## Keli Beard <kelibeard@utah.gov>



Re: 1 message

## Bryan Torgerson <br/> <br/>bryantorgerson@utah.gov> To: Keli Beard <kelibeard@utah.gov>

Cc: Scott Bartlett <scottbartlett@utah.gov>, Chris Fausett <chrisfausett@utah.gov>, Mike Johnson <mjohnson@utah.gov>

Yes, I agree. Bryan W. Torgerson | Southeast Area Manager - Surface | State of Utah School & Institutional Trust Lands Administration PO Box 215, 696 North Main St., Monticello, Utah 84535 Office: (435) 259-7417 | Cell: (435) 259-9565




Emails to and from this email address may be considered public records and thus subject to Utah GRAMA requirements.

On Fri, Apr 28, 2023 at 9:10 AM Keli Beard <kelibeard@utah.gov> wrote:

We will be picking up some of the federal lands within the boundaries, as redrawn, but I think the shape of the town is logical in its redrawn form and we don't cut any parties out of the town than the Lyman party, ourselves and the feds. I think this configuration has the highest likelihood of succeeding before the Town of Bluff. On Fri, Apr 28, 2023 at 9:07 AM Bryan Torgerson <br/>
<br/>
bryantorgerson@utah.gov> wrote: The map looks good to me because the rest of the stuff we are proposing to exchange to the federal government is part of the Bear's Ears exchange. This makes it a lot more simplistic. Thanks, Bryan W. Torgerson | Southeast Area Manager - Surface | State of Utah School & Institutional Trust Lands Administration PO Box 215, 696 North Main St., Monticello, Utah 84535 Office: (435) 259-7417 | Cell: (435) 259-9565 TRUST LANDS ADMINISTRATION Emails to and from this email address may be considered public records and thus subject to Utah GRAMA requirements. On Fri, Apr 28, 2023 at 8:29 AM Scott Bartlett <scottbartlett@utah.gov> wrote: My sketch of what we would propose for disconnection from Bluff is below. The current Bluff boundary is yellow and the area to disconnect is magenta. I think I found the right disconnection statute. 10-2-501 says the request for disconnection shall: (i) contain the names, addresses, and signatures of the owners of more than 50% of any private real property in the area proposed for disconnection; (ii) give the reasons for the proposed disconnection; (iii) include a map or plat of the territory proposed for disconnection; and (iv) designate between one and five persons with authority to act on the petitioner's behalf in the proceedings. If I'm reading this correctly, a written legal description like Bruce is requesting is not what the statute requires for the disconnection request. After all the required hearings and notices have taken place, 10-2-507 says that within 30 days after Bluff approves the disconnection ordinance, Bluff would have to file a final local ent with the lieutenant governor. So, I think we could start the process and even have Bluff approve the disconnection with a simple map that our GIS team could create, but we would need to prepare a final plat to ser lieutenant governor. The disconnection isn't effective until the lieutenant governor issues a certificate of disconnection. Does that sound right to everyone, and does the boundary below look correct? If so, I think we should verify the boundary with Bruce and then ask GIS to make a simple map.

Fri, Apr 28, 2023



Keli Beard Senior Legal Counsel School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration 675 E. 500 S., Suite 500 Salt Lake City, Utah 84102 phone: 801-538-5185 email: kelibeard@utah.gov