



**Desert Aire Parks, Marina and Greenbelt Committee Meeting**  
**Grant County PUD Desert Aire Recreation Area Developments**  
**5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m., 7/10/09**  
**Desert Aire Club House**

**Attendees:**

Kelly Larimer (GCPUD)	Terry Jensen (PMGC)
Brad Harshman (GCPUD)	Dick Dorton (PMGC)
Brandon Little (GCPUD)	Doug Shore (PMGC)
Derrick Smith (GCPUD Consultant)	James Curdy (PMGC)
Randy Allred (GCPUD Commissioner)	Bob Kibler (PMGC Chairman)

Approximately 30 additional people from the public attended this meeting.

**Meeting Summary**

Agenda Items:

1. Tennis Courts
  - a. It was a short discussion and there will be a proposal to proceed at the next meeting.
2. Grant County PUD's Desert Aire Recreation Area Developments
  - a. Grant PUD gave a brief update on the Desert Aire Recreation Area on the Grant PUD shoreline. Prior to the meeting, a letter and draft design images were sent to all Desert Aire and Cox's Landing landowners explaining Grant PUD's FERC license requirements to develop a new day use area - Priest Rapids Park, expand the Desert Aire boat launch and develop the Mattawa/Desert Aire trail. Grant PUD filed for an extension of time to complete the projects by April of 2014. The license originally required these improvements within one year.
  - b. Grant PUD is seeking comments on draft concept plans for these projects and is working on refined alternatives based on community input. If major changes are pursued, they will require consultation with agencies and tribes, require a license amendment with FERC approval and a public comment period. Grant PUD staff will be at the Desert Aire Club House at 5:00 p.m. on August 7 to share additional concept designs based on input from this meeting and past comments. The public comment period will conclude on August 15. The Grant PUD Web site hosts all the information.

- c. Grant PUD also discussed the need to develop an operations, maintenance and monitoring plan for the Desert Aire Recreation Area. This plan will need to be developed in coordination with the Desert Aire community and other stakeholders to ensure health and safety concerns and issues are addressed.
3. Question, comments and concerns Grant PUD staff fielded regarding the recreation develops:
- a. Questions were asked about the Recreation Resource Management Plan and proposed cost-share between Desert Aire and Grant PUD. Grant PUD cannot require the Desert Aire HOA to cost share a FERC requirement.
  - b. The land use designation of the Priest Rapids Park in Grant PUD's final draft Shoreline Management Plan was discussed. There was concern with Grant PUD designating the area as Resource Management and therefore prohibiting them from build the park in the area. Grant PUD staff pointed out that the Shoreline Management Plan is in draft form and that they are currently taking public comment on it. The maps will be updated to reflect the extent of the Public Recreation Development area, which includes the park, trail and boat launch, prior to finalization of the plan.
  - c. Several concerns over safety and vandalism were stated. Grant PUD emphasized the goal to build recreation amenities that will not attract unwanted or unsafe uses and activities.
  - d. Concerns over maintenance were mentioned and Grant PUD explained that a Maintenance and Operation Plan is currently being developed and that Grant PUD would like to continue the successful partnership with Desert Aire. Grant PUD will ultimately be responsible for the maintenance of their facilities whether they permit that to other entities is undecided.
  - e. Comments were made regarding the moving the swimming area and park amenities closer to the boat launch. It was suggested to move the park facility to Buckshot Boat launch, and Grant PUD responded stating that this is outside of the scope of the project, Grant PUD has other management requirements at Buckshot. There are also private land ownership access issues...
  - f. It was stated that Grant PUD's maintenance efforts along the north shoreline have improved and people are starting to revisit the area now, and a question was raised as to why Grant PUD employees cannot drive their vehicles to pick up trash and a dumped tractor-trailer tire.
  - g. It was suggested to use the boat launch as the access point to the trail area. Grant PUD staff stated that these suggestions are changes to the scope of the project and will not meet their requirements.





Grant County  
**PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT**  
*Excellence in Service and Leadership*

Grant PUD – Desert Aire Coordination Meeting  
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m., 6/18/09  
Desert Aire Club House

Attendees:

**Grant PUD**

Kelly Larimer  
Brandon Little

**Desert Aire**

Bob Kibler  
James Curdy  
Jeff Shimmin

**Meeting Summary**

Agenda items:

- 1) Feedback from the Parks and Greenbelt Committee Meeting on June 12<sup>th</sup>.
  - i) The PUD wants to work with the public and neighboring land owners to try and find a solution that meets our requirements and addresses property owner concerns.
  - ii) The PUD will begin preliminary environmental surveys and review, and must begin its permitting process by early fall of 2009.
  - iii) MacKay and Sposito is compiling the comments and working on additional alternative plans.
- b) Bob Kibler has not received much feedback after the meeting.
- c) Jeff Shimmin has received some comments
  - i) Some groups have voiced the opinion that if the northern parking lot or sandy beach is developed, they will seek legal means to prevent it.
  - ii) Overall most feedback seems to be positive and in support of a lengthened park with dispersed recreation.
  - iii) The Board is drafting a letter of support stating that they are in favor of a conservative approach in the planning for the development of the shoreline in order to limit the impact to current property owners. The Board is satisfied with the PUD's outreach process and looks forward to working through any existing issues with the PUD.
- d) James Curdy had several questions from residents regarding the plans.
  - i) Will the northern trail be asphalted; current plans do not show this detail.
    - (1) Brandon will have MacKay and Sposito show the trail as asphalt on future displays.

- ii) How will the boat basin be dredged? In the past it was done in the dry behind cofferdams.
    - (1) Brandon will double check the cost estimate to verify, but early plans had called for the dredging to be done in that manner.
  - iii) Will mooring buoys be addressed in the Shoreline Management Plan?
    - (1) Features such as mooring buoys will need to be addressed as part of the future management plan for the Desert Aire shoreline.
- 2) Future Meeting Process
- a) June 25<sup>th</sup>
    - i) The PUD will provide the same presentation as other public meetings concerning Crescent Bar and the Draft SMP.
    - ii) Information on Desert Aire and several concept plans will also be available for review and comment at this meeting.
  - b) June 27<sup>th</sup>
    - i) The PUD will set up the displays the night before. The plan is to use displays similar to the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> with the addition of any new concepts.
    - ii) The PUD and MacKay and Sposito representatives will arrive near the end of the meeting, ~11:00.
    - iii) Comments and concerns will be addressed and recorded in the same fashion as the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup>.
    - iv) The member vote on the lot assessment for the security guard will take place at this meeting.
  - c) July 10<sup>th</sup>
    - i) The PUD and MacKay and Sposito will arrive prior to the 5:00 start of the meeting to set up.
    - ii) This meeting will be held exactly like the meeting on June 12<sup>th</sup>.
    - iii) This will be the last time that the PUD will be taking open public comments on the plans at Desert Aire.
  - d) Future Steps
    - i) The PUD will gather input from:
      - (1) Law Enforcement
      - (2) Fire Department
      - (3) County Planning
      - (4) County Public Works
      - (5) County Health Department
    - ii) All feedback will be compiled by the end of July to present a final set of development alternatives to the Commission
    - iii) The PUD will develop a mailer to lot owners and provide a timeline of public involvement opportunities to share on the PUD and Desert Aire websites.



Grant County  
**PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT**  
*Excellence in Service and Leadership*

Grant PUD – Desert Aire Coordination Meeting  
5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m., 6/12/09  
Desert Aire Club House

Attendees:

**Grant PUD**

Randy Allred, Commissioner  
Chuck Berry, Assistant General Manager  
Kelly Larimer, Lands Manager  
Brandon Little, Engineer  
Igor Shaporda, Lands Specialist  
Brad Harshman, Lands Specialist

**Desert Aire**

Bob Barger, Member  
Terry Jensen, Member  
Dick Dorton, Member  
Paul Johnson, Member  
James Curdy, Superintendent  
Bob Kibler, Chair

The Desert Aire Parks, Marina and Greenbelt Committee met at 5 PM June 12 at the downstairs of the Multipurpose Building. Committee members present were Bob Barger, Terry Jensen, Dick Dorton, Paul Johnson, James Curdy and Bob Kibler. The PUD was represented by Brad Harshman, Igor Shaporda, Brandon Little, Kelly Larimer, Assistant Manager Chuck Berry and Commissioner Randy Allred. Representatives of the PUD technical consultants were also in attendance. Various other residents were in attendance for a total of about 40 people.

There were self-introductions of Committee members and PUD staff members.

The agenda included the tennis courts, boat launch and shoreline recreation options and residents' concerns about abuse of the shoreline.

Jeff Shimmin commented on a process to revise.

Darlene Bodin asked if a PUD Commissioner was present. Chuck stated that Commissioner Allred was on his way.

Gary Varney commented on lack of upkeep of the tennis courts. He thinks the survey was not a good format.

Doug Kreie thinks the courts weren't maintained.

Gary Walls thinks the survey with dollar amounts only was not good.

Sharon Stearns would like to get a tennis committee going. The amenity should be maintained even if it is a small group.

Kathleen Silvernail didn't know there was a sign in sheet but will use it from now on.

Charlotte Smith says our courts aren't what are advertised in brochures by realtors.

Jeff Shimmin thanked everyone for coming and being involved. He also asked that we keep our comments open and respect each other's opinions. Commissioner Allred arrived.

Kelly Larimer spoke of recreation and shoreline management requirements. "We are here tonight to discuss ways to move forward with formalizing the elements of these requirements with you."

Brief synopsis of Kelly's speech:

A 44-year license was awarded to Grant PUD on April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

Over 55 management plans were required by the license to be finalized and implemented.

23 Capital improvement projects within the Recreation resources Management Plan were approved by FERC and are listed in License Articles 418 and 419.

Minimum requirements for PUD owned shoreline adjacent to Desert Aire & Cox Landing include construction and maintenance of:

- a) Mattawa Desert Aire Trail;
- b) Priest Rapids Park;
- c) Extend the boat launch.

These projects are a federal mandate in order to ensure Grant PUD is providing public access and adequate recreational opportunities throughout the Priest Rapids Hydroelectric Project.

The recreation facilities must be designed, reviewed and permitted jointly, as required by our cultural resources and environmental consultation requirements. This ensures all development and associated impacts are analyzed comprehensively, and it determines the scope of mitigation actions based on the disturbed footprints.

All shoreline designation maps and recreation concept designs are draft. These maps in both the draft final Shoreline Management Plan (which is out for review) will be finalized later this year-once we have determined the placement of these recreation facilities.

Grant PUD invited their engineering consultants to this meeting to describe the work that has gone into developing these plans to date, and we also have some design drawings

they have been developed based on feedback we received from some North Desert Aire and Cox Landing residents so far.

While Grant PUD will try and accommodate your ideas, please keep in mind that Grant PUD also must consult with the tribes, agencies, law enforcement, fire districts, the county etc...

Grant PUD also must get authorizations from the PUD commission.

Commission has not reviewed any of these plans to date.

Grant PUD cannot make any promises or guarantees at this point.

Next steps include getting preferred alternatives developed to move forward with authorizations and permitting.

Grant PUD anticipates getting to this point within the next couple of months.

“We will attend your June 27<sup>th</sup> HOA meeting and we will hold a Commission review session once we have the information prepared. Thank you all for your participation.”

Derrick Smith with MacKay & Sposito presented proposed alternatives for future recreational facilities in the Desert Aire/Cox Landing area. Alternative 2 has the north end parking with 4 spaces and a 12' access trail. FERC has specified 15 picnic tables for the shoreline along Desert Aire. Alternative 1 has 25 parking spaces, picnic shelters, set back off on U Road. The marina conceptual alternatives were displayed: the Reid Middleton Plan, Alternative #2, and the bare minimum of just extending the existing ramp.

The County requires a natural buffer when proposed recreational facilities including accessory uses, such as parking, are adjacent to private residential property. In other words, the County requires some limited landscaping for screening purposes. There was a comment that the PUD should contact each adjacent owner to see what they want since it affects their view. Presenter responded that the landscaping features are not proposed to be of exceptional height and should not significantly affect any views.

There was an overview of the entire trail system of 3.1 miles.

Susan Hiatt wondered if there would be any concern about parking along the streets at access points.

Karen Mulcahy is really excited about the whole plan.

Dave Hargroves asked about EMS access to the trail system.

Hunter and fisherman usage was also asked about.

Darlene Bodin presented her petition to Commissioner Randy Allred and then reviewed her historical usage of the shoreline in her section of the shoreline. She was concerned that it would attract gang activity and be detrimental to the area in general. Yet, one of her specific concerns was the projected amount of use that might destroy the beach area and her view of it.

PUD Assistant Manager Chuck Berry says if you can't make a meeting or miss a meeting, submit comments in writing and they will be weighed just as though you were there, "Presence is not important; your comment is".

Diane Gehling of Cox Landing stated that they support Alternative #2 with a smaller parking area at the end of "U" Rd in Cox Landing North of Desert Aire.

About 6:05 PM, the attendees divided into smaller groups to view the conceptual drawings/plans and share ideas and comments. This informal part of the meeting continued until 6:45 PM.



Grant County  
**PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT**  
*Excellence in Service and Leadership*

Grant PUD - Cox Landing Neighborhood Meeting  
7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m., 6/10/09  
Priest Rapids Park & Trail Discussion

Attendees:

**Grant PUD**

Brandon Little  
Kelly Larimer  
Brad Harshman  
Igor Shaporda  
Lisa Parks

**Cox Landing**

Jeffrey Culverwell  
Teresa Culverwell  
Jan Berghout  
Anna-Maria Berghout  
Darlene Bodin (Desert Aire)

Adam Heslop  
Dianne Gehling  
Corey Zirker  
Julie Zirker

**Meeting Summary:**

After introductions, Kelly provided an overview of the new license requirements, as well as summarizing the work that has been done by Grant PUD to-date, such as hiring staff, consultants and contractors and reviewing and trying to clarify the different license requirements. Brandon also reviewed the power point presentation handouts that described in more detail the specific requirements and work done to-date for all of the recreation requirements for the area, including Desert Aire boat launch improvements, the trail and the Priest Rapids Park. Dianne Gehling also presented a plan for Priest Rapids Park that some of the neighbors had recently developed.

Those in attendance provided comments and concerns specifically regarding Priest Rapids Park and its proposed facilities.

1. Concerns were expressed about the depiction of the Cox Landing and North Desert Aire area in the relicensing documents and in the existing draft Shoreline Management Plan (SMP).
  - a. Maps filed in the original licensing documents did not show roads or lots in the Cox Landing and North Desert Aire areas.
    - i. Residents feel that FERC was unaware of their presence and allowed the Park to be planned for its current location.
  - b. Maps are old and are inconsistent from one document to the next. Even the aerial photos and maps that are being used currently are not complete.
2. Impacts to existing wildlife that would happen if the park was built were expressed. Residents have seen eagles, owls, osprey, chukars and more in the area.

- a. Grant PUD is required to address wildlife impacts, and these were considered during the preparation of the final license application and during the FERC Final Environmental Impact Statement.
3. There were questions and concerns regarding traffic impacts.
  - a. Jeffrey stated he had talked with WSDOT and Grant County Public Works, neither of whom were aware of the proposed park.
    - i. He indicated he was told that U Road was designated by the County as “Rural Residential Local Access”, which he does not believe would accommodate the increased traffic that would be caused by the park.
    - ii. Staff expressed appreciation for the input and will follow up with Grant County Public Works.
  - b. Many residents concurred that the intersection with Highway 243 is very dangerous, there have been fatality accidents, and they believe the park would increase traffic.
  - c. It was stated that traffic on U Road already travels too fast, and that increased recreation facilities will make that worse.
  - d. Staff explained that further studies, including a traffic analysis, would be required at the permitting stage. It is important to select a preferred alternative before proceeding with the more specific studies that will occur at the permitting stage. Grant PUD is not at that point yet.
4. Questions were raised regarding available water for fire suppression at the park.
  - a. Cox Landing does not have a public water system to be used for fire suppression.
  - b. There was concern expressed that area residents might have to pay for public infrastructure improvements if the park went in.
  - c. Staff explained that all costs associated with construction of the park and any necessary public infrastructure would be paid by the PUD.
5. All neighbors were concerned with criminal activity in the area.
  - a. There is criminal activity already occurring (drug deals, gang activities burglaries, etc.)
  - b. They believe that the criminal activity has significantly decreased in the last few years since the rock barrier (perpendicular – east/west – to the shoreline) was installed.
  - c. It is believed that with improved parking and “destination” recreation facilities, such as the swim area and picnic tables will significantly increase both criminal activity as well as nuisance-type behavior such as loud music, late night vehicle traffic, foul language, more garbage, etc.
  - d. Staff acknowledged the concerns over criminal and nuisance activities, and expressed that it was the intent to try to help address some of those concerns through good, thoughtful design and increased monitoring and enforcement agreements.
6. There was general consensus and support from the residents regarding the proposal that Dianne presented from the community members:
  - a. A paved trail connecting to the boat launch area.
    - i. There was some discussion that paving tends to increase problems with goat heads and snakes because of the increased heat from the surfacing.

- ii. Darlene emphasized that the trail should be located completely away from the adjoining private properties and should be located closer to the shoreline areas.
    - iii. Ensure that it is restricted for vehicle use, other than for emergency services vehicles.
  - b. Adjacent to the cul-de-sac, provide added shoulder width, on Grant PUD property, that could be used for parallel parking of 4-6 vehicles.
    - i. The fewer parking stalls in this area the better.
    - ii. Jeffrey advocated not striping the parking stalls and making them less formalized to discourage too much parking.
    - iii. Adam was in favor of parking areas being controlled for ingress and egress, regardless of how big the parking area or where located, to increase security.
    - iv. It was acknowledged that an expanded cul-de-sac would have the added benefit of providing adequate turning radius for the school bus, especially in winter, whereas currently, the bus driver has to jockey the bus around to get turned around.
    - v. Staff explained that, to meet ADA guidelines and other requirements, the parking areas that are developed by Grant PUD have to be done and signed in such a way as to be obvious parking to support public access opportunities.
    - vi. Staff also stated that with a more linear park design (i.e. spreading out the picnic tables), splitting the parking area with some on U Road and some at the expanded parking area next to the boat launch might be feasible.
  - c. Add a rock barrier running parallel to U Road to prevent random vehicle access.
    - i. The Culverwells did not necessarily agree that uncontrolled vehicle access was a significant issue, and were not fully in favor of the rock barrier.
  - d. Spread out the picnic tables along the trail in the areas that make sense.
  - e. The residents advocated focusing some of the Priest Rapids Park facilities in the existing boat launch area to substantially improve and draw visitors to that already developed area.
- 7. The largest issues generating concern are the size and location of the parking lot, the development and formalizing of the sandy beach area, and the vault toilet and dumpster.
  - a. Too much parking will generate too much traffic and use for the area. It is a quiet neighborhood with very little traffic, and the current plans are too much for the area.
  - b. Visual and odor impacts from the vault toilet and dumpster are a big concern.

The residents thanked the staff for attending and listening to them. They were complimentary toward the plans and designs for the park, indicating that in their current form they were just too much for the existing neighborhood. Staff thanked the residents for their input, and assured them that they are taking their comments very seriously and are working hard to incorporate those comments and concerns into their plans as they move forward with the project. It was reiterated that, along with their comments and the comments from other residents in the area, Grant PUD is required to consider the comments and input from FERC-identified stakeholders, as well as the license

requirements, as interpreted by FERC, in coming up with the final plans for the park facilities.

Staff invited and encouraged everyone to come to the meeting on Friday evening (6/12/09) at the Desert Aire Club House. The consulting engineers for the Desert Aire projects, MacKay & Sposito, Inc. will be in attendance with a large aerial photo that the residents can use to put their comments on with sticky notes, indicating their specific concerns and comments.

**Meeting Handouts:**

---

- Agenda
- Priest Rapids Park Minimum Requirements for License Compliance
- Powerpoint Presentation
- Priest Rapids Day Use Park Development Plan, June 2009 (MacKay & Sposito, Inc.)
- Community Residents' Proposal on Google Maps



Grant County  
**PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT**  
*Excellence in Service and Leadership*

Grant PUD - Desert Aire Coordination Meeting  
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., 6/5/09  
Desert Aire Club House

Attendees:

**Grant PUD**

Brandon Little  
Kelly Larimer  
Brad Harshman  
Igor Shaporda  
Lisa Parks

**Desert Aire**

Bob Kibler  
Steve Bodin  
Darlene Bodin  
James Curdy  
David Silvernail  
Kathleen Silvernail  
Jeff Shimmin  
Ron Stewart

- 1) Concerns were expressed regarding the list of individuals invited to the meeting.
  - a) Bob organized the meeting per the request of the PUD and did not want to expand the invitation without double checking.
  - b) The PUD welcomes all parties to express their concerns.
- 2) Why haven't the park plans been issued for public comment?
  - a) The PUD received the License April 17, 2008. Conceptual Plans were published in the Recreation Resource Management Plan, (RRMP) and the PUD is progressing from those plans.
  - b) Public meetings were held as part of the re-licensing process (Solutions Groups).
  - c) The PUD suggested recreation amenities based, in part, on the existing uses and on the input from the Solutions Groups.
  - d) The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) agreed with the plans submitted and is now requiring their implementation.
- 3) Concerns were expressed about the depiction and classification of northern Desert Aire in the relicensing documents and the existing draft Shoreline Management Plan (SMP).
  - a) Maps filed in the original licensing documents left out roads in North Desert Aire.
    - i) Residents feel that FERC was unaware of their presence and allowed the Park to be planned for its current location.
    - ii) Kelly has spoken with FERC about this park and its neighboring residents, they are aware of the inaccuracies of the original map.
      - (1) The PUD is still required to implement the RRMP.
  - b) Current SMP maps show Desert Aire in two sections, but classified the same.
    - i) Appendix D is the inventory and analysis, which described the area in two different sections for purposes of characterizing existing conditions related to

both the built and the natural environments, consistent with new Washington State Shoreline planning guidelines.

- c) Appendix D lists northern Desert Aire as a different area than the rest of Desert Aire.
  - i) The different areas in Appendix D are called “reaches” and are intended to describe and categorize areas of shoreline that are similar based on existing physical, biological and community characteristics.
  - ii) This process is intended to ensure consistency with new Washington State Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26).
  - iii) Appendix D is a listing of existing conditions only.
- d) Why can't the park be installed somewhere else.
  - i) Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) were prepared as part of the re-licensing process.
    - (1) These attempts are aimed to identify the potential impacts of future developments.
    - ii) If the recreation developments are moved, new EIS must be conducted, invalidating large amounts of work.
    - iii) FERC does not want to see new EIS documentation. They have already granted permission for our RRMP would rather see it implemented than changed.
- 4) Desert Aire residents shared their concerns for the Priest Rapids Park.
  - a) Neither North Desert Aire nor Cox Landing residents are in support of the park.
  - b) Desert Aire requested to be on record as not being against the trail and public access.
    - i) They are against the negative activities that have occurred in the past.
      - (1) Concerned that the development of the park will encourage these activities.
      - ii) Concerned for the preservation of the views and scenery.
  - c) Concerned that issues they felt they had worked on for 4+ years, which have been better for the last 2, are being ignored and the new park will return things to the way they were before.
    - i) They believe the rock barrier has significantly reduced the negative use/impacts, and they feel safer and more secure both on the shoreline and in their homes.
  - d) Cox Landing residents work cooperatively with residents of northern Desert Aire to monitor and patrol the PUD property in that area.
  - e) The FERC plans were developed based on existing use during the re-licensing period
    - i) Undesirable uses were occurring in the area of North Desert Aire at that point in time.
    - ii) Residents fear that development of the park will encourage the activities that were a problem in the past.
  - f) Concerns were expressed that building a parking lot will encourage vehicular access to the sandy beach area.
    - i) The entire parking lot will be protected by bollards or rock barriers to prevent off-road access.

- g) Desert Aire residents are concerned their property would be de-valued, and want the assessed value of their property reduced in conjunction with the development of the park.
    - i) New building projects would be cancelled as a result of the park.
  - h) Security would need to be improved as a result of increased public access to the parking lot and trail.
    - i) The PUD currently is working on a proposal to pay for an additional Fish and Wildlife officer to enforce all laws on PUD lands.
  - i) Grant County Sheriffs, public courts and the county health department should be consulted about the planned developments and potential public uses of this property.
- 5) The history of the park and the re-licensing process was discussed.
- a) September 21, 2007
    - i) A public meeting was held at Desert Aire with Cox Landing residents in attendance.
    - ii) Residents showed concern about the planned park.
    - iii) The PUD assured them that there would be time to alter the plans before FERC accepted them.
  - b) Public meeting process
    - i) The boat launch was the main topic of concern in the Desert Aire area during public meetings.
    - ii) Residents remembered the park being a trail access point in front of Cox Landing.
- 6) Further concerns for the park were expressed.
- a) Is the parking at the Desert Aire boat launch sufficient trail access?
    - i) Fee parking at Desert Aire is not as inviting to the public as free public parking elsewhere would be
  - b) Residents do not want to see the natural beauty of the area destroyed as it was in the past.
  - c) Crime has been a problem in the past.
    - i) 40 houses were victimized this winter.
    - ii) Each lot in Desert Aire was assessed \$50 to hire security
    - iii) The Desert Aire Park has now been closed to the public due to vandalism.
  - d) Residents do not feel that increased foot traffic from the trail will help prevent criminal activities.
    - i) The PUD stated that repeated studies have shown that increased public use has a positive effect on rates of vandalism.
  - e) Concerns were expressed about barbecue grills and other public uses.
    - i) The PUD will properly sign the park and discourage unauthorized uses.
    - ii) The PUD was informed that there is a poor track record of proper education through the signage programs.
  - f) In the past, rock barriers have not been enough to stop vehicular traffic.
    - i) With the existing rock barrier, public uses have been better, but not perfect.
  - g) In the past, problems with large groups and loud music, needles and condoms were all present.

- i) Residents believe that development of the park will cause these uses to reoccur.
  - ii) Residents feel that Buckshot is a frightening place and that this area will become similar in the event that a park is constructed.
- h) Residents feel that creation of a park will create more parking problems than exist currently.
  - i) Concerns were expressed about park users parking in their driveways and walking to the park.
    - (1) PUD explained that the parking lot would be to keep people from parking along the road, which is against county ordinance.
    - (2) A parking lot should be preferred by the public over personal use driveways.
- 7) The PUD asked Desert Aire residents what they would like to see in the park.
  - a) Plants
  - b) Interpretive signage
  - c) Benches
  - d) No Shelters
  - e) No tables
  - f) No swimming area
  - g) Provide no amenities to imply that this is a destination to stop at, it is a trail.
  - h) Prevent any disturbances of the area.
  - i) Meet the most minimal requirements without sacrificing views, sanity, safety or property values.
  - j) The PUD stated that the beach area may be optional requirement, but it would need to verify with FERC.
  - k) Desert Aire residents agreed that a small parking lot may have some benefit, although they stated a preference that it not be visible from their homes and the road.
    - i) PUD explained that the parking lot was initially planned to be visible from the road to make patrol and enforcement easier and more effective.
  - l) Residents would like to see:
    - i) Trail w/ ADA access and interpretive information
    - ii) Prefer benches over picnic tables
    - iii) Would prefer to have the picnic tables at the existing Desert Aire Park.
  - m) Concern was expressed about the future of the Desert Aire permit to operate the boat launch and other facilities.
    - i) There has been no discussion to date of permits. These permits will be evaluated on an individual basis in the future.
  - n) The PUD will take this feedback and compile it with feedback from the Cox Landing meeting on June 10<sup>th</sup> and have the consultants come up with several alternatives that both meet the FERC requirements and are more acceptable to area residents.
    - i) Timeline 4 to 6 weeks after the 10<sup>th</sup>
    - ii) Will try to have something prior to the June 27<sup>th</sup> annual meeting, but cannot guarantee that deadline.
- 8) Residents expressed their concerns about the proposed developments

- a) Many people are concerned
- b) 100 signatures were collected on a petition in 2 days.
- c) Residents are frustrated with the turnover in PUD staff.
  - i) Feel that they have to explain their concerns continually
- d) The public perception is that the PUD does not care about their concerns and will put the proposed elements in just to get the projects over with.
  - i) The PUD stated that this is not the case and will work to improve its image with the public by ensuring a cooperative process from here forward.
- 9) Residents informed the PUD that they can anticipate 100 people at the Desert Aire Parks Marina and Greenbelt committee on the 12<sup>th</sup>.
- 10) The PUD offered to create alternatives of the Park design to address the Residents concerns.



Grant County  
**PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT**  
*Excellence in Service and Leadership*

Grant PUD – Desert Aire Coordination Meeting  
10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., 5/22/09  
Desert Aire Club House

Attendees:

---

**Grant PUD**

Kelly Larimer

Brandon Little

Brad Harshman

**Desert Aire**

Bob Kibler

James Curdy

### Meeting Summary

Agenda items:

- 1) Clarification - May 2<sup>nd</sup> Parks Marina and Greenbelt Committee Meeting
  - a) The Committee was disappointed at the May 2<sup>nd</sup> committee meeting when Grant PUD was unable to share the concept designs for the park, trail, and boat launch.
    - i) Discussion took place regarding why the PUD could not share the designs at that point in time
    - ii) James asked if we were going to have a preferred alternative by their annual HOA meeting, 6/27/09. At this time due to the status of these factors, Grant PUD may not have a preferred alternative selected by this date, but will do it's best to have alternatives developed for review.
- 2) Communication Plan
  - a) In order to more effectively communicate both verbally and in writing Grant PUD provided a draft communication protocol to the James and Bob. They both agreed it looked like a good plan.
    - i) Grant PUD requested that the Committee designate one contact person for their Committee and for the Board. It was decided that since Bob is the Committee chair and a Board member, he would be the primary contact person for Desert Aire/Cox Landing. Bob and James will ensure all information from the Desert Aire/Cox Landing is reviewed and coordinated with board members.
    - ii) Igor will be the primary contact person from Grant PUD. Igor and Brad will ensure all information from the PUD is reviewed and coordinated with appropriate staff members and management.

- iii) Igor and Bob will be responsible for accurately collecting and disseminating information, issues and concerns both with each other, staff, and interested parties.
  - b) Grant PUD reiterated the importance of relaying timely and accurate information from the PUD to the HOA Board. Moreover, Grant PUD needs to work directly with the Board at upcoming meetings.
    - i) Bob and Dick are both board members and Parks Committee members.
  - c) Grant PUD Process – Committee/Board roles
    - i) Grant PUD discussed their updated process for implementing the recreation Developments.
    - ii) In February, Grant PUD was under the impression that Commission review could come after unveiling the preferred alternative to the Committee. However, due to the economic climate, Grant PUD Commissioners are reviewing all major expenses and looking to save money whenever possible.
  - d) This is only an issue with the boat launch since the License only requires Grant PUD to extend the boat launch. The Park and Trail are license requirements and Grant PUD is following very closely what was submitted in the Draft Recreation Resource Management Plan that FERC approved of in the License.
  - e) Grant PUD committed to attending the Committee's meeting on June 12<sup>th</sup>.
    - i) A short presentation on the Shoreline Management Plan and Recreation Resources Management Plan requirements will be provided.
  - f) Public/Private concerns and ideas regarding the recreation developments
    - i) Grant PUD will contact concerned parties to meet on June 5<sup>th</sup> to better convey our federal requirements to complete the recreation enhancement measures identified in the license.
- 3) Project Status
- a) There is one design for the park, one design for the trail and four designs for the boat launch.
    - i) These preliminary concept designs (most notably for the boat launch improvements) may be subject to change following completion of Cultural Resource Surveys, environmental review, Grant PUD Commission approval, and costs.
- 4) Consultation and Permitting Status
- a) Grant PUD will have an informal environmental review of the project designs on June 2<sup>nd</sup>.
  - b) Cultural Resource Surveys will begin upon approval from the Cultural Resource Working Group in late June.
- 5) Next Steps
- a) Grant PUD will meet with concerned parties regarding the Priest Rapids Park and the Desert Aire/Mattawa Trail.
  - b) Grant PUD will attend the Committee's Meeting June 12<sup>th</sup> and provide a presentation on the Shoreline Management Plan and current recreation concept plans
  - c) Grant PUD will attend the Desert Aire HOA annual meeting on June 27<sup>th</sup> and will likely present the same presentation given on June 12<sup>th</sup>.



Grant County  
**PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT**  
*Excellence in Service and Leadership*

Grant PUD - Desert Aire Coordination Meeting  
10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m., 2/14/09  
Desert Aire Club House

Attendees:

**Grant PUD**

Kelly Larimer  
Brandon Little  
Igor Shaporda Bob Barger  
Brad Harshman

**Desert Aire**

Bob Kibler  
James Curdy  
Terry Jensen  
Derrick Smith  
Doug Shore  
Jeff Shimmin

**Discussion topics:**

Reid Middleton Report

- 1) Reviewed designs and drawings
  - a) Discussed inclusion of potential habitat protection and mitigation elements in the plan
  - b) Mackay and Sposito will redraft the Reid Middleton Report and include the trail, park, and proposed vegetation/shoreline restoration.
  - c) Need designs to 30% level for regulatory review

Desert Aire Recreation Area

- 2) Implementation and Scheduling
  - a) Grant emphasized that the PUD owned Desert Aire Shoreline is for all public access.
- 3) Boat Launch
  - a) Three design options will be developed and will include the preferred design provided in the Reid Middleton report.
- 4) Trail
  - a) Discussed trail routing around boat launch and campground and on private property. Desert Aire said they did not investigate the idea. It was suggested to keep it on Grant PUD Property
  - b) The Desert Aire Parks Committee will pursue working with their HOA board and membership to dedicate Tract "D" for public trail head parking.
  - c) Discussed the common areas to be used as feeder trails. These properties to the South of the Boat Launch facility are already graveled and signed for public access to and from the PUD shoreline.

- d) The two feeder trails to the North are actual GCPUD easements, off Lakeside Dr, next to the two houses that are exempt from the Desert Aire Homeowner Association. Grant PUD will investigate these easements to ensure their availability for public access in perpetuity.
  - e) The trail will connect at the park on the North end, go through the Boat Launch and Campground on the eastern most border, and then a proposal to connect the trail to the New Heritage Center South of Desert Aire Community will be investigated.
  - f) The Desert Aire Parks committee agreed to promote the boat launch, trail and park as a valuable community and public amenity.
- 5) Renaming of the Park
- a) Desert Aire suggested renaming the launch and park to Halbert Landing, for a family that helped originally develop Desert Aire.
  - b) Grant PUD will seek advice from upper management and the PUD Commission on a preferred site naming protocol.
- 6) Next Steps
- a) March 31st: Deadline for preparing graphics and narrative for submittal to HOA newsletter
  - b) June 11th: Deadline for materials for the Desert Aire HOA Board Meeting held on the 12th
  - c) June 27th: Desert Aire HOA Annual Meeting

7) Action Items:

	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>	<b>April</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>June</b>
<b>Grant PUD</b>	-Investigate both easements on Edgewater Way -Deliver recreation use to MacKay and Sposito.	Provide by 3/31/09 recreation concept map for DA April newsletter and local papers.	-Late April: Hold meetings with permitting agencies concerning the boat launch designs Determine sub-contractor needs for cultural surveys	-Early May: Present Boat Launch designs to Grant PUD Commission.	-Attend DAOA Board Meeting on the 12th
<b>Desert Aire Parks Committee</b>	-Deliver ASPI survey data to GCPUD (Brandon Little).  -Deliver recreation use data to GCPUD (Brad Harshman) Board approval for Track D James Curdy will begin assistance with public education & outreach	-Present Tract "D" to their board for use as a trailhead parking area.  -Late March Review M&S redraft it will include information on potential community compost / yard waste receptacle. Message to avoid dumping on GCPUD property.	-Include Rec Area designs in April 15 <sup>th</sup> newsletter and mailing packet		-27th of June, Annual DAOA Meeting
<b>Mackay &amp; Sposito</b>		-Redraft the Reid Middleton Report and include the trail, park, and proposed vegetation/shoreline restoration. -30% level designs	Preferred design by end of April		



Grant County  
**PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT**  
*Excellence in Service and Leadership*

Grant PUD – Desert Aire Coordination Meeting  
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., 11/15/08  
Desert Aire Club House

Attendees:

---

**Grant PUD**

Kelly Larimer  
Igor Shaporda  
Brad Harshman

**Desert Aire**

Terry Jensen  
Doug Shore  
Dick Dorton

James Curdy  
Bob Kibler

The Parks, Marina and Greenbelt Committee met Saturday, November 15<sup>th</sup>, at 9 AM downstairs in the Clubhouse. The following people were in attendance: Terry Jensen, Doug Shore, Dick Dorton, James Curdy and Bob Kibler, Chairman of the Committee, and Igor Shaporda, Brad Harshman and Kelly Larimer of the Grant PUD.

The following details about the River Campground/marina improvement plan must be provided to Reid-Middleton for inclusion in their final documents for us:

1. Parking, specifying number of ways (1 or 2). Parking dimensions such as parking angle, stall width and depth, curb length, aisle width and unit depth need to be included as well.
2. Ingress/Egress for parking, including vehicular circulation
3. Trail Integration. Specifically, trail needs to be shown in the vicinity of boat launch area.
4. Add Vaulted Toilet showing setback of at least 25' from the front property line; 5' –side, and 10' –rear, to be decreased to 5' if parcel abuts a common area (green belt).
5. Zoom out to include existing and surrounding Desert Aire property,
6. Updated drawing that includes the delineation/boundary of the proposed improvements.
7. Summary of the proposed work plan, including materials, cost estimates

There was a question about whether or not the removal of the existing SW ramp in the basin will be included.

Desert Aire and the PUD together will negotiate a new use agreement for operation and maintenance of recreation facilities on PUD property. Modifications to user fees will be assessed at that time. .

Priorities for the whole shoreline plan are health and safety, user friendliness to the public, and protection and enhancement of shoreline habitat.

The exact locations of trails and double-vault toilets have yet to be worked out. Yet, it was discussed that it would be safest if the trail was built on private property along the northeast side of parking lot area. The original plan identifies 3.1 miles of trail. The PUD will begin trail improvement planning in conjunction with improvements to the boat launch.

Next steps include providing the PUD with all information listed above, and any other related information developed by the Desert Aire committee and/or their contractor. The PUD will review the materials and integrate them into the recreation improvement work schedules for the Desert Aire vicinity. The Desert Aire Parks, Greenbelt, and Marina committee has agreed to work with homeowners in the association to determine possible trail locations and public parking near and around the boat launch and park area. The meeting was adjourned at 11 AM.



Grant County  
**PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT**  
*Excellence in Service and Leadership*

Grant PUD – Desert Aire Coordination Meeting  
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m., 11/14/08  
Desert Aire Club House

Attendees:

---

**Grant PUD**

Sheryl Dotson  
Igor Shaporda  
Brad Harshman

**Desert Aire**

Terry Jensen  
Bob Kibler  
Dick Dorton

James Curdy  
Doug Shore

A workshop of the Parks, Marina and Greenbelt Committee met at the Desert Aire Clubhouse downstairs at 2 PM Friday, November 14<sup>th</sup>. In attendance were PUD employees Sheryl Dotson, Brad Harshman and Igor Shaporda, and Committee members Terry Jensen, Bob Kibler, Dick Dorton, James Curdy and Doug Shore.

Introductions were made for two new PUD people that we will be working with. Brad Harshman is a Lands and Recreation Specialist and will be our contact. Igor Shaporda is a Lands Specialist and deals with Permits and Real Estate issues.

The PUD has contracted with Alliance Consulting of East Wenatchee, who will assist the PUD with finalization and implementation of the Shoreline Management Plan and implementation of the Recreation Resources Management Plan.

Grant PUD is observing increased shoreline encroachment by various homeowners adjacent to the freeboard and some are in Desert Aire. None had called to obtain authorization for access to PUD property. New license requirements aimed to protect and enhance PUD property for natural and cultural resources must be considered before any modifications can be made to PUD property. The PUD would like Desert Aire to work cooperatively with it to stem these encroachments. During this transitioning time no new development will be allowed on PUD property, including but not limited to the delineating rock walls between parcels, paths, picnic tables, gardens etc. Desert Aire's next newsletter should get information out to residents about not modifying, driving on, dumping yard waste, or storing personal property on the freeboard area. PUD staff will write a rough draft of what they would like to see in the Newsletter and send it to us.

The Shoreline Plan must be completed and approved by FERC. FERC has required the PUD to consult with Washington State Departments of Natural Resources, Fish and Wildlife, Recreation and Conservation Office; United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Wanapum Band of Indians regarding the Shoreline Management Plan.