

House Government Operations Committee
02/19/2026

Bill: 3rd substitute HB 147 - Government Form Submission Amendments

Sponsor: Representative Teuscher

Floor Sponsor:

UASD Position: Track

This Bill addresses when a government entity is required to provide an electronic filing option to a person submitting information to the government entity.

Discussion: The sponsor presented the 3rd substitute, explaining that it expands the scope of the Bill to apply electronic submission requirements to state government in addition to local government, adds more detailed exceptions to the requirement, and delays the effective date. The 3rd substitute was adopted by the Committee.

The sponsor stated that the Bill requires state and local governmental entities to provide an electronic option for completing and submitting forms, records, and other required information. The legislation also includes specified exceptions to the electronic submission requirement.

Representative McPherson expressed concern that the estimated cost per form could increase by hundreds of dollars and questioned why costs would rise if the process is electronic. The sponsor responded that implementation costs would depend on how each entity chooses to structure and deploy its electronic systems.

Representative Peterson asked whether the sponsor would be willing to provide guidance or suggestions on implementation. The sponsor indicated that the Bill includes a list of options and considerations to assist with implementation.

Yeas: 9

Nays: 0

N/V: 3

Outcome: 3rd substitute HB 147 passed out of Committee with a favorable recommendation and was placed on the Consent Calendar.

Bill: 1st substitute HB 511 - Procurement Amendments

Sponsor: Representative Shallenberger

Floor Sponsor: Senator Brammer

UASD Position: Track

This Bill modifies provisions of Title 63G, Chapter 6a, Utah Procurement Code.

Discussion: The sponsor presented the 1st substitute, which outlines the eligibility requirements for a company to qualify as a "Utah company" for purposes of the Bill. To qualify, a company must be registered in Utah, have its primary place of business in Utah, and have been registered in the state for at least one year. The substitute also establishes that a maximum of 10% of the

scoring for a bid may be attributed to Utah-based status. The 1st substitute was adopted by the Committee.

The sponsor explained that the Bill addresses the state procurement process and is designed to provide up to a 10% scoring preference on the evaluation matrix for qualifying Utah bidders. The sponsor emphasized that this does not increase the amount of money awarded under a contract but instead affects only the scoring criteria used in evaluating bids. In response to concerns regarding potential prejudice or Commerce Clause implications, the sponsor stated that constitutional protections related to prejudice apply to individuals rather than corporations and noted that similar preferential bidding provisions exist in other states.

Representative McPherson asked whether the Bill primarily applies to competitive bid procurements. The sponsor confirmed that it does. In response to a question regarding the absence of a fiscal note and whether the 10% preference would affect overall pricing, the sponsor clarified that the preference applies only to the scoring matrix and does not alter the bid price itself.

Representative Fiefla expressed concern about potential impacts on taxpayer costs and asked whether there are caps in place. The sponsor responded that the cap is included in the 1st substitute. Representative Cutler sought clarification on whether the sponsor meant “bidding price” or “matrix”, and the sponsor confirmed that the reference was to the scoring matrix. When asked how the Bill avoids increasing costs to taxpayers, the sponsor reiterated that the measure does not add to the contract amount or program cost but simply adds a line item within the evaluation scoring during the procurement process.

Representative Burton characterized the proposal as a preference for in-state companies, and the sponsor agreed that it provides a preference for Utah-based companies. Representative Burton further inquired whether legal counsel had been consulted and whether there is risk to the state in implementing such a policy. The sponsor indicated that the issue had been raised and noted that other states have similar preferential bidding statutes, and that there was an understanding that Utah may already have comparable provisions.

Representative McPherson asked whether awarding contracts under a best-value framework, rather than strictly lowest cost, could result in higher costs and what offsets might exist if contracts are awarded to out-of-state companies. The sponsor responded that the state sometimes awards contracts based on best value rather than lowest bid, and that this distinction should not be confused with automatically selecting the lowest offer.

There was no additional Committee discussion.

Yeas: 11

Nays: 0

N/V: 1

Outcome: 1st substitute HB 511 passed out of Committee with a favorable recommendation.