



Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws

PO BOX 231 • LAYTON, UT 84041-9998
(801) 871-5215 • COMMUNICATIONS@UTRSOL.ORG

March 30, 2026

Senator Calvin R. Musselman

Co-Chair, Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Interim Committee
Utah State Senate

Representative Ryan D. Wilcox

Co-Chair, Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Interim Committee
Utah House of Representatives

Senator Musselman and Representative Wilcox,

Enclosed is a policy memorandum from Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL) requesting that the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Interim Committee adopt a 2026 interim study item. The memorandum is titled *Registry-Driven Housing Instability as a Criminal Justice System Cost* and is submitted for distribution to committee members and for your consideration in developing the committee's 2026 study agenda.

The request is grounded in ten months of documented field data from UTRSOL's housing assistance operations: 121 cases, 197 individuals, and 14 agencies across 10 Utah counties — including the Salt Lake Police Department and the Salt Lake City Housing Division — each of which contacted UTRSOL independently after encountering registry-related housing barriers they could not resolve through existing channels. The proposed study item asks the committee to examine the extent to which registry-specific constraints — exclusion zones, shelter blanket bans, and GPS address requirements — generate supervision compliance failures and downstream incarceration costs, and whether targeted administrative reforms could reduce those costs without new legislation or any change to registry law.

We respectfully request that this memorandum be distributed to committee members and that it be considered for placement on the proposed 2026 interim study item list prior to the April 15, 2026 Legislative Management Committee deadline.

Respectfully submitted,

Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL)
communications@utrsol.org • (801) 871-5215 • utrsol.org



Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws

PO BOX 231 • LAYTON, UT 84041-9998
(801) 871-5215 • COMMUNICATIONS@UTRSOL.ORG

Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Interim Committee, Utah State Legislature
Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL)
March 30, 2026
Request for 2026 Interim Study:
Registry-Driven Housing Instability as a Criminal Justice System Cost
REF: HB 370, HB 123, HB 110

Executive Summary

This memorandum requests that the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Interim Committee adopt, as a 2026 interim study item, the following question: To what extent do registry-specific constraints — supervision-imposed housing conditions, shelter blanket bans, and GPS address requirements — generate compliance failures, supervision costs, and downstream incarceration that could be reduced through targeted administrative reform?

The Core Finding

Between June 2025 and March 2026, UTRSOL responded to 121 housing assistance cases involving 197 individuals across 10 Utah counties. Fourteen agencies — including the Salt Lake City Housing Division, the Salt Lake Police Department, Weber Housing Authority, and 17 professional case managers — independently contacted UTRSOL because they encountered registry-related housing barriers they could not resolve through existing channels. These are individuals seeking housing assistance — not a population that is uniformly homeless or currently on GPS monitoring. But for those who are under supervision or who may be placed under supervision, a failed housing search does not remain a private hardship: where GPS supervision requires a registered address, housing unavailability becomes the mechanism that converts a registry status into a technical violation. That violation triggers incarceration. This is a criminal justice cost, not merely a social services gap.

I. Jurisdiction and Framing

Registry housing instability is properly understood as a criminal justice matter for this committee because the causal mechanism runs directly through the criminal supervision system, not through social welfare policy. Three registry-specific constraints — rather than general housing market conditions — drive the housing search failures this memorandum documents: supervision-imposed residence conditions administered by UDC and AP&P, shelter blanket exclusion policies, and the GPS address requirement that converts an unresolved housing search into a technical supervision violation. In Utah, these constraints operate in the absence of a statutory exclusion zone and instead arise through supervision practices and institutional policies rather than codified statewide residency restrictions.

A. GPS Supervision and the Address Requirement

Utah Code Ann. § 77-41-112 requires sex offense registrants under GPS supervision to maintain a registered address. An individual who cannot secure compliant housing cannot satisfy this condition. The resulting technical violation is not a new criminal act; it is the predictable administrative consequence of a housing market shaped by policy implementation and discretionary practices that systematically narrow compliant options. UTRSOL's data shows 55% of our cases involved single male registrants seeking housing assistance after encountering categorical denials from landlords and shelters. These individuals are not uniformly under GPS monitoring at the time of contact — but many are subject to supervision conditions, or may become subject to them, and for that population a failed housing search is not the end of the problem. It is the beginning of a compliance exposure that the supervision system will eventually be required to enforce.

B. Supervision-Imposed Housing Conditions and Geographic Concentration

Utah does not have a statutory housing exclusion zone applicable to all registrants. Housing barriers are instead driven by policy implementation and discretionary practices — most significantly, residence restrictions imposed as individualized conditions of supervision by the Utah Department of Corrections and Adult Probation and Parole. These conditions are not codified geographic restrictions applicable to the registry population broadly; they are supervision-specific requirements that vary by officer, district, and case. Their practical effect, however, is a dramatic narrowing of compliant housing options in the urban core. In Salt Lake, Davis, and Weber counties — which account for 81% of UTRSOL's caseload — the combination of UDC/AP&P-imposed residence conditions, Good Landlord Program categorical screening, and shelter blanket exclusions reduces the compliant rental inventory to a fraction of the market. The geographic search pattern in UTRSOL's data — registrants unable to secure housing in Salt Lake City searching northward into Davis County without finding meaningfully different conditions — is direct evidence of systemic unavailability driven by the accumulation of these discretionary and policy barriers, not a single statutory mandate.

C. Shelter Blanket Bans and Emergency System Failure

Emergency shelters operating within the jurisdiction of Salt Lake City's coordinated homeless response system maintain blanket exclusion policies for registry-listed individuals. These are administrative policies, not statutory requirements. Their effect is to remove the emergency housing backstop that exists for every other homeless adult in the state. A registrant seeking housing who cannot access emergency shelter and cannot secure a registered address — and who is subject to, or who may become subject to, GPS supervision — is a system failure waiting to become a revocation. UTRSOL's data shows this is not a hypothetical: multiple shelters listed in our agency contacts independently reached out to UTRSOL because they had encountered this problem and had no resolution pathway within their own systems. This creates a structurally induced bottleneck in which individuals are functionally excluded from compliance despite the absence of any legal prohibition on their access to shelter. The result is predictable housing instability for registrants.

II. The Data: Ten Months of Documented Caseload

UTRSOL was founded in April 2025. Within weeks of website launch, registrants and their families began contacting us for housing assistance before we had staff, a budget, or a formal intake process. The following data represents ten months of inbound cases a floor not a ceiling.

Metric	Figure	Significance
Cases responded to	121	Inbound only; excludes those who gave up or never found us
Individuals across households	197	76 non-registrant household members; 27 children in family
Utah counties represented	10 of 29	81% concentrated in Salt Lake, Davis, and Weber
Agencies contacting UTRSOL	14	None recruited — each reached out independently
Professional case managers	17	Each represents an unresolvable case in a formal intake system
Single-registrant cases on supervision	55% of cases	Each one technical violation from revocation; GPS requires an address

The gap between 121 cases and 197 individuals is the central finding. Registry housing policy treats the registrant as the only person affected. Our data shows 76 non-registrant household members — partners, parents, and children — experiencing housing instability as a direct downstream consequence of exclusionary policies they had no part in creating. This shows that registry restrictions destabilize entire households.

The 14 Agencies That Contacted UTRSOL

Emergency Shelters: The Lantern House, The Road Home, The Inn Between, Switchpoint Microshelter

Behavioral Health: Valley Behavioral Health, Wasatch Behavioral Health, Fourth Street Clinic

Nonprofits & Faith: Almost There Nonprofit, Utah Case Management, Volunteers of America Utah, LDS Branch Presidents

Government Agencies: Weber Housing Authority, Salt Lake Police Department, Salt Lake City Housing Division

None of these agencies were recruited by UTRSOL. When 17 professional case managers, multiple emergency shelters, three behavioral health providers, a housing authority, a police department, and the City's own Housing Division all arrive at the same wall independently, the wall is the problem. This level of convergence across independent systems indicates a structural failure point rather than isolated operational breakdowns. It reflects a systemic design issue in which existing policies and supervision requirements interact to produce predictable, repeat barriers to housing access.

III. Connection to the 2026 General Session

This committee addressed registry-adjacent matters during the 2026 General Session in ways that directly intersect with the housing instability documented here. That legislative record establishes both the committee's established jurisdiction and the urgency of a systematic study.

Bill	Subject	Housing Relevance
HB 370	GPS Monitoring Expansion	Expands GPS requirements without addressing the address-compliance gap that GPS already creates for homeless registrants
HB 123	Out-of-State Registry Obligations	Extends registry requirements to individuals newly arriving in Utah, compounding housing unavailability for a population that may have had compliant housing in their origin state
HB 110	Board of Pardons Reform	Parole and release conditions interact directly with supervision address requirements; housing unavailability creates revocation exposure at point of release

Each of these bills imposes or extends obligations on a population the committee has acknowledged is under active supervision. None addressed the structural condition — housing unavailability — that makes compliance with those obligations contingent on geographic luck rather than individual effort. A systematic study would enable the committee to evaluate the full cost of the compliance architecture it is building. The committee expanded the compliance architecture in 2026 without assessing the costs already embedded in the prior architecture.

IV. The Criminal Justice System Cost Framing

Registry-driven homelessness is not a welfare issue that has drifted into the committee's jurisdiction. It is a criminal justice system cost that belongs here because the system creates it, enforces it, and bears the fiscal consequences of it. Each barrier—from supervision-imposed residence conditions to shelter exclusions—originates within the criminal justice framework, not the housing market. Addressing these failures through policy reform would reduce revocations, lower supervision costs, and improve public safety outcomes.

A. Revocation and Reincarceration

An individual on GPS supervision who cannot secure a registered address is technically in violation of supervision conditions the moment the search fails. The Utah Department of Corrections and Adult Probation and Parole bear the supervision and revocation costs. The Utah prison system bears the reincarceration cost. These are not hypothetical downstream consequences; they are the predictable administrative endpoint of a documented housing

search failure. The study UTRSOL is requesting would allow this committee to quantify that cost and evaluate whether it is a rational expenditure given the available alternatives.

B. The Good Landlord Program Internal Contradiction

Salt Lake City's Good Landlord Program (GLP), established in October 2004, provides financial incentives to participating landlords who conduct criminal background checks and apply categorical denial criteria to applicants with sex offense convictions or registry status. The GLP operates in Salt Lake City and 14 other Utah municipalities. Its screening criteria are an administrative policy choice — not a statutory mandate. They can be revised through administrative process without new legislation (as Salt Lake City's legal counsel would need to confirm).

The criminal justice consequence of the GLP is structural: the city funds a homelessness response team (HEART) to address chronic homelessness among its most difficult-to-house populations, while simultaneously subsidizing the exclusionary screening mechanism that removes compliant housing options from the same population. The same registrants excluded by GLP-screened landlords appear in the HEART caseload. The city is funding the creation of the problem and the management of its consequences, with no mechanism to evaluate the net effect. This committee has standing to request that the GLP's intersection with supervision compliance be examined.

C. Shelter Exclusion as a Supervision System Failure

Several emergency shelters in the state's coordinated homeless response maintain blanket exclusion policies for registry-listed individuals. Where those shelters operate under the Housing Stability Division funding relationships or coordination agreements, the policy lever to require individualized assessment — rather than categorical denial — already exists. The study item UTRSOL is requesting would allow this committee to evaluate whether the state's investment in emergency shelter infrastructure is being systematically undermined by a categorical exclusion that has no statutory basis.

V. The Study Item We Are Requesting

UTRSOL requests that this committee adopt the following as a 2026 interim study item:

Proposed Interim Study Item

Registry-Driven Housing Instability as a Criminal Justice Cost: Examining the extent to which supervision-imposed housing conditions, shelter blanket exclusions, and GPS address requirements produce supervision compliance failures, technical violations, and reincarceration costs — and whether administrative reforms to Good Landlord Program screening criteria, UDC/AP&P supervision condition practices, and shelter intake protocols could reduce those costs without new legislation or changes to registry law. This analysis frames housing instability as a predictable and remediable expense of the criminal justice system rather than a social welfare issue.

This framing has several structural advantages for the committee. First, it does not require a position on whether the registry is appropriate policy. It asks only whether the compliance architecture built around the registry is operating as intended. Second, it frames reform as a fiscal and public safety question rather than an ideological one. Third, it builds on a record that already exists: the 14 agencies in UTRSOL's data, the 2026 session bills this committee acted on, and the peer-jurisdiction precedents from Seattle and Denver that show administrative reform is both feasible and established practice.

VI. Peer Jurisdiction Precedents

The reform this memorandum proposes — replacing categorical denial with individualized assessment in the Good Landlord Program's screening criteria — reflects a principle that federal housing policy has affirmed twice in the past decade and that at least one major municipal jurisdiction has codified into law. Neither precedent required a legislative body to take a position on registry law.

On April 4, 2016, HUD's Office of General Counsel issued guidance concluding that blanket criminal records bans are likely to violate the Fair Housing Act's disparate impact provisions. U.S. Dep't of Housing and Urban Dev., OGC Guidance on Application of Fair Housing Act Standards to the Use of Criminal Records (Apr. 4, 2016). The guidance states that a provider imposing a blanket prohibition without regard to when a conviction occurred or what has happened since “will not be able to meet” the burden of demonstrating a legitimate justification, and directs that individualized assessment is the legally sound alternative. HUD reinforced this in a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on April 10, 2024.

Reducing Barriers to HUD-Assisted Housing, 89 Fed. Reg. 24726. The rulemaking's preamble observes that individualized assessment “already is required of housing providers under state and local law in much of the country” and “works in practice to effectively balance various equities.” The GLP operates through municipal incentives to private landlords, not through a HUD-assisted housing program. The mandatory federal exclusions applicable to federally subsidized housing under 42 U.S.C. § 13663 do not govern it. The GLP's categorical screening criteria are an administrative choice with no federal floor requiring them.

Seattle's Fair Chance Housing Ordinance, Seattle Municipal Code § 14.09 (Ordinance 125393, effective February 19, 2018), requires that adverse action based on criminal history in city-incentivized rental programs follow individualized review rather than categorical threshold denial. It preserves the ability to screen for registry status — it requires only that screening occur through assessment, not automatic exclusion. It did not alter registry law. The GLP reform this memorandum proposes is structurally identical and operationally narrower. Both of these precedents collectively establish that individualized assessment before adverse housing action is mainstream administrative practice. This committee need not resolve any question about registry law to evaluate whether the GLP's categorical screening mandate is consistent with that standard, or whether the compliance costs it generates justify administrative revision.

VII. What UTRSOL Is Offering the Committee

UTRSOL is not requesting a position on registry law. We are offering the committee a documented evidentiary record and a specific, scoped study item that fits squarely within this committee's established jurisdiction. Our goal is to enable data-driven discussion and targeted administrative reforms without altering existing statutes. In support of any study the committee chooses to adopt and pursue, we are prepared to provide a range of detailed resources and data:

- Full case-level data from our 121-case dataset, disaggregated by county, household type, supervision status, and barrier type
- Documentation of the 14 independent agency contacts and the specific barriers each encountered
- Legislative record and bill analysis from the 2026 General Session relevant to supervision compliance and address requirements
- Peer jurisdiction ordinance and administrative policy documentation for Seattle, WA
- Technical support for any committee request directed to the Utah Department of Corrections, AP&P, or the Salt Lake City Housing Stability Division

UTRSOL presented the underlying data to the Salt Lake City Housing Stability Division and Homeless Engagement and Response Team (HEART) on March 25, 2026. That meeting is one data point in the institutional record of this issue. The Division's independent engagement with this data corroborates the systemic nature of the barriers UTRSOL's caseload reflects. Their response, whatever it is, will inform the evidentiary basis available to this committee if it adopts the study item.

VIII. Conclusion

The compliance architecture surrounding the sex offense registry creates predictable criminal justice costs that are currently invisible in the legislative record because they are attributed to individual failures rather than systemic constraints. UTRSOL's ten months of data make those constraints visible for the first time. The Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Interim Committee is the appropriate body to evaluate them because the mechanism is criminal supervision, the cost is borne by the criminal justice system, and the reform pathway operates through administrative processes already within or adjacent to the state's authority.

We are available to present additional data, documentation, or technical support at any stage of the committee's engagement with this issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL)
communications@utrsol.org • (801) 871-5215 • utrsol.org