Maulden noted that a fisherman does have the right to cast up there at night. Mr. Maulden noted that if you can't fish someone's in the dock in these lakes you can't fish, because there are docks covering every part of this lake. Mr. Maulden noted that if they get hooked on a buoy or floatation device now the hook is in there and someone could get hurt. Mrs. Brown noted that she had found hooks on her dock. Mr. Maulden noted that he wanted everyone to have fun. Mr. Maulden noted the volleyball net is in the water and they don't own the water so it should be a temporary thing, but it stays up all day all year. Mr. Clancy noted that in his 4 years living in Sweetwater he has personally never seen anyone in that fenced in area playing volleyball. Mr. Maulden noted that he never saw anyone swimming next to the buoys either. Mr. Maulden noted that they all live in a great neighborhood, and he wanted everyone to have fun. Mr. Maulden noted that if they are pulling buoys and someone sees the volleyball net is allowed to be out 365 days a year, but they can't have their buoy out they would be upset. Mr. Clancy agreed and noted that the pole for the volleyball net is more dangerous than the pool noodles. Mrs. Brown noted that they could play volleyball at the beach. Mr. Clancy discussed a trampoline on the lake being left out. Mrs. Brown noted that they could take it out and use it but bring it in at night. Mr. Clancy suggested that Mrs. Bay reach out to these specific freeholders via letter and let them know the volleyball nets fall under personal buoys and they are allowed to use these and have them in the water while in use but when not in use they need to be removed.

## **12. New Business**

### **a. Fencing around CSCD Office**

1. Mr. Clancy noted this topic was brought up to Mrs. Bay, Mr. Maulden and himself that there were some unwanted visitors after hours. Mrs. Bay noted that a contractor came after hours and dumped leaves and debris behind the barn. Mr. Maulden noted that Randy Brumfield saw the contractor doing it. Mr. Clancy asked if there had been incidents of vandalism or theft.

Mrs. Bay noted that there has not been. Mrs. Bay noted that behind the barn there isn't a camera but on the rest of the property there are cameras. Mr. Clancy noted that the commission should think about this topic and see if this was truly a need. Mr. Quill noted that they should consider putting cameras in the areas there are not any right now, it may be less expensive. There was discussion over cloud storage. There was discussion over illegal dumping.

### **13. Commission Member Concerns:**

1. Mr. Clancy gave a shout out to Chris Buckman and John Zimmerman for donating their time and material to update the gate at the boat ramp. Mrs. Brown noted that it was very nice and so much better than the cable.
2. Mrs. Brown asked if a flag needs to be up for towing someone on a tube in a no wake zone. Mrs. Bay noted that it was not a rule. Mr. Clancy noted that if they were not in the water and they were on a tube he would say no.
3. Mr. Maulden noted a freeholder asked him why Brent and Rusty, boat patrol, were patrolling double on the boat 2 weekends ago. Mrs. Bay noted that they were both scheduled, because it was a weekend, and they were pulling buoys off the lake, which is easier to do with 2 people. Mrs. Bay noted that if it isn't super busy on the lake she prefers them to utilize one boat and one will act as look out, if the lake is busy, she has them on separate boats. Mr. Burke noted that it would save gas and money by having them on one boat during slower weekends. Mr. Maulden noted that he didn't know so he couldn't answer the freeholder question. Mr. Maulden noted that he assumed it was because it was expected to be busy but ended up being cold out. Mrs. Bay noted every weekend during the busy time of summer there are 2 people scheduled for Sweetwater. Mr. Clancy noted that over that weekend he messaged about a buoy and Mrs. Bay sent them over to retrieve it. Mrs. Bay noted that weekend she has asked them to be on the same boat because that is when the buoy removal by boat patrol started.

### **14. Adjourn (8:15 PM)**

**MOTION: Mr. Clancy moved to adjourn, seconded by Mrs. Brown. Motion passed unanimously.**

Cordry Sweetwater Conservancy District  
Water Commission Meeting Minutes  
June 12, 2025  
CSCD Office

**\*\*\*These minutes are not official until approved by the Water Commission\*\*\***

**Present:** K. Brasseur, D. Caudill, A. Parris, T. Kuhn, D. Sears (CSLOA)

**Absent:**

**Guests:** Josh Bryant

**Call to order:** K. Brasseur called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

**Agenda Modifications:** None

Freeholder Concerns: None

**Minute Approval:** March 13<sup>th</sup> minutes approval, Motion by D. Caudill, seconded by A. Parris, Unanimous approved.

**Financials:** We received year end 2024 financials. Still waiting on 2025 year to date financials. Expected to receive 2025 year to date financials by July 10th meeting.

**Water Operator Report:** Josh – Rule book updated in progress and emailed to us. May water loss up to 40%... this includes the water loss of the water that refilled the dam project. With out this it would be ~33% water loss.

Staffing update: Seasonal position available... need help paying \$20/hr. Approximately 10k per month is being lost. While not immediately recouped it will be in a short period of time.

**Old Business:**

**Long Term Projects:**

A. Update Water Department Rules Book – updated and emailed to commission.

New Business:

**Water Commission Member Concern/Comments:** Dale – curious about water commission responsibility and subsequent septic/sewer discussions w/ ecology.

**Adjournment:** Motion to adjourn made by D. Caudill seconded by A. Parris at 5:46p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

**Next Meeting:** July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2025, at 5:15 p.m. at the CSCD Office.

Respectfully submitted by: Aaron Parris