

**HERITAGE HILLS INCORPORATION SECOND PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 18, 2026, 4:00 PM**

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Suite 302, Manti, Utah

Present are: Commission Chair Scott Bartholomew, Commissioners Mike Bennett and Jim Cheney. County Attorney Kevin Daniels and County Clerk Linda Christiansen.

Meeting is called to order by Commission Chair Scott Bartholomew.

BRIEF INCORPORATION OVERVIEW BY ARDEN COOK, LOCAL ENTITY SPECIALIST.

Arden Cook presents the agenda item. Arden Cook, Local Entity Specialist with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, opens the presentation by outlining the Heritage Hills incorporation process. He instructs the individuals in attendance of the meeting how to submit a question they may have by scanning a QR code or by going to the Lieutenant governor's website which is displayed in his presentation. Mr. Cook states the following disclaimer, "Neither the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, nor LRB, nor Sanpete County are in favor or against the incorporation process. The purpose of the public hearing is to inform the voters and allow the community to express their views and ask the questions they may have regarding the feasibility study." Mr. Cook explains proper public comment etiquette and Commissioner Bartholomew mentions that all public comments must meet the time limit stated and individuals need to speak into a microphone. He details the timeline, noting the first request for a feasibility study was filed on March 12th, 2025, and the initial request was rejected on May 19th due to certain thresholds that were not met. An amended request was submitted on August 11th and the process was initiated on August 12th. The Lieutenant Governor's office certified the request on September 29th, 2025. The first public hearing was held on October 29th, 2025. At that time, it gave land owners the opportunity to exclude or include their property with the incorporation. On October 19th, 2025, the Lieutenant Governor's office had 90 days to review and commission a feasibility consultant. LRB Public Finance Advisors was commissioned to conduct the feasibility study. On June 22, 2026 the final results determined the area is financially feasible, which allows the process to proceed to this second public hearing. Mr. Cook explains the second public hearing must be held within 60 days of the results of the feasibility study if the area is found to be feasible. Other requirements are that the public finance advisors present the results to the public, a copy of the map of the area, and a copy of the study must be provided at the hearing. A physical copy has been provided as well as the information on how to access the information on the incorporations website. Mr. Cook explains that following this hearing, the sponsors have one year to submit an incorporation petition, the petition must be signed by at least ten-percent of the registered voters within ninety-percent of the voting precincts and includes ten-percent of the private land area and seven percent of the property value in order to trigger an election for registered voters within the proposed boundaries. The name of the proposed incorporation is Heritage Hills but it could be changed if the sponsors choose to change it at a later time. Once the petition is submitted, the name included with the petition is the final version. As far as the election goes, there is a slim chance it would be on this year's ballot based on timelines. It will most likely be on the ballot next year. Mr. Cook explains the statute pertaining to the ballot question and how it would be listed, if the petition is circulated and meets the requirements. Election results are as follows; if the majority cast votes in favor of the incorporation, the area shall incorporate. If the majority voters vote in opposition of the incorporation, the incorporation fails and cannot

proceed. Mr. Cook explains the process of submitting questions and displays the QR Code for individuals to access during the feasibility study report.

LRB PUBLIC FINANCE ADVISORS PRESENT RESULTS OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

Logan Loftis, representing LRB Public Finance Advisors, presents the methodology and results of the feasibility study. Fred Philpot may join the meeting at some point via ZOOM but he has not joined at this point of the meeting. Ms. Loftis explains that the study projects a 5-year planning horizon (2026 to 2031) to analyze population growth, tax base, and required municipal services. Key findings establish that culinary water and sewer services will remain private, while the newly incorporated municipality would be responsible for covering county-level services, including general government, law enforcement, fire protection, and road maintenance. Revenue projections include a proportionate property tax rate, state-shared sales taxes, and other municipal fees. The advisors confirm the study found the incorporation to be financially feasible in accordance with state code, with projected revenues exceeding expenses by the required 5% average over the 5-year window. The full feasibility report is available on the incorporations page within the Lieutenant Governor's website or a paper copy is available at the County Clerk's office. Paper copies were available to all attendees of the public hearing. Arden Cook reminds individuals to submit questions or public comments through the QR code site. Commissioner Bartholomew requests that individuals state their name before making their comment and Commissioner Cheney will let them know when they have one minute remaining.

PUBLIC COMMENT (EACH PUBLIC COMMENT WILL BE LIMITED TO 3 MINUTES).

- Jon Collard expresses concern regarding the framing of the projected revenues, arguing that incorporation ultimately adds another layer of tax to the rural community rather than saving homeowners money. Mr. Collard proposed multiple questions regarding recent incorporations to an AI bot and reports on the responses that he received. He also points out missing road infrastructure elements on the feasibility study map and questions the comparisons made for local police and fire service costs.
- Dave Turner states that the provided map appears to be an incomplete master plan and suggests that the developer needs to provide a finalized plan. He also submitted questions through the QR code that can be addressed later in the meeting.
- Myrna Thompson thanks the advisors for their work but expresses that the presentation has increased her worry more about the overall project than she was before today's meeting.
- Brent Crosby, representing the Manti La Sal KOA, asks for clarification on how e-commerce sales tax revenue is calculated and raises significant safety and funding concerns regarding the necessity of a secondary emergency access road. Arden Cook instructs him to put the question in the QR portal in order to address it during the question portion of the agenda. Mr. Crosby wants to know where the business sales tax will go.

Commissioner Bartholomew asked for clarification regarding a statement he understood was made regarding the Sanpete Water Conservancy as an entity providing water to the area. Ms.

Loftis responds that her understanding is that the Sanpete Water Conservancy is not a water provider and the majority of the water is supplied by the Twin Oaks local district. Commissioner Bartholomew references the lack of a second road for access in that area and the current moratorium on building permits. Commissioner Bartholomew states Jones and DeMill is currently doing a traffic study. If the area is incorporated, does the incorporation pay for the second road (access)? Logan Loftis responds, with regards to the feasibility study, she is unsure of where the responsibility lies. Fred Philpot, also representing LRB has joined the meeting via ZOOM. Commissioner Bennett clarifies that the County is talking about a future road that needs to be there; not an existing one. The commission expresses their concerns of only having one in or out access for such a highly populated area for daily travel and emergency situations. Mr. Philpot has tried responding to the question but the sound system is not working. Myrna Thompson returns to state that when she started the process to build in the area, a petition was denied approval due to the lack of a secondary road. Her question at the time was, who pays for a second road and the developer at the time told her she (as a property owner) would pay for it. She wants that question to be answered before this incorporation goes forward.

- Jeff Kunz expresses concern over a current building moratorium and notes that if the area fails to incorporate, the burden of the development and infrastructure issues will fall back on the County. The County allowed the area to be over developed and all of the subdivision lots were approved by the County. Mr. Kunz sent an email to all of the HOA's in the area informing them of the moratorium put in place by the County. Commissioner Bartholomew agrees that a second access needs to be built. Fred Philpot is able to be heard over ZOOM. Mr. Philpot clarifies that the feasibility study does not include the cost to put in another road. It also does not define as to whom the responsibility of the construction of the road lies. Arden Cook proceeds to the submitted question portion of the agenda.

LRB PUBLIC FINANCE ADVISORS RESPOND TO SUBMITTED QUESTIONS.

The first question is submitted by David Turner; it pertains more to the study. Most of the questions pertain to the study so LRB will most likely answer the questions submitted. All of the questions and answers submitted will be posted on the LG's website for reference. Three questions have been submitted thus far. The first question refers to page 17 & 18 of the study regarding amounts for fire and law enforcement; the amounts seem grossly low. Logan Loftis refers to data shared in the study on page 17, it is noted that the contract amount listed is estimated. The study used Manti City and Fountain Green City's police service contracts for the law enforcement contract estimations. The Sheriff did verify it was a fair estimated cost based on the services provided. As far as estimating the cost for fire services; they used the fire contract cost between Sanpete County and Mt. Pleasant City. They did reach out to the Fire Warden for feedback as well. The second question is; why are the comparable numbers and the study drastically different than the actual numbers? Ms. Loftis responds that the first question is similar to this one and essentially the response is the same. The third question is; was there any additional research regarding the e-commerce revenue in the area is correct and verified? Ms. Loftis states it is difficult to get data from the State and does create a challenge in her line of work but clarifies that e-commerce sales tax revenue is distributed by the state based on point of sale and population distribution. She clarifies that they do not have data for e-commerce. Brent Crosby speaks regarding the lack of a survey that would provide data on

how much e-commerce tax revenue actually comes from the area rather than assuming the number based on population. Ms. Loftis refers to data found online regarding the sales tax. That was the last submitted question online. Sham Allred, a lot owner, comments that he is unable to build due to the moratorium regarding the lack of a secondary access road. The road is irrelevant to the township process; no one can build anything until the road is addressed. Arden Cook states it is the last call for comments. Jeff Kunz returns to pose a question regarding the e-commerce. He refers to an online purchase and why that data is not reported. Ms. Loftis states an online purchase does not reflect a record to his house directly, only to his zip code. David Turner refers to the fire protection costs data; he feels there is a wide variation. Ms. Loftis states the numbers are reflective of the County budget and the fire department budget which varies. Mr. Turner notes that the law enforcement contract costs are for service calls only. Commissioner Cheney verifies the current law enforcement contract is comparable to the contract used in the estimations. Jeff Kunz comments that the fire contract between Mt. Pleasant City and the County does not strictly cover the Twin Oaks area so it is not a true reflection of the projected costs for fire protection of the incorporation area. No additional questions or comments are made.

Arden Cook shares his contact information, Linda Christiansen, County Clerk's contact information and the sponsor, Jeff Strange's contact information.

CONCLUDE

Motion is made by Commissioner Cheney to adjourn. The motion is seconded by Commissioner Bennett, and the motion passes.

The meeting is adjourned at 5:08 P.M.

ATTEST: 
Linda Christiansen
Sanpete County Clerk

APPROVED: 
Scott Bartholomew
Commission Chair