



AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMISSION

TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 2026 AT 5:00 P.M.

CASTLE VALLEY TOWN BUILDING - 2 CASTLE VALLEY DRIVE

This meeting will be a hybrid meeting held electronically by Zoom and also in person at the anchor site at the Town Building. If you have comments or concerns please attend or email them prior to the Meeting: planningclerk@castlevalleyutah.com or call 259-9828 M-W 9AM-1PM. Thank you!

PLEASE NOTE: ** HOW TO JOIN THE ZOOM CONFERENCE CALL**

Meeting ID: 660 541 0108 Passcode: 84532

Option 1 Dial-in phone number (US): (253) 215-8782 follow prompts.

Option 2 Join the online meeting (must have computer speakers and microphone):

<https://zoom.us/j/6605410108?pwd=Q05sYm5qQ0lpNIY5TVp2bTU5VnZjQT09>

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

1. Adoption of Agenda
2. Open Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes: November 6, 2025, Regular Meeting
December 4, 2025, Regular Meeting
4. Reports - Correspondence: TBA
Building Permit Agent Report - Thompson
Procedural Matters: TBA

NEW BUSINESS

5. Discussion and Possible Action re: Appointing PLUC Chair
6. Discussion and Possible Action re: Appointing PLUC Representative to Water Advisory Committee (WAC)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

7. Draft amendments to 2019 General Plan
8. Discussion and possible action regarding updates to land use application forms, in order to align them with changes in procedure and recent amendments to Ordinances 85-3 and 95-6 (tabled):
 - Nonroutine Solar Energy System (SES) Permit Application (update)
 - Building Permit Information Sheet (update)
 - Internal Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit Application (added 6.6.24)
 - Septic Permit Application (approved 5.2.24)
 - Electric Permit Application (approved 5.2.24)
 - Land Disturbance Activity Review (approved 6.6.24)
 - Routine Solar Energy System (SES) Permit Application (approved 8.1.24)
 - Land Disturbance Activity Permit (approved 9.5.24)
 - Certificate of Land Use Compliance (CLUC) Form to replace CLUC for Agricultural Use (approved 9.5.24)
 - Agricultural Exemption Form (approved 3.6.25)
 - Certificate of Occupancy Review form (added 5.8.25)
 - Temporary Dwelling Permit Application form (approved 6.13.25)
 - Temporary Dwelling Permit Renewal form (approved 6.13.25)
 - Fulfillment of Decommission Contracts (added 5.8.25) (approved 4.3.25)
 - Three Acknowledgments – Geologic Hazard, Short Term Rentals, One Dwelling Per Lot (approved 5.8.25)
 - Temporary Accessory Dwelling Permit Application form (added 6.13.25)

CLOSED MEETING - If Needed

ADJOURNMENT

For Meeting Packets go to: <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>

Government: select "Cities", Entity: select "Castle Valley", Body: select "Town of Castle Valley", select this meeting and click on Meeting Packet to download.

PENDING MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMISSION
TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 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 (PM) Present at anchor site: Co-chair Dorje Honer, Janie Tuft, Jeff Whitney (arrived mid-meeting)

PLUC Members Present on Zoom: Marie Hawkins

PLUC Members Absent: Ryan Anderson

Present at anchor site: Mayor Jazmine Duncan, Building Permit Agent (BPA) Colleen Thompson, Egmont Honer, Mike Carlyle,

PLUC Clerk: Faylene Roth present at anchor site

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Honer called to order the Regular Meeting of the Planning and Land Use Commission (PLUC) of the Town of Castle Valley (CV) at 6:30 P.M. Roth called roll.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Tuft moved to adopt the Agenda. Hawkins seconded the Motion. Tuft, Hawkins, and Honer approved the Motion. Whitney was not present for the vote. The Motion passed unanimously with three in favor.

2. Open Public Comment – None

3. Approval of Minutes: October 9, 2025, Regular Meeting

Hawkins moved to approve the Minutes as amended. Tuft seconded the Motion. Tuft, Hawkins, and Honer approved the Motion. Whitney was not present for the vote. The Motion passed unanimously with three in favor.

4. Reports:

Correspondence - None

Building Permit Agent – Thompson reported the following permits during October 2025: a cow shade attached to an existing barn on Lot 161, a re-roof project on Lot 388, and a roof mount solar array on Lot 164. In progress as of November 5, 2025, is a Land Disturbance Part B application for installation of a culvert for shed access on Lot 408.

Thompson also reported that Conditional Use Permit renewal forms were mailed at the end of October. She said renewals are currently coming in. The PLUC will make a recommendation to the Town Council at its December Meeting for approval of the renewals.

Procedural Matters – None

NEW BUSINESS

5. Discussion and possible action re: Meeting dates for 2026.

PLUC Members agreed to meet on the first Thursday of each month during 2026 with the exception of January. The January meeting will take place on the second Thursday, January 8. Roth will inform the Town Clerk.

6. Discussion and possible action re: Draft amendments to 2019 General Plan

Both Thompson and Roth reported that all Survey data has been entered onto spreadsheets.

Thompson is assembling the individual spreadsheets into one and will forward it to Bob O'Brien who will do the statistical analysis for the PLUC. Roth handed out the following documents to PLUC Members: 2019 statistical analysis for reference and comparison, 2020 General Plan to be amended, and a blank copy of the 2025 survey to us with the statistical analysis. These documents will be used over the next few months in formulating the draft General Plan update.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS [The following two items were numbered incorrectly on the Agenda. They are numbered here as they appeared on the Agenda.]

5. Discussion and possible action re: 2025 General Plan Survey

This item was dropped from the Agenda and discussion will be continued under Item 6 above: Draft amendments to 2019 General Plan.

6. Discussion and possible action regarding updates to land use application forms, in order to align them with changes in procedure and recent amendments to Ordinances 85-3 and 95-6 (tabled): Left tabled.

- Nonroutine Solar Energy System (SES) Permit Application (update)
- Building Permit Information Sheet (update)
- Internal Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit Application (added 6.6.24)
- Septic Permit Application (approved 5.2.24)
- Electric Permit Application (approved 5.2.24)
- Land Disturbance Activity Review (approved 6.6.24)
- Routine Solar Energy System (SES) Permit Application (approved 8.1.24)
- Land Disturbance Activity Permit (approved 9.5.24)
- Certificate of Land Use Compliance (CLUC) Form to replace CLUC for Agricultural Use (approved 9.5.24)
- Agricultural Exemption Form (approved 3.6.25)
- Certificate of Occupancy Review form (added 5.8.25)
- Temporary Dwelling Permit Application form (added 5.8.25)
- Temporary Dwelling Permit Renewal form (added 5.8.25)
- Fulfillment of Decommission Contracts (approved 4.3.25)
- Three Acknowledgments – Geologic Hazard, Short Term Rentals, One Dwelling Per Lot

CLOSED MEETING - None

ADJOURNMENT

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

Honer adjourned the Meeting at 6:51 PM.

APPROVED:

Ryan Anderson Co-Chair
Dorje Hone, Co-Chair

Date

ATTESTED:

Faylene Roth, PLUC Clerk

Date

PENDING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMISSION
TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 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 (PM) Present at anchor site: Co-chairs Dorje Honer and Ryan Anders

PLUC Members Present on Zoom: Marie Hawkins

PLUC Members Absent: Janie Tuft, Jeff Whitney

Present at anchor site: Building Permit Agent (BPA) Colleen Thompson, Sherry Karp

Present on Zoom: Egmont Honer

Meeting Clerk at anchor site: Jocelyn Buck

PLUC Clerk on Zoom: Faylene Roth

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Anderson called to order the Regular Meeting of the Planning and Land Use Commission (PLUC) of the Town of Castle Valley (CV) at 6:32 P.M. Buck called roll.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Honer moved to adopt the Agenda. Hawkins seconded the Motion. Hawkins, Honer, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously with three in favor.

2. Open Public Comment – None

3. Approval of Minutes: November 6, 2025, Regular Meeting

Honer moved to table approval of the Minutes until the January Meeting since Anderson will abstain because did not attend the Meeting, so there would not be a quorum to approve them. In addition, there is a watermark on page 3 that needs to be removed. Hawkins seconded the Motion. Hawkins, Honer, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously with three in favor.

4. Reports:

Correspondence – None

Building Permit Agent – Thompson reported a Certificate of Occupancy for Lot 227, a temporary electrical meter main permit for construction on Lot 386, a four bedroom septic permit on Lot 335, and a Certificate of Land Use Compliance for a chicken coop, goat barn, and a shed on Lot 302. She also reported a garage-mount solar permit on Lot 27 from October that had not been included in last month's report. In addition, she reported that a Decommissioning fulfillment within 30 days is underway for Lot 302. The owner, Daniel Prickett, plans to decommission the kitchen and to move the structure off-site when he finds a home for it.

Procedural Matters – Anderson reported that the newly-formed Water Advisory Committee (WAC) bylaws call for a PLUC Member to serve on the committee with five knowledgeable water people. Anderson proposed three possibilities:

(1) follow the bylaws and have a member of the PLUC attend WAC meeting; (2) change the bylaws to allow the PLUC to designate a person experienced in water issues who would report to the PLUC; or (3) have John Groo be a non-voting chair and have the five experienced people serve as committee members. Anderson asked PLUC Members to think about whether one of them would

attend WAC committee meetings or whether to suggest a bylaw change. He will talk with the other PLUC Members.

5. Discussion and possible action re: recommendation to the Town Council for approval of nonpermanent conditional use permits and business license renewals for 2026

Honer moved to approve as presented. Hawkins seconded the Motion. Hawkins, Honer, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously with three in favor.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. Discussion and possible action re: Draft amendments to 2019 General Plan

PLUC Members agreed to divvy up the survey sections as follows:

Hawkins	A-Community Profile
	D-Community Life
	E-Government
Tuft	B-Water & Septic
Whitney	C-Ordinances & Enforcement
Honer	F-Fire & Fire Prevention
	G-Capital Improvement Projects & Infrastructure
Anderson	H-Let Your Voice Be Heard

Honer suggested the following protocol:

- Read results with comments
- Consider changes that might be made to the General Plan
- Look for things of note in quantitative sections
- Look for things of note that could push toward change

Buck added:

- Read over previous plan for what has changed and use it as a template
- The General Plan presents a summary. The stats are included in the appendix

Hawkins added:

- Compare responses between the last two surveys
- 90% of quantitative items seem to stay the same
- Tables can be included in the test
- The results will be available through the meeting audio for those who are unable to attend the meeting

Thompson added:

- O'B recorded responses as percent of people who answered that question, but it might be better to record as percent of all returned surveys or even as percent of all residents
- The comments have been digitized and were sent out two days before this meeting

PLUC Members agreed that the above assignments will be confirmed offline.

Honer moved to table Item 6. Hawkins seconded the Motion. Honer, Hawkins, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

PLUC Members agreed to set a deadline for finishing this review.

After discussion, Honer move to postpone the January 2026 PLUC Meeting to January 15, 2026, to allow time for members to complete their sections. Hawkins seconded the Motion. Honer, Hawkins, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

7. Discussion and possible action regarding updates to land use application forms, in order to align them with changes in procedure and recent amendments to Ordinances 85-3 and 95-6 (tabled): Left tabled.

- Nonroutine Solar Energy System (SES) Permit Application (update)
- Building Permit Information Sheet (update)
- Internal Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit Application (added 6.6.24)
- Septic Permit Application (approved 5.2.24)
- Electric Permit Application (approved 5.2.24)
- Land Disturbance Activity Review (approved 6.6.24)
- Routine Solar Energy System (SES) Permit Application (approved 8.1.24)
- Land Disturbance Activity Permit (approved 9.5.24)
- Certificate of Land Use Compliance (CLUC) Form to replace CLUC for Agricultural Use (approved 9.5.24)
- Agricultural Exemption Form (approved 3.6.25)
- Certificate of Occupancy Review form (added 5.8.25)
- Temporary Dwelling Permit Application form (added 5.8.25)
- Temporary Dwelling Permit Renewal form (added 5.8.25)
- Fulfillment of Decommission Contracts (approved 4.3.25)
- Three Acknowledgments - Geologic Hazard, Short Term Rentals, One Dwelling Per Lot

CLOSED MEETING - None

ADJOURNMENT

Honer moved to adjourn. Hawkins seconded the Motion. Honer, Hawkins, and Anderson approved the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

Honer adjourned the Meeting at 7:22 PM.

APPROVED:

Ryan Anderson Co-Chair
Dorje Hone, Co-Chair

Date

ATTESTED:

Faylene Roth, PLUC Clerk

Date

Subject: **Re: CV Cell Tower**
From: Robert P Lippman <Bob.Lippman@nau.edu>
To: planningclerk@castlevalleyutah.com
<planningclerk@castlevalleyutah.com>, Ryana <ryana@castlevalleyutah.com>
Date: 2025-12-14 5:28 pm



Greetings Feyline ~

Please review and accept this correspondence for the PLUC regarding the as yet characterized cell tower proposal for the valley.

Although the proposed tower would be placed on fire district property just outside the town boundary, the matter certainly implicates the interests of the PLUC, in regard to non-conformance, impact and public safety. For a project such as this, the entire town would be directly affected, and thus the Town and/or PLUC should do diligent research and hold a public hearing on the matter. A formal statement or opinion by the Commission would certainly carry weight, if not authority, in any Fire Commission or County Planning decisions.

A cell tower would run anywhere from 60 to 120' tall, if not higher, and would require 24/7 flashing red lights, constituting an extreme visual intrusion and violation of our dark skies designation. Such a tower would also constitute a grave hazard for emergency helicopter landings and take-offs adjacent to Fire Station 1. There are also very serious risks and proven impacts to public health of the entire community from the high power RF microwave emissions.

Please find and review my initial comments to the Fire Commission, below.

There is no need for a cell tower in Castle Valley, and it would add nothing to emergency services. We already have a fiber-optics system in place that allows for cell calling, reverse 911 noticing, fire department radio and paging capacity allowing direct contact with the Sheriff's Office, other emergency networks, and between emergency personnel in the field, and now, cell phone satellite connectivity available to all (which will become universal very soon, and render toxic and intrusive cell towers obsolete).

Thank you for the PLUC's thoughtful consideration of this matter.

Bob Lippman
/ / /

Greetings Fire Commission, et al.

As most of you know, I served on the fire commission for 8 years, from 2007 to 2014, and communications were always a concern and priority. For this reason, I continued to advocate for an upgraded telecom system in Castle Valley, and was instrumental in securing the willingness and funding for the successfully implemented, Emery-Telcom fiber-optics system, which allows for cellular calling/receiving via in-home modems. The top reason that I advocated and worked at this, with a Town committee, was, in addition to enhanced telecommunications, to obviate the perception of any need for a cell tower in the valley, for the compelling reasons I have outlined below.

I have, for over 20 years now, followed the issue of cell tower impacts on people living and working in proximity to towers, and the evidence of serious mental and physical impacts and decline from microwave exposure is now overwhelming and undeniable, and yet still largely suppressed, despite the fact that the World Health Organization classifies RF microwave radiation as a Class 2 carcinogen. Further, as early as 2004, when towers were only 2G, the **International Association of Firefighters**, along with local firefighter unions and other organizations, officially called for a *ban on tower siting on or near fire stations* due to documented, *serious impairment of firefighters* from the extreme microwave RF radiation. As a result, the State of California and other areas created exemptions for such tower siting due to the recognized grave risk of cancer and other serious diseases and impairments.

These risks and impacts go far beyond the required, *unacceptable 24/7 flashing red lights* from the tower that this community would certainly not tolerate. These are *community issues and concerns*, beyond any insular decisions of the Fire Commission. Please review the 3 webpages noted below for an overview of the gravity of this problem, especially relevant to firefighter health and safety, and I urge you to act accordingly to protect the public health of our community and firefighters.

<https://www.iaff.org/cell-tower-radiation/>

Summary:

The International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) maintains a longstanding opposition to the placement of cell towers and antennas on fire station facilities, a position formally adopted in August 2004.²³⁴⁺⁵ The IAFF asserts that such installations pose potential health risks to firefighters, particularly due to prolonged exposure to low-intensity radiofrequency (RF) and microwave (MW) radiation, which may affect the central nervous system and immune system.⁹ The association continues to call for a comprehensive, high-quality scientific study to determine the health effects of this exposure, emphasizing the need for the precautionary principle until safety is proven.²⁹

- The IAFF's official resolution states that it opposes the use of fire stations as base stations for cell towers or antennas until a study with the highest scientific merit and integrity is conducted and it is proven that such sitings are not hazardous to the health of its members.²³⁴⁺⁵
- The IAFF has expressed concern that firefighters exposed to RF radiation from towers on their stations have reported neurological symptoms such as headaches, fatigue, memory loss, slowed reaction time, and disorientation, with some studies suggesting brain damage as indicated by SPECT scans.⁴⁹
- In 2004, the IAFF called for a \$1 million study to investigate the health impacts on firefighters living and working in stations with cell towers, but funding was not secured, and the telecommunications industry's regulatory framework has hindered implementation of a moratorium.⁴
- As of 2025, the IAFF is actively investigating funding for a new U.S. and Canadian study to compare health outcomes of firefighters in stations with and without cell towers.⁹
- The IAFF's position has led to legal exemptions in California, such as AB 57, which grants fire stations protection from forced cell tower placement due to health concerns.

<https://globalpossibilities.org/firefighter-unions-opposing-cell-towers/>
 Summary:

Firefighter groups in the United States have long opposed cell towers on their stations. Not only that, but in California they have been able to be exempt from the forced placement of towers on their stations because of the strong opposition they have- due to health concerns from the radiation. On this page we are keeping documentation on the firefighters' opposition and we have posted important news videos that cover this issue. Teacher unions also have made position statements on wireless radiation.

<https://ehtrust.org/a-cautionary-tale-from-firefighters-of-california-fighting-cell-towers-on-stations/>

The firefighters of California have a cautionary tale to share. They have spent 15 years and millions of dollars fighting cell towers on their stations. They have done so because they know they are among the strongest of the strong when it comes to professionals among us. Yet they have suffered harm living and working in the presence of cell towers, and they know they cannot carry out their duties to protect the general public as they should if they are indeed impaired. Furthermore, they know that those they protect are often more vulnerable than they

are. Logic tells the firefighters, as it tells us, that if the strongest of the strong are harmed, the weakest and most vulnerable among us are at even greater risk.

[detailed, documented health impacts on firefighters (and residents in proximity of towers) are noted in this article]

Thank you greatly for your serious consideration of, and appropriate action and resolution regarding this matter. Given the documented risks and impacts of a residentially-located cell tower (and the volumes of studies and literature accessible regarding this matter), the present ability for wifi-calling in the valley, and the larger community interest involved, any proposals for a cell tower in Castle Valley should properly be rejected, as the risk, harm and visual intrusion far outweigh any short-term (and emergency) benefit.

Bob Lippman

TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY - Building Permits Report

Approval Date Between 12/1/25 And 12/31/25

Approval	Lot	Road	Owner	Type	Purpose	Description	Height	Sq Ft <=19	Sq Ft >19
12/15/2025	185	Shafer Lane East	Humbrecht, John & H	Other	Other	LDA	0	0	0
12/18/2025	227	Miller Lane East	Daniel Prickett	Decomm	Fulfillment	single-wide			

In Process

153	Buchanan	Honer & Cate	Demo	Remove decommissioned mobile home
216	Shafer	Cermak & Grinspoon	Elec	Violation Minisplit installed without permit. They will apply.
404	Cliffview	Steven Rowe	Septic	
404	Cliffview	Steven Rowe	BP	Residence

Survey	Freq.	Percent
First (Primary or joint response)	181	95.77%
Second (Second member of household)	8	4.23%
Total	189	100.00%

SECTION A—COMMUNITY PROFILE

(A1) Are you a (circle all that apply)

(comment: O'B some people circled more than one response such as both part-time resident and non-resident property owner)

Status	Freq.	Percent
Full time resident	99	51.30%
Part time resident	62	32.12%
Renter	1	0.52%
Non-Resident Prop Owner	31	16.06%
Total	193	100.00%

(A2) Number of People in your Household?

Number Freq. Percent

0	3	1.75%
1	37	21.64%
2	114	66.67%
3	7	4.09%
4	8	4.68%
5	1	0.58%
11	1	0.58%
Total	171	100.00%

(A3) Age of household members

mean	median	# of People
age	62.00	298

(A4) Number of years you have owned land in Castle Valley?

mean	median	# of responses
years	20.78	20
		179

(A5) How many lots do you own?

# owned	Freq.	Percent
1	147	82.58%
2	25	14.04%
3	2	1.12%
5	1	0.56%
8	2	1.12%
10	1	0.56%
Total	178	100.00%

(A6) Number of years you have been residing in Castle Valley?

mean	median	# of responses
#years	16.14	13
		159

(A7) If you are you a registered voter is Castle Valley your registered voting address?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	89	52.98%
No	79	47.02%
Total	168	100.00%

(A8) Are you currently renting out a home that you own in Castle Valley?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	4	2.21%
No	177	97.79%
Total	181	100.00%

(A9) At what stage of development is your property (circle all that apply; use back of paper for additional lots):

(a) Permanent housing

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	144	76.19%
No	45	23.81%
Total	189	100.00%

(b) Temporary Housing

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	16	8.47%
No	173	91.53%
Total	189	100.00%

(c) Actively Building

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	12	6.35%
No	177	93.65%
Total	189	100.00%

(d) Vacant

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	24	12.70%
No	165	87.30%
Total	189	100.00%

(A10) If you do not currently have permanent housing, or if you own additional lots, do you plan to build a residence in (circle one: use back of paper for additional lots)

	Freq.	Percent
1-4 years	15	25.42%
5 years	7	11.86%
10 years	0	0.00%
Never	15	25.42%
Depends	22	37.29%
Total	59	100.00%

SECTION B—WATER & SEPTIC

(B1) Do you have a well?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	153	82.26%
No	33	17.74%
Total	186	100.00%

(B2) If yes, has the quality or quantity of your well changed within the past three years (use back of paper for additional lots)

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	18	11.76%
No	87	56.86%
Don't Know	48	31.37%
Total	153	100.00%

(B3) If you do not have a well, why not (circle all that apply: use back of paper for additional lots)

(a) Poor water quality

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	12	36.36%
Not Circled	21	63.64%
Total	33	100.00%

(b) Lack of water availability

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	10	30.30%
Not Circled	23	69.70%
Total	33	100.00%

(c) Cost of drilling

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	14	42.42%
Not Circled	19	57.58%
Total	33	100.00%

(d) Property undeveloped

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	16	48.48%
Not Circled	17	51.52%
Total	33	100.00%

Other

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	10	30.30%
Not Circled	23	69.70%
Total	33	100.00%

(B4) If you do not have a well, do you have a cistern?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	19	29.23%
No	46	70.77%
Total	65	100.00%

(O'B comment: there are some other questions like the one above with more responses than possible: see question B1 where there are only 33 who don't have a well, but here we have 74 answering the question. Difficult to know what to do since people with well that does not produce potable water may well have cistern.)

(84a) What size of cistern capacity

mean	median	# of properties
2,674	1700	17

(B4b) Do you have water commercially delivered?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	9	12.16%
No	65	87.84%
Total	74	100.00%

(B4C) If not commercially delivered, what is the primary source of your water (circle one)?

	Freq.	Percent
Moab	8	47.06%
Castle Valley Neighbor	5	29.41%
Rooftop	4	23.53%
Total	17	100.00%

(B5) Do you support the Town continuing research on options to provide residents whose lots produce little or no water and/or poor quality water with

(5a) Non-potable water

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	95	59.75%
No	64	40.25%
Total	159	100.00%

(5b) potable water

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	116	67.05%
No	57	32.95%
Total	173	100.00%

B6 The Town has historically been concerned with the aquifer and surface water protection and management. Would you support further restrictions and lot mitigations.

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	102	66.23%
No	52	33.77%
Total	154	100.00%

B7 Do you support putting more money toward our water infrastructure?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	91	58.33%
No	65	41.67%
Total	156	100.00%

(B8) If you have a septic system, when was it installed? In the last (circle one; use back of paper for additional lots):

	Freq.	Percent
0-5 years	18	11.39%
5-10 years	7	4.43%
10-15 years	24	15.19%
Over 15 years	94	59.49%
Don't Know	15	9.49%
Total	158	100.00%

(B9) When was your septic system last pumped? In the last (circle one: use back of paper for additional lots)

	Freq.	Percent
0-5 years	86	55.13%
5-10 years	25	16.03%
10-15 years	4	2.56%
Over 15 years	3	1.92%
Never	23	14.74%
Don't Know	15	9.62%
Total	157	100.00%

SECTION C—ORDINANCES AND ENFORCEMENT

(C1) Currently, Castle Valley regulates height and square footage to protect viewshed, drainage, and rural character. Are the current regulations (circle 1)

	Freq.	Percent
Satisfactory	123	71.93%
Too Stringent	32	18.71%
Too Lenient	16	9.36%
Total	171	100.00%

(C2) Enforcement of Town ordinances is primarily handled through the Formal Complaint Process. Do you favor the Town investigating other means to enforce ordinances?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	66	41.51%
No	93	58.49%
Total	159	100.00%

(C2a) If yes, please identify specific mechanisms that might be considered (circle all that apply).

(a) Complaint-driven

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	46	69.70%
Not Circled	20	30.30%
Total	66	100.00%

(b) Town can initiate

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	57	86.36%
Not Circled	9	13.64%
Total	66	100.00%

(c) Hire code enforcement officer

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	28	42.42%
Not Circled	38	57.58%
Total	66	100.00%

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	21	31.82%
No	45	68.18%
Total	66	100.00%

SECTION D—COMMUNITY LIFE

(D1) Currently the Town allows home and premises businesses. Do you think current level allowed commercial activity is

	Freq.	Percent
Satisfactory	142	80.68%
Too stringent	27	15.34%
Too lenient	7	3.98%
Total	176	100.00%

(D4) Controlling and/or eradicating migrating noxious weeds and other non-native invasive species from Castle Valley is an ongoing challenge for all property owners.

Please rate the impact of weeds on your property.

	Freq.	Percent
Minimal impact	52	29.89%
Moderate impact	87	50.00%
Severe impact	35	20.11%
	174	100.00%

(D5) The median age of residents in Castle Valley is 68.9 years as of the July 1, 2024, U.S. Census Bureau update. How concerned are you about your ability to remain living in your home as you get older or if you have a health challenge at any age (circle one)

	Freq.	Percent
Not concerned	22	12.57%
Low concern	55	31.43%
Medium concern	54	30.86%
High concern	44	25.14%
Total	175	100.00%

(D6) As people grow older, they may need services not usually required for younger people. On a scale of 1-5, with 1 being little interest/support and 5 being substantial interest/support, do you think the Town should

(a) Explore the costs, benefits, practicality, and likely usage of a regular transportation service to Moab?

	Freq.	Percent
1	48	31.37%
2	17	11.11%
3	28	18.30%
4	15	9.80%
5	45	29.41%
Total	153	100.00%

(b) Explore options for a visiting nurse to come to CV on a regular basis?

	Freq.	Percent
1	46	29.49%
2	12	7.69%
3	44	28.21%
4	20	12.82%
5	34	21.79%
Total	156	100.00%

(c) Explore senior housing for seniors/caretakers other than the currently allowed temporary accessory dwelling units and internal accessor dwelling units.

	Freq.	Percent
1	62	43.97%
2	11	7.80%
3	25	17.73%
4	10	7.09%
5	33	23.40%
Total	141	100.00%

SECTION E—GOVERNMENT

(E1) How do you receive news about the Town government (circle all that apply)

(a) Town Website

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	80	42.33%
Not Circled	109	57.67%
Total	189	100.00%

(b) Attending Meetings

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	35	18.52% [corrected]
Not Circled	154	57.67%
Total	189	100.00%

(c) Word of mouth

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	109	57.67%
Not Circled	80	42.33%
Total	189	100.00%

(d) Email

	Freq.	Percent
Circled	128	67.72%
Not Circled	61	32.28%
Total	189	100.00%

(e) Bulletin Board

	Freq.	Percent
Circle	48	25.40%
Not Circle	141	74.60%
Total	189	100.00%

(f) Town Mailings

	Freq.	Percent
Circle	78	41.27%
Not Circle	111	58.73%
Total	189	100.00%

(g) TI's Castle Valley Comments

	Freq.	Percent
Circle	60	31.75%
Not Circle	129	68.25%
Total	189	100.00%

(h) Unofficial Castle Valley Facebook Page

	Freq.	Percent
Circle	60	31.75%
Not Circle	129	68.25%
Total	189	100.00%

(i) Other

	Freq.	Percent
Circle	11	5.82%
Not Circle	178	94.18%
Total	189	100.00%

(E2) If you use the Town website (castlevalleyutah.com), do you find the Town website easy to use, with useful information?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	111	91.74%
No	10	8.26%
Total	121	100.00%

(E3) Are you on the Town email list?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	142	82.56%
No	30	17.44%
Total	172	100.00%

(E4) The Town has several part-time employees. It relies on volunteers to fill positions on the Town Council, the Planning and Land Use Commission, and other ad hoc committees. Would you consider serving on the Town government?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	33	18.75%
No	82	46.59%
Maybe	61	34.66%
Total	176	100.00%

(E5) The Town operates on a small budget, excluding capital projects. The Town receives only about 9.2% of your total County property taxes in 2024. This portion of the County property tax is the primary source of Town revenue. The Town's property tax rate was last raised in 2016. Do you favor raising taxes, as needed?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	105	62.50%
No	63	37.50%
Total	168	100.00%

(E6) Do you favor increasing Town property taxes to hire more staff and/or increase the hours and/or pay of current staff?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	82	51.90%
No	76	48.10%
Total	158	100.00%

SECTION F—FIRE AND FIRE PREVENTION

(F1) Castle Valley properties are vulnerable to wildfire because of the extensive vegetation on most properties. Cheatgrass, dead tumbleweeds and other weeds, dead sage or trees are highly flammable. The Castle Valley Fire Department, and other agencies, encourage making your property Firewise safe, that is defensible against fire. See the Town and Fire Department websites on preparing fire defensible properties. (castlevalleyfire.org)

(a) Has the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands conducted a free Firewise inspection of your lot in the (circle one)

	Freq.	Percent
Past 5 years	46	27.71%
Past 10 years	21	12.65%
Never	99	59.64%
Total	166	100.00%

(b) The Castle Valley Fire Department conducts these wildfire hazard lot assessments by request. Would you use the service?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	102	56.98%
No	40	22.35%
Maybe	37	20.67%
Total	179	100.00%

(c) Would you be willing to hire people to clear vegetation around your property, if the service was available?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	83	45.60%
No	49	26.92%
Maybe	50	27.47%
Total	182	100.00%

SECTION G—CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS & INFRASTRUCTURE

(G1) How do you feel about the condition/maintenance of the road you live on (circle one):

	Freq.	Percent
Very satisfied	24	13.48%
Satisfied	99	55.62%
Dissatisfied	43	24.16%
Very dissatisfied	12	6.74%
Total	178	100.00%

(G2) Should the Town explore improved cell phone coverage? (circle one)

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	126	70.39%
No	53	29.61%
Total	179	100.00%

(G3) Please prioritize the following projects that may require additional taxes or fees. Rate each with a 0-3:
0 = Do not Favor 1 = Low Priority 2= Medium Priority
3 = High Priority

(a) Side road improvement beyond what is currently budgeted.

	Freq.	Percent
0	39	22.29%
1	51	29.14%
2	53	30.29%
3	32	18.29%
Total	175	100.00%

(b) Drainage work beyond what is currently budgeted.

	Freq.	Percent
0	30	17.54%
1	25	14.62%
2	59	34.50%
3	57	33.33%
Total	171	100.00%

(c) Purchase of additional needed equipment for the Town Road Department.

	Freq.	Percent
0	31	18.45%
1	24	14.29%
2	71	42.26%
3	42	25.00%
Total	168	100.00%

(d) Water monitoring wells for quantity/quality

	Freq.	Percent
0	45	25.86%
1	33	18.97%
2	40	22.99%
3	56	32.18%
Total	174	100.00%

SECTION H—LET YOUR VOICE BE HEARD

(H1) Which community values and policies do you believe the Town should continue to protect and maintain? Please prioritize the following community values by rating each with a 0-3:

0 = Do not Favor 1 = Low Priority 2= Medium Priority
3 = High Priority

(a) Water Quality

	Freq.	Percent
0	7	3.91%
1	7	3.91%
2	30	16.76%
3	135	75.42%
Total	179	100.00%

(b) Air Quality

	Freq.	Percent
0	16	9.04%
1	20	11.30%
2	32	18.08%
3	109	61.68%
Total	177	100.00%

(c) Protection of Aquifer

	Freq.	Percent
0	6	3.31%
1	8	4.42%
2	19	10.50%
3	148	81.77%
Total	181	100.00%

(d) Scenic Views

	Freq.	Percent
0	7	3.95%
1	6	3.39%
2	32	18.08%
3	132	74.58%
Total	177	100.00%

(e) Open Space

	Freq.	Percent
0	9	5.14%
1	13	7.43%
2	24	13.71%
3	129	73.71%
Total	175	100.00%

(f) Tranquility/Silence

	Freq.	Percent
0	5	2.79%
1	14	7.82%
2	21	12.69%
3	139	78.68%
Total	179	100.00%

(g) Wild Habitat

	Freq.	Percent
0	11	6.21%
1	22	12.43%
2	39	22.03%
3	105	59.32%
Total	177	100.00%

(h) Dark Skies

	Freq.	Percent
0	7	3.91%
1	10	5.59%
2	25	13.97%
3	137	76.54%
Total	179	100.00%

(i) 5-Acre Minimum Lot Size

	Freq.	Percent
0	6	3.35%
1	7	3.91%
2	19	10.61%
3	147	82.12%
Total	179	100.00%

(j) Single Family Dwelling per Lot

	Freq.	Percent
0	20	11.17%
1	21	11.73%
2	29	16.20%
3	109	60.89%
Total	179	100.00%

(k) Renewable Energy Technologies

	Freq.	Percent
0	21	12.21%
1	35	20.35%
2	51	29.65%
3	65	37.79%
Total	172	100.00%

(d) Emergency Preparedness

	Freq.	Percent
0	9	5.11%
1	26	14.77%
2	74	42.05%
3	67	38.07%
Total	176	100.00%

(l) Sustainable Community Practices

	Freq.	Percent
0	23	13.77%
1	43	25.75%
2	49	29.34%
3	52	31.14%
Total	167	100.00%

(e) Road Improvements

	Freq.	Percent
0	6	3.33%
1	30	16.67%
2	85	47.22%
3	59	32.78%
Total	180	100.00%

(m) Sustainable Agriculture

	Freq.	Percent
0	17	9.94%
1	42	24.56%
2	49	28.65%
3	63	36.84%
Total	171	100.00%

(H7) Is it important that this survey be anonymous in the future?

	Freq.	Percent
Yes	126	74.12%
No	44	25.88%
Total	170	100.00%

(n) No Commercial Development Beyond What Currently Allowed

	Freq.	Percent
0	24	13.48%
1	20	11.24%
2	22	12.36%
3	112	62.92%
Total	178	100.00%

(H2) Which issues do you believe the Town should make a high priority to develop or improve upon? Please prioritize the issues below by rating each with 0-3:

0 = Do not Favor 1 = Low Priority 2= Medium Priority 3 = High Priority

(a) Fire Prevention

	Freq.	Percent
0	6	3.33%
1	3	1.67%
2	30	16.67%
3	141	78.33%
Total	180	100.00%

(b) Evacuation Policies and Plans

	Freq.	Percent
0	10	5.65%
1	37	20.90%
2	61	34.46%
3	69	38.98%
Total	177	100.00%

(c) Animal Control

	Freq.	Percent
0	19	11.05%
1	78	45.35%
2	50	29.07%
3	25	14.53%
Total	172	100.00%