

## House Political Subdivisions Committee

2/18/2026

---

### **Bill: HB 450 – Data Privacy Amendments**

Sponsor: Representative Shallenberger

Floor Sponsor: Senator Cullimore

**UASD Position: Track with concern**

This Bill amends the Government Data Privacy Act and the Government Records Access and Management Act.

Discussion: The sponsor, accompanied by Chris Bramwell, Director of the Office of Data Privacy, presented the Bill and explained that ongoing concerns regarding data privacy within the banking system, as well as cyberattacks on state agencies, led to the creation of the Utah Office of Data Privacy. The Director outlined the development of a statewide privacy program framework, including the creation of a 0–5 maturity scale to assess agency data practices and a structured model to improve data governance across state agencies.

The sponsor explained that the Bill restructures leadership and statutory code provisions related to data privacy, addresses the application of privacy standards for higher education, refines data governance models, and creates exemptions where necessary. The Bill also establishes a formal complaint process, adds clarifying reporting requirements, modifies training guidelines, and creates a new section titled “Truth in Surveillance”, which requires disclosure of certain surveillance technologies in annual budget documents.

The Director explained that the Government Records Access and Management Act (“GRAMA”) was originally designed primarily to promote transparency rather than individual privacy protections. He stated that this Bill strengthens privacy protections by incorporating GRAMA Section 303 into the Government Data Privacy Act (“GDPA”), thereby shifting certain privacy-focused provisions into a more appropriate statutory framework.

Representative Hansen questioned the removal of the State Auditor from the oversight structure. The Director clarified that State Auditors had previously established the standards against which they audited. Under this Bill, the Office of Data Privacy would instead create the standards that the State Auditors would review.

Representative Gwynn raised concerns regarding potential privacy breaches, particularly as they relate to law enforcement. The Director responded that the Office of Data Privacy does not receive notifications when cyber breaches occur. Representative Gwynn further inquired about high-risk state data, such as law enforcement tactics. The Director emphasized that the Bill would not require disclosure of sensitive information that should remain protected.

Representative Arthur questioned the “Truth in Surveillance” section, specifically whether individuals would be notified if they were subject to surveillance. The sponsor clarified that the Bill would not alter existing warrant or law enforcement processes. However, surveillance

technologies used in public spaces would be disclosed. The Director added that disclosure of such technologies would occur in public meetings to ensure local control and transparency.

Representative Fitismanu asked about potential local expenses associated with the Bill. The Director explained that some entities would need to report the purposes and uses of certain systems, and that compliance would require staff time and resources.

The Utah League of Cities and Towns expressed appreciation for the sponsor's work. The Utah Chiefs of Police Association expressed concerns regarding the "Truth in Surveillance" section, particularly the potential disclosure of operational tactics. Representative Ward asked the League whether specific issues needed to be resolved, and it was clarified that certain language revisions and law enforcement concerns remained to be addressed.

The Libertas Institute spoke in support of the Bill. The Executive Director of the Utah Statewide Association of Prosecutors expressed concerns. Several members of the public spoke in opposition to the Bill, while one member of the public spoke in support. The Utah County Sheriff's Office also expressed concerns.

Representative Ward asked for clarification regarding what information would be required to be disclosed in open and public meetings and the level of detail required. The sponsor responded that the majority of the relevant details would be disclosed through annual operational budgets.

The Committee adopted the 1<sup>st</sup> substitute. Representative Walter moved to hold the Bill in Committee. Representative Gwynn spoke in support of holding the Bill to allow for additional changes to be made before passing the legislation out of the Committee.

Yeas: 10

Nays: 2

N/V: 0

**Outcome: 1<sup>st</sup> substitute HB 450 was held in Committee.**

---

**Bill: HB 400 – Landscaping Water Amendments**

Sponsor: Representative Owens

Floor Sponsor:

**UASD Position: Support**

This Bill addresses regulations regarding landscaping.

Discussion: The sponsor explained that HB 400 addresses water conservation within the Great Salt Lake drainage basin. The Bill requires cities located within the basin to adopt an ordinance that allows residents to access funding or incentives to remove nonfunctional turf and implement water-efficient landscaping. The sponsor emphasized that the Bill does not include enforcement mechanisms or penalties for noncompliance.

The sponsor stated that a substantial portion of residential water use occurs outdoors, noting that approximately 60 percent of water delivered to homes is used outside and is fully depleted. He explained that the transition from agricultural water use to municipal and industrial use is part of broader water management efforts. He also noted that incorporating water-efficient landscaping standards in new construction adds only marginal cost compared to retrofitting older, water-intensive landscapes. The sponsor clarified that the Bill does not require “rock scaping” or prohibit traditional landscaping, but instead enables more water-efficient alternatives.

Representative K. Peterson asked how the Bill aligns with existing water conservation and water use reduction plans adopted by cities. The sponsor responded that some cities have not yet adopted ordinances addressing turf removal or water-efficient landscaping and stated that the Bill would not impose a significant burden on municipalities. Representative Dunnigan questioned the lack of enforcement provisions. The sponsor reiterated that the Bill does not impose penalties or other consequences on cities. Representative Kohler expressed support for local control and voiced concern about adding additional statutory requirements for municipalities.

Joel Williams, representing the Utah Division of Water Resources, spoke in support of the Bill.

Yeas: 7

Nays: 3

N/V: 2

**Outcome: HB 400 passed out of the Committee with a favorable recommendation.**

---

**Bill: 1<sup>st</sup> substitute HB 422 – Public Infrastructure District Amendments**

Sponsor: Representative Koford

Floor Sponsor:

**UASD Position: Track and amend**

This Bill modifies requirements for public infrastructure districts.

Discussion: The sponsor explained that 1<sup>st</sup> substitute HB 422 addresses statutory gaps related to public infrastructure districts (PIDs). The Bill enhances transparency requirements, establishes a defined dissolution timeline requiring a PID to dissolve within 180 days after its debts are paid, and requires consent from landowners within the PID. The Bill also provides that annexations and withdrawals must be approved by board resolution and requires board members to regularly update conflict of interest disclosures.

Representative Ward questioned how the existence of a PID would be disclosed to prospective property purchasers. The sponsor clarified that the presence of a PID, and any associated obligations, would be disclosed to buyers during the due diligence period thus allowing purchasers to make informed decisions and avoid unexpected financial impacts.

Representative K. Peterson asked about the dissolution process for PIDs. The sponsor responded that PID bonds are time-constrained financial instruments and that they are structured to pay off

their bonds according to a schedule. After all debts have been paid, dissolution would occur pursuant to the timelines established in the Bill.

The Executive Director of the Utah Inland Port Authority spoke in support of the Bill. A member of the public also spoke in support.

The Committee adopted House Amendment 1, which requires posting the conflict-of-interest statements on the Utah Public Notice website, and House Amendment 2, which deletes lines 922-936.

Yeas: 9

Nays: 1

N/V: 2

**Outcome: 1<sup>st</sup> substitute HB 422, as amended, passed out of the Committee with a favorable recommendation.**

---

**Bill: HB 363 – Water Easement Amendments**

Sponsor: Representative Abbott

Floor Sponsor:

**UASD Position: Track and amend**

This Bill addresses provisions related to a prescriptive easement for water conveyance.

Discussion: HB 363 was not heard in the Committee.

Yeas:

Nays:

N/V:

**Outcome: HB 363 was not heard in the Committee.**

---