

Number 2026-55



**Housing Stability and the Registry
Weber County Community Reentry Coalition
A Companion Report**

July 1, 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

July 1, 2026

Weber County Community Reentry Coalition
477 23rd St.
Ogden, UT 84401

To members of WCCRC:

Attached is our comprehensive report on registrant housing instability in Utah, documenting fifteen months of housing assistance data collected by Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL) between April 2025 and June 2026. The report summarizes 207 cases, 329 individuals, 14 agencies and nonprofits, and a geographic footprint spanning 12 Utah counties. It draws on a legislative and service-provider record developed across the 2026 Utah General Session and our ongoing case intake operations.

This report identifies structural barriers in the registrant housing market that externalize costs onto shelters, behavioral health providers, and the other frontline agencies represented in WCCRC's coalition. Each of these agencies sits at a point in a reentry process that begins well upstream, absorbing individuals that structured reentry programs and the private rental market have already been unable to accommodate before supervision compliance and housing stability are put at risk.

We are presenting this material in the context of our July 1, 2026 meeting with the Weber County Community Reentry Coalition and welcome the opportunity to discuss how the coalition's collaboration would convert work WCCRC is 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 WCCRC determines is appropriate at each stage.

Sincerely

Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws

UTRSOL/lm

Who We Are: UTRSOL's Organizational Model

Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL) is a Utah-based policy organization founded in April 2025. This document supplements the July 1, 2026 presentation to Weber County Community Reentry Coalition (WCCRC) and is intended to provide program leadership and members with a complete record of the data, analysis, and proposals discussed.

In its first fifteen months of operation, UTRSOL has documented 207 housing assistance cases spanning 329 individuals across 12 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.

UTRSOL is a volunteer-run organization working at the intersection of housing, employment, and policy for people on Utah's Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry, and for the families who live alongside them. UTRSOL is not currently incorporated as a nonprofit; the organization is pursuing a dual 501(c)(4)/501(c)(3) structure that would allow it to advance evidence-based public policy through legislative advocacy while separately supporting research, education, public awareness, housing assistance, and reentry services.

UTRSOL operates through five 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, highlighting trends, data gaps, and outcomes.
- **Litigation Development.** UTRSOL identifies constitutional test cases and builds the legal record through the UTRSOL Legal Action Committee (ULAC), supporting strategic challenges to ineffective, overbroad, and unsupported policies.

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. Together, they create a comprehensive framework for advancing evidence-based reform while addressing the immediate needs of affected individuals and families across Utah communities.

Why This Matters for WCCRC

UTRSOL's housing assistance efforts are integrated into a broader policy and advocacy framework; it is informed by the same statutory and statistical analysis that drives its legislative work. That matters for WCCRC because the housing barriers described in this report are not anecdotal impressions but the product of UTRSOL's broader research apparatus, including direct review of district court case-outcome data, criminal justice statistics, and registry population figures maintained by Utah's Bureau of Criminal Identification (BCI) and the Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry.

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.

207 Households Contacted UTRSOL	329 Household Individuals Represented	12 Utah Counties Documented Outreach	14+ Professional Agencies Independently Contacted Us	123 Non-registered family members partners, children, parents
---	---	--	---	--

Those 207 cases represent 118 single registrants, 67 couples, and 22 families, meaning 123 of the 329 individuals affected had no offense of their own, and appear on no registry.

The 67 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. As a result, the true scale of housing instability and exclusion experienced by Utah registrants is likely substantially greater than these documented figures indicate.

Geographic Distribution

Households are concentrated in Salt Lake, Davis, and Weber counties, which together account for roughly 72% of the 207 households, while the remaining share is spread thinly across nine additional counties from Utah County to Summit. This pattern likely reflects population density and the location of UTRSOL's existing outreach and landlord relationships as much as it reflects where housing need is greatest, since a volunteer-run organization with no dedicated intake staff will naturally surface more cases where it already has a presence.

Salt Lake	102	49%
Davis	26	13%
Weber	20	10%
Utah County	13	6%
Cache	4	2%
Washington	4	2%
Box Elder	2	1%
Other/Multi	7	3%

Approximately 43 of the 207 households (21%) provided no county record. 13 households list more than one county (households that relocated or were searching across counties during their case). Each household was counted once per distinct county it touched, so the total mentions (164) exceed the household count. Because 13 households are counted in more than one county and 43 households have no county on file, the county figures above total 178 mentions across 164 of the 207 households, and will not sum to 207 or to 100%. Proximity restrictions, Good Landlord Program screening criteria, and landlord reluctance do not stop at a county line, so a household forced to widen its search compounds rather than escapes housing barriers. Multiple-county searches therefore function as an indicator of housing scarcity and displacement pressure rather than increased housing opportunity.

These figures are drawn directly from UTRSOL's internal intake records, logged at the point of first contact and updated as cases progress. Each entry records household composition, county, supervision status, employment status, and the referring agency where applicable. UTRSOL does not extrapolate or model statewide totals from this dataset; the 207/329/123 figures are a direct count of confirmed contacts, not an estimate. Every case reflects a documented request for assistance.

Outreach has been driven almost entirely by word of mouth, referrals from the 14+ partner agencies, and UTRSOL's presentations to shelters, housing authorities, and reentry coalitions. An organization with dedicated intake capacity would almost certainly surface a larger population; Utah's total registry population is substantially larger than UTRSOL's current caseload, and the unsupervised share of that population in particular is the segment least likely to be captured by any institutional channel.

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 Utah Department of Corrections (UDC)-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.

The 123 non-registered family members affected are presented separately because WCCRC's frame is reentry risk. A registrant returning to a household with a spouse and two children carries that household's stability into every supervision and treatment requirement AP&P imposes, an unstable placement doesn't just fail the registrant, it destabilizes the family members whose housing depends on it. This is the basis for the point made in the next section: family-sized units are structurally harder to place than single-occupant placements, and most existing reentry housing pathways were not designed with that household shape in mind.

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 UDC.

Status	Share	Approx. Households
No active supervision	35%	~42
Probation	32%	~39
Parole	32%	~39
Pretrial / federal	2%	~2

The single most important figure for WCCRC's purposes is the 35% with no active supervision. This is not a correctional caseload. A portion of households seeking UTRSOL's assistance are community members years removed from any court or parole oversight, excluded from the rental market by registry status alone, with no supervising agency, treatment team, or case manager actively involved in their housing search. They typically reach UTRSOL the same way any other person seeking housing reaches a community resource: word of mouth, an online search, or a referral from a frustrated case worker who has run out of options. Of the 207 in-takes, only 122 provided supervision status.

Employment & Treatment

The majority of individuals in the dataset are employed at the time of contact, concentrated in construction, logistics, food service, retail, and skilled trades. This is a population seeking stability, not special accommodation, and 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: a significant share are enrolled in active SOTP treatment, and a meaningful share of the supervised portion of the caseload is in documented compliance with all supervision conditions.

Neither stable employment nor active treatment participation insulates 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. Nor is affordability the primary driver: in the majority of cases, the barrier is not cost but landlord willingness to rent to a registrant at any price point. As a result, housing decisions are often based on registry status alone rather than on individualized indicators of stability, compliance, or demonstrated risk, information the registry itself does not convey to a landlord running a background check. This dynamic creates a structural disconnect between actual risk-relevant information and the criteria used in housing screening decisions.

Household Composition

Two findings from the caseload are easy to miss in a single presentation slide but matter for how LCPC and its partners design solutions:

- Family-sized households (3–5 people) are harder to place than single individuals. Most existing reentry housing pathways, including transitional and halfway-house models, were built around single-occupant placement. A family unit with a registrant parent does not fit that pipeline and is correspondingly underserved by it.
- Only about 10% of the caseload is coming directly out of incarceration to a halfway house. The substantial majority are already housed and need to relocate, whether due to a lease ending, a landlord discovering registry status after move-in, a family member's

housing falling through, or a change in employment or supervision county. This is a population in ongoing housing instability, not solely a reentry-transition population, and it recurs throughout a person's years on the registry rather than resolving after an initial reentry period.

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.

1	Emergency Shelters › The Lantern House › The Road Home › The Inn Between › Switchpoint Microshelter
2	Behavioral Health › Valley Behavioral Health › Wasatch Behavioral Health › Fourth Street Clinic
3	Nonprofits & Faith › Almost There Nonprofit › Utah Case Management › Volunteers of America Utah › LDS Branch Presidents
4	Government Agencies › Weber Housing Authority › Salt Lake Police Department › Salt Lake City Housing Division (HEART)

Building the Landlord Side of the Pathway

Since UTRSOL's founding, the organization has worked to build relationships on the landlord and institutional side of the housing pathway, not just the registrant side, because a coalition like WCCRC can only refer people to housing that actually exists. This approach recognizes that expanding referral capacity requires increasing the number of landlords and housing providers willing to consider qualified applicants, rather than relying solely on stronger case management or referral coordination.

Good Landlord Program

The Good Landlord Program (GLP) is the primary channel through which Utah municipalities regulate rental housing licensing and, in the course of doing so, shape landlord screening practice. Understanding how GLP training and municipal ordinances interact is central to understanding why registry-based exclusion is so widespread despite having no uniform statutory basis.

How screening practice is shaped before it becomes ordinance text

- Training curriculum: GLP landlord-training materials present a categorical “no sex offenders” rule as a model screening criterion, distributed to landlords statewide.
- Industry norm: sample screening policies distributed alongside the training model categorical exclusion, with no individualized review of time since offense, risk level, or treatment compliance.
- Shelter as endpoint: applicants excluded under this norm land at emergency shelters, which then face their own capacity limits — shifting the cost of a private-market screening practice onto the public shelter system.

The statutory nuance is this: Utah's Good Landlord Program statutes (HB 178; Utah Code § 10-1-203.5(3)(b)) do not require registry-based denial. The categorical exclusion is a training-driven industry norm, not a statutory mandate, which is precisely why it has been able to spread across municipalities without any city council, or the legislature, formally deciding that it should.

Documented industry-level sourcing

UTRSOL's review of GLP training curriculum and model screening materials found verbatim “no sex offenders” language in the sample screening policy distributed to landlords across multiple cities. The joint model screening policy retains categorical registry-based exclusion as the post-reform default, and that language survived the 2016 and 2017 statutory reform cycles without modification.

UTRSOL also reviewed the referral capacity of The Good Landlord (the private training and advocacy organization operating alongside the municipal GLP structure). Inbound calls from registrants seeking housing currently go unanswered by any formal referral pathway,

there is no resource within that organization's operations for placing a registrant applicant, and landlords who wish to exclude registrants can and do use general criminal history language as a pretext, whether or not the applicant's registry status was the actual basis for denial. As a result, registrants seeking housing are left to navigate the private rental market without institutional support, relying almost entirely on personal relationships, individual advocacy, or chance connections to locate willing landlords.

Taken together, these findings indicate that the exclusion norm is authored and propagated at the industry level, not by individual city governments, and that it persists in municipalities whose own code is silent on the question. This creates a de facto statewide practice in which access to housing is shaped more by industry guidance and informal implementation than by consistently enacted municipal policy.

Shelter and Housing Authority Presentations

Beyond the landlord-facing relationships described above, UTRSOL has also worked the institutional side of the housing pipeline: the shelters, housing authorities, and reentry coalitions, WCCRC among them, that see this population first and most often. These presentations have served less to ask for direct placements and more to make UTRSOL's caseload and intake process visible to staff who otherwise have no clear referral path for a registrant client. UTRSOL has completed five presentations to date, including today's:

- March 25, 2026 — Homeless Engagement and Resource Response Team (HEART), Salt Lake City Housing Stability Division.
- May 12, 2026 — The Lantern House, an emergency shelter facility, where UTRSOL estimates roughly 20% of the facility's approximately 330 residents are on the registry.
- May 22, 2026 — Weber Housing Authority, presented to the Executive Director and the Prevention Specialist of Weber Human Services, who also serves as Vice Chair of the Weber County Community Reentry Coalition (WCCRC). This meeting produced the referral that led to UTRSOL's current WCCRC presentation.
- June 25, 2026 — Utah Housing Coalition/Landlord and Community Partners Coalition (LCPC) presented to approximately 27 members of this coalition.

Municipal GLP Programs: No Consistent Standard

UTRSOL reviewed Good Landlord Program ordinances and enforcement practice in eight Utah municipalities between 2025 and 2026. The review found no consistent standard across cities, municipalities range from mandatory, uncapped categorical exclusion to no registry-related screening requirement at all, with several enforcement details unconfirmed or informally handled. This variation means that otherwise similarly situated applicants may receive substantially different treatment depending solely on the municipality in which they apply for housing. The findings also indicate that implementation frequently depends on local administrative interpretation rather than a uniform statewide policy.

Municipality	Screening posture	Key details
Midvale	Strictest	Mandatory registry check; categorical exclusion; no time limit; not enforced post-license
Sunset City	Strictest	Mandatory registry check; categorical exclusion; no time limit; \$167/unit fee spread
South Ogden	Time-limited	Permissive registry check; 4-year conviction window; offense-category based
Ogden City	Time-limited	No registry requirement; 4-year conviction window; offense-category based
South Salt Lake	No exclusion	No registry requirement; no exclusion criteria; background check functions as awareness only; amended March 2025
Roy	No exclusion	No registry requirement; no exclusion criteria; background check functions as awareness only
North Salt Lake	Codified, unenforced	Criminal-history criteria codified in ordinance; confirmed unenforced beyond training and licensing maintenance
Alpine	No ordinance	No municipal GLP ordinance; screening delegated to third-party property management

Two patterns stand out from this comparison. First, the strictest programs (Midvale, Sunset City) impose categorical, indefinite exclusion regardless of time since offense, the same categorical logic documented in the industry training material above. Second, several municipalities with codified criminal-history criteria (North Salt Lake) or fee structures tied to screening (Sunset City) do not confirm active enforcement, meaning the practical effect on an applicant may depend more on which property management company or individual landlord processes the application than on the municipality's own ordinance.

This inconsistency is itself the policy problem UTRSOL's draft bill (HB6, GLP Minimum Standards Amendments) is intended to address: absent a statewide floor, screening outcomes for an otherwise identical applicant vary by municipal boundary in ways unrelated to documented risk. A uniform minimum standard would improve transparency, provide greater consistency for landlords and applicants, and reduce reliance on informal or unwritten screening practices. It would also allow municipalities to retain local flexibility while ensuring that core eligibility criteria are applied in a more predictable and evidence-informed manner.

Where the Gap Lands

The categorical exclusion documented in the preceding section does not operate in isolation, it compounds across three points where formal oversight is absent, each widening the gap between what a registrant has actually done to comply and what the housing market will actually recognize. The following breakdown traces where that gap currently lands, and why it has been able to persist without correction. This holds at the state level: no Utah statute compels registry-based denial. Individual municipalities are a separate matter, as the comparison below shows, at least two cities (Midvale, Sunset City) have written categorical exclusion directly into their own GLP contracts, making it a local mandate even though no state law required them to adopt one.

- No statutory floor — without registry-specific statutory guidance, municipalities default to whatever the training curriculum models, rather than to an independently considered local standard.
- No individualized review — categorical exclusion means time-since-offense, documented risk level, and treatment compliance are never factored into a screening decision.
- Sober living — the same exclusionary logic UTRSOL documented in rental screening now also appears in sober-living intake decisions, extending the same categorical barrier into a second housing channel that reentry-involved individuals frequently use.

The compliance bind

A registrant can satisfy every supervision and treatment requirement the state imposes and still be categorically unhousable, because the exclusion operates one level below statute, inside training materials that are not visible to anyone outside the industry, including the applicants those materials exclude. As a result, housing decisions may be shaped less by an individual's demonstrated risk or compliance than by private screening practices that function outside public scrutiny or meaningful avenues for appeal.

Why This Belongs at WCCRC

Housing instability is not adjacent to reentry risk; UTRSOL's position is that it functions as a direct component of reentry risk, through a documentable chain rather than a general association. When individuals are unable to secure stable housing despite complying with supervision requirements, the resulting instability can undermine employment, treatment continuity, family reunification, and long-term community integration, increasing the likelihood of supervision failure even in the absence of new criminal behavior.

The chain from exclusion to reincarceration risk

- Categorical housing exclusion spreads through training curriculum and screening norms, not statute — leaving no formal administrative or legislative mechanism to challenge a specific denial.

- That exclusion produces housing instability or homelessness, which breaks supervision compliance from day one: no verified address and no consistent proximity to required treatment.
- Reduced supervision compliance and treatment access follows, AP&P agents managing unstable registrants carry higher caseload complexity with fewer available compliance levers.
- The end result is elevated recidivism risk and reincarceration cost. Housing instability is among the strongest proximate predictors of reoffense in the broader reentry literature, not registry status itself, but the destabilization that categorical exclusion produces.

This framing is why UTRSOL is presenting housing data to a reentry coalition rather than exclusively to housing authorities: the WCCRC's members, supervision agencies, treatment providers, and case managers are positioned to observe and mitigate the compliance consequences of housing exclusion even though most of them do not control the screening decision itself. Their collective perspective makes them uniquely positioned to identify where housing barriers are disrupting otherwise successful reentry and to inform policy discussions with evidence drawn from day-to-day supervision and service delivery.

AfterMath Alliance

AfterMath Alliance is a UTRSOL initiative to establish a non-clinical, recurring support group for registrants and family members navigating sex offense registry requirements. The group is structured like group treatment, regular attendance, shared disclosure, mutual accountability, but operates without a clinician, without formal treatment goals, and without billing as treatment. Target launch is the August 2026 coalition meeting.

Design element	Detail
Facilitator	A Peer Support Specialist with lived registry experience, providing credibility, relatability, and structured accountability.
Launch phasing	In-person meetings in Salt Lake and Weber counties.
Hosting model	Facilities that already host substance use and addiction recovery meetings, or space embedded within AP&P / SOTP provider locations.
Structural constraint	Requires addition to AP&P's approved program exceptions under its fraternization policy before supervised individuals can attend as a matter of course.

Both the hosting model and the structural constraint point to the same conclusion: the fastest path to launch runs through an existing recovery or treatment space rather than a

standalone facility, which is why UTRSOL's outreach has concentrated on two options. Both options build on existing infrastructure and partnerships, reducing implementation barriers while allowing services to be integrated into settings already serving individuals reentering the community.

Active hosting outreach

- USARA (Ogden) — hosted UTRSOL meetings in June 2025 and remains the active target for formalizing a recurring biweekly hosting arrangement; currently pending internal review.
- SOTP provider (pilot) — embedding within an SOTP provider's existing space would remove the attendance barrier for supervised individuals already required to be present there, and would leverage an established therapeutic environment without requiring a separate facility relationship.

Three Asks

UTRSOL's requests to WCCRC members are specific, low-commitment, and sequenced, each is intended to be actionable independently of the others. Together, they move from the least demanding ask (sharing anonymized cases already collected) toward the most substantive (exploring a hosting relationship), so that a partner can engage at any point on that spectrum without committing to the rest.

1. Cases for legislative submission

UTRSOL requests coalition partners' support in identifying anonymized case examples drawn from the 207-case housing dataset for submission to legislative committees, grounding policy arguments in documented real-world outcomes rather than hypothetical harm. This would strengthen the evidentiary basis for reform discussions by illustrating how screening practices function in practice.

2. Data exchange

UTRSOL proposes a standing data-sharing channel so each coalition partner sees aggregate housing-barrier patterns across the full referral network, not just the cases that reach its own intake desk. This would allow partners to identify systemic bottlenecks earlier and coordinate responses based on shared, real-time trend data rather than isolated organizational snapshots.

3. AfterMath Alliance exploration

UTRSOL requests an initial conversation about whether WCCRC members' existing case-management infrastructure could host or support the peer-specialist model described above, non-clinical, AP&P-approved, and serving the reentry population already present in members' caseloads. This discussion would help determine where the model could be embedded with minimal operational disruption while leveraging existing supervisory and service delivery frameworks.

From Documentation to Coordination

The data in this report describes a problem that already exists, fully formed, across Utah's service landscape. UTRSOL did not create the demand reflected in its 207-household caseload; it simply became the place where that demand became visible, one independent contact at a time, from more than 14 agencies that had no coordinated pathway of their own. The same is true on the landlord side: willing property owners exist, but every relationship UTRSOL has documented was built by one person finding one other person, with no institution holding the connection once that individual moves on.

That is the core finding of this report, and it points to a specific kind of solution. The barrier facing UTRSOL's caseload is not a lack of willing landlords, a lack of need, or a lack of agencies trying to help. It is a lack of infrastructure connecting the three. Registry status operates as a categorical disqualifier that does not track risk, treatment compliance, supervision status, or time since offense, and no single agency, including UTRSOL, can absorb that exclusion's downstream effects through individual relationships alone.

The three asks outlined in this report are not a request for WCCRC to take on a new mission. They are a request to extend infrastructure this coalition is already building, a case-management network, an established referral pathway between member agencies, a hosting relationship for recurring meetings, to a population that has been independently finding its way to a single volunteer-run organization because no other coordinated channel exists. UTRSOL has done what an organization of its size can do: build the caseload, document the pattern, earn standing relationships with Weber Housing Authority and a growing set of partner agencies, and bring that documentation to this coalition in a form ready to act on. What it cannot do alone is turn person-to-person relationships into durable, institution-held infrastructure. That is the gap this report asks WCCRC to help close.

UTRSOL welcomes the opportunity to follow up on any of the three asks individually, to share underlying intake data with appropriate privacy safeguards, or to answer questions from Weber County Community Reentry Coalition member agencies before the next coordination conversation.

