

## ***A Sample of Organizational Opposition to Sex Offender Residency Requirements***

“Residency restrictions are having unintended consequences that decrease public safety ... Because residency requirements cause instability, which may increase the risk of re- offense, Day One opposes residency restrictions.”

- **Day One**, “Policy Statement on Management of Sex Offenders,”  
[www.ilvoices.com/uploads/2/8/6/6/2866695/07-dayone.pdf](http://www.ilvoices.com/uploads/2/8/6/6/2866695/07-dayone.pdf)

“Sex offenders in the states with residency restrictions are more likely to move frequently, become homeless, or ‘go underground,’ all of which consequences make them much more difficult to supervise and monitor. Instead, research shows that sex offenders with residential and family stability (which can be disrupted by such restrictions) are less likely to commit new sex offenses.”

- **Rhode Island Sex Offender Management Task Force**, Draft Policy Statement

“The unintended consequences of residence restrictions include transience, homelessness, instability, and other obstacles to community reentry that may actually compromise, rather than promote, public safety ... Thus, residence restrictions, aimed at improving community safety may inadvertently create an environment in which offenders are at an increased risk to reoffend.

- **Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers**, “Sexual Offender Residence Restrictions, <http://www.atsa.com/pdfs/Policy/2014SOResidenceRestrictions.pdf>

“There is no demonstrated protective effect of the residency requirement that justifies the huge draining of scarce law enforcement resources in the effort to enforce the restriction.”

- **Iowa County Attorneys Association**, “Statement of Sex Offender Residency Restrictions in Iowa,” [http://www.csom.org/pubs/iowa%20DAs%20Association\\_Sex%20Offender%20Residency%20Statement%20Dec%202011%2006.pdf](http://www.csom.org/pubs/iowa%20DAs%20Association_Sex%20Offender%20Residency%20Statement%20Dec%202011%2006.pdf)

“There is no evidence to support the efficacy of broadly applied residential restrictions on sex offenders, and ... it is contrary to good public safety policy to create sex offender ghettos.”

- **Association of State Correctional Administrators** Resolutions, “Resolution #13- Neighborhood Exclusion of Predatory Sex Offenders”,  
[www.asca.net/system/assets/attachments/910/Resolution\\_13.pdf](http://www.asca.net/system/assets/attachments/910/Resolution_13.pdf)

“Whereas, it is contrary to good public safety policy to create disincentives for predatory sex offenders to cooperate with the responsible community corrections agencies, therefore be it resolved that the American Correctional Association calls upon all legislative bodies to take into consideration the unintended consequences to statutes intended to exclude these offenders from neighborhoods or locations.”

- **American Correctional Association**, “Neighborhood Exclusion of Predatory Sex Offenders”,  
[http://www.uncomfortabletruth.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=101:american-correctional-association-resolution&catid=44:residency-restrictions&Itemid=68](http://www.uncomfortabletruth.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=101:american-correctional-association-resolution&catid=44:residency-restrictions&Itemid=68)