

Number 2026-44



**Housing, Re-Entry, and the
Registry Population in Weber County
Weber Housing Authority**

May 22, 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 22, 2026

Weber Housing Authority
2380 Washington Blvd, Suite #112
Ogden, Utah 84401

To Weber Housing Authority:

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 169 cases, 271 individuals, 14 agencies and nonprofits, and a geographic footprint spanning 10 Utah counties, including 20 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.

The report identifies structural barriers converging on the registrant housing market that externalize costs onto Ogden-area shelter providers. As Weber County's primary housing authority, Weber Housing Authority is positioned to intervene at a critical point in a displacement process that begins well upstream – receiving individuals that structured re-entry programs and the private rental market have been unable to accommodate before a housing crisis fully develops.

We are presenting this material to you in the context of our meeting with Weber Housing Authority and welcome the opportunity to discuss how your agency's participation in a coordinated stakeholder response 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 Weber Housing Authority 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 22, 2026 in-person presentation to Weber Housing Authority 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 169 housing assistance cases spanning 271 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 Weber Housing Authority 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:

Weber Housing Authority 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 169 cases represent 97 single registrants, 52 couples, and 22 families — meaning 102 of the 271 individuals affected had no offense of their own, and appear on no registry.

The 52 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 Weber Housing Authority 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 169 cases, 85 (50%) are in Salt Lake County, with Davis County (23) and Weber County (20) representing the next largest concentrations. Weber County — Weber Housing Authority’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	85	50%
Davis	23	14%
Weber	20	12%
Utah County	9	5%
Cache	4	2%
Washington	4	2%
Box Elder	2	1%
Other/Multi	22	13%

Weber County's position as the third-largest concentration in the dataset is directly relevant to Weber Housing Authority’s operational context. Of the 20 Weber County cases, the majority were searching in Ogden and surrounding areas — the same service area where Weber Housing Authority 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 169 households:

- 87 (51%) have no active supervision
- 42 (25%) are on probation
- 37 (22%) are on parole
- 3 (2%) are pretrial or federally supervised

51% 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 169 cases representing 271 individuals — a 40% 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)

The Lantern House Meeting Findings and Data Analysis

On May 12, 2026, UTRSOL held a formal meeting at The Lantern House in Ogden. The meeting covered UTRSOL's organizational mission, the housing assistance dataset, the GLP displacement analysis, and potential areas for future coordination.

Population Data

The Lantern House estimate of approximately 66 registry-listed residents draws on direct case management experience with the facility's population, not from any data provided by UTRSOL. UTRSOL's independent cross-reference of Utah's public sex offender registry identified 34 individuals with The Lantern House listed as their address of record, suggesting the actual registry-listed population at the facility is larger than what the public registry reflects.

330 Current residents at The Lantern House	~66 Estimated on registry (~20%)	34 Publicly listed at TLH address	~32 Estimated undisclosed residents
---------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------

The ~20% figure was Lantern House' independent estimate — arrived at through their own case management experience, not provided by UTRSOL. This is independent institutional corroboration, not an advocacy figure. The gap between 34 and ~66 suggests approximately 32 additional individuals residing at the facility who have not updated their registry address, whether because they consider the stay temporary, because they lack awareness of the requirement, or because they have not yet complied with the update obligation.

This undisclosed population carries specific legal significance under H.B. 370, discussed on page 13.

Meeting Observations

Several substantive signals emerged from the Lantern House meeting:

- The Lantern House noted that H.B. 370's ankle monitoring provision had already surfaced as a concern among their clients, UTRSOL raising it proactively aligned with what her team was already observing on the ground.
- The Lantern House has established working relationships with the Ogden Police Department, Ogden Fire Department, and the Weber County Sheriff's Office.
- The facility maintains no exclusion policy based on registry status, which makes it structurally unique among Weber County shelter options. It is both the endpoint of the displacement pipeline and the most accessible stable-address option for this population.

The 283 Unknown Location Figure — Statewide Context

At a February 19 Sentencing Commission meeting, the Director of the Sex Offense Management Advisory Committee (SOMAC) reported that approximately 283 individuals on Utah's sex offense registry had unknown locations statewide. This figure predates HB 370's effective date of May 6, 2026.

HB 370 Intersection with the 283 Unknown Location Registrants

The 283 individuals with unknown locations as of February 19 are grandfathered — they are not subject to HB 370's GPS monitoring requirement because the requirement applies only to registrants who fail to provide a physical address after the May 6 effective date.

However, the statewide pool of individuals who are now newly at risk of GPS monitoring activation — those who have not yet updated their address following May 6 — is an ongoing and growing population. Any registrant who enters homelessness, exits incarceration, or leaves a prior address without updating their registration after May 6 is now subject to monitoring activation.

The practical consequence for Weber County: the already-constrained housing market now carries an additional compliance pressure layer for any new entrant without a stable address. Early housing placement is no longer merely a stability outcome — it is a registry compliance mechanism.

The Good Landlord Program — Upstream Cause of Displacement

The central structural driver of housing instability for registry-listed individuals in Weber County is not the sex offense registry itself — it is the municipal Good Landlord Programs operated by Ogden and South Ogden. Understanding these programs is prerequisite to understanding why The Lantern House functions as a shelter of last resort for this population.

What Good Landlord Programs Are

Good Landlord Programs (GLPs) are municipal incentive structures that offer participating landlords reduced licensing fees, code compliance waivers, or other administrative benefits in exchange for adherence to screening and property management standards set by the city. Participation is voluntary for landlords, but the incentive structure is strong enough that GLP participation has become effectively normative across large portions of Ogden's and South Ogden's rental markets.

The screening standards required for GLP participation historically included categorical exclusion of applicants with sex offense registry status. A 2016 reform to Ogden's program created a limited waiver pathway — but the waiver is available only to registrants who have maintained continuous probation or parole status for four or more years, a condition that excludes the majority of registry-listed individuals seeking housing.

Ogden vs. South Ogden — Key Distinctions

While both municipalities operate programs that functionally exclude registry-listed individuals from the majority of their private rental markets, they do so through different legal mechanisms — a distinction that matters for how each program can be challenged, amended, or navigated. The table below identifies the key structural differences relevant to housing placement decisions in Weber County.

Factor	Ogden City GLP	South Ogden GLP
Program type	Codified municipal ordinance (two ordinances)	Operating program; similar structure to Ogden
Legal character	Statutory — challengeable through ordinance amendment process	Program-level — amendable through administrative action
Registry exclusion	Historically required; 2016 reform created limited waiver pathway	Similar exclusion mechanism; waiver pathway less documented
Waiver availability	Available to registrants on probation or parole for 4+ continuous years	Not fully documented in public-facing materials
State override	No Utah state law requires GLP participation or registry exclusion	Same — municipal policy, not statutory mandate
Practical effect	Majority of private rental market inaccessible to registrants without waiver	Same displacement effect; compounds Ogden's market closure

The critical legal point for any housing authority operating in Weber County: there is no Utah state statute that requires a landlord, public housing authority, or Good Landlord Program to exclude individuals based on registry status. The exclusion is a policy choice — a discretionary municipal and program-level decision, not a legal obligation. Decisions that treat registry status as a categorical disqualification are not legally mandated.

Practical Effect on the Private Rental Market

The combined effect of Ogden and South Ogden GLPs is the functional closure of the majority of Weber County's private rental market to registry-listed individuals. This is not a marginal effect — it is structural. The pipeline runs in one direction:

1	GLP market closure Registry-listed individuals cannot obtain housing in GLP-participating properties without a waiver. The waiver pathway is narrow and time-conditioned. Most individuals seeking housing do not qualify.
2	Private market rejection Even outside the formal GLP structure, landlord refusal rates are high. The GLP certification mark functions as a signal to registrants that properties are unavailable — reducing application attempts and concentrating demand at the remaining non-GLP market, which is limited.
3	Shelter as endpoint With both the GLP and non-GLP private markets largely inaccessible, The Lantern House becomes the primary stable-address option. This is not a failure of individual choice — it is the terminal output of a closed market system.

For Weber Housing Authority specifically: this structural analysis is directly relevant to the Rapid Re-Entry pipeline. Individuals releasing from incarceration in Weber County are entering a housing market that is functionally closed to them before they arrive. Early identification and intervention — before they cycle through The Lantern House into instability — is the only point in the pipeline where coordination can prevent the worst outcomes.

HB 370 — Legislative Context and Operational Implications

House Bill 370, passed during the 2026 Utah General Session, took effect May 6, 2026. The bill's primary mechanism is the imposition of GPS electronic monitoring on registrants who do not maintain a current physical address in the registry.

What the Law Requires

Prior to HB 370, registrants who were homeless or transient were required to report to their supervising law enforcement jurisdiction on a defined schedule in lieu of a fixed address. HB 370 replaces that mechanism with GPS monitoring for registrants who do not provide a physical address. The monitoring requirement is automatic upon failure to provide an address, it is not a discretionary judicial or supervision decision in most scenarios.

Operational Implications for Weber County

The implications for Weber County's housing landscape are direct and immediate. Weber County's particular vulnerability stems from the combination of GLP market closure and NUCCC releases: individuals exiting incarceration into a county where the private rental market is already functionally closed now face an additional compliance clock that begins the moment they lack a stable address. The practical effect is that the window for successful housing placement — already narrow — has been shortened further by a legal mechanism that was designed as a monitoring tool but functions, in this market context, as an accelerant of instability.

1	New entrants face monitoring activation Any registrant who arrives in Weber County following an incarceration release, a move from another county, or a loss of a prior housing address — and who cannot immediately secure a stable physical address — is now subject to GPS monitoring as a condition of registry compliance. This is an additional layer of stigma and administrative burden that further reduces their housing placement prospects.
2	The Lantern House address gap The ~32 individuals residing at The Lantern House without a publicly listed address are grandfathered — not subject to the requirement. But any new Lantern House entrant post-May 6 who does not update their registry to reflect the TLH address is immediately at risk. TLH case management may not be uniformly aware of this obligation or its consequences.
3	Coordination as a compliance tool Weber HA and UTRSOL coordinating on early housing placement is not only a stability intervention — it is, under HB 370, a mechanism for preventing GPS monitoring activation. An individual placed in stable housing before a monitoring order issues avoids a cascading set of consequences that make subsequent housing placement even harder.

Re-Entry Coordination, Proposed Framework

UTRSOL is not presenting today with a formal proposal. The purpose of this meeting is to establish shared understanding and identify where coordination, however informal, would serve both organizations and the population we are each working to support. The framework below reflects UTRSOL's assessment of the most productive intersection points.

Weber Housing Authority adding a Re-Entry Systems Coordinator to this meeting — without being asked, signals institutional alignment. The most productive coordination point is the Re-Entry pipeline itself: individuals releasing from incarceration in Weber County who are registry-listed are entering a housing market that is functionally closed to them. Early identification is the only intervention point that prevents the worst outcomes.

Why the Re-Entry Frame Is the Right Frame

The instinct to treat registry-listed individuals as a specialized or exceptional population often leads organizations to build separate, siloed responses. The data suggests a different approach: the housing challenge facing this population is structurally identical to the general re-entry housing challenge, with two amplifying factors.

- GLP market closure compounds standard credit and background screening barriers. The rental market is narrower before any individual-level screening begins.
- HB 370 adds a compliance urgency that does not exist for the non-registry re-entry population: failing to secure housing quickly now triggers GPS monitoring, which further reduces placement prospects in a feedback loop.

Treating this as a re-entry housing problem — rather than a registry management problem — opens access to the full toolkit of re-entry housing resources, including landlord development, rapid re-housing frameworks, and coordinated entry systems. The population fits the re-entry housing framework; the registry status is an amplifying factor, not a categorically different problem.

Coordination Framework

The six areas below reflect the points where UTRSOL's data, Weber Housing Authority's program functions, and the Re-Entry pipeline overlap most directly — each with a designated lead and a concrete operational description.

Area	Lead	Description
Re-Entry housing pipeline	(Re-Entry Systems Coordinator)	Cross-reference UTRSOL's Weber County intake cases against current caseload to identify individuals already known to both organizations. Shared visibility could reduce duplication of effort and allow earlier intervention before a housing crisis develops.
HB 370 placement urgency	WHA	Identify current Weber HA applicants or known individuals without a stable housing address who are post-May 6 registrants — these individuals are now subject to GPS monitoring. Coordinated early placement could prevent or reduce monitoring activation.
Lantern House coordination	UTRSOL as liaison	UTRSOL has an active relationship with The Lantern House case management team. Weber HA and TLH case management could benefit from a three-way information channel for individuals moving between shelter and independent housing.

Landlord development	UTRSOL + Weber HA jointly	UTRSOL's Weber County employment data identifies employers where registrants are successfully maintaining work. Employer-adjacent housing – proximity to workplaces – is an underutilized placement strategy. UTRSOL can share employer geography; Weber HA can bring landlord relationships.
Information referral	Weber HA → UTRSOL	Registry-listed individuals who approach Weber HA without an existing case can be referred to UTRSOL for housing assistance intake and navigation support, reducing Weber HA staff burden on unfamiliar intake situations.
Data sharing	UTRSOL	UTRSOL can provide a de-identified Weber County case summary – stripped of all personally identifying information – for Weber HA staff orientation, program planning, or internal reporting purposes. No formal data-sharing agreement is required for de-identified aggregate data.

The Coordinating Committee Concept

UTRSOL has proposed to The Lantern House the concept of a cross-organizational coordinating committee – a structured but informal information-sharing body that would include shelter case management, housing authority staff, and UTRSOL as the data-holding intermediary. The committee would not require formal data-sharing agreements for its initial function; it would operate on de-identified case discussions and shared pattern recognition.

Weber Housing Authority's Re-Entry program is a natural fit for this structure. UTRSOL would propose including Weber HA in the committee's formation discussion – potentially alongside The Lantern House and a third organization yet to be identified from the Weber County service ecosystem.

No commitment is required today. UTRSOL is simply flagging this as a direction worth considering if today's conversation surfaces sufficient overlap to justify a follow-up.

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 Weber Housing Authority determines is appropriate at that stage. They are not a contract. They are a starting point for a conversation leadership and management at WHA can take as far as the organization determines makes sense.

1	Agree on data-sharing MOU scope Designate a WHA 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 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 WHA cases illustrating GLP displacement 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 Weber Housing Authority at the table, which is why we are here.

