Bill: 1st Substitute HB 311 – Watershed Amendments

Sponsor: Representative Casey Snider

Floor Sponsor:

UASD Position: Support (original version)

This Bill addresses water loss and water quality issues in watersheds.

Discussion: Representative Snider presented the Bill and addressed the 1st substitute, which was subsequently adopted by the Committee. The sponsor explained that the Bill provides a framework for entities to engage in essential discussions regarding water management. Initially, the Bill was drafted to establish robust regulations concerning Utah's water, to mitigate the negative impacts of hydro-electric facilities, and to secure compensation for those impacts on state assets. However, the 1st substitute alters the previously negotiated approach, shifting it significantly.

The adopted substitute allows the Utah water agent to include facilities and land in negotiations for water augmentation projects. It also grants the Board of Water Resources the authority to enter into contracts for water augmentation projects negotiated by the Utah water agent. Representative Peck inquired about the removal of language regarding interstate compacts in the substitute. The sponsor clarified that compacts divide rivers into segments with specific allocations, and the removal of that language enables the water agent to engage in discussions with states and agencies within the Colorado River Compact. Jon Cox, representing Rocky Mountain Power expressed gratitude to the sponsor for the efforts put into the Bill and for collaborating on the substitute.

Yeas: 8 Nays: 0 N/V: 5

Outcome: 1st Substitute HB 311 passed out of the Committee with a favorable recommendation.

Bill: 1st Substitute HB 366 - Access to Call Location Information Amendments

Sponsor: Representative Cory A. Maloy

Floor Sponsor: TBD **UASD Position: Support**

This Bill concerns access to call location information.

Discussion: Representative Maloy addressed the 1st substitute, which was adopted. 1st Substitute HB 366 enhances law enforcement's ability to access device location information in urgent and emergency situations. The Bill ensures that phone service providers respond as promptly as possible when law enforcement determines that an individual is in immediate danger. It expands

the definition of location data and adds a missing person at risk of harm to the list of urgent cases that require priority access. Additionally, it establishes procedures for law enforcement requests and provides protections for mobile service providers from civil liability when acting in good faith. The Bill aims to improve emergency response, expand law enforcement access, clarify definitions, create standardized request procedures, and limit liabilities for mobile service providers.

Candace Cooley was asked to share her experience with her late son and discussed why this Bill is necessary to assist others in similar situations. Representative Clancy clarified that the Bill prioritizes warrants sent to phone providers to enable law enforcement to obtain critical location information for missing individuals. It is designed to protect Fourth Amendment rights and will only be used to locate individuals in danger, such as hikers or skiers, not to investigate thefts or other crimes.

Representative Chew inquired about the scope of the Bill, specifically whether it would be used solely for extreme situations or also for theft cases. The sponsor clarified that the Bill is intended to locate missing persons, not to identify suspects. Representative Shelley asked about the process telecom companies would follow to provide the necessary information. The sponsor explained that the Department of Public Safety would facilitate the process. Representative Clancy further detailed that a warrant is issued to the district judge, who then returns a signed PDF to the requesting agency, which can forward it to the phone provider. Once the provider receives the signed warrant, the requesting agency must confirm that it pertains to a missing individual that may be in danger of physical harm to prioritize the warrant. Only after this clarification will the provider release the information to the appropriate detective or department.

Yeas: 8 Nays: 0 N/V: 5

Outcome: 1st Substitute HB 366 passed out of the Committee with a favorable recommendation.