

Number 2026-41



**Registrant Housing Instability in Utah
A Cross-Agency Housing Initiative Proposal for
The Lantern House**

May 12, 2026

Office of
UTAH FOR RATIONAL SEX OFFENSE LAWS



Office of Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws

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

May 12, 2026

The Lantern House
269 W. 33rd St.
Ogden, Utah 84401

To The Lantern House:

Attached is our comprehensive report on registrant housing instability in Utah, documenting twelve months of housing assistance data collected by Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL) between April 2025 and May 2026. The report summarizes 156 cases, 259 individuals, 14 agencies and nonprofits, and a geographic footprint spanning 10 Utah counties, including 18 cases in Weber County – the third-largest concentration in the dataset. It draws on a legislative and service-provider record developed across the 2026 Utah General Session and our ongoing case intake operations. (Publication #2026-29).

The report identifies structural barriers converging on the registrant housing market that externalize costs onto Ogden-area shelter providers. As Weber County's primary emergency shelter, The Lantern House is a documented absorber of those costs, receiving a population that structured reentry programs have categorically declined and that the rental market has systematically excluded.

We are presenting this material to you in the context of our meeting with The Lantern House and welcome the opportunity to discuss how your agency's participation in a coordinated stakeholder response – alongside The Road Home and Volunteers of America Utah – would convert the work your case managers are already doing into documented evidence with legislative standing. Each element of the proposed collaboration is scoped to require no policy endorsement, no new resources, and no commitment beyond what The Lantern House determines is appropriate at each stage.

Sincerely

Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws

UTRSOL/lm

Executive Summary

Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL) is a Utah-based policy organization founded in April 2025. This document supplements the May 12, 2026 in-person presentation to The Lantern House and is intended to provide program leadership with a complete record of the data, analysis, and collaborative proposals discussed.

In its first twelve months of operation, UTRSOL documented 156 housing assistance cases spanning 259 individuals across 10 Utah counties. Case managers and program staff from more than 14 professional organizations — including emergency shelters, behavioral health providers, nonprofits, faith communities, and government agencies — independently contacted UTRSOL seeking housing assistance for their registered clients. None of these organizations had coordinated with one another. That is the central finding this document addresses.

UTRSOL is presenting to The Lantern House for three reasons: to share documented data on the scope of the problem, to explain the structural barriers driving it, and to propose a collaborative initiative that formalizes the coordination that case managers are already attempting informally.

Core Proposition:

The Lantern House is already absorbing the cost of registry-related housing exclusion through longer shelter stays and harder-to-place clients. This document describes how participation in a cross-agency coordinating committee — and a limited data-sharing arrangement with UTRSOL — would give your agency a structured pathway to influence the policies generating that demand, at no cost and with no policy position required.

Who Are We

UTRSOL is a Utah-based advocacy organization dedicated to evidence-based reform of the state's sex offense registry laws and related criminal justice policies. UTRSOL provides direct housing assistance to individuals on the registry and their families, conducts policy research and legislative advocacy, and coordinates with service providers across the state to document and address the housing barriers this population faces. UTRSOL is not a civil liberties organization or a legal defense organization. It is an evidence-based policy organization that supports reform where data justifies it and opposes it where it does not — a distinction that shapes every partnership and submission it produces.

UTRSOL operates through four functional tracks:

- **Legislative Advocacy.** UTRSOL provided formal public comment during the 2026 legislative session on 13 bills affecting the sex offense registry, and submits policy memoranda to legislative interim committees grounded in empirical evidence.
- **Registrant Housing and Employment Assistance.** UTRSOL maintains an active network of nonprofit partners and private property owners willing to rent to individuals on the registry, and provides employment resources for companies known to hire registrants.
- **Policy Research.** UTRSOL produces independent datasets, institutional analyses, and legislative memoranda. Its evidence-proportionality framework means it supports reform where data justifies it and opposes it where it does not.
- **Investigative Journalism.** Through its News From The Wire outlet, UTRSOL documents structural mismatches between media narratives and population-level research on sex offense policy.

These tracks allow UTRSOL to function simultaneously as a policy research institution, direct-service support network, legislative advocacy organization, and media accountability platform — integrating empirical analysis with practical intervention at both the individual and state-policy levels.

Twelve Months of Housing Assistance Data

The Scope of the Problem

UTRSOL launched in April 2025. Within weeks, registrants were contacting the organization for housing assistance before any formal intake process existed. The volume of requests immediately indicated that demand substantially outpaced available supply.



Those 156 cases represent 90 single registrants, 44 couples, and 22 families — meaning 103 of the 259 individuals affected had no offense of their own, and appear on no registry.

The 44 non-registrant partners committed no offense. Yet their clean rental history becomes irrelevant when bundled with a registrant application — they are not disqualified by their own record, but by proximity to someone else's. The children and additional family members in those households are experiencing housing instability as a direct downstream consequence of exclusionary policies they had no part in creating.

These figures represent a floor, not a ceiling. Cases not captured — from registrants who don't know UTRSOL exists, from rural counties without service infrastructure, from individuals who stopped searching after a first rejection — are not reflected here. The cases Lantern House staff is already managing but has not had a channel to document are not reflected here either. That is precisely what a coordinating committee would change.

Geographic Distribution

Of the 156 cases, 82 (53%) are in Salt Lake County, with Davis County (22) and Weber County (18) representing the next largest concentrations. Weber County — Lantern House's primary service area — accounts for the third-largest share.

Nearly all individuals were searching across multiple counties simultaneously, compounding the difficulty of placement. Proximity restrictions, GLP screening, and landlord reluctance reproduce across county lines.

Salt Lake	82	53%
Davis	22	14%
Weber	18	12%
Utah County	7	4%
Cache	4	3%
Washington	4	3%
Box Elder	2	1%
Other/Multi	17	11%

Weber County's position as the third-largest concentration in the dataset is directly relevant to The Lantern House's operational context. Of the 18 Weber County cases, the majority were searching in Ogden and surrounding areas — the same service area where Lantern House operates and where Ogden City's Good Landlord Program creates documented financial incentives for landlords to screen out registrant applicants. The concentration of cases in Salt Lake County reflects both population density and the relative availability of service infrastructure in that area — individuals from rural counties with fewer resources often search toward Salt Lake as a last resort, which means the dataset likely undercounts rural need while overstating Salt Lake as a primary point of origin. Davis County cases predominantly cluster around Layton and Bountiful, reflecting the commuter corridor where registrants with employment in Weber or Salt Lake County attempt to find housing at the geographic midpoint.

Who Is Seeking Housing

The individuals and families in UTRSOL's dataset are not a monolithic population. They range from single registrants navigating the rental market alone to couples where one partner has no offense history, to families with children whose housing stability depends entirely on whether a landlord will rent to a household that includes someone on the registry. The majority are employed at the time they contact UTRSOL, many in trades, logistics, food service, and construction, and a significant share are actively enrolled in treatment through DOC-approved providers. What they share is not a risk profile but a structural problem: registry status functions as a categorical disqualifier in the housing market regardless of individual circumstances, offense type, time since offense, or supervision status.

Supervision Status

This is one of the most important variables in understanding who is actually seeking housing assistance and why the problem is broader than a corrections-system concern. The common assumption is that registrants struggling with housing are primarily individuals under active supervision — on parole or probation, recently released, and managed by the Department of Corrections — but the data does not support that framing. Of the 156 households:

- 73 (47%) have no active supervision
- 42 (27%) are on probation
- 37 (24%) are on parole
- 3 (2%) are pretrial or federally supervised

52% of this population is not a correctional caseload. They are a community housing challenge — individuals who have completed their sentence and are being systematically excluded from the rental market.

Employment & Treatment

The majority of individuals in the dataset are employed at the time of contact, across construction, logistics, food service, retail, and skilled trades. A significant share are enrolled in active SOTP treatment and in full compliance with all supervision conditions. This is a population seeking stability, not special accommodation. The barriers they face are structural, not behavioral. Employment and treatment compliance are the two variables most commonly cited in recidivism research as predictors of successful reintegration, and both are well-represented in UTRSOL's dataset. The presence of stable employment and active treatment participation does not, however, insulate individuals from registry-related housing barriers — a landlord screening against the registry is not evaluating employment history or treatment compliance, and a Good Landlord Program certification requirement does not contain an exception for individuals who are working and in treatment.

The Problem is Already Shared

Agencies That Have Independently Contacted UTRSOL

The organizations listed below did not respond to an outreach campaign. They contacted UTRSOL independently, through their own case managers and program staff, because they had clients on the registry who needed housing and no coordinated pathway to find it. That distinction matters: what this list documents is not a network that UTRSOL built, but a problem that already existed across Utah's service landscape.

The breadth of the list is itself the finding. Emergency shelters, behavioral health providers, nonprofit case managers, faith community leaders, a housing authority, and a municipal police department do not typically appear on the same referral network. The fact that all of them arrived at the same organization asking the same question — where can my client find housing — is evidence that the barrier is structural and systemic, not isolated to any single service sector.

In March 2026, UTRSOL presented its housing assistance dataset to Salt Lake City's Housing and Emergency Response Team (HEART), a municipal program focused on housing stability for individuals experiencing homelessness. That presentation documented 121 cases across 10 counties, with case managers from 14 organizations having independently contacted UTRSOL. The dataset has since grown to 156 cases representing 259 individuals — a 29% increase in the three months since that presentation.

1	Emergency Shelters <ul style="list-style-type: none">› The Lantern House› The Road Home› The Inn Between› Switchpoint Microshelter
2	Behavioral Health <ul style="list-style-type: none">› Valley Behavioral Health› Wasatch Behavioral Health› Fourth Street Clinic
3	Nonprofits & Faith <ul style="list-style-type: none">› Almost There Nonprofit› Utah Case Management› Volunteers of America Utah› LDS Branch Presidents
4	Government Agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none">› Almost There No› Weber Housing Authority› Salt Lake Police Department› Salt Lake City Housing Division (HEART)

Why Compliant Housing is Effectively Inaccessible

Three Barriers Converging Simultaneously

Registrant homelessness is not the product of a single policy failure. Three distinct structural barriers converge simultaneously — each creates hardship in isolation; together they make stable housing nearly impossible.

01 — Proximity Restrictions

Utah statute and parole-imposed conditions impose distance requirements from schools, parks, playgrounds, and daycare facilities. In dense urban areas — where shelter beds, transitional housing, and affordable rentals are concentrated — these requirements eliminate large portions of available housing stock. In many cases, the compliant housing stock in a registrant's required supervision county is insufficient to house them at all.

02 — Good Landlord Program Screening

Good Landlord Programs (GLPs) are municipal fee-discount structures incentivizing landlords to participate in city certification programs in exchange for reduced licensing fees. UTRSOL's research has documented that GLP participation requirements embed mandatory registry screening directly into program agreements — meaning certified landlords are financially incentivized to exclude registrant tenants.

Midvale City — Documented	Ogden City — Partially Reformed	Statewide — Under Investigation
Program Agreement Section 1(b) contains explicit mandatory registry screening and exclusion language embedded within the landlord fee-discount application. City staff communications normalize the exclusion — it is not disclosed as a notable requirement.	A 2016 partial reform introduced a waiver pathway for landlords renting to individuals on probation or parole. Registry-based exclusions remain unaddressed and in force for all other registrants.	UTRSOL is conducting systematic research across Utah municipalities with active GLPs. The pattern of registry screening in fee-discount structures appears widespread and has not previously been documented as a coordinated barrier.

Key Finding for Lantern House:

GLP-embedded registry screening externalizes exclusion costs while making them invisible to policymakers. The cost is borne by emergency shelters and the individuals displaced. As an Ogden-based service provider, The Lantern House is a direct absorber of Ogden's GLP cost externalization. This dynamic shifts the downstream burden of housing instability onto already strained nonprofit systems while obscuring the structural role of exclusionary screening practices in producing homelessness.

03 – Reentry Program Exclusion

Proximity restrictions and Good Landlord Program screening operate on the front end of the housing market, determining what a registrant can access when searching for a place to live. The third structural barrier operates differently – it eliminates a reentry pathway that would otherwise reduce demand on emergency shelter entirely, routing individuals who are turned away directly into the shelter system.

The Other Side Academy

The Other Side Academy (TOSA) is Utah's flagship social-enterprise reentry model, widely cited nationally for success in structured housing, employment, and peer accountability for individuals returning from incarceration. TOSA explicitly excludes individuals with sex offense convictions categorically – without any individualized risk assessment.

TOSA's exclusion is not an outlier – it reflects a broader pattern in which structured reentry programs, which are designed to provide exactly the kind of supervised, accountable housing environment that recidivism research identifies as protective, apply categorical exclusions to individuals with sex offense convictions without individualized risk assessment. The practical effect is that the population most likely to benefit from structured reentry – individuals with stable employment potential, treatment history, and a documented need for transitional support – is systematically redirected away from the programs built to serve them and into emergency shelter systems that are not equipped to provide equivalent wraparound services.

While TOSA's exclusion argument is a service-capacity and cost argument, not a registrant advocacy position, The Lantern House remains in a service-provider lane. The question is: who absorbs the cost when the flagship reentry model categorically excludes a population? At present, the answer is emergency shelters.

What This Creates for Shelter Providers

The consequence for shelter providers is not abstract. When structured reentry programs categorically exclude a population, the shelter system becomes the default absorber – receiving individuals who arrive without the employment infrastructure, peer accountability network, or clinical wraparound support that a program like TOSA would have provided, and who face the same registry-related housing barriers on exit from shelter that they faced on entry.

- A population with high reintegration potential has no structured reentry pathway and flows directly into emergency shelter
- Lantern House and The Road Home absorb individuals excluded from TOSA – without TOSA's wraparound services or employment infrastructure
- UTRSOL's Clinical Working Group is documenting this gap for HHS submission in 2027
- A coordinated clinical + service-provider presentation creates the most credible case for categorical exclusion reform

The Collaborative Initiative

How Your Agency Can Support This Population

The Lantern House's case managers are already serving registrant clients. The question is not whether to serve this population — Lantern House already does — but how to formalize and coordinate that support so that the barriers being encountered are documented and produce policy change.

1	Structured Intake Identification At intake, identify clients whose housing search is complicated by registry status. No new process is required — registry status is already collected. The change is flagging these clients for specialized housing case management so their barriers are tracked and documented rather than absorbed into general caseload.
2	Anonymized Data Contribution to the Coordinating Committee Participate in the coordinating committee session by sharing three anonymized data points: the number of clients affected by registry-related housing barriers, the geographic areas where those clients are searching, and the types of housing needed. This data stays within the professional network and is never attached to individual identities.
3	Shared Documentation of Registry-Specific Barriers Document when Good Landlord Program requirements, proximity restrictions, or landlord screening policies are the specific obstacle for a client. This cross-agency documentation is the evidentiary record that legislators currently lack and that UTRSOL is building toward the 2027 session.
4	Coordinating Committee Participation with Peer Shelter Providers Meet with The Road Home and Volunteers of America, Utah to collaborate on shared resources, housing navigation strategies, landlord outreach, and policy responses addressing homelessness among registrants impacted by housing restrictions.

None of these require policy positions, advocacy alignment, or new resources — only the systematization of work Lantern House staff is already doing.

The Lantern House's case managers are already serving registrant clients — the call that initiated this meeting is evidence of that. The question is not whether to serve this population, but whether the work being done informally by individual case managers can be systematized in a way that produces documentation, coordination, and eventually policy change. Formalizing that support requires a structure that captures what is already happening and connects it to the cross-agency effort that gives it legislative weight.

How We Work Together — Formal Collaboration Design

Beyond the coordinating committee, UTRSOL is proposing a structured data partnership built around four elements that represent a progression from the minimal to the more involved — any one of them produces value independently, and none requires commitment to the others.

Data-Sharing MOU

A memorandum of understanding establishing an anonymized intake supplement of 3–5 fields: registry status, proximate cause of housing instability, and GLP-screening flags. Generates a prospective dataset within 6–12 months with direct legislative weight. Scope-limited — no client-identifiable data is shared. The MOU is the foundation of everything else — without a consistent data collection mechanism, the other elements of the collaboration produce observations rather than evidence.

Operational Data Contribution

Lantern House's operational data on homelessness trends, housing barriers, repeat shelter utilization, and the effects of residency restrictions grounds the policy argument in documented shelter-system impact — the form of evidence that makes legislative submissions credible to committees skeptical of advocacy claims. The Lantern House does not need to conduct new research to contribute operational data — the documentation already exists in case files, and the MOU simply establishes a structured, anonymized pathway for it to be aggregated and submitted.

Reentry Gap Documentation

Systematic capture of TOSA and other reentry program referral denials by registration status, feeding UTRSOL's Clinical Working Group analysis and supporting a coordinated HHS presentation from clinical and service-provider voices in 2027. Every TOSA referral denial that goes undocumented is a data point that legislators will never see.

Municipal GLP Engagement

As an Ogden-based service provider, The Lantern House has institutional standing to raise the cost-externalization question directly with Ogden City Housing — parallel to and reinforcing UTRSOL's legislative track on Good Landlord Program reform. Ogden City's 2016 partial reform demonstrates that GLP policy is not fixed — it has moved before under pressure from service providers, and it can move again.

The Lantern House engages as a capacity and cost advocate, not a registrant rights organization. UTRSOL carries the policy argument. Your agency provides the operational evidence that makes the argument credible to legislators. Taken together, these four elements convert Lantern House's existing operational knowledge into a form that has legislative standing — which is the one thing UTRSOL cannot manufacture on its own.

The Full Picture of a Partnership

The table that follows is designed to give Lantern House leadership a complete, at-a-glance picture of what this partnership entails — what is being formally proposed, what is explicitly not being asked, and what the agency stands to gain. It is structured this way because the most common point of hesitation for service providers engaging with registry-adjacent advocacy is the concern that participation implies a policy position. It does not.

The Formal Elements column describes the mechanics of the collaboration. The What We Are Not Asking column is as important as anything else on the page — it defines the boundary of the ask explicitly, so that leadership is not left to infer what they are and are not committing to. The What Lantern House Gains column reflects something that is easy to overlook in a meeting focused on the ask: this partnership produces value for Lantern House independent of any outcome for UTRSOL.

Formal Elements	What We Are Not Asking	What Lantern House Gains
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data-sharing MOU with anonymization and scope-limitation provisions • Anonymized data contribution to legislative briefing (Business & Labor — GLP housing impact) • Coordinating committee participation alongside VOA Utah, The Road Home, and others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No policy endorsement or political positioning of any kind • No client-identifiable data — all data is anonymized before sharing • No funding or resource contribution • No ongoing commitment beyond what Lantern House determines is appropriate at each stage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy analysis and legislative intelligence on developments directly affecting shelter operations • A research partner that converts your operational observations into legislative language • A structured pathway to influence the housing policies generating your intake demand

The through-line across all three columns is the same: Lantern House stays in its service-provider lane. The organization is not being asked to become an advocacy partner, to take positions on registry policy, or to align itself publicly with UTRSOL's legislative agenda. It is being asked to do what it already does — document the housing experiences of its clients — within a structure that makes that documentation useful beyond the individual case file. What changes is not the work. What changes is where the work goes. In that sense, the proposal reframes routine service documentation as a mechanism for identifying systemic exclusion patterns that would otherwise remain institutionally invisible.

Proposed Next Steps

The three steps below are sequenced intentionally — each one creates the conditions for the next, and none requires a commitment beyond what The Lantern House determines is appropriate at that stage. They are not a contract. They are a starting point for a conversation leadership and management at The Lantern House can take as far as the organization determines makes sense.

1	Agree on data-sharing MOU scope Designate a Lantern House point of contact for the coordinating committee and agree on the anonymized intake fields to capture: registry status, proximate cause of housing instability, and GLP-screening flag.
2	Participate in the coordinating committee Join The Road Home and Volunteers of America, Utah in a coordinating committee focused on emergency shelter coordination, housing placement strategies, landlord outreach, resource sharing, and policy responses addressing homelessness among registrants impacted by housing restrictions.
3	Identify 2–3 illustrative existing cases Identify existing Lantern House cases illustrating GLP displacement, TOSA referral denial, or similar reentry program exclusion — for anonymized inclusion in UTRSOL's next legislative submission to Business and Labor. A brief case description from a case manager is sufficient for UTRSOL to anonymize and incorporate.

What UTRSOL is asking for at this stage is not a formal partnership agreement, a policy endorsement, or a long-term commitment. It is a conversation — specifically, a conversation among the professionals in this room who are already working on the same problem from different angles, without the coordination infrastructure that would make that work more effective. The coordinating committee is the first step toward building that infrastructure. The data-sharing MOU is the mechanism that makes the committee's output useful to legislators. And the illustrative cases are the human dimension that prevents the data from becoming abstract. None of it works without Lantern House at the table — which is why we are here.

