

1 Item #2-Permit Fees: Mr. John Toliver asked to speak to the Committee at this
2 time. Mr. Toliver stated that was speaking on behalf of himself as a property owner and
3 as the President of the Toledo Bend Citizens' Advisory Committee. He stated that he
4 would like to share his perspective of what he feels are shoreline management violations
5 and leaseback violations around his property as well as his concern of the lack of SRA
6 enforcing the regulations upon those property owners. He said that he owns
7 approximately five plus acres which has about 600ft of shoreline. His property is located
8 in a small bay that comes off the main lake with four fingers on it. He stated that within
9 the bay, he could actually see what he considers five different violations. He stated with
10 the new FERC license and Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) which tend to address
11 violations. He made reference to the Mission Statement on the website as well as the one
12 listed under the Strategic Plan. He continued looking at the "new" plan which will take
13 effect, it states that the leasee should keep their premises free of garbage, refuse debris
14 and other unsightly materials that detract from the ecstatic quality of Toledo Bend. He
15 stated that he could see three boats lying on the shoreline for at least six years that's the
16 length of time he had been at his present residence. He stated that there are two
17 boathouses lying in the water and seawalls that are falling. He stated that continuing out
18 of his area into the main body he can see other areas of debris etc... He stated that he has
19 asked in the past why SRA has not done anything to enforce the property owners to clean
20 up their areas, but is now putting this in the new plan. Mr. Toliver continued that he
21 would like to see SRA enforce these rules. Mr. Pratt answered that the Shoreline
22 Department inherited the problems of the past because there were limited policies. He
23 stated that the policies that are within the new SMP were developed with our past
24 deficiencies in mind. He stated that SRA had not allocated the proper resources
25 employees or funding to the shoreline management department to address those in
26 violation of the policies. He stated that in the past exceptions were made which did not
27 help resolve some issues. He stated that staff hopes to be able to a much better job
28 implementing the SMP policies under the new FERC license especially because SRA
29 feels FERC will be more assertive and will hold SRA more accountable. He stated that
30 the Board will have to understand that allocation for resources will be a necessity. Mr.
31 Ron Williams stated that as a resident on Toledo Bend, if we as citizens see these

1 violations would take the time to report them to the SRA, so that way staff could follow-
2 up. Mr. Pratt stated that SRA has had issue with a landowner that does not comply with
3 the Leaseback Agreement and Policies, SRA's only recourse was to go to court and
4 cancel that Leaseback Agreement. He stated that SRA does not have any way to charge
5 or fine people; however, we can dismantle that structure and assess that to the leasee or
6 permit holder. He stated that he would prefer to work with the landowner rather than
7 getting involved with the legal system. Mr. Toliver stated that a rumor among members
8 of the Toledo Bend Lake Association was that SRA was going to raise and assess new
9 rate/fees on the property owners. He stated that he would like to understand why SRA
10 plans to impose an increase and is there "just" cause for this proposal. Mr. Pratt stated
11 the current fee was implemented in 1990. He continued that today's discussion is to ask
12 the Committee for some direction in how to handle this issue. He stated that there are
13 three questions to answer: 1) Do you want to continue to charge a fee? 2) Do you want
14 the current fees adjusted and how to base these adjustments? 3) Do you want to charge
15 these fees only once or annually etc. He stated that staff has given the Committee some
16 examples to review that have comparative responsibilities as SRA. He continued that
17 until this Committee can decide what to recommend to the full Board for approval, staff
18 has no direction at this point. He stated that SRA does not have to charge any fee. Mr.
19 Chance stated that staff knows that the fees were established sometime before 1990 when
20 the cost of living was much cheaper. He stated that his staff continues to drive a 2000
21 model vehicle with over 123,000 miles, future water sales which could have funded the
22 much needed resources were stopped; and other factors within the SRA. He stated that a
23 short comparison showed Cane River Lake in Natchitoches charges no feed; Lake
24 D'arbonne does not issue permits; and Cross Lake begins with a \$30 fee for the first
25 \$3,000.00 construction value of project and adds a \$4.00 for each additional \$1,000.00 of
26 value; \$65.00 for inspection. He stated that if the programmatic agreement is granted to
27 SRA by , then the Shoreline Department will take that responsibility. Mr. Vidrine stated
28 that he would like to have a motion to table any decisions until the public could submit in
29 writing to Mr. Pratt, Mr. Chance or Mrs. Anderson by March 15th. He stated then
30 schedules another Leaseback Committee meeting after that time to discuss issue. **Mr.**
31 **Foret moved, seconded by Mr. Davis to table any decision concerning Permit Fees**

1 **until after March 15th allowing the public to submit in writing any concerns for the**
2 **Committee to review at scheduled meeting after that date. Motion carried**
3 **unanimously.**

4 New Business: Item #1- Edward's Boathouse Issue- Mr. Chuck Soileau, attorney,
5 stated that he would like to discuss the issue with a boathouse that was permitted by SRA
6 that is encroaching upon the leaseback of a neighbor. He stated that Mr. Harrington had
7 initially agreed to tear down the boathouse, but once he realized the cost to re-build the
8 boathouse, he wanted to ask the SRA to help him resolve the issue. He stated that said
9 client did build the boathouse differently from what was submitted on the SRA
10 application; however, the SRA granted the permit on the submitted application. He
11 stated that when looking at the pier it is perpendicular to his house, but actually does
12 encroach on the Robertson's leaseback. He stated that the Robertson's feel it prohibits
13 their usage water frontage and therefore, makes it difficult for them to build their own
14 pier and boathouse. Mr. Soileau continued that his client had received a letter telling him
15 that he had a leaseback violation and needed to move the boathouse to resolve the issue.
16 He stated that he felt this was not necessary because there was enough room for another
17 boathouse to be built. **Mr. Bobby Williams moved, seconded by Mr. Davis to table**
18 **any action from the Committee until the next Leaseback Committee meeting is**
19 **scheduled to allow all parties involved to work toward resolving the issue. Motion**
20 **carried unanimously.**

21 With no further business to discuss, Mr. Vidrine asked for a motion to adjourn.
22 **Mr. Ron Williams moved, seconded by Mr. Davis to adjourn. Motion carried.**
23 **Meeting adjourned at 2:06pm.**

24

25

26

27

STANLEY VIDRINE, CHAIRMAN