Lloyd's Bayou Lake Board Meeting
Unofficial Transcript

August 10, 2026

DISCLAIMER - UNOFFICIAL TRANSCRIPTION FOR REFERENCE ONLY: This document is an unofficial transcription of the August 10, 2026 Lloyd's Bayou Lake Board meeting and is provided solely as a convenience for public reference. It is not an official record of the Lloyd's Bayou Lake Board, has not been adopted, approved, or certified by the Board, and should not be relied upon as a verbatim, complete, or legally authoritative account of the meeting or any action taken. The transcription was prepared from a machine-generated transcript and other available reference materials and may contain omissions, transcription errors, misidentified speakers, paraphrasing, or other inaccuracies. Where context was sufficiently clear, obvious speech-to-text errors and terminology were normalized; uncertain wording may be identified as unclear, and some speaker identifications are inferred from context. Readers should consult the Board's official meeting minutes, resolutions, motions, recordings (if maintained), and other official public records for the authoritative record of Board proceedings. In the event of any conflict or discrepancy, the official records of the Lloyd's Bayou Lake Board control. Nothing in this transcription constitutes a representation, warranty, legal opinion, or certification as to the accuracy or completeness of the contents.

Confirmed Board roster: Brad Boven, Chair; Kim Crozier, Vice Chair; Joe Bush, Treasurer and Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner; Josh Bruger, Commissioner and Ottawa County Commissioner; Jeff Tloczynski, Riparian Member.

1. Call to Order / Attendance / Agenda / Prior Minutes

Brad Boven / Board: Attendance was taken. Board members Brad Boven (Chair), Kim Crozier (Vice Chair), Joe Bush (Treasurer and Ottawa County Water Resources Commissioner), Josh Bruger (Commissioner and Ottawa County Commissioner), and Jeff Tloczynski (Riparian Member) were identified as present. There was brief discussion of the pronunciation of Jeff Tloczynski's last name. The Chair confirmed that all Board members were present.

Board: The agenda and draft minutes were discussed. One member said they had emailed draft minutes but did not have a printed version available and apologized that another member had not received them.

Board: A motion was made to approve the emailed draft minutes, seconded by Kim. The motion was approved by voice vote.

2. Treasurer's Report

Treasurer / Board: The draft Treasurer's Report dated August 10, 2026 reported a cash balance of $26,081.48 and MI CLASS savings of $20,346.57, for a total of $46,428.05.

Board: Members discussed the number of invoices paid for treatments during the year. The discussion indicated approximately three or four treatment applications, with the first treatment being the largest.

Consultant / Board: The Board discussed treatment frequency and prior work. The draft financial report documents a $7,615 algae-and-weed treatment on June 19, a $950 algae treatment on July 2, a $2,405 weed treatment on July 16, and a $1,360 algae-and-weed treatment dated August 6. The consultant explained that straightforward algae treatments can generally be scheduled quickly, while targeted invasive-plant treatments are more expensive.

Board: A member asked whether the current balance appeared sufficient for future-year work under the contract. The response was that the Board had a healthy balance and that some funds remained because harvesting had not occurred as planned.

Board: A motion was made and seconded to accept the Treasurer's Report. The motion was approved.

3. New Business - Alternate Board Members

Consultant / Board: The Board discussed two additional residents who had expressed interest in serving. Based on consultation with an attorney and with Paul, the consultant stated that alternates could serve.

Consultant / Board: One alternate could be appointed for the riparian representative position by the Lake Board. Another could potentially serve as an alternate for the township or village representative, but that governmental unit would need to approve the alternate at its own meeting.

Consultant / Board: Alternates could participate in meetings and provide comments but would vote only when substituting for an absent primary member. The purpose would include helping avoid quorum problems.

Board: The group discussed whether the second alternate would be associated with the township or village and noted that the township might be easier to coordinate with.

4. Aquatic Vegetation Survey / Mechanical Harvesting Permit

Consultant: The consultant stated that he surveyed the lake that morning. The USACE mechanical harvesting permit had not yet been granted and, based on feedback from the Army Corps, he did not expect approval until possibly the end of August or into September.

Consultant: The permit application had been submitted in February. Although a 90-day processing time is referenced, he said there was no binding legal obligation requiring the Corps to issue the permit within 90 days.

Consultant: He described two practical choices: wait for the permit and attempt harvesting late in the season, or forego harvesting this year and treat the lake chemically to improve navigation and plant control for the remainder of the season.

Board: Members asked how long the permit would remain valid once issued. The consultant said he did not yet know the exact term. He noted that some Army Corps permits can be indefinite if conditions are followed, while EGLE permits commonly have three-to-five-year terms.

Consultant: He said he had been contacting the reviewing agency about every other week and receiving vague answers. He described different treatment of the Spring Lake and Lloyd’s Bayou applications by EGLE, with EGLE ultimately determining that no separate EGLE permit was required for Lloyd’s Bayou.

Consultant: The Army Corps had issued a public notice and was consulting with DNR Fisheries, Parks, and other entities. He believed the delay involved DNR Fisheries and Corps coordination. He had received correspondence stating that DNR Fisheries had 15 days to respond to an inquiry, after which the Corps reviewer would prepare materials for supervisory sign-off.

Consultant: He said there seemed to be some misunderstanding by reviewers about the project, including concerns about sediment removal or dredging, even though the harvesting proposal had been explained multiple times.

Board / Consultant: The Board discussed whether treatment should proceed despite the pending permit. The consultant recommended treatment because dense plant growth was already affecting navigation and residents’ recreational use.

Consultant: From an ecological standpoint, he said harvesting would be preferable because it removes plant biomass from the lake rather than allowing treated vegetation to die and decompose in place. However, with the season already in August, treatment could provide quicker relief.

Board: Members discussed resident concerns about floating mats of milfoil after treatments, including material collecting around docks and interfering with jet skis and other watercraft.

Consultant: He said treatments should reduce plant biomass but floating material can occur as roots die and plants become dislodged. He suggested that, if permitted, PLM could later perform surface cleanup of floating vegetation.

Consultant: He estimated cleanup rates in the range of roughly $250 to $350 per hour and said he would provide a more specific estimate. Cleanup would likely be prioritized by location based on the densest floating vegetation.

Board: Members asked for a cost estimate before committing to cleanup. The consultant agreed.

Consultant: He noted that the harvesting permit might eventually contain conditions limiting where harvesting could occur or which plant species could be removed, including potentially protected lotus areas near the Grand River.

Board: The discussion moved toward authorizing treatment now because the permit timeline remained uncertain.

5. Treatment Budget / Authorization

Consultant / Treasurer: The consultant stated that approximately $11,795 remained in the plant-control budget for the year. He compared the anticipated treatment cost to the June treatment, which the draft Treasurer's Report confirms at $7,615, and estimated the new treatment at roughly $8,000. That would leave approximately $3,700 potentially available for cleanup.

Board: Members discussed that the originally contemplated harvesting budget was around $12,000 and that future years might involve two harvests, such as one in late June or early July and another in August.

Board: A motion was proposed to authorize up to approximately $8,000 for treatment, with possible cleanup funding discussed separately. Because money was involved, a roll-call vote was taken.

Board: The iPhone transcript records affirmative roll-call responses corresponding to Brad Boven, Joe Bush, Josh Bruger, and Jeff Tloczynski. Kim Crozier's individual response is not sufficiently clear in the supplied transcript to state it as fact without checking the audio. The motion was announced as passed.

Consultant: The consultant said he would develop the treatment plan by the end of the week and try to schedule treatment for early the following week. He also said he now had access to the website and would post the treatment date and treatment map when available.

6. Website Administration / Domain Access

Board / Consultant: The Board discussed transition problems with its website following the death of the person who had previously managed it. Historical Board minutes identify the former Board member involved with establishing the website as Brad Fritz.

Consultant: The existing domain has security controls requiring verification through the prior manager's personal email for certain domain-level changes. The consultant said they may need to contact the Fritz family to complete a domain transfer.

Consultant: If transfer proved impossible, one option would be to strip the old website down to a link directing users to a new official site. The goal was also to establish a Board-controlled email address so future board members could maintain access.

Board: Jeff and the consultant were asked to work on the website and domain issues.

7. Public Comment - Kevin Priddy

Kevin Priddy: Good afternoon. My name is Kevin Priddy. I am here primarily to discuss the website and transparency. Trying to obtain information from the Board has been very difficult. I requested information and then had to use FOIA, and I received a charge for information that taxpayers are already paying for.

Kevin Priddy: I could not find complete 2026 meeting records, a current budget, financial statements, expenditure reports, contracts, invoices, bidding records, or related information on the website.

Kevin Priddy: I recognize that not every public record is legally required to be posted online. However, the Open Meetings Act contains specific requirements concerning meeting records and public availability. The website information is currently scattershot.

Kevin Priddy: Residents paying assessments should not need repeated FOIA requests just to understand how their money is being used.

Kevin Priddy: I also raised concern that my FOIA request resulted in a bill from Fahey Schultz Burzych Rhodes for records involving a governmental body that residents already fund. I said I was not alleging an unlawful arrangement, but I was asking for transparency.

Kevin Priddy: I requested that the Board establish a public-records section on its website containing budgets, financial reports, contracts, invoices, bidding records, agency correspondence, and other basic records.

Kevin Priddy: A check register is useful, but it is not a substitute for a budget or complete financial statements. Residents should be able to see what was bid, what services were requested, who responded, what was awarded, and what results were expected.

Kevin Priddy: I also asked for access to substantive correspondence with EGLE and the Army Corps concerning harvesting and permitting.

Kevin Priddy: The larger issue is accountability for results. When the Board contracts for services, residents should be able to determine what was purchased, what standard of performance applied, whether the contractor delivered, and whether the lake actually improved.

Kevin Priddy: I explained that contracts should not be so vague that merely performing an activity automatically counts as success. The public should be able to evaluate whether the work achieved measurable results.

Board Member: The Board explained that historically the Village maintained some of the website functions and that a former member had been improving the independent website before passing away. The Board has been trying to regain access and rebuild the site.

Board Member: A Board member suggested that the easiest technical way to avoid website obligations would be to eliminate the website, but acknowledged that doing so would also eliminate a useful communication tool.

Board Member: Members emphasized that residents are encouraged to attend meetings, where information is presented and questions can be asked.

Kevin Priddy: I responded that requiring residents to attend a 4:00 p.m. meeting is not an adequate substitute for publishing routine information. A good website lets the Board answer common questions once rather than repeatedly responding to individual residents.

Kevin Priddy: I explained that in prior public service, putting meeting information and decision explanations online reduced the need for residents to attend meetings simply to obtain basic information.

Board Member: The Board asked what information was most important.

Kevin Priddy: I said one example was the bidding process: what was put out for bid, what the expectations were, who responded, why a contractor was selected, and what the public should expect the lake to look like after the work.

Kevin Priddy: I emphasized that I was not accusing the Board of hiding information. I was asking the Board to publish records it already has because they are public documents and because proactive disclosure would make the process easier for everyone.

Board Member: A member stated that the Board is composed of volunteers and that when a FOIA request requires information not readily available, the Board may need to pay someone to process it. The member described FOIA fees as a way to avoid making all assessment payers bear the cost of one individual's request.

Kevin Priddy: I replied that this is exactly why routine records should be published. If the information is already online, the Board avoids repeated FOIA processing and residents avoid being charged to obtain basic public information.

Board Member: The Board indicated it would be putting more information online and invited residents to contact Board members or attend meetings for information.

Kevin Priddy: I offered to assist with publishing information on LloydsBayou.com at no cost, including meeting minutes, notices, and other public information. I explained that the site already provides fishing, lake-condition, and treatment-advisory information and could also organize public records.

Board Member: The Board said official information should ultimately be maintained under the Board's own domain and website.

Kevin Priddy: I reiterated that my goal was simply to make the information easy for residents to access and thanked the Board for its time and service.

8. Additional Resident Comment

Resident: A newer resident introduced herself and said she and her husband had recently purchased a home/cabin on the bayou. There was brief discussion of the prior owner and contact information.

9. Future Meeting / Closing

Consultant: The consultant said he was collecting data during the year and expected to prepare a new report. He recommended a late-fall meeting to review the season and the data.

Board: The next meeting was set for October 19, 2026.

Kevin Priddy: I commented that the date could also be placed on the website.

Board: The meeting then moved toward adjournment.

Financial-document verification: The August 10 draft Treasurer's Report independently confirms the $46,428.05 total balance and the listed treatment expenditures. It is a transaction/balance report; it does not itself resolve the separate discussion about the annual budget, vendor contracts, invoices, or procurement records.

Source cross-check: Lloyds Bayou Lake Board Draft Treasurer's Report, 8/10/2026.