

Residency Restrictions

In Broward County, 27.6% of registrants are homeless, and in Miami-Dade, 28.2% are homeless, with residency restrictions being the main obstacle in finding stable housing. [OPPAGA-Report-21.pdf](#) (See pages 25-26)

Why the state of Kansas does NOT have residency restrictions – the 20 findings of research in Iowa all showing that residency restrictions do NOT work. (**Kansas Department of Corrections, “Sex Offender Housing Restrictions”**, <https://www.doc.ks.gov/publications/CFS/sex-offender-housing-restrictions>)

Why Maryland does not have residency restrictions – because evidence shows that residency restrictions do NOT help to prevent sexual offenses from occurring because the victims and the offenders, in most situations, know each other. (**Maryland Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services, “Sex Offender Registry FAQs”**, see question 15, https://www.dpscs.state.md.us/onlineservs/sor/frequently_asked_questions.shtml)

In 2017, the Illinois Task Force reported that research showed that residency restrictions lead neither to reductions in sexual crime nor recidivism. (**Illinois December 2017 Sex Offenses & Sex Offender Registration Task Force Final Report**, page iv, http://www.icjia.state.il.us/assets/articles/SOTF_report_final_12292017.pdf)

“Residency Restrictions for Sexual Offenders in Minnesota: False Perceptions for Community Safety”, 2016: “There is no research to support residence restrictions as effective in reducing sexual recidivism. The Minnesota Department of Corrections concluded in one study that ‘during the past 16 years, not one sex offender released from a Minnesota Correctional Facility has been re-incarcerated for a sex offense in which he made contact with a juvenile victim near a school, park, or daycare center close to his home.’” ([MnATSA-Residency-Restrictions-2016.pdf](#))

In 2018, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida sex offender residency restrictions were declared unconstitutional. (<https://floridaactioncommittee.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/OrderGrantingDefsMotiontoDismiss.pdf>)

Residency restrictions have not accomplished the goals that politicians have promised they would but have caused collateral consequences that can actually make society worse off. (**Boston College Journal of Law & Social Justice, “No Place to Call Home: Rethinking Residency Restrictions for Sex Offenders”**, Gina Puls, <https://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1102&context=jljsj>)

Residency restrictions should be abolished. (**Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, Levenson, Leibowitz, and Grady, 2016, “Grand Challenges: Social Justice and the Need for Evidence-Based Sex Offender Registry Reform”**, page 22, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304990286_Grand_Challenges_Social_Justice_and_the_Need_for_Evidence-based_Sex_Offender_Registry_Reform)

From the African American Studies Program at the University of South Carolina, “policymakers need to rethink...residency restriction laws and change them to reflect empirical evidence based on the nature of sexual offending...that change could bring about meaningful reductions in homelessness, associated with being a registered sex offender.” (**University of South Carolina African American Studies Program, “Sex Offender Residence Restrictions and Homelessness”** https://sc.edu/study/colleges_schools/artsandsciences/african_american_studies/about/news/2019/offender.php)

Actual study: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0887403419862334>