

**WATER ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA**  
**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16<sup>th</sup> 2026. AT 9:00 A.M.**  
**CASTLE VALLEY TOWN BUILDING - 2 CASTLE VALLEY DRIVE**

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

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=O05sYm5qO0lpNlY5TVp2bTU5VnZjOT09>

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

**REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETING**

1. Open Public Comment
2. Approval of Minutes
  - WAC meeting January 12th, 2026
3. Items of Interest
  - MAWP report
  - Water supply outlook report

**NEW BUSINESS**

4. Scheduling of meetings for the calendar year - discussion and action
5. General WAC protocols and open meetings requirements - discussion
6. TCV General Plan Section 5 update - discussion and possible action
7. Water Management Plan Priority Action List (attached)- discussion
  - Explore options for use of surplus water (banking or leasing water options)

**EXECUTIVE REPORTS**

8. Water Management Plan Priority Action List (attached); strategies for implementation
  - Water Rights - Groo
  - Well Metering – Stock/Groo/Honer
  - Castle Creek – Pam
  - Aquifer Monitoring (UGS Program) – Stock/O’Brien
  - Aquifer Monitoring (additional well) - Groo
  - Non-Potable Water for Cisterns – Groo
  - Grand County Watershed Protection Overlay District – O’Brien
  - DRWi Appropriations Policy for CV – Erley

**ADJOURNMENT**

**For Meeting Packets go to:** <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html> Government: select "Cites"  
Entity: select "Castle Valley" Body: select "Town of Castle Valley "Select this meeting and click on "Download attachments"

**Contact information:** Sarah Stock, [wateragent@castlevalleyutah.com](mailto:wateragent@castlevalleyutah.com)

**WATER ADVISORY COUNCIL [DRAFT] MEETING MINUTES**  
**MONDAY, JANUARY 12<sup>th</sup> 2025. AT 9:00 A.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 of the Town Building.

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=O05sYm5aO0lDNlY5TVp2bTU5VnZiOT09>

Water Committee Members Present: Bob O'Brien, Pam Hackley, Dave Erley

Water Committee Present on Zoom: John Groo

Absent: Sue Bellagamba

Present at the anchor site: Ryan Anderson (pending appointment to the WAC), Jocelyn Buck, Sarah Stock, Faylene Roth, Egmont Honer, Laura Cameron, Michael Carlyle

Others Present on Zoom: Colleen Thompson

**REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETING**

WCM Groo called the Meeting to Order at 9:00 AM, Buck called the roll .

1. Open Public Comment: **Roth** brings up Castle Valley leasing of water rights and sole source aquifer status. Asks how hard it is to end such leases and why has it taken so long to get the federal land managers to honor the sole source aquifer status.

WC responds:

Groo: No leasing has been proposed as of this point. The water budget study of 2025 has implications for the future of leasing, but we haven't moved on any of this yet.

Hackley: Sole Source Aquifer designation is in place and the federal agencies understand this. There has been engagement with the EPA on this as well.

O'Brien: Clarifies the protections offered by SSA status. If federal money is going to be used in the SSA, the EPA can look at it and make recommendations on those projects. Symbolically it is important as a hook to get further protections.

Erley: FS and BLM can use categorical exclusions to get around SSA designation. They have used this, including the big project up in Willow Basin, which did happen. But, we have a good position as a town where we are talking directly with both of those agencies as projects come up.

**Anderson** brings up the ordinance creating WAC and the inclusion of a PLUC member. Ryan is here pending the PLUC meeting and pending approval.

**Cameron:** Thinks it's great to have an official water committee with public minutes and recordings because there are so many people with interest. Questions about metering: would it be different for those that had water rights from the town vs. those that have rights through the state directly.

WC responds: Groo: Directs those that are interested to check out the Water Management Plan ([link](#)). This has all the relevant information up to date and is the place where we will be working from for this WAC.

2. Approval of Minutes: None

### 3. Executive Reports:

- MAWP- Hackley explains Moab Area Watershed Partnership (MAWP) is a partnership of local governments, state and federal agencies, watershed interest groups, and concerned citizens. O'Brien is the representative, a meeting is happening next week. Zoom option and recording now available.  
WC discussed the agenda item "executive reports."

### NEW BUSINESS

#### 4. Water Management Plan Priority Action List (attached); strategies for implementation

Groo introduces the document which is split between items requiring funding and those requiring time and effort but no funding.

- Metering of wells using TCV water

WC discusses: If we had a metering system, UDWRi would likely let us administer water as a municipal water system. This would simplify accounting for the Town's water system. The future of water in the west is that one day there will be a state mandate for metering. If we stay ahead of it, we can save money. There are non-invasive options, like metering electrical currents on pumps rather than installing meters at physical pumps. What is the timeline for this? How much will it cost? The public process would be extensive to mandate water metering in Castle Valley, and the decision would not be made by this body alone. Metering would be for the purpose of accurately determining total water use and seeking a Municipal designation for TCV's water rights.

TCV should seek assurances from DWRi that the municipal designation would be approved before implementing metering.

We should make sure that if we implement metering, that the DWRi will allow CV to have a municipal designation.

There is a public presentation on the 2025 USG Water Study Tuesday 2.24.2026 6:30PM

Stock agrees to work with Honer and move this forward.

- Gauging station on upper Castle Creek

WC discusses: There is a new stream gauge at the outlet of Castle Creek. We still need to understand water flow in Castle Creek above the diversions, to understand groundwater/ creek interactions.

MAWP's Arne Hulquist was using a temporary gauge last summer. This is important and should be continued under new MAWP coordinator Colton Lay.

We will seek outside funding for this.

Hackley will work on this.

- Ongoing monitoring of UGS Wells:

Groo explains this includes maintaining the current cost sharing agreement between the UGS and TCV to continue monitoring these wells. Greg Gavin is the current UGS contact.

Stock and O'Brien will take this on.

- Additional monitoring well near the Castle Creek Shafer Lane intersection.

WC discusses: Explains this area has been identified as an important location to understand creek/aquifer interactions. Discussion of well on lot 194, an abandoned well, which would be cheaper than drilling a new well. The well is subject to sanding problems. This well was used for the 2025 study. If the owner is willing, we could re-fit the well to equip it for monitoring. The issue may be the permanent easement that we would require. The ideal location is about 200 yards SE of this site.

Outside funding, including NGWMN (National Groundwater Monitoring Network) funding, should be explored for this.

Groo will initiate conversation with the property owner.

- Non-potable water source (water to be delivered to those without wells).

Groo: There is a demand, though we don't know how big. Currently property owners without wells have to have the water hauled in from Moab. There is the potential to make this potable. The water from the fire department well on lot 13 has some sanding issues. We are seeking an appropriate well for this.

Erley: We have an obligation to look into this as a Public Water Supplier.

Roth: Doesn't see much of an issue with having your water delivered. Brings up the issue of folks getting water from other people's lots and how that is not a trackable use.

Cameron: The City of Moab and the County are becoming more aware of the scarcity of water and we may lose the option of hauling from these communities in the future.

Anderson: Indicates that responses from the recent survey on this issue all over the spectrum, but it is clear we need more information about this option. Matrimony is becoming increasingly difficult to get water from. Some folks report changes to water quality and flow in the survey.

Hackley: Another important aspect of this might be for property owners to have cisterns on their own property for firefighting.

Erley: Could look at getting a well on BLM land near the upper 80 with an eye to a future where we have some fire hydrants along Castle Valley Drive.

Groo will talk to communities with current systems like these in Colorado.

- Ensure inclusion in Grand County WSPOD (Watershed Protection Overlay District)

O'Brien: Explains the WSPOD. This exists for "water suppliers" and large provider wells. Extra protections are afforded to lands within this district. We have a WSP zone near the Mormon Church, because they provide enough water to enough people on enough days to qualify. Also, at the Castle Valley Inc. Academy Campus.

O'Brien will continue this work

- Work with DWRi to develop an appropriation policy for the CV aquifer.

Groo: The town can make a proposal to UDWRi to close the basin to future appropriations.

Erley will work on this and pass it to O'Brien

- Work with DWRi to improve water rights management (consolidation, move towards municipal model)

Groo will continue this work

- Explore options for use of surplus water (banking or leasing water options)

Discussion postponed.

Anderson: Brings up the importance of working with state legislators in order to inform them of our issues and stories and also to craft legislation that would benefit us.

Anderson will work on this.

## 5. Time goal for metering implementation

WC discussed the need for more information on cost and logistics before setting a timeline. Honer explains that he already has four electrical metering devices running for over a year. The devices seem to be working. Asks what the vision for the complete system looks like. How many devices do we need

to connect? The system will be integrated with the Emergency Communication System. 50 wells would be a different route of development than one that includes monitoring all the wells.

Erley: We should leave it open to all people regardless of water rights source.

Thompson: We could position ourselves as a pilot program for the state.

6. Closing the CV watershed to new appropriations-no further discussion

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS-None**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Erley makes a motion to adjourn. All voted in favor.

**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  
"download attachments." Minutes and audio recording are also available on this site.

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

**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%

**(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%

**(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%

**(c) Actively Building**

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

**(A3) Age of household members**

	mean	median	# of People
age	62.00	67	298

**(d) Vacant**

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

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

	mean	median	# of responses
years	20.78	20	179

**(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%

**(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%

**SECTION B—WATER & SEPTIC**

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

	mean	median	# of responses
#years	16.14	13	159

**(B1) Do you have a well?**

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

**(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%

**(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?**

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%

**(d) Other**

	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%
Total	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
Circled	48	25.40%
Not Circled	141	74.60%
Total	189	100.00%

**(f) Town Mailings**

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

**(g) TI's Castle Valley Comments**

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

**(h) Unofficial Castle Valley Facebook Page**

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

**(i) Other**

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

**(E2) If you use the Town website ([castlevalleyutah.com](http://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](http://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%

**(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%

**(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%

**(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 Polies 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%

**(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%

**(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%

**(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%

**(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%

## SECTIONS 5 OF THE DRAFT GENERAL PLAN FOR WAC REVIEW:

### 5. WATER AND WASTE-WATER DISPOSAL SYSTEMS

#### EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Water is provided through individual wells and waste is managed by individual septic wastewater disposal systems. Castle Valley's aquifer is the sole source of drinking water for its residents and an irreplaceable resource. There is no reasonable alternative source available at an economical cost and contamination of this source would pose a significant hazard to public health.

In 1996, the Town passed a Watershed Protection Ordinance (96-1). The Town is committed to working with private landowners, agencies, and authorities that own property in the Castle Valley Watershed to protect water quality and availability.

Our aquifer is extremely vulnerable to contamination. It is an unconsolidated valley-fill type and exposed at the surface with no overlying confining geologic formation. This allows contaminants to move more quickly downward to the water supply. Past and current surveys have shown that respondents consider aquifer protection a high priority as well as protection for Castle Creek [Placer Creek?/] and the artesian spring surface water from nitrate and other possible contaminants.

The Castle Valley Aquifer was declared a Sole Source Aquifer by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency in 2012 and classified by the Utah Geological Survey as "pristine" in certain areas. However, water quality varies with a wide range of potability and usability in different parts of the Town. About 40% of the Town's lots have very hard water that must be purified in order to drink and some lots do not have access to potable water. The Town now has six monitoring wells for measuring water quality changes over time and publishes, on its website, water quality information on an annual basis. Update & describe work of WACS

The Town owns four large water rights which it holds for current use and the long-term development of the Town. With proper management, the Town believes there should be sufficient water rights for all future development in the Town. The State has designated the Town of Castle Valley as a Public Water Supplier. The Town Council has developed procedures to promote efficient management of its water rights. Property owners must sign a Water Use Agreement and Permit with the Town and are allocated a portion of the Town's water rights so they may drill wells and use water for domestic, irrigation, and stock watering purposes. At the time of this update, 167 lots have a Water Use Agreement and Permit with the Town. Of those, 83 lots also have state-issued water rights, and there are 87 lots that have only state issued water rights. There are 161 lots that currently have no water rights but may obtain an allocation of Town rights in the future.

#### GOALS:

- Maintain water quality and availability in the Watershed by expanding our knowledge, developing policies, and taking action as needed.

- Provide oversight to ensure that our sole source “pristine” drinking water resource is available for future generations. (See Appendix III for map of the Castle Valley Watershed).
- Remain diligent, as a Public Water Supplier, in allocating and tracking the use of the Town’s water rights.
- Develop appropriate procedures for monitoring and maintaining septic health on Town lots.

**POLICIES: Add accomplishments since 2020**

1. The Town will use existing data and collect new data in order to monitor water quality and availability.
2. The Town will develop regulations that protect and maintain our water quality and availability.
3. The Town will continue to identify and address potential hazards and contaminants to our drinking water supply through public awareness, incentives, and/or regulations to mitigate their impacts.
4. The Town will continue to provide information to residents and property owners regarding the best septic system maintenance practices and promote public awareness through the Town’s website and handouts with new septic permits.
5. The Town will inform residents and property owners of any new septic regulations made by the State of Utah.
6. The Town will inform residents and property owners of the geologic properties and vulnerability of our aquifer, best water conservation practices, best practices regarding the disposal and management of household hazardous materials (motor oil, pesticides, electronics, pharmaceuticals), and make recommendations for alternative least toxic and non-toxic household and gardening products.
7. The Town will explore ways to prohibit large-scale use of pesticides, especially in areas that drain into any open waterway or natural stream such as Castle Creek.
8. The Town will ensure that ordinances are developed to protect open waterways, natural streams, and other drainages from agricultural and livestock runoff.
9. The Town will update its Watershed Protection Plan and implement/enforce the Existing Watershed Protection Ordinance (96-1). The Town will clarify and implement the permit process required before any developments or activities occur that have the potential to pollute the Watershed recharge area. The Town will coordinate Memoranda of Understanding with regional water stakeholders to implement this permit process.
10. The Town will actively coordinate cooperation among all regional water stakeholders to achieve a watershed protection management plan, to be applied to the Watershed recharge area as identified and mapped in the Town’s U.S. Sole Source Aquifer determination. The plan should address water quantity and climate change probabilities, sustainable water use, wastewater and storm water management, protection of water quality, flood prevention, and the protection of wildlife and vegetation along riparian habitats.
11. The Town will actively participate in County, State, and Federal land use planning processes to ensure that any proposed developments/activities in our Watershed are thoroughly reviewed

by the Town to meet our watershed protection goals. This may include researching and seeking a Municipal Watershed designation for the Castle Valley Watershed with the appropriate County, State and Federal entities.

# TOWN OF CASTLE VALLEY

## WATER MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES / ACTION PLAN

8/28/25

### Priorities Requiring Funding

- 1) Metering of wells using TCV water
- 2) Gauging station on upper Castle Creek
- 3) Ongoing monitoring of UGS wells
- 4) Additional monitoring well near CC / Shafer Lane (perhaps use abandoned well on Lot 194)
- 5) Non-potable water source (water to be delivered to those without wells)

### Priorities Requiring Time and Effort

- 1) Ensure inclusion in Grand County WSPOD
- 2) Work with DWRi to...
  - Develop an appropriation policy for the CV aquifer
  - Improve water rights management (consolidation, move towards municipal model)
  - Enforce state and Town requirements
  - Explore options for use of surplus water