

From: Leigh Marymor <mleighm33@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 8:41 AM

To: Office <office@townofbluffutah.gov>

Subject: Re: PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PETITION OF KIM ERIC ACTON AND IDA ELIZABETH ACTON TO DISCONNECT LANDS FROM THE TOWN OF BLUFF PURSUANT TO SECTION 10-2-501 OF THE UTAH CODE ANNOTATED. September 25 @ 6:00 pm – 7:15 pm.

City Manager,

Please forward our comments to be read into the record at Thursday's Town Council meeting. Wish we could be there in person. Thanks.

Leigh and Amy Marymor

To: Bluff Town Council

c/o office@townofbluffutah.gov

September 22, 2025

Re: PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PETITION OF KIM ERIC ACTON AND IDA ELIZABETH ACTON TO DISCONNECT LANDS FROM THE TOWN OF BLUFF PURSUANT TO SECTION 10-2-501 OF THE UTAH CODE ANNOTATED. September 25 @ 6:00 pm – 7:15 pm.

Dear Mayor and Town Council,

We are writing in opposition to the request by Kim Eric Acton and Ida Elizabeth Acton to disconnect lands from the town of Bluff.

The current boundaries of the town in its entirety are critical to maintain. Local control of our aquifer, San Juan River water rights, and future planning for growth and basic services is bound up in our ability to plan and control our geographic integrity and the natural and intangible resources contained therein.

The future of the town of Bluff, through our elected government, must be allowed to be formed by the will of all of our residents through local political process, and should never be swayed by undue pressure brought to bear by State government or disproportionate monied interests.

We support inviting the Acton family to sit and negotiate their vision for town growth and development with the City Council. Hopefully they can find satisfaction through dialog and compromise with their fellow residents of Bluff as represented by our elected officials. Failing the ability to reach mutual satisfaction, and in the face of potential legal action brought by the Acton family, we are in support of the raising of appropriate funds that will allow the town of Bluff to defend its integrity.

Sincerely,

Leigh and Amy Marymor, Homeowners

950 W. Cottonwood Ave.

Bluff, Utah 84512

From: Marti Callahan <grept@hotmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2025 6:21 AM

To: Office <office@townofbluffutah.gov>

Cc: David Allen <BikeFlagAZ@gmail.com>

Subject: Comments to Bluff Town Council for Disconnect hearing on September 25, 2025

Since my husband David Allen and I will be unable to attend, I hope this is the correct email address to submit written comments to Council for the special hearing on September 25 on the pending request to disconnect over 9000 acres from our town boundaries. If not, could someone let us know the correct address?

As a land and homeowners and residents of Bluff for over 25 years we have been involved with many issues and projects and have kept a keen eye on those that affect the future of our beloved home. We are therefore opposed to the petition to disconnect that is the subject of this hearing. Our town is small but mighty, and we need to maintain control of as much of our current town boundaries as possible. The fact that the litigants in this lawsuit have not revealed their land use plans but instead decided to file suit indicates that they may not have Bluff residents' best interests in mind.

One of the motivations to incorporate Bluff was to maintain some local control of our land and resources. Many years of hard work on the part of our citizens and town council have yielded excellent results and we are proud of our leaders and the progress we've made on a myriad of issues/projects that greatly benefit the town. To give up control of such a huge portion of our current town boundaries is a scary prospect and as such we support the town's continued efforts to fight this lawsuit.

Thanks for considering our concerns,

Marti Callahan and David Allen

From: Barry Beisner <blbeisner@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2025 10:49 AM

To: Office <office@townofbluffutah.gov>

Cc: Barry Beisner <beisnerb3d2@gmail.com>; Jack Chase <jgchase@windstream.net>;

Cornelia Eaton <ceaton.ecn@gmail.com>; Leon Sampson <sampsonl74@yahoo.com>;

Stephen Hutchinson <shutchinson@episcopal-ut.org>; Karen Aubrey

<ka@karenaubrey.com>; Margaret Putnam <gsmputnam@gmail.com>; GJ Gordy

<gerlenejgordy1996@gmail.com>

Subject: Comments for Sept. 25 Town Council Mtg

Greetings. Please accept this brief statement, which I hope to be able to share at Thursday's meeting. I will be participating by Zoom.

Thanks,

+Barry Beisner

September 23, 2025

Dear Members of the Bluff Town Council:

When the Episcopal Church officially formed Navajoland Area Mission more than 40 years ago, St. Christopher's Mission in Bluff was included as one of its charter member congregations. But St. Christopher's had already been in existence and was an active part of this community long before that moment. Visitors to St. Christopher's will have seen the Utah Division of State History Historic Site and National Register of Historic Places plaques describing how our Mission was established in 1943 as a center for medical care, education, worship, and service to the surrounding community.

Recently, the Episcopal Church changed our status to that of the Missionary Diocese of Navajoland. St. Christopher's continues to be a key congregation for us, and we continue to seek an active and productive role in the life of the Town of Bluff, as an essential part of the identity of our church. That is who we are.

Two years ago, in statements made by local and regional Episcopal Church leaders before this Council, we opposed a Petition similar in many respects to the one before you now. Our opposition then was basically two-fold: first, we have always been part of the community of Bluff, we enthusiastically embrace that identity, and we have absolutely no desire for or interest in seeing it change, especially when we are excluded from consultation in matters directly involving us; second, we wish to help protect a vital community water source, which serves the needs of St. Christopher's, and from which we freely distribute clean, safe water to our neighbors in need. When we described this stance to the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church, The Most Rev. Sean Rowe, during his visit to St. Christopher's last April, he enthusiastically encouraged us to persist.

And so, in summary, our basic position has not changed from that which we put before you in August of 2023. We celebrated your courageous decision in rejecting that Petition then, and we call for the rejection of this new Petition now also.

Respectfully, and in gratitude,

The Rt. Rev Barry L. Beisner
Bishop Provisional
Episcopal Diocese of Navajoland

From: Tim and Eirene Hamilton <casabluff@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 10:00 AM

To: Office <office@townofbluffutah.gov>

Subject: disconnect

Hello Mayor and Town Council.

This is regarding the attempt to disconnect lands from the Town of Bluff, Utah.

I believe that it is in the best interest of the Town of Bluff to protect our aquifer and land within the town boundaries.

I also believe that we should not subject the Town of Bluff to financial peril in pursuit of litigation concerning this matter.

Thank you!

Tim Hamilton

From: Michael Haviken <viken547@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 11:04 AM

To: Ann Leppanen <ann@townofbluffutah.gov>; Linda Sosa <linda@townofbluffutah.gov>; Luanne Hook <luanne@townofbluffutah.gov>; Britt Hornsby <britt@townofbluffutah.gov>; Jennifer Davila <jennifer@townofbluffutah.gov>; Erin Nelson <manager@townofbluffutah.gov>

Subject: Proposed disconnect- Bluff Bench

Greetings Council Members,

As a resident I have no objection to a solar farm on the bench. Nor do I have an objection to the Acton family disconnecting from the town providing that they agree legally not to drill through or disturb in any manner the town's aquifer.

If the Acton family can not agree to that then it probably means that they intend to drill through the aquifer.

Based on what I've learned about drilling and fracking there would be a risk of contamination of the town's culinary water.

Thank you,

Michael Haviken

Public Comment Sheet

Disconnection Public Hearing

September 25, 2025 - 6:00 pm

Name: 2015 YOUNG

Address: PO BOX 57, BLUFF, VT.

I'M APPALLED TO THE DISCONTINUATION OF
ACTION'S LAND TO THE DEGREE THAT
I HAVE ^(OR DON'T HAVE) INFORMATION SHARED BY THE
TOWN COUNCIL.

IT IS A BAD PRECEDENT TO SET, THAT
PEOPLE WITH LOADS OF \$ CAN REMOVE
THEMSELVES OF JURISDICTION OF THE
TOWN - WE DON'T ~~KNOW~~ KNOW ACTION'S
PLAN FOR THIS LAND, AND WHETHER
THEY PLAN TO JEOPARDIZE BLUFF'S
WATER SUPPLY. THEIR LACK OF
TRANSPARENCY WITH THEIR INTENTIONS
IS VERY CONCERNING.

ALSO - IF THEY ~~TO~~ BLUFF SHOWS
THAT IF SOMEONE DOESN'T WANT
TO ABIDE BY RULES -

THEY CAN JUST SEPERATE.
PLEASE SAVE BLUFF.

In response to the disconnect;

In Josh Ewing's words he states that bluff is being threatened and bullied. Addressing that statement, neither the Acton's nor SITLA chose to be placed into the incorporated Town of Bluff in the first place, so we should ask ourselves who's threatening and bullying who. Secondly, I feel all decisions about this were made with good intentions, but with emotion rather than fact.

Now let's look at facts

- 1) Bluff's decision to fight this disconnect was determined not by a majority vote, but by the majority of people that showed up at a public hearing. Therefore, it was totally Bluff's decision to start this. Nothing was forced upon us; we could have simply allowed the disconnect.
- 2) Bluff cannot afford to provide services to this property even if we wanted to.
- 3) Bluff receives little or no income from this property.
- 4) All of the state land in this disconnect is totally out of the control of the town.
- 5) As far as them not telling Bluff what their intentions are, in that it may affect Bluff or its watershed is like asking everyone south of Blanding and White Mesa to inform us as they could potentially affect Bluff's watershed as well.
- 6) When it comes to protecting our watershed it's very obvious that people saying this have no idea that the watershed surrounding Bluff has nothing to do with our drinking water aquifer. They do not know what a contained aquifer is, nor have read any geological data or source protection studies related to this.
- 7) Josh states that this land should be protected from fracking, drilling and industrialization. Again, we have no control over state land, especially land located in the Bears Ears Monument, even if it remains in our incorporated town.
- 8) I would question the ideology of defending Bluff's boundaries that includes more than 90% State, BLM and SITLA land anyway, of which we can't inhabit and have no control over anyway.

With this being said I believe that it's time to stop excessively spending money on attorneys and start spending on things helpful to Bluff. Such as roads, secondary water, affordable housing and other concerns not related to controlling what other people do.