

**PENDING MINUTES**  
**SPECIAL MEETING**  
**OF THE PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMISSION**  
**TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY**  
**THURSDAY, AUGUST 14, 2025 AT 6:30 P.M.**  
**CASTLE VALLEY TOWN BUILDING - 2 CASTLE VALLEY DRIVE**

**This meeting was a hybrid meeting held electronically by Zoom and also in person at the anchor site at the Town Building.**

**PLUC Members Present at anchor site:** Ryan Anderson, co-chair, Dorje Honer, co-chair, Janie Tuft, and Jeff Whitney

**PLUC Members Present on Zoom:** Marie Hawkins

**PLUC Members Absent:** None

**Present at anchor site:** Building Permit Agent (BPA) Colleen Thompson, Pamela Gibson, Ted Bright, Egmont Honer, Jocelyn Buck, Debbie Holland, Russ Cooper, Dan Prickett, Dan Vink (Rocky Mountain Power [RMP] representative)

**Others Present on Zoom:** Dave Frey, Mayor Jazmine Duncan, Harry Holland, Mary Wakeley

**PLUC Clerk:** Faylene Roth present at anchor site

**CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

Anderson called to order the Special Meeting of the Planning and Land Use Commission (PLUC) of the Town of Castle Valley (CV) at 6:35 P.M. Roth called roll.

**1. Adoption of Agenda**

Whitney moved to adopt the Agenda. Tuft seconded the Motion. Honer, Whitney, Tuft, Hawkins, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

**2. Open Public Comment**

Russ Cooper said it is ironic that the power just went out [before the Meeting]—the exact thing we're trying to stop.

Pamela Gibson asked Vink whether the cause of the outage was in the valley or out. Vink replied that the cause is currently under investigation.

Harry Holland thanked the PLUC for the time they have spent, on short notice, on the power issue. He thanked Gibson for pointing out the project. He noted that the Town has developed ordinances throughout the years to address problems like this power line issue.

**3. Reports - Correspondence:** Anderson reported he had received some questions from residents which he will be asking later in the Meeting.

**Procedural Matters** – Anderson asked PLUC Members to make a statement to declare whether they have had some connection with their property on this project.

Honer said that he lives on Shafer Lane and does have some visual impact. He feels he could benefit from being able to use three-phase power on his lot, but has no plans to do so at this time. He plans to remain neutral regarding that.

Whitney reported that he had noted at the last PLUC Meeting that he had some conflict. If this project goes through, the four property owners at the bottom of Shafer (himself included) plan to eliminate four poles—all the overhead lines clear out to the BLM. He said he doesn't necessarily see this as a conflict, but it does make him want [the project] to happen, which will allow power to be looped around future outages and eliminates four poles. He thinks it is important to add the

three-phase line and to get the connection. His next-door neighbor, he said, gets his power from upper Shafer. His power comes from the fire station on the Loop Road. The electricity doesn't connect. In the past there has been no way to connect.

Tuft said that when she moved to Castle Valley in 1976, it was Utah Power and Light that provided electricity to the Town. She observed that there have been many upgrades since then and improvement in public relations with RMP. She commented that, in the course of decision making, we need to look at what's best for the whole, not just the few. She said that when Ordinance 92-1 was adopted, preserving viewshed was considered important and one of the reasons they adopted it. She suggested that the planning commission at that time may not have been as efficient as today's planning commission, but they did the best they could. She added in a response to Hawkins that Utah Power and Light did not like the underground requirement.

Hawkins suggested they may all have been a little too excited about putting everything underground without understanding the technical problems that were explained at the last PLUC Meeting.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

##### **4. Discussion and possible action re: Nonroutine Decommissioning Contract on Lot 227.**

BPA Thompson explained the need for a Decommissioning Contract for removing a double-wide trailer on the lot before issuing a building permit for a new dwelling. She referred to the Contract in which Prickett states that the existing dwelling will be "moved off the property as soon as disposition can be arranged." The contract further states that while the temporary dwelling remains on the lot, he will disconnect the kitchen range and move it away from the supply line. All electrical service to the dwelling will be disconnected and the structure will not be used as a dwelling nor allowed to be leased or rented after a period of thirty (30) days after occupancy of the new dwelling.

Tuft moved to approve the Nonroutine Decommissioning Contract for Prickett. Whitney seconded the Motion. Honer, Whitney, Tuft, Hawkins, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

##### **5. Discussion and possible action re: Non-Routine Electric Installation Application from Rocky Mountain Power.**

Whitney moved to table Item 5. Tuft seconded the Motion. Honer, Whitney, Tuft, Hawkins, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

Honer read Sections 1-5 of Ordinance 92-1 into the record. (See Attachment.)

Anderson asked Dan Vink to report on his talks with people along Shafer Lane.

Vink replied that he had talked with quite a few customers along Shafer and at the intersection of Shafer and Castle Valley (CV) Drive. He is getting a cost estimate for the customers at the end of Shafer Lane who choose to go underground along their properties. In conversation with Gibson, Vink came up with an alternative that would decrease the number of new poles from five to two. He reported that the owners of Lots 206 and 207 were willing to grant an easement to RMP along the boundary between their lots which allows RMP to remove the three new poles at the intersection with CV Drive. He will have to install one new pole on that boundary line, to which both property owners agreed, and another pole at the end of Shafer to dip underground for the four property owners there who will be paying for that work. If the TC is good with it, Vink said he will get surveys done and recorded for Lots 206 and 207.

Anderson inquired about how many property owners expressed interest in going underground.

Vink said that one property owner along CV Drive expressed interest in putting the line underground if his neighbors concurred. One neighbor was okay with an overhead line. However, Vink explained, the power poles along CV Drive are not required with the new plan and the poles already there will be removed. The existing poles coming up Shafer will be replaced and new equipment will be installed. The owner of Lot 180 agreed to have a down guy installed on his lot.

Honer thought it was important to have electrical upgrades because increased power consumption can be expected in the coming years. As far as the Ordinance goes, installing a clean pole in order to go underground goes against the no new poles declaration in the Ordinance. He added, though, that minimizing the overall impact was a good thing.

Tuft questioned whether Ordinance 92-1 needed to be amended.

Honer didn't think that was a bad idea. He said the Ordinance is confusing in dealing with primary and other lines. He said that he thinks we all understand the intent of the ordinance; so, in his opinion, we should follow the intent over the language when the language is murky and follow the language when the language is not murky.

Whitney observed that the population of CV is increasing. During the first 20 years of its existence population growth stagnated. There was no phone service and other things that attract people to live here, then eventually we progressed to dial-up internet. Now, he noted, people want to live in places like this and they need good reliable power. He and his neighbors saw this as an opportunity to remove poles and improve the views; but, he said, it can't happen unless this project to upgrade the lines is approved. RMP will have to upgrade these lines at some point because they, too, see the increase in use, and they have to deal with our power outages. This, he said, is a great opportunity.

Anderson asked the following questions which had been submitted by email.

1. Where does current power come into CV?

Vink explained that a 69,000 volt line runs from Monticello to Moab where it is reduced to 25,000 volts. From there it is pushed up from a substation at the bottom of Blue Hill and along the Loop Road to Porcupine Rim where it descends near Porcupine Ranch and travels on to Castle Rock Ranch. From there a three-phase line enters the Town at Lazaris Lane. The Blue Hill substation cuts about 30 miles of line from the original LaSal substation transmission. This has provided for a small increase in development in CV.

2. Do CV power lines dead end or do they continue out of the Town and on to other locations?

Vink said that in the past there was a 90-mile three-phase line that started in LaSal and went to Westwater and Gateway. Within CV, he said, it travels from Lazaris to all CV residents. The power within CV dead ends at each residence. From Castle Rock Ranch, it goes on to the Colorado River and on to Gateway to power nearby cell towers.

3. Where does the redundant line in CV begin and end the loop?

According to Vink, the original feed is from Castle Rock Ranch to Lazaris. The redundant feed is from the CV Fire Station on the Loop Road to Shafer.

4. Are there two separate projects here?

Vink said yes. One is to supply the redundant three-phase line which provided an opportunity to correct the safety hazard over the house on Lot 207.

5. Are new three-phase lines required anywhere else in the Town?

Yes, Vink said. We will need to balance the load in the future across the three-phase lines (labeled A, B, and C). He added that some customers may use three-phase lines where there are

large wells or large-equipment motors.

6. Does RMP need to get a right-of way for every project to put up a power pole?

Vink said yes. RMP gets a property easement from all customers.

7. Holland asked if this project will interfere with or overlap with the culvert work at the Town entrance.

Vink said it could, but RMP has traffic control protocol. If the RMP project is approved, they may be finished before the culvert begins.

Honer added there may be delays with the culvert project, so there may be no conflict.

Honer then suggested a recommendation to the TC with our opinion regarding what this project would do, issues with the ordinance and what it would include. The TC will take responsibility for interpreting the Ordinance.

Whitney asked whether the recommendation would be for the old proposal or the updated proposal which would get rid of the poles at upper Shafer, put in two new poles, and eliminate the four poles at the bottom of Shafer.

Vink confirmed that the underground project at lower Shafer is separate in that customers have chosen to go underground. He said rate-payers will not be paying for that. He said that one of the property owners had requested an estimate in 2018 for going underground. He considered it too expensive at the time. That project is now proceeding with three other neighboring property owners joining with him.

Honer acknowledged increased power demand in CV and queried Vink about funding timelines for future upgrades, wondering how important it is to go with this project now.

Vink said he is always looking to improve reliability in CV. He works with his team to find problems and fix problems. He informed PLUC Members that nothing of the scale of this project is planned in the next year or two. He repeated that RMP is scoping a substation near Porcupine Ranch, but that project has been pushed back. He said he has informed his team to consult with CV when scoping out any project. He said timelines are outage driven. When there are lots of outages he can push harder. Sometimes, if something is not funded one year, it will be pushed out another year or even two.

Tuft asked whether the scope of this project includes both the private underground project at the cul-de-sac and the extension of three-phase lines on Shafer.

Vink replied a lot of this is on private property. We're not putting in overhead because the Ordinance doesn't allow it. But, we do have to put in a new clean pole. So, he said, yes.

Honer stated that the current intention is to get three-phase secondary input into the Valley which requires both pieces. We can examine them separately, but the approval needs to be for the whole project.

Vink confirmed that the two poles up on CV Drive will be removed. He already has an existing pole on the boundary between Lot 206 and 207 along with one on the other side of Shafer. However, the span is too great so he has to put in a second pole on the boundary between 206 and 207.

Anderson confirmed that the line will come in at the east end of Shafer and continue up the north side of Shafer. He added that one pole already exists between Lots 206 and 207.

Honer stated that this recommendation to the TC will cover what this project would do and what it would include. The TC, he said, will take responsibility for interpreting the Ordinance.

Whitney moved to recommend to the Town Council that—with the scope of the Ordinance and having looked at the project—it approve the Rocky Mountain Power project that eliminates the two new poles on Castle Drive, that adapts the underground to overhead at the soonest possible

point to current poles, that only replacement of current poles and the addition of the one pole to make the safe removal of overhead lines across a roof, and with the configuration as recommended by Rocky Mountain Power that eliminates four poles and adds only two poles with the caveat that the four existing poles at the end of Shafer Lane will be eliminated because the four property owners at the end of Shafer are allowing the lines to go underground across their properties. Tuft seconded the Motion. Honer, Whitney, Tuft, Hawkins, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

Gibson requested that a map be included for the TC. Vink said he would supply one.

Anderson stated that the recommendation will be forwarded to the TC for their next Meeting.

Buck asked when the Town will know the cost sharing for the project.

Vink replied that RMP does not share the expenses made by private property owners.

Anderson thanked everyone for their work.

**CLOSED MEETING** - None

**ADJOURNMENT**

Honer moved to adjourn. Tuft seconded the Motion.

Anderson adjourned the Meeting at 7:58 P.M.

**APPROVED:**

Ryan Anderson Co-Chair  
Dorje Hone, Co-Chair

Date

**ATTTESTED:**

Faylene Roth, PLUC Clerk

Date

Attachment: Town of Castle Valley Ordinance 92-1