Number 2026-57

Housing Access and the Registry
Homeless Veterans Fellowship
A Companion Report

July 24, 2026

Office of
UTAH FOR RATIONAL SEX OFFENSE LAWS

Office of Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws
32 W 200 S STE 302 • SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101
(801) 871-5215 • COMMUNICATIONS@UTRSOL.ORG

July 24, 2026

Homeless Veterans Fellowship
541 23rd St
Ogden, UT 84401

To members of HVF:

Attached is our comprehensive report on registrant housing instability in Utah, presented to the Homeless Veterans Fellowship (HVF) coalition by Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL) on July 24, 2026. The presentation argues that homelessness among people on Utah's Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry is not an incidental byproduct of registry status, but a structurally manufactured outcome of three overlapping housing-exclusion mechanisms, the Good Landlord Program's private training curricula, AP&P proximity-zone enforcement, and categorical exclusion from reentry programs. Together, these funnel registrants toward shelter and street homelessness, which is then cited as justification for further restriction, including new GPS-monitoring enforcement under H.B. 370.

This report reconstructs and expands the presentation for readers who were not in the room. It documents UTRSOL's organizational structure and evidentiary basis, lays out the scale of the problem as currently estimated (with explicit caveats about data quality), details the three-barrier framework and its downstream enforcement consequences, summarizes UTRSOL's existing housing network, and outlines the specific partnership questions UTRSOL is asking HVF and its Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) partners to help answer.

The core ask of HVF is not a resource commitment. It is a data and referral partnership: help UTRSOL determine whether and how these general-population housing barriers apply specifically to veterans, and explore whether SSVF's landlord relationships and UTRSOL's referral list can be linked.

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 non-profit Utah-based policy organization founded in April 2025. This document supplements the July 24, 2026 presentation to the Homeless Veterans Fellowship (HVF) 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 16 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 currently incorporated as a non-profit organization which filed for 501(c)(4) tax-exempt status to advance evidence-based public policy through legislative advocacy. It is equally pursuing a 501(c)(3) structure that would allow it to separately support research, education, public awareness, housing assistance, and reentry services for the population and its families.

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, victims rights, and related sentencing legislation grounded in empirical evidence.
- Registrant Housing and Employment Assistance. UTRSOL maintains an active network of non-profit partners, private property owners, and property managers 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.

- AfterMath Alliance. This is a support group facilitated by trained Peer Support Specialists to provide non-12 step, non clinical support to registrants and their families, both through virtual and in-person meetings.

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 HVF

Many veterans experiencing homelessness carry justice-involved histories, including registry status, that compound housing and employment barriers even when they've completed treatment and pose no elevated risk. UTRSOL's data-driven landlord and employer network, along with its policy advocacy, offers HVF a concrete resource and partnership model for veterans in this situation who might otherwise fall through the cracks.

The Problem is Already Shared

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 › Sol Recovery Community

3	**Nonprofits & Faith** › Almost There Nonprofit › Utah Case Management › Volunteers of America Utah › LDS Branch Presidents › Homeless Veterans Fellowship
4	**Government Agencies** › Weber Housing Authority › Salt Lake Police Department › Salt Lake City Housing Division (HEART)

This convergence across sectors underscores that housing barriers for registrants are not a niche problem but a systemic gap in coordination that any organization serving justice-involved veterans is likely to encounter, including at HVF itself.

The Scope of the Problem

Utah's 2026 statewide Point-in-Time Count (PIT), conducted January 29–31, 2026 recorded 1,151 Utahns experiencing chronic homelessness, part of an overall statewide homeless count of 4,512 people on a single night in January.

The most recent published annual report on the homeless population distribution released by the State found that nearly 80% of people experiencing chronic homelessness in Utah were living in Salt Lake County, where most of the services exist, alongside about half of all people experiencing homelessness statewide. Applying that same concentration pattern to the 2026 count of 1,151 puts the Salt Lake County chronically homeless population at roughly 920 individuals.

1,151 Chronically homeless statewide (2026 statewide Point-in-Time Count)	**~80%** Of the statewide chronically homeless population is concentrated in Salt Lake County (~920 individuals)	**~30%** Informal estimate of registrants among Salt Lake County's chronically homeless population

Roughly 30% of Salt Lake County's chronically homeless population may be registrants on Utah's Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry. Applying that share to ~920 individuals yields an estimated 276–345 chronically homeless registrants in the county. This figure traces to the Utah Department of Corrections but has not been independently verified, and should be treated as a working estimate that motivates further data collection, including through the SSVF/HVF partnership proposed later in the presentation, rather than a citable statistic on its own.

Three Barriers, One Pipeline to the Street

UTRSOL's central analytic argument is that three distinct policy and industry mechanisms, none individually designed to increase homelessness, combine to produce exactly that outcome for registrants.

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 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. UTRSOL grounded this finding in first-hand completion of both major GLP training pathways: the online refresher course through The Good Landlord (Certificate #344893550, June 29, 2026) and the in-person Rental Housing Association training (Certificate RHA26-02024, July 10, 2026).

Reentry Program Exclusion

Reentry and transitional housing programs exclude registrants by policy, closing off one of the few remaining safety nets available to people leaving incarceration or supervision. UTRSOL's presentation specifically names The Other Side Academy, described as Utah's flagship reentry model, as an organization that receives public funding for homeless services while categorically excluding registrants from participation, with no individualized risk assessment applied. This exclusion is particularly acute given that an estimated 30% of Salt Lake County's chronically homeless population is registry-involved, meaning the very program positioned as the county's model reentry pathway is closed to nearly a third of those it claims to serve. For veterans in this population, categorical exclusion means one of the few structured, funded routes off the street simply doesn't exist.

Among other reentry level programs that commonly bar registrants as a matter of insurance policy or landlord agreements are sober-living homes, faith-based transitional housing, and halfway house networks, and Utah's major reentry housing providers often carry the same blanket exclusion even when they serve other justice-involved populations.

Compounding Effect

None of these three mechanisms was designed to increase homelessness. Together, however, registry-related housing exclusion pushes people into shelter and street homelessness, and that resulting instability is then cited as evidence that more restrictive registry laws are needed, reinforcing the cycle. This creates a closed loop that data alone cannot break, since the very outcome the exclusions produce is then read as proof the exclusions were justified. Breaking it requires treating housing instability as a downstream effect of policy choices, not as independent evidence of ongoing risk. This closed loop also makes the underlying data harder to trust over time, since each cycle further conflates policy-driven displacement with genuine risk indicators.

Where the Gap Lands

The compounding effect of these three barriers isn't just more exclusion, it's exclusion with no backstop. Where a registrant might reasonably expect statute, individualized judgment, or at least a consistent standard to apply, they instead find a system that defaults, categorizes, and now extends into an adjacent area of housing altogether:

- No statutory floor — Without registry-specific statutory guidance, municipalities default to whatever the private training curriculum models, rather than to any legislated standard.
- No individualized review — Categorical exclusion means time-since-offense, current risk level, and treatment compliance are never considered on a case-by-case basis.
- Sober living, too — The same exclusionary logic UTRSOL documented in rental housing now also appears in sober-living intake decisions, extending the barrier beyond conventional rental housing.

UTRSOL summarizes the resulting bind this way: a registrant can satisfy every supervision and treatment requirement the state imposes, and still be categorically unhousable, because the exclusion operates one level below the statute, embedded in training materials that are effectively invisible to anyone outside the housing industry.

When Homelessness Becomes an Enforcement Problem

The housing-barrier structure is directly connected to a recent legislative and enforcement development: House Bill 370, effective May 6, 2026. H.B. 370 mandates GPS monitoring for registrants who have no fixed address. UTRSOL's argument is that this treats a documentation gap in the registry, itself caused largely by the housing barriers described in the previous sections as an enforcement failure, rather than what it actually is: an administrative symptom of housing exclusion.

- 283 pre-existing “location unknown” cases were grandfathered under H.B. 370 and exempted from the requirement the bill created, notably, the very cohort whose existence was used to justify passing the bill in the first place.
- ~8% of all parole violations statewide are absconding / failure-to-register violations, according to Utah Department of Corrections SOTP Director Jared Hill (May 2026).

UTRSOL's takeaway for the HVF coalition specifically: enforcement resources are currently being spent tracking a problem that stable housing placement would substantially shrink. This reframes housing assistance not simply as a service to registrants, but as a more cost-effective lever than expanded GPS enforcement for reducing the underlying compliance failures the state is trying to solve. For the HVF coalition, this framing matters most where the two systems overlap directly: veterans who are also registrants and currently unhoused.

Where UTRSOL Fits: Existing Housing Network

UTRSOL enters this coalition with an active, if still-developing, housing referral infrastructure spanning three categories: property owners and managers willing to rent directly to registrants, non-profit and reentry organizations with existing placement relationships, and case-level partnerships built through direct outreach to landlords and agencies across county lines.

Multi-Family Housing

Active multi-family housing relationships now span four property managers across Weber and Salt Lake counties, with properties in Ogden, West Valley City, and Salt Lake City (2 property managers). This footprint reflects direct, relationship-based outreach rather than a formal referral program, and is expected to expand as additional property managers are engaged in the coming months.

Single Male / Shared Housing

Almost There non-profit, the John Taylor House, and one other property manager in the Salt Lake region anchor UTRSOL's single-male referral pipeline. Each operates through property managers in Salt Lake County who accept registrants into shared housing arrangements. Together, these three relationships currently represent the most reliable placement pathway for single male registrants entering the pipeline.

Financial Resources

UTRSOL maintains referral relationships with Advantage Services and Cottages of Hope, giving registrants a path to financial assistance resources that most mainstream housing programs do not offer them. This gives registrants a rare foothold toward financial stability that most housing pipelines, structured around exclusion rather than support, simply don't provide.

8. A Two-Way Partnership: What Each Side Brings

The relationship between UTRSOL and HVF is reciprocal rather than one-directional, each side holds something the other currently doesn’t. HVF brings direct access to a veteran population UTRSOL's housing and employment infrastructure isn't yet reaching, while UTRSOL brings a working referral network and policy framework that HVF's veterans currently have no other route into.

UTRSOL Offers	SSVF / HVF Offers
• A landlord referral network across Weber and Salt Lake counties • Good Landlord Program research pinpointing where exclusions originate • A standardized intake process and case-tracking dataset • A direct line into active legislative advocacy on housing barriers	• Ground-truth data on veteran-specific registry housing barriers • An established case-management relationship with veterans already navigating this system • Credibility with veteran-focused funders and legislators UTRSOL doesn't currently reach

The asymmetry is intentional rather than a gap to be filled evenly: UTRSOL is offering operational infrastructure it has already built, while asking HVF/SSVF for the piece it cannot generate on its own, direct, veteran-specific ground truth. Neither side is expected to commit resources at this stage; the partnership starts with comparing notes.

Why This Belongs at HVF | Open Questions

Everything in the prior sections is built from general registrant casework. UTRSOL does not yet have a dedicated referral pathway, or reliable data, on how these barriers specifically affect veterans. Rather than presenting conclusions, we propose three questions to explore jointly with SSVF:

- How often do HVF/SSVF caseworkers encounter registry status as a placement barrier?
- Do veteran-specific housing programs face the same GLP screening and proximity-restriction barriers documented in the general registrant population?
- Could SSVF's existing landlord relationships plug into UTRSOL's consolidated referral list — or vice versa?

These questions define the scope of a proposed exploratory partnership, not a resource ask. Answering them is meant to clarify fit and shared interest before either side commits to anything more formal. A short follow-up conversation between the two teams is likely enough to work through them.

Notes for Readers Who Were Not in the Room

A few points of context that the presentation could convey through discussion but that are worth stating explicitly here: these figures and framings reflect UTRSOL's own case data and partner conversations to date, not a finalized or peer-reviewed analysis.

- This is a briefing document, not a policy proposal. Its purpose was to establish shared situational awareness across a coalition that already handles this population separately, and to propose a specific, bounded next step with one partner (SSVF/HVF).
- The Good Landlord Program finding that exclusion is taught through private training curricula rather than written into ordinance, is UTRSOL's own research finding, based on completing both major training pathways directly, and is likely the least familiar point to audiences outside UTRSOL's housing work.
- UTRSOL's ask of this specific audience is narrow and diagnostic: help determine whether and how these barriers apply to veterans specifically, before any broader partnership commitment is discussed.

Taken together, these points mean this document should be read as a snapshot of an early, exploratory conversation, not a finalized program or a commitment already in motion.

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 16 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 agencies trying to help. It is a lack of infrastructure that UTRSOL wishes to construct. Registry status operates as a categorical disqualifier that does not track risk, treatment compliance, supervision status, or time since offense, and no single agency can absorb that exclusion's downstream effects through individual relationships alone.

UTRSOL has done what an organization of its size can do: build the caseload, document the pattern, earn standing relationships with the Homeless Veterans Fellowship 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 HVF to help close.

UTRSOL welcomes the opportunity to answer questions from the Homeless Veterans Fellowship before the next coordination conversation.