

Number 2026-45



**Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (LECJ)
2026 Interim Committee
Constituent Profile
Cross-District Analysis**

May 2026

Office of
UTAH FOR RATIONAL SEX OFFENSE LAWS



Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws

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

Introduction

This document presents a cross-district analysis of the fifteen constituent profiles comprising UTRSOL Publication 2026-37, which cover all fifteen members of Utah's Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (LECJ) Interim Committee. Each profile was produced from the 2026 Utah Department of Public Safety (DPS) Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry dataset and submitted directly to the corresponding committee member prior to this publication.

The purpose of this analysis is to identify patterns, variations, and structural features that emerge when the profiles are read together rather than in isolation. The findings are presented descriptively. No policy recommendation is advanced. Where the data supports inference, that inference is stated; where the data is ambiguous or incomplete, those limitations are noted explicitly.

This supplement incorporates materials from the following sources, in addition to the district-level DPS data contained in the individual profiles: the 2020 CCJJ Sex Offender Research Brief; the 2019 CCJJ study, Predicting New Criminal Convictions while on Parole (Nystrom and Poulson); the 2019 BJS report, Recidivism of Sex Offenders Released from State Prison: A 9-Year Follow-Up (Alper and Durose); the 2017 Utah Legislative Auditor General performance audit of the Sex Offender Treatment Program (Report 2017-04); the 2016 Utah Legislative Auditor General performance audit of the Board of Pardons and Parole (Report 2016-01); SOMAC/LECJ presentations by Dr. Michelle Leslie (August 2024) and Dan Strong, Director of the Sentencing Commission (multiple sessions, 2020–2025); LECJ interim committee transcripts from 2019 through 2025; the May 2026 UPAN presentation by UDC Sex Offender Treatment Program Director Jared Hill; ACS 5-year estimates for registry-concentration ZIP codes matched to the individual district profiles; and the November 2024 Legislative Research and General Counsel (LRGC) presentation on the registry recodification (Shad Larson, Associate General Counsel).

All quantitative data specific to the district profiles are drawn directly from the individual profiles. Readers seeking district-specific methodology, data source documentation, or clarification on any figure should refer to the corresponding profile's Data Sources and Methodology Notes section. Data presented in this report are intended to provide a comparative overview and may be updated as new information becomes available. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy and consistency, slight variations may occur due to differences in reporting periods, collection methods, or source availability.

Companion Document: Publication 2026-37

The sixteen individual district profiles referenced throughout this analysis are published as a separate companion document: **LECJ Interim Committee Constituent Profiles, Publication 2026-37** (UTRSOL, May 2026). Each profile contains the full district-level data table, offense composition charts, geographic distribution map, and Data Sources and Methodology Notes section for one LECJ committee member's district. Profile page references in this document cite the companion document by district designation and page number. Publication 2026-37 is available at utrsol.org alongside this analytical supplement.

Series Scope and Population Coverage

Publication 2026-37 covers all fifteen district profiles corresponding to the fifteen members of the LECJ Interim Committee. House District 21, represented by Rep. Sandra Hollins, required two analytical populations because it contains the Utah State Correctional Facility (USCF) at 1480 N 8000 W, Salt Lake City, which generates a raw DPS dataset of 2,922 records, of which 2,696 carry the institutional address. All HD21 analysis in this report uses the community-active subset (n=225).

The fifteen profiles span the geographic breadth of Utah: Weber, Box Elder, Davis, Morgan, Summit, Salt Lake, Utah, and Washington counties. Districts range from rural (HD6, Box Elder County) to densely urban (HD21, west Salt Lake City) to exurban retirement communities (SD29, Washington County). The series includes both Senate and House members, both committee chairs (Sen. Calvin Musselman, SD4; Rep. Ryan Wilcox, HD7), and members representing the full range of committee seniority and institutional roles.

Across the fifteen profiles, the combined community-active registrant population covered by this analysis is approximately 2,232 individuals. This represents a substantial portion of Utah's community-residing registered population, contextualized against the state's total active registry of approximately 7,239 community-residing registrants and provides a sufficient base for cross-district inference. The scale of coverage strengthens the comparative value of the district profiles by allowing for more consistent identification of regional trends, service gaps, and supervision patterns across jurisdictions. While the findings are intended to support policy discussion and resource planning rather than predict individual outcomes, the breadth of the dataset provides meaningful insight into the distribution and characteristics of Utah's community-active registrant population.

Three profiles contain institutional address inflators that affect raw counts and require methodological adjustment: SD7 (Davis County Correctional Facility in Farmington, 16.6% incarcerated; community-residing share ~98.7% adjusted); SD3 (Weber County Correctional Facility in Ogden, 10.6% incarcerated; community-residing share ~98.8% adjusted); and HD21 (Utah State Correctional Facility, 92.3% of raw dataset). All remaining profiles report zero incarcerated registrants as of May 12, 2026. Twelve of fifteen profiles present fully community-active datasets with no institutional address complications.

Registry Administration and Statutory Context

The Utah Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry underwent substantial structural change in the years immediately preceding the 2026 interim study cycle. Understanding this context is material to interpreting the profile data, which reflects the current DPS-administered registry as recodified under Title 53, Chapter 29, effective in the 2025 General Session. These statutory revisions consolidated prior reporting frameworks into a unified registry structure. As a result, comparisons with pre-2025 datasets require careful methodological alignment.

Registry Transfer and Recodification

Prior to July 1, 2024, the registry was administered by the Utah Department of Corrections under Title 77, Chapter 41. HB 156 (2023 General Session) transferred administration to the Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Identification (BCI), effective July 1, 2024. The transfer involved 14 staff positions and approximately \$1.5 million in personnel and operational funding, along with the registry's Offender Watch vendor contract of \$342,716 for the 2024-2025 renewal contract.

In the November 2024 LECJ interim session, LRGC Associate General Counsel Shad Larson described the registry code as "one of the worst areas of the code", opaque to practitioners, confusing to courts, and difficult for registrants to understand. The registry recodification bill, favorably recommended by the committee on November 20, 2024, reorganized all registry provisions into a new Title 53, Chapter 29, structured in four parts: general provisions; registrable offenses, registration timelines, and petition processes; offender, court, and law enforcement responsibilities; and DPS functions. The recodification was explicitly non-substantive in intent, reorganizing rather than changing the law, though the Sentencing Commission noted it as a necessary precondition for substantive reform.

Registry Consolidation

In the October 2023 LECJ interim session, LRGC confirmed that Utah was the only state that had maintained two separate registries: the Sex and Kidnap Offender Registry and the Child Abuse Offender Registry. The Child Abuse Offender Registry had been created in 2017 (HB 149, sponsored by then-Rep. Owens) and carried two offenses, aggravated child abuse and human trafficking of a child, but had diverged from the Sex and Kidnap Registry in multiple areas: no petition-for-removal process, no definition of conviction for plea-in-abeyance purposes, no non-public juvenile registry provision, and no standing provision for intervention in legal actions affecting registration requirements.

The consolidation bill, approved unanimously by the committee in October 2023 and subsequently passed, merged the two registries into a single Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry, added aggravated child abuse to the main registry, and resolved the bifurcation in human trafficking registration requirements. It also corrected a longstanding inconsistency

in which felony enticement carried a lifetime registration requirement regardless of the underlying offense's registration length, a structural anomaly in which attempting a ten-year offense produced a lifetime registration obligation, while completing the same offense produced only a ten-year requirement. The correction tied enticement registration length to the registration length of the underlying offense.

Institutional Reform Trajectory

The LECJ interim committee has sustained active engagement with registry reform since at least 2019, when the Judiciary Interim Committee first formally examined the registry structure and voted to open a committee bill file. By 2022, the Utah Sentencing Commission's subcommittee had developed a comprehensive reform menu including recodification, risk-based registry transition, five-year petition expansion, and non-public database options for lower-risk registrants, drawing on Oregon's 2021 risk-based implementation as a reference model.

HB 268 (2023 General Session, sponsored by Rep. Andrew Stoddard and Sen. Stephanie Pitcher) created the Sex Offense Management Advisory Committee (SOMAC) within CCJJ, with a sunset date of July 1, 2026. SOMAC, directed by Dr. Michelle Leslie, produced the working proposal for a risk-based three-tier registry system, presented to the LECJ committee in August 2024 and August 2025. The November 2024 LECJ session also passed a companion bill requiring that all new registrants receive a risk assessment, a data-collection precursor to a risk-based system. These efforts collectively established the analytical foundation for ongoing registry reform.

At the August 2025 LECJ session, following Dr. Leslie's presentation, a committee bill file was opened for a risk-based registry. The formal adoption of Item 3, what offenses should qualify as registrable, as an LECJ interim study item in April 2026 reflects the culmination of this six-year reform trajectory. The district profiles comprising Publication 2026-37 were produced in direct service of that deliberative process. This work is intended to inform evidence-based legislative evaluation and refinement of registry policy.

Offense Composition Across the Series

Each district profile organizes its registered population into five offense categories: non-contact and exploitation offenses; contact offenses involving a minor victim; contact offenses involving an adult victim or force; kidnapping offenses where no sexual conduct is the primary charge; and an other/unclassified category capturing records that could not be assigned to a primary offense type from DPS statute descriptions. These categories are applied uniformly across all fifteen profiles using UTRSOL's classification of DPS statute codes, enabling direct cross-district comparison. The distribution across these five categories varies meaningfully by district and is presented in the subsections below, beginning with the category most directly relevant to Item 3's scope. This structure supports consistent analytical interpretation across all profiles.

Non-Contact and Exploitation Offenses

The most consistent finding across the series is the substantial proportion of each district's registered population whose conviction of record falls into the non-contact and exploitation category. As defined in the individual profiles, this category includes sexual exploitation of a minor (child pornography in possession, receipt, and distribution forms), enticing a minor via online or electronic means where no physical contact is required for registration, voyeurism, lewdness, indecent exposure, and electronic solicitation offenses.

District	Member	N	Non-Contact %
SD14	Sen. Stephanie Pitcher	122	49.20%
HD40	Rep. Andrew Stoddard	120	45.00%
SD4	Sen. Calvin Musselman	220	43.20%
HD20	Rep. Melissa Garff Ballard	76	42.10%
SD7	Sen. J. Stuart Adams	181	42.00%
HD11	Rep. Katy Hall	109	37.60%
HD26	Rep. Matt MacPherson	123	36.60%
HD16	Rep. Trevor Lee	60	35.00%
HD6	Rep. Rob Bishop	59	33.90%
HD21	Rep. Sandra Hollins	225	32.90%
SD29	Sen. Don L. Ipson	230	31.10%
SD3	Sen. John D. Johnson	379	29.00%
HD7	Rep. Ryan D. Wilcox	149	29.50%
HD47	Rep. Mark A. Strong	44	29.50%
HD63	Rep. Stephen L. Whyte	67	28.40%

Source: UTRSOL Publication 2026-37, LECJ Interim Committee Constituent Profiles (May 2026). See individual district profiles for complete data tables, geographic maps, and methodology notes. Profile page references: SD4 pp. 4–5; HD7 pp. 6–7; SD7 pp. 8–9; SD29 pp. 10–11; SD3 pp. 12–13; SD14 pp. 14–15; HD20 pp. 16–17; HD6 pp. 18–19; HD11 pp. 20–21; HD16 pp. 22–23; HD40 pp. 25–26; HD47 pp. 27–28; HD63 pp. 29–30; HD21 pp. 33–35; HD26 pp. 37–38.

The series range is 28.4% (HD63) to 49.2% (SD14). The series median falls at approximately 36%. No district falls below 28%. Across the approximately 2,232 community-active registrants covered by this series, roughly 800 individuals, approximately 36%, are registered for offenses in the non-contact and exploitation category. This indicates that non-contact offenses constitute a consistently substantial share of the registry across all districts, rather than an outlier pattern. The uniformity of this distribution further reinforces its relevance to scope definitions under Item 3.

Within the non-contact category, sexual exploitation of a minor and child pornography offenses (possession, receipt, distribution) consistently represent the largest sub-category, accounting for roughly 44–68% of non-contact registrants depending on district. Enticing a minor via electronic means is the second-largest sub-category in most districts. Voyeurism, lewdness, and indecent exposure, predominantly classified as Class A misdemeanors, constitute a smaller but consistent presence, ranging from zero to 32.4% of the non-contact population (SD29). These sub-category distributions highlight meaningful variation in how non-contact offenses are structured across districts. They also indicate that the non-contact category is not monolithic and contains distinct behavioral and statutory profiles relevant to policy interpretation.

The non-contact category's prevalence in every district is directly relevant to Item 3's inquiry into what offenses should qualify as registrable. The 2022 Sentencing Commission subcommittee identified the question of whether certain non-contact offense categories warrant the same registration obligations as contact offenses as a substantive reform question that had not been formally analyzed in Utah's legislative record. This category therefore represents a primary focal point for evaluating proportionality and scope within the current registry framework. Its consistent presence across all districts underscores the importance of clearly defining statutory thresholds for inclusion.

Contact Offenses

Contact offenses involving minor victims are the single largest offense category in eleven of fifteen profiles, with proportions ranging from 30.3% (SD14) to 53.0% (HD7). Contact offenses involving adult victims or force range from 9.9% (SD7) to 20.3% (HD6). The two districts with the highest contact-with-minor proportions, HD7 (Wilcox, 53.0%) and HD63 (Whyte, 49.3%), also rank among the districts with the highest recidivism rates in the series, a relationship further examined in the Compliance and Recidivism section.

HD63 (Rep. Whyte) carries the highest contact-with-minor share in the series at 49.3%, alongside the second-highest district-specific recidivism rate (11.9%). The HD63 individual profile explicitly flags these figures as relevant to LECJ Item 3 deliberations. These patterns suggest a potential association between offense composition and district-level supervision outcomes that warrants further examination. However, causal interpretation is not implied and should be evaluated alongside contextual enforcement and demographic factors.

Attempted Convictions, Prevalence and Distribution

Across the series, a substantial share of registrants carry convictions for attempted offenses under Utah Code 76-4-101, where no completed offense is of record. Under Utah Code 53-29-202, attempted offenses are registrable on equivalent terms as completed offenses, the same registration duration, reporting requirements, and public disclosure obligations apply regardless of whether the underlying conduct was completed. This equivalence in treatment means that attempt-based entries are structurally indistinguishable from completed offenses within the registry framework. As a result, they must be interpreted within the same classification and policy considerations when assessing overall offense distributions.

District	Member	Attempted %	Approx. Count
HD7	Rep. Ryan D. Wilcox	28.90%	~43
SD14	Sen. Stephanie Pitcher	27.90%	~34
SD4	Sen. Calvin Musselman	27.70%	~61
HD47	Rep. Mark A. Strong	27.30%	12
SD7	Sen. J. Stuart Adams	26.50%	~48
SD3	Sen. John D. Johnson	26.10%	~99
HD11	Rep. Katy Hall	24.80%	~27
HD6	Rep. Rob Bishop	23.70%	~14
HD40	Rep. Andrew Stoddard	22.50%	27
HD63	Rep. Stephen L. Whyte	22.40%	~15
HD21	Rep. Sandra Hollins	21.80%	~49
HD20	Rep. Melissa Garff Ballard	21.10%	~16
HD16	Rep. Trevor Lee	20.00%	12
HD26	Rep. Matt MacPherson	19.50%	~24
SD29	Sen. Don L. Ipson	10.50%	~24

Source: UTRSOL Publication 2026-37, LECJ Interim Committee Constituent Profiles (May 2026). See individual district profiles for complete data tables, geographic maps, and methodology notes. Profile page references: SD4 pp. 4–5; HD7 pp. 6–7; SD7 pp. 8–9; SD29 pp. 10–11; SD3 pp. 12–13; SD14 pp. 14–15; HD20 pp. 16–17; HD6 pp. 18–19; HD11 pp. 20–21; HD16 pp. 22–23; HD40 pp. 25–26; HD47 pp. 27–28; HD63 pp. 29–30; HD21 pp. 33–35; HD26 pp. 37–38.

The series range is 10.5% (SD29) to 28.9% (HD7). The series median falls at approximately 23–24%. SD29 is the clear outlier at the low end, a pattern the SD29 profile attributes in part to the district's heavy out-of-state conviction composition: California Penal Code 288 (lewd acts with a child) is a completed contact offense statute that constitutes the single largest OOS statute group in the district, suppressing the attempted offense proportion.

In the largest districts by registrant count, SD3 (n=379), SD4 (n=220), SD29 (n=230), the absolute counts of attempted-only registrants are substantial. In SD3 alone, 26.1% of 379 registrants yields approximately 99 individuals registered for non-completed offenses. Across the series as a whole, the attempted-only population is estimated at roughly 500–520 individuals out of the approximately 2,232 community-active registrants covered.

The legislative record documents specific recognition of this structural inconsistency. In the June 2023 LECJ session, LRGC identified three specific offenses, forcible sexual abuse, custodial sexual relations when the individual is under 18, and voyeurism, where committing the completed offense carries a ten-year registration requirement, but enticing a minor into that same conduct carries a lifetime requirement. The committee voted unanimously to incorporate the correction (tying enticement registration length to the registration length of the underlying offense) into the registry consolidation bill, and the correction was enacted. However, the broader question, whether attempted offenses as a class should carry identical registration obligations to completed offenses, remains unresolved and is directly implicated by Item 3's scope.

The Enticement Correction and the Unresolved Question

The 2024 registry consolidation addressed the most visible anomaly in Utah's attempted offense framework: felony enticement of a minor carried a lifetime registration requirement regardless of the registration length attached to the underlying offense being enticed. A person who attempted forcible sexual abuse, a ten-year offense if completed, and was stopped before completion faced lifetime registration, while a person who completed the same offense did not. LRGC identified three specific instances of this inversion in the June 2023 LECJ session, and the committee voted unanimously to correct it, tying enticement registration length to the registration length of the offense being enticed.

What the correction did not address is the broader principle the anomaly illustrated. Attempted offenses as a class, not just enticement, but any inchoate conviction under Utah Code 76-4-101, remain registrable on identical terms as completed offenses under 53-29-202. The 20–28% attempted conviction rates documented across most districts in this series represent individuals registered under that equivalence: the same duration, the same public disclosure, the same location restrictions, and the same petition process as registrants whose offenses were completed. The enticement correction resolved a sentencing disparity within that framework. The framework itself, equal treatment of attempted and completed offenses for registration purposes, was not among the corrections the consolidation made.

Registry Tenure, Duration and Distribution

This data documents how long individuals have remained on the Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry following release into the community. Because Utah's registration countdown does not begin until sentence termination, meaning the period of incarceration, probation, and parole does not count toward the registration requirement, the elapsed time on the registry understates total time under criminal justice supervision.

Average Tenure and Long-Term Cohorts

Average registry tenure across the series ranges from 9.2 years (HD20, Ballard) to 13.6 years (SD29, Ipson). The series median falls at approximately 11–12 years. The proportion of registrants who have been on the registry for ten or more years ranges from 43.3% (HD16) to 61.1% (HD7). More than half of registrants have been registered for a decade or longer in twelve of fifteen profiles.

District	Member	Avg Tenure	10+ %	20+ %	Longest Single
SD29	Sen. Don Ipson	13.6 yrs	54.00%	27.00%	44 yrs
HD47	Rep. Mark Strong	13.4 yrs	59.10%	18.20%	45 yrs
HD7	Rep. Ryan Wilcox	13.4 yrs	61.10%	24.80%	41 yrs
SD3	Sen. John Johnson	13.0 yrs	60.20%	21.40%	46 yrs
HD21	Rep. Sandra Hollins	12.5 yrs	54.70%	18.70%	41 yrs
HD26	Rep. Matt MacPherson	12.2 yrs	57.70%	14.60%	34 yrs
SD4	Sen. Calvin Musselman	11.8 yrs	55.00%	16.40%	39 yrs
HD11	Rep. Katy Hall	11.7 yrs	52.30%	19.30%	39 yrs
HD40	Rep. Andrew Stoddard	11.1 yrs	53.30%	12.50%	44 yrs
HD63	Rep. Stephen Whyte	10.8 yrs	50.70%	13.40%	32 yrs
HD6	Rep. Rob Bishop	10.6 yrs	49.20%	13.60%	33 yrs
HD16	Rep. Trevor Lee	10.3 yrs	43.30%	13.30%	29 yrs
SD7	Sen. J. Stuart Adams	10.0 yrs	43.60%	12.70%	40 yrs
HD20	Rep. Melissa Ballard	9.2 yrs	47.40%	17.10%	38 yrs
SD14	Sen. Stephanie Pitcher	10.7 yrs	49.20%	15.60%	36 yrs

Source: UTRSOL Publication 2026-37, LECJ Interim Committee Constituent Profiles (May 2026). See individual district profiles for complete data tables, geographic maps, and methodology notes. Registry tenure data from DPS dataset for each district. See Pub. 2026-37: SD29 p. 10; HD47 p. 27; HD7 p. 6; SD3 p. 12; HD21 p. 33; HD26 p. 37; SD4 p. 4; HD11 p. 20; HD40 p. 25; HD6 p. 18; HD16 p. 22; SD7 p. 8; HD20 p. 16; SD14 p. 14.

The twenty-year cohort is present in every district, ranging from 12.5% (HD40) to 27.0% (SD29). The series-wide estimate for registrants with twenty or more years of continuous registry tenure is approximately 340–380 individuals across the fifteen profiles. These individuals, who have maintained registration compliance for two or more decades by definition, since non-compliant registrants would carry a subsequent offense status code, represent a population whose continued registration burden has the longest elapsed duration relative to any actuarial reduction in risk that time-in-community produces.

The longest single tenures in the series, 46 years (SD3), 45 years (HD47), 44 years (SD29 and HD40), predate Utah's current registry statute. As documented in the 2019 Judiciary Interim session, these historical registrations reflect a period in which registration requirements were less clearly defined and several offense categories that are no longer registrable (including certain kidnapping subsections and unlawful detention) were then on the registry. At least some long-tenure registrants may be registered for offenses that, had they been sentenced today, would not qualify for registration.

New registrations (0–2 years) reach up to 23.7% in HD20. HD63 has the highest new-registration share in the series at 16.4%, with the profile noting at least one conviction as recent as November 2025. The wide variation in new-registration share across districts reflects the differing age profiles of each district's registered population and the varying rates at which recent convictions feed into each geographic area.

Petition Process Context

Utah's petition-for-removal processes: five-year, ten-year, and twenty-year, were extensively discussed across multiple LECJ interim sessions. As documented in the 2022 LECJ session and 2023 recodification proceedings, the petition process has been widely described as complex and opaque. The 2023 LRGC recodification restructured the petition sections to clarify which offenses are eligible for each petition period and when each clock begins, addressing what practitioners described as a chronic source of confusion.

As of the 2019 Judiciary Interim session, between 2015 and 2019, 83 individuals had requested early termination since the five-year petition was enacted in 2012, and 12 had been removed, a figure that, as the UDC registry administrator noted at the time, understates actual removal rates because most eligible individuals successfully obtain certificates of eligibility before proceeding to court. By 2020, approximately 350 individuals were removed from the registry annually, the large majority through automatic expiration of their ten-year requirement rather than petition. The 2026 DPS compliance data in the individual profiles reflects the current state of this population.

Compliance and Recidivism

Recidivism in the DPS dataset is measured by subsequent sex offense conviction only, not registration compliance, not technical parole violations, and not criminal contact that did not produce a conviction, so the figures below reflect a narrower outcome than behavioral compliance in any general sense. Because the dataset is a single-point-in-time pull rather than a longitudinal follow-up, a registrant who has been community-active for twenty years and one released six months ago are treated identically, both are either compliant or recidivated as of 2026. Longer time at risk increases the probability of a recorded reoffense, which makes the compliance rates below a conservative floor rather than a ceiling.

District	Member	Compliant %	Recidivated %
HD6	Rep. Rob Bishop	96.60%	3.40%
HD47	Rep. Mark Strong	93.20%	6.80%
HD26	Rep. Matt MacPherson	92.70%	7.30%
SD29	Sen. Don Ipson	92.20%	7.80%
HD40	Rep. Andrew Stoddard	91.70%	8.30%
SD4	Sen. Calvin Musselman	91.00%	9.00%
SD3	Sen. John Johnson	90.80%	9.20%
HD7	Rep. Ryan Wilcox	90.60%	9.40%
HD16	Rep. Trevor Lee	90.00%	10.00%
SD7	Sen. J. Stuart Adams	89.00%	11.00%
HD20	Rep. Melissa Ballard	88.20%	11.80%
HD63	Rep. Stephen Whyte	88.10%	11.90%
HD11	Rep. Katy Hall	86.20%	10.10%
SD14	Sen. Stephanie Pitcher	86.10%	13.90%
HD21	Rep. Sandra Hollins	84.60%	15.40%

Source: UTRSOL Publication 2026-37, LECJ Interim Committee Constituent Profiles (May 2026). See individual district profiles for complete data tables, geographic maps, and methodology notes. Compliance/recidivism figures derived from DPS status codes. See Pub. 2026-37: SD4 p. 4; HD7 p. 6; SD7 p. 8; SD29 p. 10; SD3 p. 12; SD14 p. 14; HD20 p. 16; HD6 p. 18; HD11 p. 20; HD16 p. 22; HD40 p. 25; HD47 p. 27; HD63 p. 29; HD21 p. 33; HD26 p. 37.

Series-Wide Compliance Rates

Compliance figures in the DPS dataset reflect absence of a subsequent sex offense conviction following release. They do not measure compliance with registration requirements, nor do they capture subsequent non-sex-offense criminal contact. This definitional constraint is consistent across all profiles and is noted in each methodology section. The series range (excluding HD21's qualified figure) is 3.4% to 13.9% recidivism. The series median falls at approximately 9–10%. These figures are consistent with broader evidence base on sex offense recidivism and are supported by multiple independent sources.

Of the 4,794 total registrants within all fifteen districts, 4,160 (86.8%) are recorded as compliant with registration requirements. The remaining 634 (13.2%) are flagged as having recidivated, meaning a subsequent registrable offense was documented after initial registry placement. The population is overwhelmingly male (4,652 / 97.0%), with female registrants comprising just 142 individuals (3.0%). By registration status, 2,767 individuals (57.7%) are currently incarcerated and 2,025 (42.2%) are active in the community. The median registrant has been on the registry for 7 years, with a mean of 9.6 years and a range extending to 58 years. These figures suggest that the substantial majority of Utah's registry population maintains ongoing compliance over time, a finding that merits weight in any evidence-proportionality analysis of registry burden relative to recidivism risk.

Recidivism Breakdown

Of the 4,794 registrants captured in this dataset, 634 (13.2%) have a documented subsequent registrable offense, 545 (86.0% of recidivists) with a single subsequent offense and 89 (14.0% of recidivists) with two or more. The 13.2% figure represents the share of the registry population with documented re-offense, not a population-level recidivism rate, and should be interpreted accordingly.

Among those who recidivated, 427 (67.4%) are currently incarcerated and 206 (32.5%) remain active in the community. The gender composition of recidivists closely tracks the overall registry population: 619 males (97.6%) and 15 females (2.4%). Conviction state data shows that 593 of the 634 recidivists (93.5%) had their predicate offense in Utah, with Federal (15), California (6), and Idaho (3) as the next most frequent jurisdictions, suggesting that out-of-state registrants account for a disproportionately small share of subsequent offenses.

Notably, years on registry and age at offense are virtually identical between recidivists and non-recidivists (9.0 vs. 9.7 years; 36.6 vs. 36.8 years), indicating these variables offer limited predictive differentiation in this dataset and that time-on-registry alone is not a reliable proxy for ongoing risk, a finding directly relevant to LECJ Item 3 deliberations on what should qualify as a registrable offense.

Utah-Specific Recidivism Research

The district-level compliance rates in this series are corroborated by two peer-reviewed Utah-specific studies and by current UDC treatment program data.

The 2019 CCJJ study Predicting New Criminal Convictions while on Parole (Nystrom and Poulson) analyzed 3,173 parolees released from Utah State Prison in 2013 and 2016, with an average follow-up time of 382.5 days. The study found that parolees whose primary offense was a sex offense had a statistically reduced likelihood of being convicted of a new crime compared to all other offense types. Less than 2% of sex offenders in the sample were reconvicted of a sex-related crime during the follow-up period. The authors noted that 44% of sex offense parolees were classified as high or intensive risk on the Level of Service/Risk, Need, Responsivity (LS:RNR) instrument, the lowest high-risk share of any offense category studied (compared to 82% for drug possession only offenders), a finding consistent with the actuarial literature's characterization of sex offenders as a population with lower overall recidivism risk relative to general criminal populations.

The 2020 CCJJ Sex Offender Research Brief synthesized the available Utah and national evidence, including a local study finding a 2% reconviction rate over approximately one year, a longer-term Utah study (Bench and Allen) finding a 10% rate over 15 years, and the BJS 2003 national study finding a 5.3% rearrest rate over a three-year follow-up on over 9,000 sex offenders. The brief identified a systematic pattern in the research: recidivism rates for sexual offenses are the same or lower than general crime recidivism rates in Utah, and high-risk individuals account for the majority of sexual reoffense within the first several years at risk, while low-risk individuals show offense-free rates approaching 97.5% within five years in the national actuarial literature.

The 2019 BJS report, Recidivism of Sex Offenders Released from State Prison: A 9-Year Follow-Up (Alper and Durose), analyzed outcomes for 20,195 persons released from state prisons in 30 states in 2005 after serving a sentence for rape or sexual assault. Within nine years: 8% were arrested for rape or sexual assault; 67% were arrested for any type of crime. Released sex offenders were less likely than other released prisoners to be arrested overall (67% vs. 84%), but were more than three times as likely as other released prisoners to be arrested for rape or sexual assault specifically (7.7% vs. 2.3%). Released sex offenders who had a prior arrest for a sex offense but were serving time for a non-sex offense had a 6.7% subsequent arrest rate for rape or sexual assault, suggesting that the registry population's prior-conviction composition is relevant to any estimate of the community population's ongoing risk level.

The most current Utah-specific data comes from UDC Sex Offender Treatment Program Director Jared Hill, who presented to UPAN's monthly meeting on May 11, 2026. Director Hill reported that in a cohort of 483 individuals released in 2021 and tracked for three years, approximately 2% returned for a new sex crime conviction, 5% for a new non-sex crime

conviction, 10% for concerning behaviors that did not result in a charge, and 45% for parole violations. Director Hill further noted that the 45% parole violation rate, the dominant driver of returns to custody, was composed predominantly of technical violations, with approximately 60% attributable to non-criminal condition breaches (unauthorized contact with minors, failure to obtain employment, pornography use, drug use, and absconding) rather than new offenses.

Taken together, these sources support the series observation that approximately 86–97% of district-level registrants have not been convicted of a subsequent sex offense following release. The variation across districts (3.4% in HD6 to 13.9% in SD14) likely reflects a combination of district demographic characteristics, length of time at risk, and differences in the offense composition of each district's registrant population rather than any systematic difference in individual-level risk.

Utah's Position in the National Context

Director Hill's May 2026 UPAN presentation provided a national comparator rarely addressed in Utah policy discussions. Utah ranks seventh nationally for rapes per capita, compared to near the bottom for most other crime categories (49th in murders). More significantly, Utah ranks first nationally in the percentage of incarcerated individuals with sex offenses as a share of total prison population, approximately 33–36% of Utah's prison population, compared to a national average of approximately 6%. Director Hill attributed this disparity to the combined effect of Utah's above-average sex offense incidence and its characteristically long prison sentences for sex offenses relative to other states. He noted that some Scandinavian countries impose a small fraction of Utah's typical sentence length and achieve comparable recidivism rates, and that research does not establish a linear relationship between sentence length and reduced sexual recidivism.

The 2017 Utah Legislative Auditor General performance audit of the Sex Offender Treatment Program (Report 2017-04) documented a recidivism rate of 6% for paroled UDC sex offenders who had committed at least one new crime, a figure consistent with the DPS-based compliance rates in the district profiles and with the Utah-specific study findings. The audit additionally found that SOTP was not in compliance with statutory requirements to use the most current evidence-based practices, that management did not track program performance, and that the waitlist cost an estimated \$678,000 in fiscal year 2016 due to delays. Subsequent reform under Director Hill has substantially expanded treatment capacity, though the treatment waitlist as of May 2026 remained at approximately 1,367 individuals.

The Absence of a Simple Offense-Category and Recidivism Correlation

The series data does not support a straightforward correlation between offense category composition and recidivism rate. SD14 (the most exploitation-heavy district at 49.2% non-contact) reports the highest recidivism in the series at 13.9%. HD6 (relatively conventional

offense composition) reports the lowest recidivism at 3.4%. These contrasts suggest that district-level recidivism outcomes are likely shaped by a broader combination of demographic, supervision, socioeconomic, and reentry-related factors beyond offense composition alone. The findings also indicate that offense category distribution, by itself, is not a reliable predictor of recidivism variation across districts in the series.

This pattern does not establish that offense category is unrelated to recidivism risk. It establishes that district-level aggregate recidivism rates are insufficient to resolve that question, for several reasons: the DPS status code measures whether a registrant has a subsequent sex offense conviction but not the category of that subsequent conviction; aggregate rates do not control for risk tier, supervision intensity, treatment completion, time at risk, or other variables established in the actuarial literature; and district-level populations are compositionally heterogeneous in ways that aggregate offense-category data cannot fully capture. As the 2020 CCJJ brief noted, the conviction-based approach does not capture individual risk variation: two individuals convicted of identical offenses may have substantially different actuarial risk profiles, and this variation is invisible to the current offense-based system.

Treatment and Supervision Context

The individual profiles document the registry's public-facing characteristics, offense composition, tenure, and compliance status, but do not address treatment and supervision, which directly shape both recidivism outcomes and the risk profile of the community-active population. This section draws on institutional sources to provide that context.

Sex Offender Treatment Program (SOTP), Current State

As of May 2026, the UDC Sex Offender Treatment Program maintained a waitlist of approximately 1,367 individuals awaiting treatment entry. Director Hill reported that the program graduated 163 individuals in 2023 and has expanded substantially, with a target of approximately 325 graduations in 2026, roughly double the 2023 rate, through new therapist positions, expanded county jail treatment beds, and a transition to a rolling-group model that reduces the administrative lag between cohorts.

The 2017 Utah Legislative Auditor General performance audit of the SOTP (Report 2017-04) documented several institutional failures that preceded current leadership: SOTP was not in compliance with statutory requirements to use the most current evidence-based practices; management did not track program performance; the waitlist cost an estimated \$678,000 in FY2016 delays; and the program failed to treat low-risk offenders differently from high-risk offenders despite evidence that treating low-risk offenders intensively produces minimal recidivism benefit while consuming scarce resources. Director Hill's reforms since 2024 have directly addressed these deficiencies, including the creation of a low-risk protective factors program, a CSEM-specific curriculum, and risk-stratified treatment intensity.

The treatment program uses two primary risk instruments: the Static-99R, which assesses historical (static) risk factors, and the Stable-2007, which assesses changeable (dynamic) risk factors including impulsivity, emotional identification with children, sexualized coping, and social influences. Director Hill noted that these instruments have not been validated for two populations that appear in the profiles and on the registry: females (too small a sample for validation) and CSEM-only offenders (the CPORT instrument developed for this population has not yet received full validation). Both populations are currently placed in Tier II under the SOMAC risk-based registry proposal, a conservative placement reflecting the absence of validated risk data rather than an assessment of elevated risk.

Regarding the parole violation data, Director Hill's analysis of all 272 parole violations resulting in returns to custody in 2025 found: 60% were technical violations; 16% were new non-sexual crimes; 10% were concerning behaviors that reflected risk-relevant activity but did not result in charges; 5% were new domestic violence crimes; and 5% were new sex crimes. The 60% technical violation rate represents what Director Hill identified as an area for reform, creating parole violator programs at halfway houses to avoid the costly and arguably counterproductive practice of returning individuals to prison for condition breaches that do not reflect new offense activity.

Utah's National Position on Incarcerated Sex Offenders

Director Hill's May 2026 UPAN presentation documented Utah's unusual national position: approximately 33–36% of Utah's prison population has sex offense convictions, compared to a national average of approximately 6%. Utah ranks first nationally by this measure. He attributed this to a combination of above-average sex offense incidence (seventh nationally for rapes per capita) and Utah's characteristically long prison sentences, which keep sex offense prisoners incarcerated for substantially longer than comparable jurisdictions.

This finding is relevant to the district profiles' compliance data in the following way: the community-active registrant population documented in the fifteen profiles represents individuals who have been released from institutional custody and are living in the district. The approximately 2,696 individuals incarcerated at the USCF who were identified and isolated in the HD21 methodology represent the concurrently incarcerated registry population. The two groups, community-active and incarcerated, represent substantially different risk profiles on average, and the compliance figures in the profiles pertain exclusively to the former.

Risk Assessment Framework

The individual profiles uniformly note that risk tier data, Static-99R or equivalent actuarial classification, is not accessible from public sources, and reserve this dimension pending potential data-sharing with UDC or UCJC. This section provides the institutional context for understanding what that missing data would show and what the current reform trajectory anticipates.

Current Assessment Practices

As documented by the 2020 CCJJ Sex Offender Research Brief and confirmed by Director Hill's May 2026 UPAN presentation, Utah currently uses two actuarial instruments for assessing the risk of incarcerated and supervised registrants: the Static-99R (static risk factors: historical characteristics that do not change) and the Stable-2007 (dynamic risk factors: behavioral and psychological characteristics that are stable but can change with intervention). For community supervision, AP&P uses the SOTIPS/VASOR-2 instruments. These instruments are used for treatment planning and Board of Pardons recommendations but do not currently inform registry tier placement or notification requirements.

The actuarial literature, summarized in the 2022 LECJ Sentencing Commission presentation and the 2020 CCJJ brief, establishes that: (1) validated risk assessments predict sexual reoffense more accurately than professional judgment alone; (2) high-risk individuals on validated instruments have reoffense rates approximately 22% within five years; (3) low-risk individuals on validated instruments have offense-free rates of approximately 97.5% within five years; (4) after 16 years offense-free in the community, no reoffense was observed in any risk category in a study of 8,000 individuals (Hansen et al., cited in the 2020 CCJJ brief); and (5) static and dynamic risk classifications do not map directly onto offense categories, two individuals convicted of the same offense may have substantially different risk profiles.

The SOMAC Risk-Based Registry Proposal

SOMAC's working proposal, presented to the LECJ committee by Dr. Michelle Leslie in August 2024 and August 2025, envisions a three-tier risk-based registry system. Tier Three (highest risk for reoffense) would be public-facing with lifetime registration requirements; Tier Two (average risk) would be public-facing with ten-year requirements; Tier One (lowest risk) would be law enforcement-only with ten-year requirements. Removal would be governed by the desistance framework, petition eligibility beginning at five, ten, and twenty years from the date of community placement, corresponding to the points at which the actuarial literature identifies meaningful risk reduction.

As of May 2026, 17 states utilize risk assessment in some form for registration and/or notification requirements, according to SMART Office data cited in Dr. Leslie's August 2024 presentation. Twenty-two states use offense-based tiers meeting or exceeding SORNA minimum requirements. Utah, in partial SORNA compliance (currently eligible for approximately 10% of Adam Walsh grant funding, estimated at \$80–90,000 annually), would not necessarily become less SORNA-compliant under a risk-based system, as SMART Office guidance does not preclude risk-based modifications to registration tier structure.

The absence of risk tier data in the district profiles is thus not merely a methodological gap, it reflects a deliberate feature of the current conviction-based registry system, which assigns registration obligations based on offense name rather than individual risk

assessment. The SOMAC proposal, the November 2024 risk assessment requirement bill, and Item 3's scope collectively represent the institutional recognition that this gap should be addressed. Until validated risk tier data is available at the population level, the recidivism figures in the district profiles function as population-level baselines, aggregate outcomes that cannot be decomposed by risk classification.

Out-of-State Conviction Complexity

Out-of-state (OOS) convictions are present in every district, ranging from 6.5% (HD26) to 26.5% (SD29). Utah applies its registrability criteria uniformly regardless of the originating jurisdiction's offense definitions, a registrant convicted under another state's statute is registered in Utah regardless of whether that statute has a direct Utah equivalent. Several profiles document OOS statutes for which no direct Utah equivalent exists: Alaska 11.41.460 (indecent exposure, SD14); Pennsylvania 3123 Involuntary Deviate Sexual Intercourse (SD29); Hawaii 707-0736 Sex Abuse 1st, 1984 vintage (SD29); a United States territorial court conviction from American Samoa (HD26, flagged as requiring individual review because American Samoa territorial statutes are not indexed in standard OOS equivalency tables); and California 647.6 (annoy/molest children, HD20). Two districts (SD7, HD16) include military convictions under UCMJ Article 120/134.

California convictions are the most common OOS origin across the series, appearing as the leading OOS source in SD3, SD4, SD7, SD14, SD29, HD11, and HD21. This reflects both California's large population base and its historical charging practices under statutes, particularly PC 288 (lewd acts with a child) and PC 647.6, that do not map cleanly onto Utah's offense framework. SD29 has the highest OOS conviction rate in the series at 26.5%, with California accounting for 37.7% of all OOS cases; this reflects Washington County's character as a retirement and transplant-destination county drawing heavily from western states.

As noted in the 2019 Judiciary Interim session, Utah's registrability uniformity principle means that out-of-state offenders are placed on the Utah registry using a substantially equivalent analysis conducted by the Attorney General's office. When an out-of-state offense has no direct Utah equivalent, the registrability determination involves a judgment call with legal implications for the registrant that are not visible in aggregate DPS data. The HD26 American Samoa case is the most extreme example in this series; several others (the 1984 Hawaii conviction, various UCMJ convictions) reflect similarly unusual jurisdictional circumstances.

HD40 (Rep. Stoddard), HD21 community-active, and HD47 (Rep. Strong) have the highest federal conviction rates in the series, 6.7%, 6.2%, and 6.8% respectively, with all federal convictions being child pornography statutes under 18 USC 2252A/2254. The federal conviction concentration in HD40 is consistent with that district's 45.0% non-contact offense share and is the highest federal rate in the series.

Near-Peer Offense Registrants

Under Utah Code 76-5-401.2, unlawful conduct with a 16–17 year old involving parties within four or more years of age constitutes a registrable offense. Near-peer cases are present in fifteen of fifteen profiles.

Near-peer counts are small in absolute terms across the series: SD3 (8), SD7 (8), SD29 (7), SD4 (6), HD20 (6), HD40 (4), HD21 (4), HD26 (4), HD16 (3), HD7 (3), HD11 (2), SD14 (2), HD6 (1), HD47 (1), HD63 (1). The series total is approximately 60 near-peer registrants across approximately 2,232 community-active registrants, roughly 2.7% of the covered population.

The near-peer provision's small absolute impact (approximately 60 individuals series-wide) makes it analytically distinctive: it is a narrow, legally defined category with a clear age-gap criterion (four or more years of age difference), affecting a small identifiable population in every district. The Sentencing Commission's 2022 LECJ presentation identified near-peer cases as one of the cleaner reform targets because of the legal clarity of the age-gap criterion, unlike the broader attempted offense question, which involves a binary charge classification rather than a numerical threshold.

Gender Composition

The registry population across all profiles is overwhelmingly male. Male proportions range from 93.2% (HD47) to 99.4% (SD7, excluding institutional population). Female registrant proportions range from 0.6% (SD7, community-active after CUCF adjustment) to 6.8% (HD47). SD3 has the largest absolute female registrant count (n=17, 4.5% of a large dataset); HD47 has the highest female proportion at 6.8% (n=3 of 44).

The SOMAC risk-based registry proposal notes that the Static-99R, the primary risk assessment instrument used by UDC, has not been validated on female registrant populations because the population is too small for validation research. Dr. Leslie's August 2024 and August 2025 presentations to the LECJ committee identified females as an automatic Tier II placement under the working proposal regardless of risk assessment score, reflecting this validation gap rather than an assessment of elevated risk. Director Hill's May 2026 UPAN presentation noted that female sex offenders recidivate at rates comparable to non-sex-offense males, approximately 1–3%, which is the actuarial literature's characterization of "desistance level" risk.

SD29 has the highest female registrant share in the series at 4.8%. The SD29 profile notes one female registrant who has been on the registry for 41 years under a 1984 Hawaii conviction, the longest female tenure documented in the series and a case that illustrates the interaction between historical OOS convictions, registry uniformity, and the absence of a time-based tier-reduction mechanism.

Data Limitations and Analytical Constraints

The series presents a comprehensive picture of Utah's registry population within the covered districts, but several analytical constraints should be noted by any reader drawing conclusions from the data.

Risk tier data is unavailable. Static-99R scores or equivalent actuarial classifications are not accessible from public records. This means that aggregate recidivism rates cannot be decomposed by risk level, and no inference about the risk distribution within any district population is possible from DPS data alone. As the CCJJ 2020 brief observed, the conviction-based registry does not capture individual risk variation: offense name is not predictive of reoffense likelihood, and without risk tier data, the district profiles cannot distinguish between high-risk and low-risk individuals within any offense or tenure category.

Recidivism is measured as subsequent sex offense conviction only. The DPS status code does not capture subsequent non-sex-offense criminal contact, registration compliance violations, or law enforcement contacts that did not result in a conviction. Director Hill's UPAN presentation documented that an additional approximately 10% of parole violators exhibited concerning risk-relevant behaviors that did not result in charges, suggesting that the 2–4% conviction-based recidivism figure in the UDC cohort data likely understates total concerning behavior, though it remains an order of magnitude lower than public perception of sex offense recidivism rates.

Offense-specific recidivism is not available. The DPS status code records the fact of a subsequent sex offense conviction but not the offense category of that subsequent conviction. It is therefore not possible to determine from DPS data whether a non-contact registrant who reoffends does so with a contact or non-contact offense. This constrains any inference about offense-category-level recidivism risk.

Out-of-state statute equivalency is not uniformly resolved. The series documents multiple instances of OOS convictions for which no direct Utah equivalent exists. Whether each such record meets Utah's registrability threshold under Utah Code 53-29-202 has not been individually adjudicated in all cases. The American Samoa conviction in HD26 is explicitly flagged as requiring individual review.

The community-active HD21 recidivism figure is unresolved. The compliance and recidivism figures reported for HD21 (84.6% / 15.4%) reflect the full dataset including the USCF institutional population. The community-active subset's compliance and recidivism profile is not separately computed in the individual profile and should not be directly compared to other districts in the series without this qualification.

Dataset vintage is the 2026 DPS pull. Registry status, registrant addresses, and offense records reflect the DPS dataset as of the 2026 pull. Individuals who have been removed from the registry, had their status changed, or relocated subsequent to the data pull are not captured. The series represents a snapshot, not a continuously updated population count. Female-specific and CSEM-specific actuarial data is limited. As noted in the SOMAC presentations and Director Hill's May 2026 remarks, validated risk assessments for female registrants and CSEM-only registrants do not currently exist. The recidivism baseline for female registrants (approximately 1–3% in the literature) and CSEM-only registrants differs from male contact offenders in ways that aggregate district data cannot capture.

Summary of Cross-District Findings

The fifteen profiles comprising Publication 2026-37 document a registry population with several characteristics that are consistent across geographically, demographically, and politically diverse districts:

Non-contact and exploitation offenses constitute a substantial share of every district's registered population. The range is 28.4% to 49.2%, with a series median of approximately 36%. There is no district in the series where the registered population is composed predominantly or overwhelmingly of contact offenders.

Attempted convictions, for offenses that were never completed, are present in every district at rates ranging from 10.5% to 28.9%. The series median is approximately 23–24%. These individuals are registered on identical terms to those whose offenses were completed, under Utah Code 53-29-202. A legislative correction enacted in the registry consolidation bill (2024) resolved specific inconsistencies in which enticement carried a higher registration burden than the underlying completed offense, but the broader attempted-offense registration equivalence remains unchanged.

The majority of registrants in most districts have been registered for ten or more years. Proportions range from 43.3% to 61.1%. The twenty-year cohort is present in every district, ranging from 12.5% to 27.0%. Several district profiles contain registrants with tenures of 40 or more years, predating Utah's current registry statute.

Compliance rates, defined as absence of a subsequent sex offense conviction, range from 86.1% to 96.6% across the series. The series median is approximately 90%. These figures are consistent with Utah-specific peer-reviewed research (CCJJ 2019, 2020), the BJS 9-year national study (2019), and current UDC SOTP cohort data presented in May 2026. Geographic concentration follows housing availability in every district type profiled. The pattern is consistent across rural, suburban, urban, and exurban districts and is supported by ACS housing data showing that registrant-concentration ZIPs have systematically lower median rents, higher renter-occupied shares, and, in urban districts, the highest housing cost burdens relative to median household income.

Out-of-state convictions are present in every district, with some documenting convictions for which no direct Utah statutory equivalent exists. Utah applies registrability criteria uniformly regardless of originating jurisdiction's offense definitions.

Near-peer registrants under 76-5-401.2 are present in fifteen of fifteen districts in small absolute numbers, with a series total of approximately 60 individuals across the covered population.

Risk tier data is uniformly unavailable from public records across the entire series, representing the most significant gap for any population-level risk assessment. The SOMAC risk-based registry proposal, the November 2024 risk assessment requirement bill, and Item 3's formal adoption as an LECJ interim study item collectively represent the institutional context in which these profiles are presented.

