



Florida Action Committee, Inc.  
6615 W Boynton Beach Blvd #414  
Boynton Beach, FL 33437  
www.floridaactioncommittee.org

August 18, 2025

City of Coral Springs Commission  
Attn: John Hearne, City Attorney  
9500 West Sample Road  
Coral Springs, FL 33065

SENT VIA EMAIL  
jhearn@coralsprings.gov

**RE: ORDINANCE 2025-114  
AMENDING SECTION 14-3**

Dear City Attorney Hearne:

I am President Emeritus of the Florida Action Committee (FAC). FAC is a 3,000+ member statewide non-profit organization that advocates for sex offense laws based on empirical evidence and best practices. Many of our members are individuals required to register in Coral Springs.

I am writing to express our opposition to the proposed amendments to your City's Sex Offender Residency Restriction (SORR), which is up for first read on Wednesday, August 20, 2025.

In addition to providing an ability to bring a civil suit against those who violate the law, the amendment seeks to clarify its retroactive effect "(regardless of the offense or conviction date)". Accordingly, someone who is required to register will now be restricted from living within the majority of your city, regardless of whether the offense took place years or even decades before the enactment of your SORR and irrespective of current risk, unless they registered and maintained *that residence* since 2005.

What if someone needs to downsize? Move to an assisted living facility? Relocate to live with family? Your amendment imposes a significant burden and restriction on an individual long after their offense date. In the Background section of your Summary Sheet, it even states, "This ordinance was established as an attempt to provide clear guidance and **restrict the ability of such individuals to relocate within the jurisdictional boundaries of Coral Springs.**"

The intent of "restricting an individual's ability to relocate within your city" is not remedial, but punitive. As Judge Solomon found in *City of Ft. Lauderdale v. Ira Anderson and Sean Ford* (Broward County Case Nos. 17-00361MO10A and 13-010799MO10A), that city's "Ordinance resembles banishment, a historic form of punishment" and violative of the Ex Post Facto clause of our Constitution.

Multiple studies have shown that SORRs do nothing to reduce recidivism (see e.g., Levenson & Hern, 2007; Zgoba et al., 2015). In fact, they have the unintended consequence of increasing homelessness and housing instability that increase recidivism.

While our organization is staunchly opposed to SORRs as a general concept, SORRs that are applied in the method you propose may also violate constitutional principles and expose the city to a lawsuit. Should such a lawsuit become necessary, we wanted to ensure our opposition and the reasons for it are on record in advance of the meeting.

I hope the City Commission will reconsider this amendment.

Respectfully,

/s/

Gail Colletta

President Emeritus

Florida Action Committee, Inc.

Copies sent to: All City Commissioners