Number 2026-47

Utah Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry
2026 Population Analysis

June 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 report presents a comprehensive population-level analysis of Utah's Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Offender Registry as of March 23, 2026. The export is drawn from the public-facing registry portal operated by Watch Systems, LLC (iCrimeWatch) under contract with the Utah Department of Public Safety Bureau of Criminal Identification (DPS/BCI) pursuant to Utah Code Title 53, Chapter 29, and captures all 10,229 individuals currently required to register in Utah. It is the most complete view of the state's registry population available from a public source.

This analysis documents and describes the full statewide registrant population at a single point in time; due to fluctuations from additions to, and removals from, the registry over the course of the year, findings reflect registry composition as of the citation date of March 23, 2026 and should not be treated as a static characterization of the registry's annual population. It is intended to serve as a durable reference document for policymakers, researchers, journalists, and partner organizations seeking a factual foundation for understanding who is on Utah’s registry, what offenses they carry, how long they have been registered, and where they reside.

The core findings of this report are as follows:

- 10,229 total registrants as of March 23, 2026. This figure encompasses incarcerated registrants, registrants under active probation or parole supervision, and registrants who have completed supervision but remain subject to ongoing registration requirements. Of these, 7,239 (70.8%) are currently active in the community and 2,985 (29.2%) are incarcerated. The total registry figure of 10,229 is 41% larger than the population actually residing in Utah communities.
- 72.8% of registrants (7,445 individuals) have a single conviction date and no subsequent registrable offense recorded
- The registry is offense-heterogeneous. Approximately 54.7% of registrants carry primary child contact offenses; 18.7% carry CSAM or digital exploitation offenses with no contact history; 10.1% carry forcible sexual abuse convictions; and 8.8% carry adult rape or sexual assault convictions. The same supervision, notification, and restriction regime applies to all categories.
- 85.4% of registrants were convicted in Utah. The remaining 14.6% were convicted in other jurisdictions and subsequently registered in Utah upon relocation, largely from neighboring Western states.

- The average registrant has been on the registry for 10.9 years (median: 9 years). 1,699 registrants have been registered for 20 or more years; 468 for 30 or more years.

Salt Lake County holds 52.2% of the statewide population (5,339 registrants), consistent with population concentration but representing a structural challenge for housing and supervision resources in that county.

I. Dataset Origin and Analytical Context

1.1 Source and Methodology

The Utah's Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Offender Registry Population Dataset was compiled from the iCrimeWatch public registry maintained by Utah's Bureau of Criminal Identification (BCI) under Utah Code Title 53, Chapter 29. The citation date is March 23, 2026. The dataset contains individual-level records for all 10,229 persons required to register in Utah on that date, including sex, county of residence, current registry status, year of birth, age bracket at time of conviction, years on registry, recidivism marker, conviction state, and up to three registrable statutes per individual. iCrimeWatch is a publicly accessible platform and the only standardized source through which BCI makes registry data available for population-level analysis; no equivalent structured dataset is available through direct agency request or GRAMA petition.

The analytical work, offense categorization, cross-tabulations, and the recidivism methodology assessment defined in Section 4, was performed by UTRSOL. Offense categories (Child Contact, CSAM/Exploitation, Adult Contact/Force, Lewdness, Enticement, and Other) were assigned based on primary statute using Utah Code section identifiers and federal statute references embedded in the DPS records. Where registrants had multiple qualifying offenses, categorization was based on the offense determined to be most representative of the underlying conviction conduct for analytical consistency. The categorization framework used here is consistent with the offense-bucket methodology applied across UTRSOL's prior legislative and policy research work, enabling direct comparison between this statewide analysis and jurisdiction-specific findings produced under the same analytical structure.

The statewide view enables identification of population-level structural patterns and the computation of baseline rates against which geographic and demographic variation can be measured. All figures in this report are derived from the March 23, 2026 export and reflect a single-day population snapshot; the registry is a dynamic system and individual-level statuses change continuously. Accordingly, the findings should be interpreted as a point-in-time assessment rather than a longitudinal measure of change over time. Subsequent registry updates, removals, relocations, and new registrations may alter specific counts and percentages reported herein. Nevertheless, the data remains sufficiently comprehensive to support robust analysis of the registry's overall composition, distribution, and structural characteristics at the time of extraction.

1.2 Legislative and Policy Context

The Utah Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Offender Registry was recodified under Utah Code Title 53, Chapter 29, effective May 7, 2025, transferring from its prior location in Title 77 without substantive modification. The registry has grown through decades of incremental statutory expansion: individual bills have added offense categories, often without dedicated analysis of whether registration serves the public safety function the registry was designed to fulfill for each category added. This pattern of expansion without proportionality review has produced a registry that courts, administrators, and advocates increasingly struggle to defend as a coherent regulatory instrument rather than an accumulated set of individually-passed mandates. As a result, the modern registry encompasses a heterogeneous population whose offense histories, risk profiles, and pathways to registration vary substantially. This diversity complicates broad policy assumptions about registrants as a single group.

This report documents that heterogeneity in full, providing a factual baseline that can inform legislative, judicial, and administrative deliberations about the registry's scope, structure, and application going forward. It is intended to support evidence-based evaluation rather than prescriptive policy conclusions. Researchers, journalists, legal advocates, and policymakers working from this data are encouraged to apply the same standard: the findings support conclusions the evidence can sustain and should not be extended beyond what the data, its limitations, and its methodological constraints permit. Broader interpretation should be grounded in the specific statutory and methodological context outlined throughout the report.

II. Population Composition

2.1 Total Population and Registry Status

As of March 23, 2026, Utah’s Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Offender Registry contains 10,229 individuals. This figure encompasses three distinct population subgroups: registrants who are currently incarcerated in a Utah correctional facility; registrants who are active in the community under probation or parole supervision; and registrants who have completed their supervision term but remain subject to ongoing registration requirements under Utah Code Title 53, Chapter 29. It does not include individuals who have formally transferred their registration obligation to another jurisdiction upon leaving Utah, nor individuals whose registration obligation was administratively closed following deportation to their country of origin.

This scope reflects deliberate methodological choices. Including incarcerated registrants is appropriate because their registration obligations under Utah law continue uninterrupted during incarceration, the registry clock does not pause, fees may continue to accrue, and their records remain active in the DPS system. Excluding them would understate the total population subject to Utah’s registration framework and would misrepresent the administrative scope of the registry as a legal instrument. Including post-supervision

registrants is equally appropriate: Utah's lifetime registration requirement for many offense categories means that completion of a probation or parole term does not terminate registration obligations. These individuals remain legally required to verify their address, report changes in employment and residence, and appear on the public-facing iCrimeWatch database. Their inclusion is not an artifact of data collection , it reflects the actual legal condition of a significant share of the registry population.

The exclusion of out-of-state transfers is appropriate because those individuals have formally registered in another jurisdiction and are no longer subject to Utah's registration administration, reporting requirements, or enforcement. Their presence in a Utah dataset would misrepresent Utah's active legal obligations and inflate counts in ways that are not actionable by Utah's supervision and notification infrastructure. The exclusion of deported individuals reflects the same logic: deportation administratively terminates the practical enforceability of Utah's registration requirements, and those individuals are not present in Utah communities, not subject to Utah supervision, and not appearing on Utah's public notification system. Including either group would introduce population counts that the registry's community notification and supervision functions cannot reach, distorting any per-registrant analysis of cost, risk, or compliance.

The population divides into three status categories:

Status	Count	Percent	Notes
Active (Community)	7,243	70.80%	Residing in community, compliance obligations active
Incarcerated	2,985	29.20%	Currently in prison or jail; registration runs concurrently
TOTAL	10,229	100%	

Table 1. Registry Status Distribution, Utah Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Offender Registry, March 23, 2026

The incarcerated share, 29.2% of the total population, is analytically significant. It means that approximately 3 in 10 people subject to all registration obligations are already under the state's direct custodial control. They cannot access housing in the community. They cannot benefit from community notification functions. Yet the registration clock runs, administrative obligations accrue, and they are counted in the total figure used to characterize the registry's reach. The total registry count of 10,229 is 41% larger than the community-residing population of 7,239, meaning any policy analysis that treats those figures as interchangeable is working from a materially inflated denominator. This distinction is not an abstraction, it determines whether supervision costs, recidivism rates, and compliance burdens are being measured against the population they actually apply to.

This status split has direct implications for any resource allocation analysis. Adult Probation & Parole (AP&P) supervision hours, GPS monitoring costs, and community notification infrastructure are all deployed against the 7,239 community-active population. The incarcerated 2,985 require only administrative registration maintenance. When the legislature considers the registry's cost-effectiveness, the denominator used matters enormously: per-registrant costs computed against 10,229 will substantially understate the actual per-community-registrant cost of the supervision functions the registry deploys.

2.2 Sex and Gender Distribution

The registry population is overwhelmingly male, consistent with national sex offense conviction patterns. The sex distribution reflects both underlying offense rate differences and the structure of Utah's prosecution practices. At 96.6%, the male share is large enough that aggregate registry statistics, recidivism rates, tenure distributions, offense compositions, effectively describe the male population and should not be assumed to apply equally to female registrants. The following table presents the distribution alongside recidivism rates for each group, which differ substantially and have direct implications for any tiered risk assessment framework.

Sex	Count	Percent	Recidivism Rate
Male	9,879	96.60%	11.80%
Female	350	3.40%	3.70%
TOTAL	10,229	100%	11.50%

Table 2. Sex Distribution and Recidivism Rate by Sex

The 96.6%/3.4% male-to-female ratio is consistent with national sex offense conviction patterns. Female registrants present a materially lower recidivism rate (3.7% vs. 11.8%) and a distinct offense composition dominated by child abuse and child contact statutes (76-5-109, 76-5-404.1) rather than exploitation or adult-victim offenses. The modal conviction age for female registrants is 26–35. Female registrant analysis warrants separate treatment in any tiering framework, as the actuarial instruments most commonly used (Static-99R) were not validated on female populations.

The divergence in recidivism rates between male and female registrants is not merely a statistical artifact of population size. It is consistent with the clinical literature on female sexual offending, which identifies a distinct etiology, different co-occurring circumstances (often a co-offending male partner), and a substantially different desistance trajectory. The approximately 3:1 recidivism rate differential observed in this dataset underscores the importance of incorporating sex-specific factors into any actuarially valid risk assessment or tiering framework.

2.3 Age Distribution

The registry population is aging. Using year of birth to compute approximate current age as of 2026, the distribution shows that the majority of registrants are now in middle age or older, a consequence of the registry's accumulation over decades without meaningful attrition mechanisms. This aging pattern is policy-relevant because sexual recidivism risk is strongly age-dependent, declining substantially past 50, yet the registry applies uniform obligations regardless of where a registrant falls in that risk curve. The following table shows the full age distribution across all registrants.

Age Group (2026)	Count	Percent
18–25	386	3.80%
26–35	2,041	20.00%
36–45	2,677	26.20%
46–55	2,268	22.20%
56–65	1,606	15.70%
66–75	875	8.60%
76–85	326	3.20%
86+	49	0.50%

Table 3. Approximate Current Age Distribution (Birth Year vs. 2026)

The median registrant is approximately 46 years old (median birth year 1980). The largest single cohort is 36–45, followed by 46–55. 1,386 registrants are aged 65 or older, 13.5% of the total population. Of those elderly registrants, 1,070 are currently active in the community, with an average of 18 years on the registry. The registry is not primarily a mechanism for managing recently-convicted individuals: over half the population is older than 45 and has been registered for nearly a decade or more on average.

The aging profile of the registry population is directly relevant to the risk-desistance literature’s central finding: that sexual recidivism risk declines substantially with age, particularly past age 50, and continues to decline through old age. A registry population that is 50.1% aged 46 or older, and 27.9% aged 56 or older, is predominantly composed of individuals in the age range that the clinical literature identifies as lowest-risk. The current registry structure applies identical compliance burdens regardless of this age-risk relationship. A tiering framework informed by actuarial evidence would reflect it. Birth-year data was collected through iCrimeWatch individual profile interface rather than bulk export.

III. Offense Composition

3.1 Primary Statute Categories

The iCrimeWatch public interface displays each offense as a discrete entry showing description, date convicted, conviction state, release date, details, and count, meaning a registrant's full conviction history is presented as a sequential list of individual offense blocks rather than as a single consolidated record. The underlying DPS dataset structures each registrant's record in the same way, with separate statute, description, and date fields for each offense position. The data's multi-statute and multi-date fields must be interpreted in light of this full range: not every second or third statute represents a separate criminal episode, and not every repeated statute represents the same one.

The registry's public-facing function is community notification, and the dataset reflects that function: it is structured to disclose what a registrant was convicted of rather than to reconstruct the procedural history of their criminal case. The statute and description fields consequently prioritize offense identity over chronological narrative, a structural feature that creates interpretive challenges when the fields are used for analytical purposes the source data was not designed to support. The offense categories below are assigned by primary statute using UTRSOL's standard categorization framework. This categorization is essential for understanding not just the registry's size but its compositional character, the relative weight of offense types that carry meaningfully different risk profiles, victim characteristics, and public safety implications. A registry that is 54.7% child contact offenses, 18.7% digital exploitation, and 18.9% adult-victim offenses is a fundamentally different policy object.

Offense Category	Count	% of Total	Key Statutes
Child Contact Offense	4,801	46.90%	76-5-404.1, 76-5-403.1, 76-5-402.1, 76-5-402.2
CSAM / Sexual Exploitation	1,772	17.30%	76-5-3 series, 18 USC 2252, 18 USC 2251
Forcible Sexual Abuse	1,031	10.10%	76-5-404 (adult victim)
Adult Rape / Sexual Assault	985	9.60%	76-5-402, 76-5-403, 76-5-405
Enticement	647	6.30%	76-4-401
Lewdness / Voyeurism	419	4.10%	76-9-702.5, 76-9-702.7
Kidnapping	289	2.80%	76-5-302, 76-5-301
Other	285	2.80%	OOS, military, unmatched

Table 4. Offense Category Distribution by Primary Statute

Child contact offenses constitute the dominant category at 54.7%, reflecting Utah's prosecution patterns and the concentration of registrable statutes around juvenile victims. CSAM and digital exploitation, offenses involving images, online communication, or digital production with no necessary physical victim contact, account for 18.7% of the total registry, nearly one in five registrants. The combined adult-victim categories (forcible abuse and rape/assault) account for only 18.9% of the total registry. The same geographic restrictions, residence prohibitions, and community notification obligations apply across all four major categories without differentiation.

The enticement category (76-4-401) warrants specific attention. Across all statute fields, 795 individuals carry a 76-4-401 conviction in at least one statute field (636 primary, 159 in a secondary or tertiary position). Across all three statute fields, the statute appears 825 times in total, as 29 individuals carry it in more than one field. The conviction year data reveals that 91.2% of primary 76-4-401 registrants (580 of 636) were convicted in 2017 or later, with a median conviction year of 2021. This recency reflects the growth of undercover online enticement investigations by state and federal law enforcement over the past decade rather than a longstanding prosecution pattern. Following SB 30 (2025), the enticement cross-reference was implicated in the inadvertent registration of labor trafficking convictions. The 636 registrants carrying 76-4-401 as their primary statute cannot be disaggregated from the current dataset to isolate which were convicted of enticement with sexual intent versus those whose registration derives from the SB 30 cross-reference, that disambiguation requires court record cross-referencing and is identified as a near-term research priority.

3.2 Top Individual Statutes and Kidnapping Statute Analysis

Within the broad offense categories, the concentration of the registry population around a small number of individual statutes is striking. The five highest-volume statutes alone account for approximately 52% of all registrants, indicating that the registry's population is not diffuse across the full range of registrable offenses but is heavily weighted toward a core set of child-victim and exploitation statutes. The following table presents those top five statutes alongside their counts as primary statute.

Statute	Description	Count (Primary)
76-5-404.1	Aggravated Sexual Abuse of a Child	2,465
76-5-404	Sexual Abuse of a Child / Forcible Sexual Abuse	1,030
76-5-3 (series)	Sexual Exploitation of a Minor (CSAM)	808
76-4-401	Enticing a Minor	636
76-5-302	Aggravated Kidnapping	236

Table 5. Top Five Statutes by Count (Primary Statute Field)

Aggravated Sexual Abuse of a Child (76-5-404.1) alone accounts for 24.1% of the entire registry. The Sexual Exploitation series (76-5-3) tallies to approximately 808 when both the primary and sub-coded statute entries are consolidated. Federal CSAM statutes (18 USC 2252, 18 USC 2252A, 18 USC 2251, 18 USC 2425) add approximately 185 additional individuals, bringing the total exploitation category to 1,913 as reported in Table 4.

The kidnapping statutes require detailed treatment because they represent the clearest example of individuals registered on what the public understands as a sex offense registry for offenses with no necessary sexual conduct component. The DPS dataset enables a complete breakdown across all three kidnapping statutes:

Statute	Description	Primary	Any Field	Total Convictions
76-5-302	Aggravated Kidnapping	236	265	267
76-5-301.1	Child Kidnapping	31	51	52
76-5-301	Kidnapping	22	31	32
TOTAL	All Kidnapping Statutes	289	343	351

Table 5a. Kidnapping Statute Breakdown Across All Statute Fields

Of the 289 registrants who carry a kidnapping statute as their primary offense, 266 (92%) have no sexual offense in any statute field whatsoever. The conviction year data for kidnapping-primary registrants shows a mean of 2018.5 and a median of 2020, indicating this is a recent and growing registration category. Aggravated Kidnapping (76-5-302) dominates at 236 primary-statute registrants and 265 total across all fields. Child Kidnapping (76-5-301.1) accounts for 51 individuals in any statute field, 31 as primary. Standard Kidnapping (76-5-301) accounts for 31 individuals in any field, 22 as primary. UTRSOL's 2025 Utah media analysis documented that press coverage almost universally applies the "sex offender" label regardless of the triggering offense, a characterization that is factually inaccurate for the 266 kidnapping-only registrants whose record contains no sexual offense in any position.

3.3 Multi-Count Convictions

2,717 registrants (26.6% of the total population) have two or more registrable statutes listed, meaning their original prosecution resulted in conviction on multiple counts or charges. 742 individuals (7.3%) carry three registered statutes. These multi-count registrants are a critical analytical population. As documented in Section 3.1, the dataset's multi-statute structure does not distinguish between multiple counts arising from a single prosecution, duplicate entries reflecting the same conviction entered more than once, and genuinely separate offenses from distinct criminal episodes, all three conditions produce identical records in the DPS export. The analytical significance of the multi-count population therefore depends entirely on which of those conditions a given record reflects, a determination the data alone cannot make on its own and that requires the day-level conviction date analysis developed in Sections 3.3 and 4.2 to resolve. That analysis establishes that

the overwhelming majority of multi-statute records reflect the first condition, same-prosecution charging complexity, rather than the third, with direct consequences for how the dataset's recidivism figures must be interpreted.

Conviction Count	Registrants	% of Total	Recidivism Rate (internal)
Single statute only	7,512	73.40%	0.40%
Two statutes	1,975	19.30%	~38%
Three statutes	742	7.30%	~55%

Table 6. Multi-Count Conviction Distribution and Associated Recidivism Rates

The stark divergence in recidivism rates (0.4% for single-statute vs. 42.4% for multi-statute registrants) drives the central methodological question of this dataset, discussed in detail in Section IV below. Of the 10,229 entries, 2,784 individuals have multiple conviction dates. UTRSOL does not assert a single threshold as the definitive boundary between same-prosecution co-conviction and post-registration new offense. The full distribution of day-level intervals between primary and secondary conviction dates is as follows: 1,740 registrants (17.0% of the total population) show identical conviction dates, consistent with same-day co-conviction from a single prosecution; 267 registrants (2.61%) show an interval of 1 to 365 days, consistent with deferred counts or sequential plea agreements within the same case; 99 registrants (0.97%) show a gap of 366 to 730 days, which is ambiguous between a prolonged prosecution and a distinct new offense; and 678 registrants (6.63%) show a gap exceeding 730 days.

Across every plausible threshold, from zero days to two years, the post-registration reoffense rate does not exceed 6.63% of the total registry population. The 72.8% single-conviction compliance floor is unaffected at any threshold. Readers applying different gap thresholds for different analytical purposes will find the full distribution above sufficient to derive their own figures; no single cutoff is required to establish that the unadjusted 11.5% figure substantially overstates the post-registration new-offense rate under any reasonable interpretation of the date-gap data.

The multi-count population is therefore not a population of repeat offenders in any conventional sense. It is predominantly a population whose original prosecution was more complex, whose charging involved multiple counts, and whose registry record reflects that prosecutorial complexity rather than a pattern of ongoing criminal conduct. The recidivism field, as structured in the public export, cannot distinguish between those two conditions, and that structural limitation is the primary interpretive constraint on everything the field can and cannot tell a policy or legal audience.

IV. Recidivism: Data, Methodology, and Interpretation

4.1 Conviction Offense History

Each registrant record provides a conviction offense history where registrants with a single registrable conviction have only one date on record, while registrants with two or more registrable convictions have corresponding additional dates. This structure is among the most consequential elements of the dataset for policy purposes, as it bears directly on the registry's central public safety claim: that tracking and restricting registrants reduces the incidence of new sexual offenses. The distribution observed in registrant conviction dates is presented below; its interpretation requires the methodological analysis that follows in Section 4.2. The presence of a second conviction date is a mechanical function of conviction history: its sole trigger is the existence of a subsequent registrable conviction. It is not an independent determination of post-registration risk, it is a count of recorded convictions.

Recidivism Status	Count	% of Total
Single conviction date only (no subsequent registrable offense recorded)	7,445	72.80%
Two conviction dates recorded	1,030	10.10%
Three or more conviction dates recorded	759	7.40%
TOTAL WITH MULTIPLE CONVICTION DATES	2,784	27.20%

Table 7. Conviction Date Multiplicity Distribution

2,784 registrants have two or more conviction dates on record, 27.2% of the total registry. 72.8% (7,445 registrants) have a single conviction date and no subsequent registrable offense recorded in the dataset. The multi-date group decomposes into 2,025 registrants with exactly two conviction dates (19.8%) and 759 with three or more (7.4%). These figures require the full date-gap decomposition in Section 4.2 before they can be interpreted as post-registration reoffense rates. The 27.2% figure is not an accurate representation of post-registration new-offense conduct: it captures co-convictions from the same prosecution, deferred counts, and genuinely distinct subsequent offenses in the same undifferentiated pool. The 72.8% single-conviction floor is accurate as a statement about conviction date structure and represents the population that has never acquired a second registrable conviction of any kind.

The 2,784 registrants with multiple conviction dates decompose into analytically distinct groups based on the absolute gap between their earliest and most recent conviction dates. Because every conviction in the record required registration, the chronological order of

dates is the operative fact: the earliest conviction date establishes when the individual first became required to register, and the later date represents the subsequent registrable offense. Of the remaining 7,445 registrants with only a single conviction date on record, zero have a second conviction, this is not an independent behavioral assessment. The full breakdown is presented in Section 4.2.

4.2 The 2,784 Multi-Date Registrants: Full Decomposition

The conviction dates enable a complete day-level decomposition of all 2,784 registrants with multiple conviction dates. The interval of time between a registrant's earliest conviction date and their most recent conviction date is the number of calendar days between their recorded convictions. This becomes a measure for calculating recidivism, longer conviction intervals generally indicate a more extended period of offending behavior or subsequent criminal justice involvement following the initial conviction and a more precise estimate of Utah recidivism numbers.

Across all 2,784 multi-date registrants, the complete distribution is as follows:

Conviction Day Intervals	Count	% of 2,784	% of Total (10,229)	Interpretation
Same day (Interval = 0)	1,740	62.50%	17.00%	Same-day co-conviction; flag triggered
1–365 days	267	9.60%	2.61%	Same case or deferred plea
366–730 days	99	3.60%	0.97%	Ambiguous
730+ days	678	24.40%	6.63%	Genuinely separate offense
TOTAL	2,784	100%	27.20%	

Table 7a. Decomposition of 2,784 Multi-Date Registrants by Absolute Conviction Date Interval

Three findings from this table are analytically decisive. First, the 1,740 same-day multi-date registrants represent a population where two convictions share an identical date, consistent with same-day co-convictions from a single prosecution. Second, every registrant with a non-zero interval, all 1,044 of them, has multiple conviction dates with distinct temporal separation. The multi-date structure is a consistent count of registrable offenses. Third, 7,445 registrants have only one conviction date and no subsequent registrable offense recorded as of March 23, 2026. The 72.8% of registrants with only one conviction have never acquired a second registrable conviction of any kind. This distribution indicates that repeated registrable convictions are concentrated within a relatively small minority of the registry population rather than being a characteristic of registrants as a whole.

UTRSOL does not assert a single threshold as the definitive boundary for post-registration reoffense. The full distribution is presented so that readers applying different analytical standards can derive their own figures. What the distribution establishes regardless of threshold is this: the post-registration reoffense rate ranges from a minimum of 6.63% (730+ day intervals) to a maximum of 10.21% (all non-same-day intervals), with 7.60% as the central estimate when the ambiguous 366–730 day cohort is included. The 72.8% single-conviction floor and the 10.21% upper-bound estimate are not complementary figures that together account for the full registry: the 17% gap between them represents registrants whose same-day multi-statute records carry a second date technically distinct from the first, placing them outside the single-conviction floor but inside the same-day cohort the analysis treats as same-prosecution co-convictions.

A same-day or near-same-day interval clearly indicates a single prosecution with multiple counts. An interval of two years or more clearly suggests two temporally distinct criminal episodes separated by enough time that the second offense most plausibly occurred after the individual was already on the registry. An interval of one to two years falls between those poles, it is long enough that a genuinely separate offense is plausible, but short enough that it could also reflect a prolonged prosecution, a deferred sentencing agreement, a plea negotiated across multiple court dates, or a probation violation resolved through a new conviction on the original charge. The dataset cannot distinguish between those two conditions without access to court docket records.

Threshold Applied	Reoffense Count	% of Total	Notes
730+ day Interval (minimum)	678	6.63%	Most defensible; excludes all within-year cases
366+ day Interval (central)	777	7.60%	Includes ambiguous 1–2 year cohort
1+ day Interval (maximum)	1,044	10.21%	All non-same-day cases; includes deferred pleas
Single-conviction floor	7,445	72.80%	No second conviction date; zero subsequent registrable offenses recorded
Total with multiple conviction dates	2,784	27.20%	All multi-date registrants; includes same-day co-convictions; not a new-offense

Table 7b. Post-Registration Reoffense Estimates by Threshold

The 6.63% to 7.60% range is the most analytically defensible central estimate. It is consistent with, and at the lower end of, the Bureau of Justice Statistics' five-year sex offense recidivism range of 5–7% for released offenders generally. The 10.21% upper bound

includes all cases where conviction dates differ by even one day, capturing deferred plea agreements and sequential counts from the same case alongside genuinely distinct offenses; it represents the absolute maximum under any interpretation. Formal verification against BCI methodology documentation remains advisable before citing specific figures in legal proceedings. Any policy conclusions drawn from the higher figure should be treated with caution unless the underlying population differences and follow-up periods are properly accounted for.

UTRSOL applies the 10.21% as its operative recidivism estimate, the upper bound of the date-gap distribution, encompassing all registrants whose two conviction dates differ by any amount. This figure is deliberately conservative in the policy sense: it includes every multi-date registrant regardless of gap length, intentionally capturing individuals whose second conviction may reflect a deferred plea or sequential count from the same prosecution rather than a distinct post-registration offense.

4.3 Recidivism by Population Segment

Regardless of the methodological question about what recidivism is measuring, the variation in nominal recidivism rates across population segments provides useful descriptive information about which groups carry higher or lower recidivism markers in the dataset. These segment-level patterns are informative for risk assessment and tiering framework design even if the absolute rates require methodological qualification. The following table presents recidivism by key population segments.

Population Segment	N	Recidivated	Rate
Active (community)	7,239	725	10.00%
Incarcerated	2,985	456	15.30%
Female	350	13	3.70%
Male	9,879	1,168	11.80%
Utah conviction	8,736	1,013	11.60%
Non-Utah conviction	1,493	168	11.30%
CSAM / Exploitation	1,913	174	9.10%
20+ years on registry	1,699	393	23.10%
30+ years on registry	468	99	21.20%

Table 8. Recidivism Rates by Population Segment

Incarcerated registrants show a higher nominal recidivism rate (15.3%) than active registrants (10.0%), which is expected given that the incarcerated population includes individuals whose re-incarceration may itself reflect a subsequent offense. The elevated rates in the 20+ and 30+ year cohorts are almost certainly artifacts of the multi-statute coding issue, longer-tenured registrants are more likely to have had complex multi-count original prosecutions.

The near-identical recidivism rates between Utah-convicted (11.6%) and non-Utah-convicted (11.3%) registrants is a notable finding. It suggests that the out-of-state registration mechanism does not produce a meaningfully higher-risk population than Utah's own conviction pipeline. Arguments that out-of-state registrants represent elevated community risk are not supported by this data. The CSAM/Exploitation category's 9.1% recidivism rate, below the overall 10.21% rate, is consistent with the clinical literature finding that non-contact exploitation offenders present lower sexual recidivism risk than contact offenders.

4.4 Identifiable High-Risk Tier

A total of 117 individuals whose DPS record contains three or more convictions across separate intervals representing the registry's most persistent subpopulation qualifies them as the highest-risk tier. This figure is determined from each record with three conviction dates mutually distinct (no two are the same) that represent three genuinely separate conviction events. At 1.1% of the total registry population, they are a small cohort by count but a significant one by risk profile. A registrant with multi-conviction dates where those dates span multiple years, presents a qualitatively different record than one whose multi-statute entry reflects a single prosecution.

The individuals in this group are distributed across the full range of offense categories, conviction tenures, and geographic locations, they are not concentrated in any single offense type or jurisdiction, which means their elevated conviction frequency is not an artifact of a particular prosecution pattern or statutory category. The actuarial risk assessment instruments are strongly correlated with prior offense frequency: the number of prior convictions is among the most consistent predictors of future sexual recidivism across validated instruments including the Static-99R. This high-risk population, whatever its precise post-registration reoffense history, represents the cohort most likely to score in elevated risk tiers under any structured risk assessment protocol.

For legislative purposes, the 117-person double-recidivism population provides the empirical foundation for a tiered registry structure. If the registry's purpose is community protection through targeted supervision and notification, the concentration of resources on the 1.1% of registrants with the highest conviction frequency, rather than applying uniform obligations to all 10,229, is the allocation most proportionate to the risk distribution the data actually shows. The 7,445 single-conviction registrants with zero reoffense convictions represent 72.8% of the total population. The current registry treats both groups identically.

4.5 Registry Tenure and Recidivism

A striking pattern emerges when tenure on registry is compared between recidivated and non-recidivated populations. The following table presents mean and median years on registry for each group, revealing a gap that is consistent with, but does not confirm, the multi-count artifact interpretation.

	Mean Years on Registry	Median Years
Non-recidivated	10.4 years	8 years
Recidivated	15.4 years	15 years

Table 9. Registry Tenure by Recidivism Status

Recidivated registrants have been on the registry significantly longer on average. This is consistent with the multi-count interpretation: individuals convicted of multiple offenses in a single prosecution often carry more serious offenses that generate longer registration periods. The tenure interval does not indicate that longer registration causes recidivism; it indicates that both variables are likely consequences of original prosecution complexity.

If the date-interval analysis correctly identifies same-day cases as single-prosecution co-convictions, the 5-year tenure interval between recidivated and non-recidivated registrants is consistent with expectation: more serious original prosecutions produce longer sentences, longer registry tenures, and more complex multi-statute records. The 730+ day interval population, 678 registrants, 6.63% of total, represents the group most likely to have committed a genuinely separate post-registration offense, and their longer average tenure is consistent with having had more time on the registry within which a new offense could occur. This pattern suggests that the observed association between registry tenure and recidivation may be driven at least in part by exposure time rather than by underlying differences in offender risk alone.slightly higher

V. Registry Tenure

5.1 Overall Tenure Distribution

The average registrant has been on the Utah Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Offender Registry for 10.9 years (standard deviation: 9.0 years). The distribution is right-skewed, the median is 9 years, with a substantial long tail extending to 67 years. The oldest registrant by conviction date was convicted on April 23, 1959, under California Penal Code section 261, Rape (Attempted), at age 18–25, and is currently active in Washington County. Tenure is computed from conviction date to the present date. The pronounced gap between the median and the maximum tenure illustrates that a relatively small number of very long-term registrants exert a substantial influence on the overall average.

The tenure distribution is informative for understanding the registry not as a static snapshot of recent convictions but as a layered accumulation of individuals at very different stages of post-conviction life. The following table presents active registrant tenure across eight brackets, from less than one year to over thirty years.

Tenure Bracket	Active Registrants	% of Active
Less than 1 year	178	2.50%
1–5 years	1,405	19.40%
5–10 years	1,691	23.40%
10–15 years	1,381	19.10%
15–20 years	1,190	16.40%
20–25 years	659	9.10%
25–30 years	360	5.00%
30+ years	364	5.00%

Table 10. Active Registrant Tenure Distribution

Active registrants show an average tenure of 12.2 years, compared to 7.8 years for incarcerated registrants. This differential is consistent with timing: individuals who have served longer sentences and returned to the community have, by definition, accumulated more registry time. The incarcerated population's shorter average tenure reflects a larger share of more recent convictions. The contrast suggests that registry tenure is influenced as much by sentence chronology and release status as by the underlying offense itself, making tenure an imperfect proxy for current risk.

The tenure bracket distribution reveals a bimodal character: there is a large cluster of relatively recent registrants (the 21.9% with fewer than 5 years) and a substantial long-tenure tail (the 19.1% with 20 or more years). The middle brackets (5–20 years) account for the largest combined share (59.0%). This distribution has direct implications for any tiering or time-limited registration proposal: the population is not concentrated at either extreme, meaning virtually any tenure threshold for tier reclassification would affect a significant share of the active community population. A 10-year clean-record threshold would touch 54.6% of active registrants; a 15-year threshold would touch 35.5%; a 20-year threshold would touch 19.1%. Consequently, tenure-based policy changes would affect a substantial portion of the registry population.

5.2 The Long-Tenure Population

1,699 registrants (16.6% of total) have been on the registry for 20 or more years. Of these, 1,383 are currently active in the community, individuals who have lived under registration requirements for two full decades. 468 individuals (4.6%) have been registered for 30 or more years. One individual has been on the registry for 67 years. For the long-tenure population, registration is not a time-bounded consequence of a past offense. It is a permanent condition of adult life. These individuals were in many cases convicted under sentencing frameworks, clinical understandings, and evidentiary standards that have changed substantially since their original prosecution. The risk-desistance literature is consistent that sexual recidivism risk declines sharply over time in the absence of new offenses, particularly past 10–15 years. The registry does not currently incorporate this.

The research foundation for time-based tiering is well-established. The long-tenure population also raises a distinct constitutional consideration. The U.S. Supreme Court's reasoning in Smith v. Doe (2003), which upheld sex offender registration as non-punitive, rested partly on the registration's regulatory, prospective character. Extended application of that reasoning to a registrant who has been compliant for 30 years, whose original offense was committed in a different legal and clinical environment, and who presents at actuarially low risk, is increasingly difficult to sustain.

5.3 Conviction Age

The age at which a registrant was convicted provides a distinct dimension of analysis from current age. It captures the developmental stage at which the registrable conduct occurred and is the most relevant variable for assessing the applicability of juvenile-specific clinical frameworks. Conviction age is recorded as a bracket in the DPS data; the following table presents the full distribution across all age groups.

Age at Conviction	Count	Percent
15–17 (juvenile)	16	0.20%
18–25	2,462	24.10%
26–35	3,057	29.90%
36–45	2,424	23.70%
46–55	1,251	12.20%
56–65	546	5.30%
66–75	225	2.20%
76+	50	0.50%

Table 11. Age at Conviction Distribution

Only 16 individuals in the statewide dataset were convicted between the ages of 15 and 17. These juvenile-conviction registrants have been on the registry for an average of 22.75 years. They were teenagers at the time of conviction and are now in their mid-to-late thirties on average. Two of the 16 carry a recidivism marker (a second conviction date recorded in the DPS system). Eleven are currently active in the community; five are incarcerated.

The 18–35 age bracket at conviction (54%) dominates, consistent with national offense epidemiology. However, the conviction-age distribution does not map directly to current-age distribution because the registry's accumulation spans decades. A 26-year-old at conviction in 1995 is now 57. The registry's current population is substantially older than its conviction-age distribution suggests.

The upper tail of the conviction-age distribution, 225 individuals convicted between 66 and 75, and 50 convicted at 76 or older, is a population that rarely appears in policy discussions about the registry but represents a distinct analytical concern. These individuals were convicted in late life and, given current average ages, are now in their 70s, 80s, and 90s. The actuarial risk literature is unambiguous that sexual recidivism risk for individuals in this age range approaches zero.

5.4 Conviction Year Distribution

The DPS dataset introduces conviction year as an explicit field, enabling analysis of when current registrants were originally convicted. This dimension complements tenure and conviction-age data by establishing the historical accumulation pattern of the registry's population, which legislative, clinical, and social environments produced the individuals currently registered.

The conviction year distribution is heavily weighted toward the recent past. 37.1% of registrants (3,792 individuals) were convicted between 2020 and May 2026, meaning more than one-third of the current registry has been registered for five years or less. An equal share (37.1%, 3,784 individuals) was convicted in the 2010s. Together, convictions from 2010 onward account for 74.2% of the current registry population. Convictions from the 2000s account for 18.6% (1,897 individuals). The remaining 7.2% spans convictions from the 1980s, 1990s, and earlier decades.

The oldest conviction year in the dataset is 1959, meaning at least one registrant has been subject to registration requirements for over six decades, a population that pre-dates the registry itself and whose continued inclusion reflects lifetime designation rather than any ongoing assessed risk. At the other end, the annual conviction intake has grown steadily from 410 in 2020 to 691 in 2025, a 68.5% increase in five years that accounts for the heavy

forward-weighting of the distribution and indicates the registry is expanding at a rate that substantially exceeds any attrition from removal, expiration, or death. The 739 individuals convicted before 2000, 595 still active in the community, have been registered for a minimum of 25 years, in which desistance probability converges with population baseline.

Conviction Decade	Registrants	% of Total	Recidivism Rate
Pre-1980 / Missing	26	0.30%	varies
1980s	153	1.50%	20.90%
1990s	577	5.70%	22.00%
2000s	1,897	18.60%	21.40%
2010s	3,784	37.10%	10.40%
2020–26	3,792	37.10%	5.80%

Table 12a. Conviction Decade Distribution and Associated Recidivism Rates

The recidivism rate pattern across decades is analytically significant and reinforces the multi-count artifact interpretation. The 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s cohorts all show recidivism rates of approximately 20–22%, far above the 5.8% and 10.4% rates observed for the 2020–2026 and 2010s cohorts respectively. This declining rate is not consistent with what would be expected if recidivism was capturing genuine post-registration new offenses: older cohorts have had more time to reoffend and would, under a true recidivism measure, be expected to accumulate higher rates over longer exposure windows. The pattern is, however, exactly consistent with the multi-count artifact interpretation: older prosecutions were more likely to result in complex multi-count indictments, which produce both higher multi-statute records and the elevated recidivism risk those records generate. Recent cohorts, prosecuted under more standardized charging frameworks, show lower multi-statute rates and correspondingly lower recidivism rates.

The annual conviction trend from 2000 through 2025 shows a pattern of sustained growth interrupted by a 2020 dip consistent with COVID-19's impact on court operations. Convictions increased from 87 in 2000 to 330 by 2009, then fluctuated between 278 and 441 through 2018 before accelerating sharply: 528 in 2019, 558 in 2021, 647 in 2022, 678 in 2023, 689 in 2024, and 691 in 2025. The 2025 total represents the highest single-year conviction count in the dataset and reflects a registry that is not stabilizing but continuing to grow. At the 2025 rate, the registry would add approximately 691 new registrants annually on a gross basis before accounting for removals, deaths, and out-of-state transfers. The registry's structural accumulation dynamic, documented throughout this report, is not a historical artifact; it is an ongoing condition.

VI. Conviction Origin and Geographic Distribution

6.1 Conviction State

Understanding where registrants were originally convicted is essential to evaluating the scope of Utah's registry obligations and the rationale for out-of-state registration requirements. The conviction state data reflects both Utah's own prosecution pipeline and the population of individuals who were convicted elsewhere and subsequently migrated to Utah, triggering registration obligations under Utah Code §53-29-202. The following table presents conviction state distribution for all 10,229 registrants.

Conviction State	Count	% of Total
Utah	8,736	85.40%
Federal	300	2.90%
California	268	2.60%
Idaho	107	1.00%
Arizona	97	0.90%
Colorado	90	0.90%
Nevada	80	0.80%
Texas	63	0.60%
Oregon	53	0.50%
Wyoming	48	0.50%
All other states	187	1.80%

Table 12. Conviction State Distribution (Top 10 + Other)

85.4% of Utah registrants were originally convicted in Utah. The remaining 14.6% (1,493 individuals) were convicted elsewhere and subsequently registered in Utah upon relocation. California is the largest out-of-state source (268 registrants), driven by migration patterns and California's large absolute population base. Federal convictions (300 registrants, 2.9%) are concentrated in CSAM-related statutes, particularly 18 USC 2252, with 278 of those 300 currently active in the community. The relatively small proportion of out-of-state registrations indicates that Utah's registry population is shaped primarily by convictions originating within the state rather than by interstate migration.

Out-of-state registrants show a notably different status profile from Utah-convicted registrants: 91.9% are community-active versus only 8.0% incarcerated, compared to 67.2% active / 32.8% incarcerated among Utah-convicted registrants. This is a structural artifact, individuals who have relocated across state lines are by definition community-present.

The geographic source pattern, with neighboring Western states (California, Idaho, Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, Oregon, Wyoming) accounting for the overwhelming majority of out-of-state registrants, is consistent with Utah's in-migration patterns generally. It is not evidence of registry-motivated relocation. The recidivism rates for Utah-convicted (11.6%) and non-Utah-convicted (11.3%) registrants are nearly identical, providing no empirical support for the claim that out-of-state registrants represent elevated risk relative to Utah's own conviction population. The near-identical recidivism rates for Utah-convicted and non-Utah-convicted registrants provide no empirical support for the proposition that out-of-state registrants represent elevated community risk relative to Utah's own conviction population.

6.2 County Distribution

The geographic distribution of registrants across Utah's 29 counties is not uniform and reflects structural forces, housing market dynamics, social service availability, and proximity restriction geography, rather than random residential preference. The following table presents registrant counts for the ten highest-population counties plus a combined "all other" row and the "Location Unknown" category.

County	Registrants	% of Total
Salt Lake County	5,339	52.20%
Weber County	1,033	10.10%
Utah County	976	9.50%
Davis County	683	6.70%
Washington County	419	4.10%
Cache County	256	2.50%
Location Unknown	214	2.10%
Tooele County	205	2.00%
Iron County	162	1.60%
Box Elder County	146	1.40%

County	Registrants	% of Total
Uintah County	135	1.30%
Carbon County	98	1.00%
Duchesne County	98	1.00%
Sevier County	67	0.70%
Sanpete County	65	0.60%
Millard County	42	0.40%
San Juan County	39	0.40%
Juab County	37	0.40%
Wasatch County	36	0.40%
Emery County	29	0.30%
Kane County	28	0.30%
Grand County	26	0.30%
Summit County	26	0.30%
Beaver County	25	0.20%
Morgan County	18	0.20%
Garfield County	10	0.10%
Rich County	10	0.10%
Suppressed (N<5)	7	0.10%

Table 13. Registrant Distribution by County, All 29 Utah Counties

Salt Lake County holds 52.2% of the entire statewide registry population (5,339 registrants), a share that substantially exceeds its proportion of Utah's general population (approximately 40%). This over-representation is substantially driven by institutional population of 2,696 registrants held at the Utah State Correctional Facility (USCF). Removing the USCF population, Salt Lake County's community-based registry population is approximately 2,560, representing a more modest share of the statewide active population. The county's concentration of affordable housing options, social services, and public transit also draws community registrants seeking compliant housing. The table above presents 27 named counties, 2 whose county data is suppressed due to small population sizes of N<5, along with 214 registrants whose county of residence is unknown.

When the incarcerated population is removed, Salt Lake County holds only 35.3% of the statewide community-active registry population (2,560 of 7,239), a figure that more closely tracks its general population proportion and suggests the apparent over-representation is primarily an artifact of USCF's location rather than a genuine concentration of community-resident registrants. The remaining counties, Weber (10.1%), Utah County (9.5%), and Davis (6.7%), collectively hold 26.3% of the total registry but 37.8% of the community-active population, a distribution that more accurately reflects where the registry's housing, supervision, and compliance infrastructure must actually operate.

214 registrants (2.1%) carry an unknown or unverifiable address in the registry. This figure represents both an administrative gap and a direct consequence of the registry's own housing restrictions: when registrants cannot secure a qualifying physical address, due to residency restriction zones, landlord refusal, or cost, their registration status defaults to "unknown address," which simultaneously suspends three core registry functions. Local law enforcement typically maintains general awareness of where these individuals are located, but without a verified physical address, registration compliance on the registry database cannot be confirmed, the registry's community notification function cannot operate, and AP&P supervision conditions tied to a geographic address cannot be enforced. Housing restrictions thus produce the very non-compliance they are designed to prevent.

Registrants are not concentrated in Salt Lake County by choice, they are concentrated there because that is where compliant housing is accessible given the intersection of proximity restrictions and reentry program exclusion policies. The Salt Lake County concentration has implications that extend beyond housing. AP&P supervision resources, law enforcement coordination, and municipal social service systems in Salt Lake County are absorbing a disproportionate share of the statewide registry population's community-management burden. Weber County (10.1%), Utah County (9.5%), and Davis County (6.7%) are the next largest concentrations. The 214 location-unknown registrants represent an estimated 0.4% compliance gap, a figure that, while small as a percentage, represents individuals for whom the registry's entire notification and supervision infrastructure yields no results.

VII. Special Population Analyses

7.1 The Incarcerated Population

2,985 registrants, 29.2% of the total, are currently incarcerated. This population is analytically distinct from the community-active population in ways that are rarely acknowledged in policy discussions:

- Incarcerated registrants cannot reside in a neighborhood, cannot pose a proximity risk, and cannot benefit from community notification functions.
- Their registration obligations continue to accumulate during incarceration, including any applicable fees.
- 895 incarcerated registrants have already been on the registry for 10 or more years; 313 for 20 or more years.
- The nominal recidivism rate among incarcerated registrants (15.3%) is higher than among active registrants (10.0%), but this is consistent with the multi-count artifact, more serious original offenses produce both multi-count convictions and longer sentences.

The incarcerated population's offense composition mirrors the broader registry: 1,792 (60.0%) carry child contact offenses; 446 (14.9%) carry CSAM or exploitation offenses; 394 (13.2%) carry adult rape or sexual assault convictions. The proportion carrying adult rape or sexual assault convictions is 13.2% of incarcerated registrants, compared to approximately 7.0% of active registrants, a difference consistent with the longer sentences associated with those offense types. The 29.2% incarcerated share raises a structural question about the registry's design that rarely surfaces in policy debate: what public safety function does registration serve for an individual who is already incarcerated? Registration during incarceration does not enable community notification, there is no community presence to notify about. It does not enable proximity monitoring, the individual cannot approach a school or park. It does not enable GPS address verification, the address is the institutional facility. What it does produce is a continuing administrative record, ongoing compliance obligations for the Department of Corrections to manage, and a longer accumulated registration period that will affect conditions upon release. These are questions of system design proportionality that the population data surfaces.

Of the 2,985 incarcerated registrants, 2,696 are assigned to Salt Lake County, 93.1% of the total incarcerated population, a geographic concentration that is entirely a function of USCF's location in Salt Lake County and has no relationship to where those individuals lived, offended, or will return upon release. Counting incarcerated registrants in county-level registry statistics therefore systematically distorts the apparent geographic distribution of the registry population: Salt Lake County's 52.2% registry share drops to 35.4% of the community-active population once the institutional population is removed, and every other county's proportional share rises correspondingly.

7.2 Female Registrants

350 women are registered on the Utah Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry, representing 3.4% of the total population. They are frequently omitted from policy discussions that treat the registered population as implicitly male, an assumption the offense composition, conviction age distribution, and recidivism data collectively do not support. Treating this population as a marginal footnote to the male majority obscures clinically and legally significant differences that bear directly on the validity of any uniform tiering, risk assessment, or supervision framework applied across the full registry. Their profile differs systematically from the male majority:

- Recidivism rate: 3.7%, versus 11.8% for males.
- Modal conviction age: 26–35 (133 women), followed by 36–45 (104 women), older on average than the male distribution.
- Offense composition: Dominated by child abuse statutes (76-5-109, Series) and child contact offenses, with significant representation of unlawful sexual activity with a minor (76-5-401) and lewdness involving a child.
- Current status: 279 active (79.7%), 71 incarcerated (20.3%).

The lower recidivism rate and distinct offense profile of female registrants have direct implications for any actuarial tiering framework. The Static-99R, the most commonly used sex offense risk assessment instrument in Utah, was developed and validated on male populations. Its application to female registrants is not supported by the validation literature. Any tiering proposal should address sex-differentiated risk assessment methodology.

The 20.3% incarceration rate for female registrants is lower than the 30.3% rate for male registrants, consistent with generally shorter custodial sentences for women in the criminal justice system. The female registrant population's offense concentration in child abuse and caretaker-context offenses, rather than predatory stranger or online exploitation offenses, reflects a different offense pathway that has distinct implications for both treatment and supervision. The clinical literature on female sexual offending emphasizes the role of relational coercion by a male co-offender in a significant subset of cases; Utah's female registrant population likely contains individuals for whom the co-offender dynamic was operative, and who may be registered for conduct that the clinical and legal frameworks of their original prosecution would now treat differently.

7.3 Juvenile-Conviction Registrants

16 individuals in the statewide dataset were convicted between the ages of 15 and 17, as minors under Utah law. This is a numerically small but analytically significant population, representing the most extreme application of lifetime registration consequences to individuals whose developmental stage at the time of offense is categorically distinct from adult offenders. The following table presents their current profile in full.

Given the small cohort size, individual case characteristics can materially influence aggregate measures and should be interpreted with caution. Nonetheless, the group provides a useful window into the long-term registry outcomes associated with juvenile-age convictions.

Metric	Value
Count	16
Current active	11 (68.8%)
Currently incarcerated	5 (31.3%)
Mean years on registry	22.75 years
Median years on registry	23 years
Range	2 to 44 years
Recidivism marker	1 of 16 (6.3%)

Table 14. Juvenile-Conviction Registrant Profile

Individuals convicted as teenagers are now, on average, in their late thirties and have been registered for nearly a quarter-century. The research literature is consistent that juvenile sexual offending has fundamentally different etiological and prognostic characteristics than adult offending, particularly around desistance. A 15-year-old convicted of a registrable offense and required to register for life is a categorically different case from an adult repeat offender. This population is small in the statewide dataset but represents an extreme proportionality question: a misdemeanor committed at 16 has in some cases produced 40+ years of registration.

The juvenile-conviction population is also relevant to the broader evidence base on developmental frameworks in Utah law. The same research that supports differential legal treatment of minors in other context, documenting that minors have fundamentally different decision-making capacity, impulse control, and susceptibility to peer influence than adults, supports differential registry treatment for juvenile-conviction registrants. The single recidivism marker among this group of 16 individuals (6.3%) is consistent with the juvenile sex offense literature's finding that juvenile offenders have substantially lower long-term recidivism rates than adult offenders when provided appropriate intervention. While the cohort is too small to support definitive statistical conclusions, its observed outcomes align with the broader developmental and recidivism research on juvenile offending.

7.4 Elderly Registrants (65+)

At 13.5% of the total registry, elderly registrants constitute a larger share of Utah's registered population than is commonly assumed, a proportion that reflects both the registry's growing historical depth and the absence of any age-based sunset mechanism that would remove low-risk elderly individuals from active supervision. This population is not distributed evenly across offense categories or tenure brackets: the overwhelming majority have been registered for a decade or more, and their continued presence on the registry is a function of statutory duration requirements rather than any individualized actuarial determination that their ongoing registration serves a public safety purpose. 1,386 registrants are currently aged 65 or older. Of these:

- 1,070 are active in the community (77.2%).
- 314 are incarcerated (22.7%).
- Average years on registry: 18 years.
- Median years on registry: 17 years.
- Nominal recidivism rate: 15.7% (subject to the multi-count discussed in Section IV).

The sexual recidivism literature consistently identifies age as one of the strongest independent predictors of declining risk: risk declines sharply past age 50 and continues to decline through old age. A 70-year-old who has been registered for 20 years without a new offense presents a fundamentally different actuarial risk profile than the initial-registration population. The registry does not currently reflect this. As a result, individuals with markedly different empirically supported risk levels are often subject to the same registration requirements and public classification. This disconnect raises questions about whether a static registration framework can accurately represent risk across decades of aging and offense-free behavior.

The elderly registrant population also presents a distinct set of practical supervision and compliance challenges. Physical mobility limitations, cognitive decline, healthcare-driven residential instability, and diminished employment prospects produce registration compliance difficulties that have little relationship to ongoing sexual recidivism risk. The 1,070 community-active elderly registrants, averaging 18 years on the registry, represent a population for whom the annual compliance burden is high and the marginal public safety benefit of continued registration is, by the weight of actuarial evidence, negligible.

Elderly registrants face the compounding effect of residency restriction zones applied to a population whose housing options are already severely constrained by fixed income, physical accessibility requirements, and the limited geographic footprint of assisted living and adult care facilities. The practical result is that elderly registrants requiring memory care, skilled nursing, or assisted living are frequently unable to access appropriate facilities, forcing families and AP&P officers to navigate a housing compliance problem that the registry's drafters did not contemplate and that no existing statutory mechanism addresses.

7.5 Federal Conviction Registrants

The 300 federal conviction registrants represent a categorically distinct population within the Utah registry: individuals prosecuted under federal statutes, predominantly CSAM-related, who completed their federal sentence and were subsequently released to Utah supervision, where they register on the state registry as a condition of federal supervised release or by virtue of Utah residency. Their offense profile, sentence structure, and supervision architecture differ materially from state-convicted registrants, and conflating them with the broader registry population in any aggregate analysis obscures both the specific public safety dynamics of federal CSAM prosecution and the structural growth trajectory this category represents. The registrant profile below provides the breakdown:

- Top statutes: 18 USC 2252 (CSAM possession/distribution, 87 registrants), 18 USC 2425 (interstate solicitation, 33 registrants), 18 USC 2251 (production, 9 registrants), 18 USC 2422 (online enticement, 9 registrants).
- Current active: 278 (92.7%).
- Currently incarcerated: 22 (7.3%).
- Recidivism rate: 46 of 300 (15.3%), again subject to the multi-count interpretation.

Federal CSAM prosecutions have increased substantially over the past decade as digital offense investigative capacity has grown. This population is projected to continue growing as a share of the total registry, since federal sentences for CSAM are often longer than state equivalents, and individuals convicted federally register on state registries upon release. The policy implications are compounded by the categorical difference between CSAM possession and contact offense: these registrants are subject to identical community restrictions as contact offenders despite a meaningfully different offense profile. This structural convergence highlights how changes in enforcement practice can reshape registry composition independently of underlying offense severity trends. This shift underscores the importance of separating enforcement-driven growth from true changes in underlying offending behavior when interpreting registry statistics.

The federal conviction population's 92.7% community-active rate, compared to the statewide 70.8%, reflects the structure of federal CSAM sentences: offenders typically serve their custodial term before being released to Utah supervision, at which point they appear in the registry as active. Many federal CSAM offenders are released to the state where they lived at the time of their offense or where family support is available, which distributes them across Utah's communities rather than concentrating them in specific counties. Their 15.3% nominal recidivism rate is within the expected range given the multi-count coding issue and does not represent identifiably elevated risk relative to the broader registry population. Overall, the observed differences primarily reflect sentencing and release pathways rather than substantive differences in post-release behavior. Accordingly, cross-group comparisons should be interpreted cautiously, as they are heavily influenced by procedural and jurisdictional factors.

VIII. Analytical Implications

This section presents the data-driven observations most directly relevant to policy, research, and legal audiences. No recommendations are advanced. Each subsection identifies a distinct dimension of the statewide population data that bears on the registry's design, scope, and proportionality, and articulates what the data shows without prescribing what any particular audience should do with it. The observations that follow are grounded exclusively in the March 23, 2026 DPS export and the analytical framework documented in Sections III through VIII; any audience seeking to contest or extend them should engage with that underlying data directly rather than with the characterizations presented here.

8.1 The Registry's Functional Population

Any evaluation of the registry's public safety effectiveness must begin with a clear picture of what the registry is currently doing and for whom. The statewide data establishes that the registry's functional community-notification population is 7,239 individuals, not 10,229. Nearly 3,000 registrants are incarcerated and cannot benefit from or be addressed through community-facing registry functions.

Any analysis of the registry's cost-effectiveness that uses the headline 10,229 figure is evaluating a system whose actual community-facing population is 41% smaller. This distinction is not merely semantic. Analysis of the registry's cost-effectiveness, supervision resource allocation, and per-registrant burden must be anchored to the 7,239 community-active population if it is to accurately characterize the system Utah is actually funding. When evaluating whether a given offense category's registration is proportionate, the relevant question is whether the community notification, residence restriction, and supervision functions of registration serve a proportionate public safety purpose for that category's community-active registrants, not whether it serves a purpose for the incarcerated population, for whom those functions are operationally inapplicable.

This framing also has fiscal dimensions. GPS monitoring, AP&P supervision visits, compliance verification, and community notification infrastructure all cost real money per community-active registrant. Computing those costs against a denominator that includes 2,985 incarcerated individuals, who require only administrative record-keeping, produces a systematically misleading per-registrant cost figure that understates what the community-facing supervision system actually costs.

8.2 Categorical Uniformity vs. Categorical Heterogeneity

The registry applies identical consequences to categorically different offenses. A registrant convicted of CSAM possession and a registrant convicted of violent contact rape are subject to the same residence restrictions, employment prohibitions, GPS monitoring conditions, and community notification mechanisms. The data in this report documents that these two populations have materially different profiles, different risk characteristics, and different relationships to the registry's stated public safety functions.

18.7% of the registry, 1,913 individuals, carry digital exploitation offenses with no documented physical victim contact. Their supervision and restriction requirements are identical to those imposed on contact offenders despite a meaningfully different offense profile. Any inquiry into the registry's offense scope is implicitly an inquiry into whether this categorical uniformity is proportionate to the underlying risk distribution. This distinction becomes especially relevant when assessing whether current policy frameworks adequately differentiate between harm pathways and associated recidivism risks.

The data in Sections III and IV together provide the empirical inputs for a categorical proportionality analysis. Section III documents what the registry's offense composition actually is: 54.7% child contact, 18.7% digital exploitation, 10.1% forcible sexual abuse, 8.8% adult rape/assault, and 6.2% enticement. Section IV documents the methodological challenge in assessing recidivism risk across those categories. Together, they establish that the registry is a heterogeneous population being managed as if it were homogeneous, and that the degree of heterogeneity is empirically substantial, not marginal.

8.3 Duration and Desistance

1,699 registrants have been on the registry for 20 or more years. 468 have been registered for 30 or more years. The risk-desistance literature is consistent that sexual recidivism risk declines sharply after 10–15 years without a new offense. The registry's current structure does not incorporate this evidence, a registrant in year 30 of compliance is supervised identically to a registrant in year 1. This uniformity means the system does not differentiate between long-term demonstrated desistance and recent entry into supervision.

The tenure data in Section V provides the quantitative foundation for assessing the population impact of any time-based tiering threshold. A 10-year clean-record criterion would affect 54.6% of active registrants; a 15-year criterion would affect 35.5%; a 20-year criterion would affect 19.1%. These are the maximum populations that any such threshold could reach, before additional criteria such as offense category, actuarial score, or supervision compliance history are applied. These figures allow any audience, legislative, judicial, or administrative, to assess the population-scale implications of a duration-based approach without committing to its specific contours.

The constitutional dimension of this analysis is also significant. Smith v. Doe (2003) upheld sex offender registration as non-punitive based in part on its regulatory and prospective character. That reasoning becomes harder to sustain for individuals who have been registered for 20 to 67 years, periods that substantially exceed many criminal sentences and that continue to apply regardless of any actuarial assessment of ongoing risk. The long-tenure population data documented in this report provides the numerical foundation for any as-applied constitutional challenge grounded in duration. This tension is most pronounced where lifetime administrative burdens persist despite extensive time elapsed without new offending, raising questions about the continuing regulatory rationale.

8.4 The Recidivism Figure's Evidentiary Use

The 72.8% single-conviction compliance floor is the most accurately cited figure: it reflects the proportion of registrants with only one conviction date and no subsequent registrable offense recorded in the dataset. The more precise non-recidivism baseline is 72.8%, the 7,445 registrants representing the population that has never acquired a second registrable conviction of any kind. The date-interval analysis in Section 4.2 establishes a defensible post-registration reoffense range of 6.63% (730+ day absolute gap) to 7.60% (including the ambiguous 366–730 day cohort), consistent with the BJS five-year sex offense recidivism range of 5–7%. UTRSOL will however cite the 10.21% in conservative estimates absent clinical confirmation of the 6.63% to 7.60% range.

72.8% s citable as the single-conviction compliance floor; 72.8% of registrants have a single conviction date (the most defensible compliance floor); 6.63–7.60% is the empirically derived post-registration reoffense range derived from the absolute date-interval analysis. Formal BCI methodology verification remains advisable before citing specific figures in legal proceedings, but the date-comparison mechanism is sufficiently documented in the export structure to support the analytical conclusion.

The recidivism data's significance extends beyond any specific percentage. If the overwhelming majority of registrants present no post-registration offense record, the proportionality question for any specific offense category becomes: does this category's community notification function serve a public safety purpose that justifies its imposition on a population that is, by the data's own measure, predominantly non-recidivating? This analysis provides the empirical foundation from which that question must be answered, regardless of the institutional context in which it is asked.

IX. Data Sources and Methodology Notes

9.1 Source Data

Primary source: Utah Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Offender Registry DPS export via iCrimeWatch (https://www.icrimewatch.net/index.php?AgencyID=54438), maintained by the Utah Department of Public Safety Bureau of Criminal Identification under Utah Code §§53-29 et seq. Citation date: March 23, 2026. Total records: 10,229.

Statutory reference: Utah Code Title 53, Chapter 29 (recodified May 7, 2025). The registry was formerly maintained under Title 77; all substantive requirements transferred without modification under the recodification.

The iCrimeWatch export is a public-facing export produced for community notification purposes. It is not a research database and does not include fields that would permit actuarial risk scoring, victim relationship data, offense circumstances, supervision tier, or criminal history beyond the registrable offenses listed. UTRSOL has treated the export

limitations as analytical constraints rather than gaps to be filled through inference: where the data does not speak, this report does not speculate. The underlying individual-level export is retained by UTRSOL, and available to qualified researchers upon written request, subject to applicable privacy and data-use requirements.

9.2 Offense Categorization

Offense categories were assigned based on the primary statute using the following hierarchy: (1) CSAM/Exploitation if any Utah 76-5-3 series or federal 18 USC 2252/2251/2425 statute appears; (2) Child Contact if any Utah 76-5-404.1, 76-5-403.1, 76-5-402.1, 76-5-402.2, 76-5-109, or equivalent statute appears; (3) Enticement if 76-4-401 appears; (4) Forcible Sexual Abuse if 76-5-404 appears in an adult-victim context; (5) Adult Rape/Assault if 76-5-402, 403, or 405 appears; (6) Lewdness if 76-9-702 series appears; (7) Kidnapping if 76-5-301 or 76-5-302 appears; (8) Other/Unclassified for unmatched or out-of-state generic codes.

Out-of-state statute codes present a categorization challenge: they vary substantially in format across 50 state systems and are often entered in the DPS export as partial codes, narrative descriptions, or generic placeholders. Registrants with out-of-state primary statutes that could not be reliably categorized were assigned to Other/Unclassified. This category's 1.4% share (144 registrants) likely understates the true other/unclassified population, as some out-of-state statutes were categorized by offense description rather than code. UTRSOL considers the categorization reliable for aggregate analysis but cautions against using the other/unclassified figure as a precise count of any specific offense type.

9.3 Recidivism Interpretation

Of the 10,229 registry entries, 2,784 individuals have multiple conviction dates. Those dates were analyzed by computing the intervals between each registrant's earliest and latest conviction, producing four analytically distinct intervals: registrants whose dates are identical, consistent with same-day co-conviction from a single prosecution; registrants whose intervals falls within one year, consistent with deferred counts or sequential plea agreements within the same case; registrants whose interval falls between one and two years, a range ambiguous between a prolonged prosecution and a genuinely distinct new offense; and registrants whose interval exceeds 730 days, the population most consistent with a post-registration reoffense separate from the original conviction.

Because the appropriate boundary between same-prosecution co-conviction and post-registration new offense is a methodological judgment rather than a fixed rule, UTRSOL presents the full distribution without asserting a single threshold, leaving the reader to apply whichever standard their analytical or legal purpose requires. What the distribution establishes regardless of threshold is that the 7,445 registrants with a single conviction date, 72.8% of the total registry, have never acquired a second registrable conviction of any kind, and that figure is unaffected by any choice of interval cutoff.

The date-interval analysis across all 2,784 multi-date registrants produces the following decomposition: 1,740 (62.5% of multi-date records) show identical dates with same-day co-convictions; 267 (9.6%) show a 1 day interval; 99 (3.6%) show a 366 day interval; and 678 (24.4%) show an interval exceeding 730 days. Formal verification against BCI methodology documentation remains advisable before citing specific figures in legal proceedings. The 117 high-risk recidivated population is computed as the count of registrants for whom conviction dates are all recorded and all values are mutually distinct, no two conviction dates are identical.

9.4 Age and Date Calculations

Approximate current age was computed as 2026 minus year of birth. Age at conviction is recorded as a bracket (15–17, 18–25, etc.) in the source data; individual-level birth year is not provided. Registry tenure (years on registry) is recorded as a numeric field in the DPS export and is taken at face value; it reflects the date of initial registration in Utah, which may not equal the conviction date for out-of-state convictions. Full MM/DD/YYYY conviction dates are available for 10,212 of 10,229 registrants (99.8%) for the primary conviction date, and for decreasing shares of registrants across secondary, tertiary, quaternary, and quinary positions (27.2%, 7.4%, 2.5%, and 0.9% respectively).

The current-age calculation introduces a potential half-year average error: individuals born in the first half of any year will be a year younger than the calculation suggests for part of the year. At the population level this error is random and approximately self-canceling; at the individual level it should not be used for precise age attribution. All age-group counts should be treated as approximations accurate to within one year for individuals near any bracket boundary. Because the analysis is conducted at the population level and uses broad age categories rather than exact ages, this limitation does not materially affect the overall age-distribution findings or the conclusions drawn from them. Any resulting misclassification is confined to individuals located near category thresholds and is unlikely to alter aggregate age-group proportions in a meaningful way.

9.5 Geographic Data

County-level assignments reflect the county of address-of-record in the DPS export. 214 records contain no county information (“Location Unknown”). These may include individuals who are homeless, non-compliant, or whose address verification is pending. They are counted in the total population but cannot be assigned to any county distribution.

The county distribution reflects residential address at the time of the export, not the county of conviction or the county of supervision. For registrants with UDC or AP&P supervision conditions, the county of supervision may differ from the county of registration address if the individual’s address-of-record and the supervising office’s county are not the same. County-level analysis in this report should be understood as a residential distribution, not a supervision jurisdiction distribution.

9.6 Publication Context

This report is Publication 2026-47, produced by Utah for Rational Sex Offense Laws (UTRSOL). Correspondence regarding this publication should be directed to by email to communications@utrso.org or by phone at (801) 871-5215. UTRSOL applies an evidence-proportionality framework to all policy analysis: it supports measures the evidence justifies and opposes measures it does not, explicitly distinguishing its work from civil liberties advocacy and the criminal defense bar. This publication is produced in that tradition. Its findings are presented descriptively; where the data supports an inference, that inference is stated with its evidentiary basis; where the data does not support an inference, that limitation is disclosed. UTRSOL makes no warranty as to the accuracy of the underlying DPS export data and has not independently verified individual-level records. All figures in this report are derived from the March 23, 2026 DPS export and should be cited accordingly.

Section 10. Conclusion

The Utah Sex, Kidnap, and Child Abuse Registry is a population of 10,229 individuals whose internal diversity, by offense type, conviction year, tenure, age, sex, conviction jurisdiction, and current status, is rarely reflected in the policy discussions that govern it. This report has documented that diversity in full, using the March 23, 2026 DPS export as its sole evidentiary basis, and the aggregate picture that emerges differs materially from the assumptions underlying Utah's current registration framework.

This report makes no recommendations. What it establishes is the factual foundation from which any serious policy, research, or legal engagement with Utah's registry must proceed, and the distance between that foundation and the assumptions currently embedded in the registry's design is, by any measure, substantial. Questions of public safety, constitutional law, proportionality, resource allocation, and long-term effectiveness can only be meaningfully evaluated when grounded in a clear understanding of who is actually on the registry and how that population is distributed.

The evidence presented here suggests that many commonly held assumptions about the registry population are incomplete, oversimplified, or inconsistent with the observed data. Whether viewed through the lens of offense composition, age, tenure, conviction origin, recidivism indicators, or demographic structure, the registry is a far more heterogeneous institution than its current design often assumes. The distance between the population described in these data and the assumptions embedded in the existing framework is, by any measure, substantial, and any future discussion of Utah's registry will be strengthened by beginning with that reality.