

Ineffective, Costly, and Harmful: DEBUNKING THE SEX OFFENSE REGISTRY

Sex Offense Litigation and Policy Resource Center (SOLPRC)
at Mitchell Hamline School of Law*
solprc@mitchellhamline.edu
<https://mitchellhamline.edu/sex-offense-litigation-policy/>

Published March 2025

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The modern sex offense registry was borne out of the belief that a public registry listing people who had been convicted of a sex offense would make communities safer. That premise was wrong. We now have thirty years of data concluding that public registries do not work as intended—in fact, there is evidence that public registries actually increase registrant recidivism. Furthermore, there is no definitive evidence that these laws deter non-registrants from sexually offending. At the same time, sex offense registration and notification (SORN) laws contribute to the stigmatization of registrants, which make securing employment and housing more challenging, and disrupt or preclude the maintenance of strong social ties. Registrants' families also experience significant hardships. SORN laws should be abandoned, and resources should instead be invested in evidence-based interventions to address sexual violence that are currently starved for resources.

INTRODUCTION

Sex offense registration and notification (SORN) laws exist in all fifty states, the District of Columbia, U.S. territories, and tribal jurisdictions. It is estimated that almost one million people are subjected to registries.¹ Yet, SORN laws do not reduce sexual offending by registrants. Not only are SORN laws ineffective, but these laws also come at a considerable cost to registrants, their family members, and taxpayers alike.

HISTORY, PURPOSE, AND OPERATION OF SORN LAWS

By the late 1990s, all states and U.S. territories, as well as some tribal governments, adopted registration and notification laws, largely as a response to a handful of widely publicized brutal sex crimes, almost all of which were committed by recidivists—individuals who had previously been convicted of a sex offense.² Generally, SORN laws require that people convicted of certain sex offenses provide sweeping information to law enforcement (the registration component), and that this information be made public to varying degrees (the notification component). In 1994, Congress conditioned certain federal funds on states' adoption of registration laws meeting prescribed minimum standards³, and in 1996, Congress added to those standards, most notably by requiring that states inform local communities of registrants' addresses.⁴ By 2003, every state in the country had public internet registries⁵, though state statutes varied significantly, and many states do not comply with the federal standards.⁶ Operating under the belief that the network of state registries contained “loopholes and deficiencies,” Congress enacted the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA) in 2006.⁷ SORNA magnified the reach of SORN laws by, among other things,

* The views expressed in this Policy Brief are those of its authors, working under the direction of Eric S. Janus, Director, Sex Offense Litigation and Policy Resource Center, and do not necessarily reflect the views of Mitchell Hamline School of Law (MHSL), the MHSL community, or others who assisted in its preparation.

modifying federal standards by increasing the number of people required to register and expanding the amount of information available to the public regarding registrants.⁸ In addition to their ubiquity, SORN laws are “widely supported by the public, law enforcement, policymakers, and sometimes even those convicted of se[x] offenses.”⁹

SORN laws were enacted based on the belief that public registries would make communities safer. “[R]egistration was intended to facilitate police apprehension of recidivists by maintaining a pool of potential suspects, as well as the deterrence of subsequent offending due to increased scrutiny...[N]otification was to improve the community’s ability to protect themselves from [registrants], through altered personal behavior or reports to law enforcement regarding suspicious behavior by registrants.”¹⁰

Typically, registrants are publicly identified on official government websites as “sex offenders.” In addition to listing a registrant’s name and photo, these websites may contain a registrant’s home address and place of employment. For those subjected to registration, complying with SORN laws can be time-intensive, confusing, and expensive.¹¹ Under federal law¹² and in many jurisdictions¹³ noncompliance is a felony.

States and other jurisdictions invest significant financial and human resources to implement SORN laws. Law enforcement agencies must receive registrant information and updates, verify registrant information, conduct community notifications, and maintain public websites.¹⁴ “Most large police departments have created internal SORN units to handle the ever-increasing number of registrants.”¹⁵ Yet no good estimate of the total cost of implementing SORN laws throughout the country exists (one estimate suggests that the cost is somewhere between \$10 billion and \$40 billion per year¹⁶). In addition to the direct costs required to implement SORN laws, these laws also produce other societal costs. For example, SORN laws that make it difficult for registrants to obtain remunerative employment cost the public in foregone taxes on their income, and registrants who are un- or underemployed may need to rely on public benefits, which results in more government spending. Due to misconceptions that living near a registrant increases the risk of sexual victimization¹⁷, studies have found a negative impact on property values for homes in close proximity to where registrants reside.¹⁸

EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT SORN LAWS DO NOT WORK AS INTENDED

THE PREMISES UNDERLYING SORN LAWS ARE NOT SUPPORTED BY FACTS

As outlined above, SORN laws were enacted in response to heinous crimes that shocked the public—crimes that were committed by people who were a stranger to their victim(s), and who had been previously convicted of a sex offense. But very little sexual offending resembles these sensationalized crimes.¹⁹ In fact, contrary to common belief, the vast majority of sex offenses are committed by persons familiar to their victims.²⁰ Almost all sexual offending is committed by non-registrants—and very few people who have been convicted of a sex offense reoffend in the future.²¹ Nonetheless, the belief that sexual violence policy should focus on recidivism persists.

SORN LAWS DO NOT REDUCE RECIDIVISM

Many empirical studies have been conducted on the impact of SORN laws on recidivism since the inception of these laws. Researchers who study SORN laws have come to a consensus: SORN laws do not prevent recidivist sexual violence.²²

PRIMARY SCHOLARSHIP STUDYING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SORN LAWS AND RECIDIVISM

A chapter in *Sex Offender Registration and Community Notification Laws: An Empirical Evaluation*, titled *Offenders and SORN Laws* “present[s] an overarching perspective and the consensus views of the experts in the field.”²³ In this chapter, authors Agan and Prescott summarize and examine the findings of dozens of

empirical studies on SORN laws, which vary in size and scope and utilize various data sources, including federal crime reports and criminal history data.

Agan and Prescott discuss at length the two largest studies on the effects of SORN laws, both published in 2011. The first large study examines trends in federal crime reports for fifteen states—with a sample size of 328,260 individuals—and the effective dates of registration and notification laws in those states to identify any effects the enactment of the laws had on criminal behavior.²⁴ The study finds some evidence that registration alone, without public notification, may reduce registrant recidivism²⁵ (though it should be noted that “private registration without notification was in effect for only a short span of years at the dawn of the SORN era,”²⁶ making this finding limited in its significance). Moreover, the study also finds that notification appears to increase registrant recidivism at approximately the same rate that registration appears to reduce recidivism, such that the two effects roughly offset each other.²⁷

The second large study examines the criminal history of specific individuals to study the impact of SORN laws on recidivism.²⁸ The criminal history dataset followed individuals who were imprisoned for a sex offense and released from state prisons in fifteen states. Some of the states had not yet enacted SORN laws, allowing for a control group of individuals not subjected to SORN. From the criminal history data, the study finds “no statistically significant difference between the two groups...[and] if anything, the results hint at *higher* arrest and conviction rates for those subject to SORN laws.”²⁹ The two studies are “complementary and mutually reinforcing because they study different states, use different data sources, and incorporate independently collected law and registry information yet draw the same basic conclusions about the effects of SORN laws on sexual offending.”³⁰

Agan and Prescott also discuss a variety of other empirical studies that failed to detect any evidence that SORN laws reduce recidivism. Researchers have examined the changes in arrest rates for sex offenses in New York based on 170,000 arrests for sex offenses over a twenty-one-year period³¹, the criminal histories of 6,000 people in South Carolina³², the criminal histories of almost 3,000 registrants in Arkansas for a five-year period³³, and the number of sex offenses in a large Texas county during a thirty-five-year period³⁴, to name a few of the studies examined in this chapter. Except for a single, relatively small study³⁵—in a state with an atypically limited notification scheme—researchers have found that SORN laws have no impact on recidivism.³⁶

SECONDARY SCHOLARSHIP STUDYING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SORN LAWS AND RECIDIVISM

Two meta-analyses studying the relationship between SORN laws and recidivism further support the conclusion that SORN laws do not prevent recidivism. A meta-analysis systematically synthesizes results from numerous independent research articles. The first of these meta-analyses was a peer-reviewed study authored by Zgoba and Mitchell and published in 2021.³⁷ *The effectiveness of Sex Offender Registration and Notification: A meta-analysis of 25 years of findings* was the first study to “synthesize the statistical effects and results of numerous studies into one inclusive examination on the overall trend of SORN.”³⁸ Zgoba and Mitchell’s meta-analysis included 18 independent studies, containing data for 474,640 formerly incarcerated people and covering the previous 25 years during which SORN laws were in operation. Zgoba and Mitchell find that SORN laws do not have a statistically significant impact on recidivism.³⁹

The second meta-analysis, which used an entirely different research methodology, is a peer-reviewed study that was published in 2023 titled *Against All Odds: The Unexplained Sexual Recidivism Drop in the United States and Canada*.⁴⁰ Authors Lussier, McCuish, and Jeglic conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 555 studies regarding sex offense recidivism, 369 (66.5 percent) of which were from the United States and 186 (33.5 percent) from Canada. Unlike the United States, Canada did not adopt a SORN regime. The comparison between the two countries thus provides a natural experiment. Analyzing the available recidivism studies in Canada and the United States, the authors found that recidivism fell in both countries

during the 80-year period between 1940 and 2019. In the United States, the recidivism rate dropped by more than 40 percent, while in Canada, the drop was more than 60 percent. That the decline in recidivism was more robust in Canada strongly suggests, the authors conclude, that “sex offender registration is not an effective crime prevention tool.”⁴¹

The scientific consensus that SORN laws do not reduce registrant recidivism is reflected in the 2022 update of the Model Penal Code provisions on Sexual Assault and Related Offenses.⁴² The Model Penal Code (MPC) is produced by experts in criminal law policy which constitute the American Law Institute (ALI). More than half of the states have enacted modern criminal codes that draw heavily on the MPC, and courts throughout the country consider the MPC persuasive authority.⁴³ In 2022, the ALI concluded a ten-year review of the MPC provisions on Sexual Assault and Related Offenses, which include provisions related to registration and notification. The “ALI’s deliberative process ensures that every issue receives a full airing of viewpoints, and that the final product will represent the considered scholarship, experience, and judgment of the ALI as a whole.”⁴⁴ Dozens of expert advisors, including judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and scholars considered many of the same studies described above showing that public notification does not reduce registrant recidivism. The ALI also considered input from the Department of Justice, a group of state Attorneys General, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, all of which forcefully pressed for public notification laws.⁴⁵ The ALI ultimately determined that existing SORN policies are unjust and counterproductive.⁴⁶ As a result, the MPC provisions on Sexual Assault and Related Offenses that were updated in 2022 substantially depart from existing SORN policies. Under the updated MPC provisions, registration is permitted as a confidential tool for law enforcement to aid in the investigation of a specific criminal offense, and disclosure of specific information about particular registrants to particular recipients is permitted in three circumstances under an obligation of confidentiality.⁴⁷ Significantly, the MPC provisions prohibit public disclosure of registry content.⁴⁸

While there is a vast body of primary and secondary scholarship conducted by experts that has determined that SORN laws do not prevent recidivism, a 2022 report commissioned by the Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking Office (SMART Office)—the federal agency tasked with implementing SORNA—asserted that the research on SORN’s impact on recidivism was “inconclusive.”⁴⁹ The Report had no listed authors. The section of the report examining adult and juvenile recidivism cited only seven articles.⁵⁰ Not one of these articles finds that a SORNA-compliant law is effective at reducing recidivism. Six of the articles are not based on empirical data, or address issues other than recidivism. The seventh article hoped to compare recidivism rates of juveniles who sexually offended before and after the law required their registration, but concluded that no statistically valid comparison was possible because recidivism was so uncommon in both groups.⁵¹ The 2022 SMART Office report fails to provide any evidence that SORN laws reduce recidivism—and fails to rebut the consensus described above that SORN laws do not prevent recidivism.

SORN LAWS DO NOT DEFINITELY DETER NON-REGISTRANTS FROM SEXUALLY OFFENDING

Another asserted justification for SORN laws is that these laws might have a deterrent effect on non-registrants. As discussed above, almost all sexual offending in the criminal justice system is committed by non-registrants. But, unlike the consensus that has formed on the issue of recidivism, the evidence on the deterrent effect of SORN laws on non-registrants is “best characterized as mixed.”⁵²

For example, studies have found SORN laws to have a deterrent effect when analyzing arrest data for adults in South Carolina over a fifteen-year period (resulting in an 11% decrease in offenses committed by non-registrants)⁵³, and federal crime reports for fifteen states (resulting in an almost 13% decrease in offenses committed by non-registrants).⁵⁴ Conversely, researchers found no deterrent effect on non-registrants

when studying criminal history data from adults in New York over a twenty-one-year period⁵⁵, or on juvenile charges and adjudications in Maryland and Oregon.⁵⁶

More research is necessary to determine whether SORN laws have a deterrent effect on non-registrants. However, if such an effect exists, it likely does not counteract the observed increase in registrant recidivism as described above.⁵⁷

SORN LAWS RESULT IN CONSEQUENCES THAT ARE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE TO THEIR STATED GOALS AND NEEDLESSLY CAUSE HARM TO REGISTRANTS AND THEIR FAMILIES

People are less likely to sexually offend when they have stable employment and housing, and strong social ties.⁵⁸ But rather than facilitate these conditions, SORN laws do just the opposite: the burdens that SORN laws impose on registrants make it harder for registrants to obtain stable jobs and housing, and contribute to their social isolation.⁵⁹

SORN LAWS CREATE BARRIERS TO SECURING EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING AND THE MAINTENANCE OF STRONG SOCIAL TIES, AND OTHERWISE HARM REGISTRANTS AND THEIR FAMILIES

While people with a criminal conviction generally face barriers to securing employment⁶⁰, this challenge is even more pronounced for individuals convicted of a sex offense.⁶¹ Employers fear being publicly associated with registrants, which is compounded when registrants are required to list their place of employment on a public registry.⁶² At the same time, state laws bar registrants from a broad range of occupations.⁶³ As a result, registrants frequently lose their jobs, struggle to find jobs, and when they can find jobs, the jobs are below their qualifications.⁶⁴

Registrants also experience significant challenges in securing stable housing.⁶⁵ In the rental market, many landlords refuse to rent to registrants, or will do so only under conditions not required of other applicants.⁶⁶ If a registrant can't find stable housing through the rental market, public housing may not be available to them—federal law bars lifetime registrants from public housing.⁶⁷ Elderly registrants, which is an increasingly large population, may also be denied access to housing with supportive services, subsidized housing, and assisted living and skilled nursing facilities on the basis of their status as registrants.⁶⁸ And registrants may not even be able to access the “last line of defense for people experiencing housing problems”—homeless shelters—because many shelters have policies prohibiting registrants.⁶⁹ In Florida, registrants can't enter emergency shelters even during disasters, such as hurricanes.⁷⁰

While a conviction for a sex offense on its own generates stigma, the modern system of public registries—where the names, photos, home addresses, and place of employment are available to anyone, permanently—operate as “state-sanctioned public shaming, augment[ing] the stigmatic experience of registrants.”⁷¹ In addition to publicizing registrants' personal information, registries formally brand registrants with the label “sex offender.”⁷² This label is harmful because it elicits false stereotypes of registrants—that they are uniformly dangerous, unresponsive to treatment, and highly likely to reoffend⁷³—and has been shown to negatively impact public opinion of registrants more than the fact of conviction alone.⁷⁴ As a consequence of their stigmatization, registrants experience discrimination, social exclusion, public ridicule, harassment, and violence.⁷⁵ Registrants may avoid social interactions to reduce the likelihood of their registrant status being discovered, and when they do have social interactions, they may feel anxiety that they will be confronted or attacked.⁷⁶

All of this takes a toll on registrants' mental health.⁷⁷ The “unique stigma of the ‘sex offender’ label can foster a profound sense of disempowerment, social isolation, hopelessness, and shame”⁷⁸, and the challenges in obtaining stable employment and housing, as well as the financial burdens and time requirements

associated with SORN compliance, can cause distress.⁷⁹ SORN laws seem to be particularly harmful to the mental health of individuals who are required to register based on offenses committed when they were a juvenile; for this population, SORN laws are associated with high rates of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and death by suicide as compared to juvenile non-registrants.⁸⁰

Each of these consequences of SORN laws—the barriers to securing employment and housing, the social exclusion, and the corresponding mental health issues that registrants face—are all risk factors for recidivism.⁸¹ Registrants suffer, their efforts to reintegrate successfully are directly undermined, and, as a result, the communities they return to are less safe.

Registrants' families are also affected. When a registrant is un- or underemployed, their family members experience resulting financial hardship.⁸² And as with finances, registrants' family members are affected by housing disruption and forced relocation when registrants struggle to secure stable housing.⁸³ Registrants' family members also experience stigmatization (particularly for registrants' children), harassment, threats, and violence—all of which impact the mental health of registrants' family members.⁸⁴

That SORN laws do not prevent sexual violence and are counterproductive to successful reintegration is enough to call for a change in sexual violence policy. But these laws also inflict palpable harm to registrants, their families, and their communities. Decades after SORN laws were first implemented, the evidence is clear that SORN laws have failed.

CONCLUSION

Experts on sexual violence policy recognize that SORN laws do not reduce sexual offense recidivism. The gratuitous burdens that SORN laws impose on registrants and their families harm both them and the communities in which they live. Those communities would benefit from shifting the resources currently devoted to administering SORN laws to funding interventions to reduce the incidence of sexual violence that are effective, including primary prevention⁸⁵, support services for victims/survivors, and reentry and treatment programs to facilitate the reintegration to civil society of people who have sexually offended.

¹ Kristen M. Zgoba & Meghan M. Mitchell, *The Effectiveness of Sex Offender Registration and Notification: A Meta-Analysis of 25 Years of Findings*, 19 JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY 71, 72 (2023) (citing to the most recent estimate from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children).

² For a detailed history of the origins of these laws, see Wayne A. Logan, *Origins and Evolution*, in SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION AND COMMUNITY NOTIFICATION LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 5-13 (Wayne A. Logan & J.J. Prescott eds., 2021) [hereinafter "SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION"]. For a detailed discussion of tribal jurisdictions' SORN codes, see Virginia Davis & Kevin Washburn, *Sex Offender Registration in Indian Country*, 6 OHIO STATE JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW 3 (2008).

³ Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act, Pub. L. 103-322, 108 Stat. 1796, 2038 (1994).

⁴ Megan's Law, Pub. L. 104-145, 110 Stat. 1345 (1996) (amending 42 U.S.C. § 14071(d)).

⁵ Alissa R. Ackerman, *Registries and Registrants: Research on the Composition of Registries*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 35.

⁶ See generally Andrew J. Harris & Scott M. Walfield, *Variations in the Structure and Operation of SORN Systems*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION.

⁷ Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, Pub. L. 109-248, title I, §16901, 120 Stat. 590 (2006) (This is part of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, originally codified at 42 U.S.C. § 16901 and reclassified to 34 U.S.C. § 20901 et. seq.) (repealing 42 U.S.C. § 14071).

⁸ See *Current Law*, OFFICE OF SEX OFFENDER SENTENCING, MONITORING, APPREHENDING, REGISTERING, AND TRACKING [hereinafter "SMART Office"], <https://smart.ojp.gov/sorna/current-law> (last visited September 23, 2024); see also *SORNA: Tribal Election, Delegation to*

the State and Right of Access, SMART OFFICE, <https://smart.ojp.gov/sorna/current-law/implementation-documents/tribal-election-delegation-state-and-right-access> (last visited January 24, 2025).

⁹ Kristen M. Zgoba & Meghan M. Mitchell, *The Effectiveness of Sex Offender Registration and Notification: A Meta-Analysis of 25 Years of Findings*, 19 JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY 71, 72 (2023) (citing to David M. Bierie, *The Utility of Sex Offender Registration: A Research Note*, 22 JOURNAL OF SEXUAL AGGRESSION 263 (2016); Jill S. Levenson, David A. D'Amora & Andrea L. Hern, *Megan's Law and its Impact on Community Re-entry for Sex Offenders*, 25 BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES & THE LAW 587 (2007); NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSOCIATION, SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING INITIATIVE (2017); Richard Tewksbury & Matthew B. Lees, *Perceptions of Punishment: How Registered Sex Offenders View Registries*, 53 CRIME & DELINQUENCY 380 (2007)).

¹⁰ Kristen M. Zgoba & Meghan M. Mitchell, *The Effectiveness of Sex Offender Registration and Notification: A Meta-Analysis of 25 Years of Findings*, 19 JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY 71, 73 (2023) (citing SCOTT MATSON & ROXANNE LIEB, WASHINGTON INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC POLICY, MEGAN'S LAW: A REVIEW OF STATE LEGISLATION DOCUMENT No. 97-10-1101 (1997); Laura M. Ragusa-Salerno & Kristen M. Zgoba, *Taking Stock of 20 Years of Sex Offender Laws and Research: An Examination of Whether Sex Offender Legislation has Helped or Hindered Our Efforts*, 35 JOURNAL OF CRIME AND JUSTICE 335 (2012)).

¹¹ See Kristen M. Zgoba & Richard Tewksbury, *Law Enforcement and SORN*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 50-51 (describing generally the registration and verification process); Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 128-129 (explaining that noncompliance is often unintentional and can be explained by the burdensome requirements of registration and the life circumstances of many registrants); see generally Tanja C. Link, Melanie Holland & Joey Villemez, *Crossing the Line: A Comprehensive Analysis of Jurisdictional Variations in SORNA Statutes*, 30 PSYCHOLOGY, PUBLIC POLICY, AND LAW 159 (2023) (describing the lack of uniformity and clarity in SORN statutes, which can jeopardize compliance efforts); and see generally David A. Makin, Andrea M. Walker & Christopher M. Campbell, *Paying to be Punished: A Statutory Analysis of Sex Offender Registration Fees*, 37 CRIMINAL JUSTICE ETHICS 215 (2018) (reviewing statutory language in all fifty states and the District of Columbia to identify jurisdictions that impose registration costs onto registrants, and the amount and frequency that registrants must pay).

¹² 18 U.S.C. § 2250. Failure to register.

¹³ See, e.g., Minn. Stat. § 243.166.5 Registration of predatory offenders. Criminal penalty.

¹⁴ Kristen M. Zgoba & Richard Tewksbury, *Law Enforcement and SORN*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 50-51.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 51.

¹⁶ CALIFORNIA SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT BOARD, WHAT YOU MAY NOT KNOW ABOUT CALIFORNIA'S SEX OFFENDER REGISTRY 13 (2017), available at https://casomb.org/pdf/CASOMB_Education_Pamphlet.pdf (last visited September 26, 2024).

¹⁷ Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 90 (citing to Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Sex Offender Law and the Geography of Victimization*, 11 JOURNAL OF EMPIRICAL LEGAL STUDIES 786 (2014)).

¹⁸ Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 89-90 (citing to James E. Larsen, Kenneth J. Lowrey & Joseph W. Coleman, *The Effect of Proximity to a Registered Sex Offender's Residence on Single-Family House Selling Price*, 71 APPRAISAL JOURNAL 253 (2003); Leigh Linden & Jonah E. Rockoff, *Estimates of the Impact of Crime Risk on Property Values from Megan's Law*, 98 AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW 1103 (2008); Jaren C. Pope, *Fear of Crime and Housing Prices: Household Reactions to Sex Offender Registries*, 64 JOURNAL OF URBAN ECONOMICS 601 (2008); Steven B. Caudill, Ermanno Affuso & Ming Yang, *Registered Sex Offenders and House Prices: An Hedonic Analysis*, 52 URBAN STUDIES 2425 (2015); John C. Navarro & Cara Rabe-Hemp, *The Financial Impact of Registered Sex Offenders on Home Sale Prices: A Case Study of McLean County, Illinois*, 4 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RURAL CRIMINOLOGY 87 (2018); but see John C. Navarro & Matt Ruther, *A Geospatial Analysis Between the Sale Prices of Single-Family Properties and the Presence of Registered Sex Offenders in Jefferson County, Kentucky*, URBAN STUDIES, 1-15 (2018) (final version available at 57 Urban Studies 944 (2020))(finding no relationship between registrants and decreased property values)).

¹⁹ See Eric S. Janus, *Preventing Sexual Violence: Alternatives to Worrying About Recidivism*, 103 MARQUETTE LAW REVIEW 819, 825-836 (2020).

²⁰ See Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 138 (citing to J.J. Prescott & Jonah E. Rockoff, *Do Sex Offender Registration and Notification Laws Affect Criminal Behavior?*, 54 JOURNAL OF LAW AND ECONOMICS, 161 (2011)); and Jill S. Levenson, *Integrating the Etiology of Sexual Offending into Evidence-Based Policy and Practices*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 151 (citing to BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, SEXUAL ASSAULT OF YOUNG CHILDREN AS REPORTED TO LAW ENFORCEMENT: VICTIM, INCIDENT, AND OFFENDER CHARACTERISTICS (NCJ 182990) (2000), www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/saycrle.pdf); Lucy Berliner, Donna Schram, Lisa L. Miller, Cheryl Darling Milloy, *A Sentencing Alternative for Sex Offenders: A Study of Decision Making and Recidivism*, 10 JOURNAL OF INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE 487 (1995); BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION (NCJ 199994) (2002), www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/cvictgen.htm; Grant Duwe, William Donnay & Richard Tewksbury, *Does Residential Proximity Matter? A Geographic Analysis of Sex Offense Recidivism*, 35 CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR 484 (2008); Paul A. Zandbergen, Jill S. Levenson & Timothy C. Hart, *Residential Proximity to Schools and Daycares: An Empirical Analysis of Sex Offense Recidivism*, 37 CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR 482 (2010); Nicole Colombino, Cynthia Calkins Mercado, Jill S. Levenson & Elizabeth Jeglic, *Preventing Sexual Violence: Can Examination of Offense Location Inform Sex Crime Policy?* 34 INTERNATIONAL

JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY AND LAW 160 (2011); Melanie Clark Mogavero & Leslie W. Kennedy, *The Social and Geographic Patterns of Sexual Offending: Is Sex Offender Residence Restriction Legislation Practical?* 12 VICTIMS & OFFENDERS 401 (2017)).

²¹ See Eric S. Janus, *Preventing Sexual Violence: Alternatives to Worrying About Recidivism*, 103 MARQUETTE LAW REVIEW 819, 832, 835 (2020) (citing to MARIEL ALPER & MATTHEW R. DUROSE, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, RECIDIVISM OF SEX OFFENDERS RELEASED FROM STATE PRISON: A 9-YEAR FOLLOW-UP (2005–14) 4 (2019), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsorsp9yfu0514.pdf> (finding that, of people who had been convicted of a sex offense and subsequently released from prison, 92.3% were not rearrested for a new sex offense in the nine-year follow up period); Kelly K. Bonnar-Kidd, *Sexual Offender Laws and Prevention of Sexual Violence or Recidivism*, 100 AM J PUB. HEALTH 412, 414 (2010) (finding that 96% of all arrests for sexual crimes in N.Y. involved individuals without previous sex offense convictions); Jeffrey C. Sandler, Naomi J. Freeman & Kelly M. Socia, *Does a Watched Pot Boil? A Time-Series Analysis of New York State's Sex Offender Registration and Notification Law*, 14 PSYCHOLOGY, PUBLIC POLICY, AND LAW 284, 295 (2008) (showing that 95% of arrests for sex offenses in N.Y. between 1986 and 2006 were of people who had not previously sexually offended); PATRICK A. LANGAN, ERICA L. SCHMITT & MATTHEW R. DUROSE, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, RECIDIVISM OF SEX OFFENDERS RELEASED FROM PRISON IN 1994 11 (2003), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsorp94.pdf> (finding that, of the people convicted of sex offense who were released from prisons in 1994, 86% had no prior conviction for a sex offense); MATTHEW R. DUROSE, ALEXIA D. COOPER & HOWARD N. SNYDER, U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, RECIDIVISM OF PRISONERS RELEASED IN 30 STATES IN 2005: PATTERNS FROM 2005 TO 2010 10 (2014), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rprts05p0510.pdf> (finding that, of people released from prisons in 2005, 84% had no prior conviction for a sex offense); Joshua Vaughn, *Failure-to-Comply Arrests Reveal Flaws in Sex Offender Registries*, APPEAL (Aug. 1, 2018), <https://theappeal.org/skyrocketing-charges-for-failing-to-comply-with-sexoffender-registries-reveal-their-flaws/> (observing that 96% of people charged with a sex offense in PA in 2016 had no criminal history of sexual violence); Brian Collins, Minn. Dep't of Corr., Presentation at the 2017 MnATSA Conference: Residency Restrictions: Sound Public Policy or Tinfoil Hats? (Apr. 21, 2017) (on file with author) (finding that 93% of all sex offense convictions in MN had no prior conviction for criminal sexual conduct); and Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 138 (citing to Jeffrey C. Sandler, Naomi J. Freeman & Kelly M. Socia, *Does a Watched Pot Boil? A Time-Series Analysis of New York State's Sex Offender Registration and Notification Law*, 14 PSYCHOLOGY, PUBLIC POLICY, AND LAW 284 (2008); and Jill S. Levenson and Kristen M. Zgoba, *Community Protection Policies and Repeat Sexual Offenses in Florida*, 60 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF OFFENDER THERAPY AND COMPARATIVE CRIMINOLOGY 1140 (2016)) (noting that individuals who have not previously been arrested for a sex offense necessarily have not been convicted of one).

²² Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 109, 130; see also Kristen M. Zgoba & Meghan M. Mitchell, *The Effectiveness of Sex Offender Registration and Notification: A Meta-Analysis of 25 Years of Findings*, 19 JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY 71, 89, 92 (2023).

²³ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 109.

²⁴ J.J. Prescott & Jonah E. Rockoff, *Do Sex Offender Registration and Notification Laws Affect Criminal Behavior?*, 54 JOURNAL OF LAW AND ECONOMICS 161 (2011).

²⁵ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 110-111 (citing to J.J. Prescott & Jonah E. Rockoff, *Do Sex Offender Registration and Notification Laws Affect Criminal Behavior?*, 54 JOURNAL OF LAW AND ECONOMICS 161 (2011)).

²⁶ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 111.

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ Amanda Y. Agan, *Sex Offender Registries: Fear Without Function?*, 54 JOURNAL OF LAW AND ECONOMICS 207 (2011).

²⁹ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 115 (citing to Amanda Y. Agan, *Sex Offender Registries: Fear Without Function?*, 54 JOURNAL OF LAW AND ECONOMICS 207 (2011)).

³⁰ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 111.

³¹ *Id.* at 116-117 (citing to Jeffrey C. Sandler, Naomi J. Freeman & Kelly M. Socia, *Does A Watched Pot Boil? A Time-Series Analysis of New York State's Sex Offender Registration and Notification Law*, 14 PSYCHOLOGY, PUBLIC POLICY, AND LAW 284 (2008)).

³² Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 117 (citing to Elizabeth J. Letourneau, Jill S. Levenson, Dipankar Bandyopadhyay, Kevin Armstrong & Debajyoti Sinha, *Effects of South Carolina's Sex Offender Registration and Notification Policy on Deterrence of Adult Sex Crimes*, 37 CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR 435 (2010)).

³³ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 116 (citing to Sean Maddan, *Sex Offenders as Outsiders: A Reexamination of the Labeling Perspective Utilizing Current Sex Offender Registration and Notification Policies* (2005) (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska); SEAN MADDAN, *THE LABELING OF SEX OFFENDERS: THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF THE BEST INTENTIONED POLICIES* (2008); Sean Maddan, J. Mitchell Miller, Jeffery T. Walker & Ineke Haen Marshall, *Utilizing Criminal History Information to Explore the Effect of Community Notification on Sex Offender Recidivism*, 28 JUSTICE QUARTERLY 303 (2011)).

- ³⁴ Amanda Agan and J.J. Prescott, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 118 (citing to Jeff A. Bouffard & LaQuana N. Askew, *Time-Series Analyses of the Impact of Sex Offender Registration and Notification Law Implementation and Subsequent Modifications on Rates of Sexual Offenses*, *CRIME & DELINQUENCY* 1-30 (2019) (final version available at 65 *CRIME & DELINQUENCY* 1483 (2019))).
- ³⁵ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 118-120 (citing to Grant Duwe & William Donnay, *The Impact of Megan’s Law on Sex Offender Recidivism: The Minnesota Experience*, 46 *CRIMINOLOGY* 411 (2008)).
- ³⁶ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 109, 120 (citing to Grant Duwe & William Donnay, *The Impact of Megan’s Law on Sex Offender Recidivism: The Minnesota Experience*, 46 *CRIMINOLOGY* 411 (2008)).
- ³⁷ Kristen M. Zgoba & Meghan M. Mitchell, *The Effectiveness of Sex Offender Registration and Notification: A Meta-Analysis of 25 Years of Findings*, 19 *JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY* 71 (2023) (originally available as an advance online publication in 2021).
- ³⁸ *Id.* at 76.
- ³⁹ *Id.* at 89.
- ⁴⁰ Patrick Lussier, Evan McCuish & Elizabeth L. Jeglic, *Against All Odds: The Unexplained Sexual Recidivism Drop in the United States and Canada*, 52 *CRIME AND JUSTICE* 125 (2023).
- ⁴¹ *Id.* at 126.
- ⁴² The discussion of the Model Penal Code and the 2022 SMART Office Report are extensively based on the work of Professor Ira Ellman. See Brief of *Amici Curiae* Scholars of Criminal Justice, Economics, Law Psychology, Social Work, and Sociology in Support of Summary Judgment for Plaintiffs at 21, 23-24. *Does v. Whitmer (Does III)*, No. 22-cv-10209 (E. D. Mich. 2024).
- ⁴³ SANFORD H. KADISH, STEPHEN J. SCHULHOFER & RACHEL E. BARKOW, *CRIMINAL LAW AND ITS PROCESSES: CASES AND MATERIALS* 189 (11th ed. 2022).
- ⁴⁴ *Frequently Asked Questions*, AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE, <https://www.ali.org/faq> [click “Who works on ALI projects?”] (last visited December 2, 2024).
- ⁴⁵ STEPHEN J. SCHULHOFER, REPORTERS’ MEMORANDUM TO MODEL PENAL CODE: SEXUAL ASSAULT AND RELATED OFFENSES TENTATIVE DRAFT NO. 6 (2022), <https://www.thealiadviser.org/sexual-assault/reporters-memorandum-for-model-penal-code-sexual-assault-and-related-offenses-tentative-draft-no-6> (last visited December 2, 2024).
- ⁴⁶ *Id.*
- ⁴⁷ MODEL PENAL CODE: SEXUAL ASSAULT AND RELATED OFFENSES § 213.11H(1)-(2) (AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE 2022).
- ⁴⁸ *Id.*
- ⁴⁹ FEDERAL RESEARCH DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, *SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION AND NOTIFICATION ACT—SUMMARY AND ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH 2* (2022), available at <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/smart/305231.pdf>.
- ⁵⁰ *Id.* at 18-19.
- ⁵¹ See Elizabeth J. Letourneau & Kevin S. Armstrong, *Recidivism Rates for Registered and Nonregistered Juvenile Sexual Offenders*, 20 *SEXUAL ABUSE* 393 (2008).
- ⁵² Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 121.
- ⁵³ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 122-123 (citing to Elizabeth J. Letourneau, Jill S. Levenson, Dipankar Bandyopadhyay, Kevin S. Armstrong & Debajyoti Sinha, *Effects of South Carolina’s Sex Offender Registration and Notification Policy on Deterrence of Adult Sex Crimes*, 37 *CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR* 435 (2010); Jin-Hong Park, Dipankar Bandyopadhyay & Elizabeth Letourneau, *Examining Deterrence of Adult Sex Crimes: A Semi-parametric Intervention Time Series Approach*, 69 *COMPUTATIONAL STATISTICS & DATA ANALYSIS* 198 (2014)).
- ⁵⁴ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 123-124 (citing to J.J. Prescott & Jonah E. Rockoff, *Do Sex Offender Registration and Notification Laws Affect Criminal Behavior?*, 54 *JOURNAL OF LAW AND ECONOMICS* 161 (2011)).
- ⁵⁵ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 122 (citing to Jeffrey C. Sandler, Naomi J. Freeman & Kelly M. Socia, *Does A Watched Pot Boil? A Time-Series Analysis of New York State’s Sex Offender Registration and Notification Law*, 14 *PSYCHOLOGY, PUBLIC POLICY, AND LAW* 284 (2008)).
- ⁵⁶ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 123 n.35 (citing to Elizabeth J. Letourneau, Ryan T. Shields, Reshmi Nair, Geoffrey Kahn, Jeffrey C. Sandler & Donna M. Vandiver, *Juvenile Registration and Notification Policies Fail to Prevent First-Time Sexual Offenses: An Extension of Findings to Two New States*, 30 *CRIMINAL JUSTICE POLICY REVIEW* 1109 (2018)).
- ⁵⁷ Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 124.
- ⁵⁸ See e.g., Giulia Lowe & Gwenda Willis, *“Sex Offender” Versus “Person”: The Influence of Labels on the Willingness to Volunteer with People Who have Sexually Abused*, 32 *SEXUAL ABUSE* 591, 593 (2020) (citing to Svenja Göbbels, Tony Ward & Gwenda M. Willis, *An Integrative Theory of Desistance from Sex Offending*, 17 *AGGRESSION AND VIOLENT BEHAVIOR* 453 (2012)).
- ⁵⁹ See e.g., Amanda Agan & J.J. Prescott, *Offenders and SORN Laws*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 111, 130; and Jill S. Levenson, *Integrating the Etiology of Sexual Offending into Evidence-Based Policy and Practices*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 153; see also J.J. Prescott, *Portmanteau Ascendant: Post-Release Regulations and Sex Offender Recidivism*, 48

CONNECTICUT LAW REVIEW 1035, 1055-1056 (2016); and J.J. Prescott, *Do Sex Offender Registries Make Us Less Safe?*, 35 REGULATION 48, 55 (2012).

⁵⁹ Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 85 (citing to Jill S. Levenson & Richard Tewksbury, *Collateral Damage: Family Members of Registered Sex Offenders*, 34 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE 54 (2009)).

⁶⁰ Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 79 (citing to Robert Apel & Gary Sweeten, *The Impact of Incarceration on Employment during the Transition to Adulthood*, 57 SOCIAL PROBLEMS 448 (2010); Harry Holzer, Steven Raphael & Michael A. Stoll, *Employment Barriers Facing Ex-Offenders*, Washington, DC (Urban Institute Reentry Roundtable Discussion Paper, May 19, 2003), www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410855_holzer.pdf; Becky Pettit & Christopher Lyons, *Status and the Stigma of Incarceration: The Labor-Market Effects of Incarceration, by Race, Class, and Criminal Involvement*, in *BARRIERS TO REENTRY? THE LABOR MARKET FOR RELEASED PRISONERS IN POST-INDUSTRIAL AMERICA* 203-226 (Shawn Bushway, Michael Stoll & David Weiman eds., 2007); AMY L. SOLOMON, KELLY DEDEL JOHNSON, JEREMY TRAVIS & ELIZABETH CINCOTTA MCBRIDE, URBAN INSTITUTE, *FROM PRISON TO WORK: THE EMPLOYMENT DIMENSIONS OF PRISONER REENTRY* (2004), www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411097)).

⁶¹ Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 79 (citing to CSOM [CENTER FOR SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT], *Managing the Challenges of Sex Offender Reentry*, 10 (2007)).

⁶² Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 79-80 (citing to Keri B. Burchfield & William Mingus, *Not in My Neighborhood: Assessing Registered Sex Offenders' Experiences with Local Social Capital and Social Control*, 35 CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR 356 (2008); Richard Tewksbury & Matthew B. Lees, *Perceptions of Sex Offender Registration: Collateral Consequences and Community Experiences*, 26 SOCIOLOGICAL SPECTRUM 309 (2006); Monica L.P. Robbers, *Lifers on the Outside: Sex Offenders and Disintegrative Shaming*, 53 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF OFFENDER THERAPY AND COMPARATIVE CRIMINOLOGY 5 (2009)).

⁶³ See, e.g., La. Stat. Ann. § 15:553 (2023) Prohibition of employment for certain sex offenders (listing types of employment that registrants cannot perform on pain of punishment in Louisiana).

⁶⁴ See Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 79 (citing to Vanessa Woodward Griffin & Mary Evans, *The Duality of Stigmatization: An Examination of Differences in Collateral Consequences for Black and White Sex Offenders*, JUSTICE QUARTERLY, Advance Online Publication (2019) (final version available at 38 JUSTICE QUARTERLY 1019 (2019)); Cynthia Calkins Mercado, Shea Alvarez & Jill Levenson, *The Impact of Specialized Sex Offender Legislation on Community Reentry*, 20 SEXUAL ABUSE 188 (2008); Monica L. P. Robbers, *Lifers on the Outside: Sex Offenders and Disintegrative Shaming*, 53 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF OFFENDER THERAPY AND COMPARATIVE CRIMINOLOGY 5 (2009)).

⁶⁵ Residency restrictions also significantly limit housing options for registrants because such laws prohibit registrants from living (or staying) in certain areas. However, because residency restrictions are not necessarily a component of SORN laws, this brief does not address these laws specifically.

⁶⁶ Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 80-81 (citing to Naomi Kunstler & Jack Tsai, *Understanding Landlord Perspectives on Applications with Sex Offenses*, 23 HOUSING, CARE AND SUPPORT 27 (2020) (finding that 44% of landlords “will not rent to individuals with a history of sexual offending” and that an additional 36% would only do so “under conditions not necessarily required of other applicants (e.g., stable housing history)”); see also Douglas N. Evans & Jeremy R. Porter, *Criminal History and Landlord Rental Decisions: A New York Quasi-Experimental Study*, 11 JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY 21 (2015) (finding that prospective tenants who revealed a prior conviction for child molestation were significantly more likely to be excluded from consideration than those who revealed a prior felony conviction for drug trafficking).

⁶⁷ Shawn M. Rolfe, Richard Tewksbury & Ryan D. Schroeder, *Homeless Shelters' Policies on Sex Offenders: Is This Another Collateral Consequence?*, 61 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF OFFENDER THERAPY AND COMPARATIVE CRIMINOLOGY 1833, 1834 (2017) (citing to 42 U.S.C. §13663).

⁶⁸ See Mary Helen McNeal & Patricia Warth, *Barred Forever: Seniors, Housing, and Sex Offense Registration*, 22 KANSAS JOURNAL OF LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY 317, 334-343 (2013).

⁶⁹ Shawn M. Rolfe, Richard Tewksbury & Ryan D. Schroeder, *Homeless Shelters' Policies on Sex Offenders: Is This Another Collateral Consequence?*, 61 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF OFFENDER THERAPY AND COMPARATIVE CRIMINOLOGY, 1833, 1834 (2017).

⁷⁰ See David M. Reutter, *Sex Offenders Excluded from Florida Shelters During Hurricane*, PRISON LEGAL NEWS (November 5, 2019), <https://www.prisonlegalnews.org/news/2019/nov/5/sex-offenders-excluded-florida-shelters-during-hurricane/>. At the time of publication, a new bill has been proposed to the United States House of Representatives that would ban registrants from emergency shelters or face fines and imprisonment. Jackson Walker, *Nancy Mace Proposes Banning Sex Offenders from Sharing Emergency Shelters with Women, Kids*, THE NATIONAL NEWS DESK (December 12, 2024), <https://nbcmontana.com/news/nation-world/nancy-mace-proposes-banning-sex-offenders-from-sharing-emergency-shelters-with-women-kids-safe-shelters-act-of-2024-bill>.

⁷¹ Douglas Evans, Adam Trahan & Kaleigh Laird, *Shame and Blame: Secondary Stigma Among Families of Convicted Sex Offenders*, 23 CRIMINOLOGY AND JUSTICE 78, 79 (2021); see also Douglas N. Evans & Michelle A. Cubellis, *Coping with Stigma: How Registered*

Sex Offenders Manage their Public Identities, 40 *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 593, 595 (2015) (describing how SORN laws have “enhanced the stigmatization of [registrants]” who were previously “somewhat insulated from social stigmatization”).

⁷² See Douglas N. Evans & Michelle A. Cubellis, *Coping with Stigma: How Registered Sex Offenders Manage their Public Identities*, 40 *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 593, 594 (2015) (“[SORN] laws [] formally and publicly label [registrants] as sex offenders”).

⁷³ See Andrew J. Harris & Kelly M. Socia, *What’s in a Name? Evaluating the Effects of the “Sex Offender” Label on Public Opinions and Beliefs*, 28 *SEXUAL ABUSE* 660, 661 (2016) (citing to Stacey Katz-Schiavone, Jill S. Levenson & Alissa R. Ackerman, *Myths and Facts About Sexual Violence: Public Perceptions and Implications for Prevention*, 15 *JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND POPULAR CULTURE*, 291 (2008); Jill S. Levenson, Yolanda N. Brannon, Timothy Fortney & Juanita Baker, *Public Perceptions About Sex Offenders and Community Protection Policies*, 7 *ANALYSES OF SOCIAL ISSUES AND PUBLIC POLICY* 137 (2007)); see also Giulia Lowe & Gwenda Willis, “Sex Offender” Versus “Person”: The Influence of Labels on the Willingness to Volunteer with People Who have Sexually Abused, 32 *SEXUAL ABUSE* 591, 592 (2020) (citing to Justin T. Pickett, Christina Mancini & Daniel P. Mears, *Vulnerable Victims, Monstrous Offenders, and Unmanageable Risk: Explaining Public Opinion on the Social Control of Sex Crime*, 51 *CRIMINOLOGY* 729 (2013); James F. Quinn, Craig J. Forsyth & Carla Mullen-Quinn, *Societal Reaction to Sex Offenders: A Review of the Origins and Results of the Myths Surrounding their Crimes and Treatment Amenability*, 25 *DEVIANT BEHAVIOR*, 215 (2004)).

⁷⁴ See Andrew J. Harris & Kelly M. Socia, *What’s in a Name? Evaluating the Effects of the “Sex Offender” Label on Public Opinions and Beliefs*, 28 *SEXUAL ABUSE* 660 (2016) (finding that the sex offender label increases support for laws targeting people convicted of sex offenses); see also Giulia Lowe & Gwenda Willis, “Sex Offender” Versus “Person”: The Influence of Labels on the Willingness to Volunteer with People Who have Sexually Abused, 32 *SEXUAL ABUSE* 591 (2020) (finding that the sex offender label decreases the likelihood of potential volunteers to work with people with sex offenses).

⁷⁵ See Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 78, 86-87; see also Beth M. Huebner, Kimberly R. Kras & Breanne Pleggenkuhle, *Structural Discrimination and Social Stigma among Individuals Incarcerated for Sexual Offenses: Reentry across the Rural-Urban Continuum*, 57 *CRIMINOLOGY* 715, 717, 731 (2019); see also Danielle J.S. Bailey & Jennifer L. Klein, *Ashamed and Alone: Comparing Offender and Family Member Experiences with the Sex Offender Registry*, 43 *CRIMINAL JUSTICE REVIEW* 440, 443 (2018) (citing to Keri B. Burchfield & William Mingus, *Not In My Neighborhood: Assessing Registered Sex Offenders’ Experiences with Local Social Capital and Social Control*, 35 *CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR* 356 (2008); Jennifer L. Klein, Joseph Rukus & Katheryn Zambrana, *Do Experienced Behaviors Lead to Increased Shame and Strain for Registered Female Sex Offenders?* 9 *JUSTICE POLICY JOURNAL* 1 (2012); Jennifer L. Klein, Danielle Tolson & Cathy Collins, *Expressing Strain: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Testimonies of Female Sex Offenders*, 2 *JOURNAL OF QUALITATIVE CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND CRIMINOLOGY* 119 (2014); Richard Tewksbury, *Experiences and Attitudes of Registered Female Sex Offenders*, 68 *FEDERAL PROBATION* 30 (2004); Richard Tewksbury, *Collateral Consequences of Sex Offender Registration*, 21 *JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY CRIMINAL JUSTICE* 67 (2005); Richard G. Zevitz & Mary Ann Farkas, *Sex Offender Community Notification: Managing High Risk Criminals or Exacting Further Vengeance?* 18 *BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND THE LAW* 375 (2000) (describing consequences of living “under the formal label of ‘registered sex offender,’” which include harassment, physical assault, and public ridicule); see also J.J. Prescott, *Portmanteau Ascendant: Post-Release Regulations and Sex Offender Recidivism*, 48 *CONNECTICUT LAW REVIEW* 1035, 1056 (2016) (citing to Michael P. Lasher & Robert J. McGrath, *The Impact of Community Notification on Sex Offender Reintegration: A Quantitative Review of the Research Literature*, 56 *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF OFFENDER THERAPY & COMPARATIVE CRIMINOLOGY* 6 (2012); Richard Tewksbury, *Collateral Consequences of Sex Offender Registration*, 21 *JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY CRIMINAL JUSTICE* 67 (2005); Steven Yoder, *Life on the List*, *AMERICAN PROSPECT* (April 4, 2011), <http://www.prospect.org/article/life-list>) (noting that harassment and violent assault by community members are “particularly salient consequence[s] of making the identities and address of known sex offenders broadly available to the community”); see also Mycah Hatfield, *Man accused of killing sex offender said police not doing enough against pedophiles, records allege*, *ABC 13* (February 1, 2024), <https://abc13.com/houston-deadly-shooting-sean-connelly-showers-registered-sex-offender-killed-james-lewis-spencer-iii-accused-of-murder/14379164/> (reporting on the targeting and killing of a registrant in Texas).

⁷⁶ See Beth M. Huebner, Kimberly R. Kras & Breanne Pleggenkuhle, *Structural Discrimination and Social Stigma among Individuals Incarcerated for Sexual Offenses: Reentry across the Rural-Urban Continuum*, 57 *CRIMINOLOGY* 715, 726, 728, 730 (2019); Douglas N. Evans & Michelle A. Cubellis, *Coping with Stigma: How Registered Sex Offenders Manage their Public Identities*, 40 *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 593, 607-609 (2015).

⁷⁷ See Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 85 (citing to Danielle J.S. Bailey & Jennifer L. Klein, *Ashamed and Alone: Comparing Offender and Family Member Experiences with the Sex Offender Registry*, 43 *CRIMINAL JUSTICE REVIEW* 440 (2018)).

⁷⁸ Jill S. Levenson, *Integrating the Etiology of Sexual Offending into Evidence-Based Policy and Practices*, in *SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION* 154 (citing to Rebecca L. Fix, Kelli R. Thompson, Elizabeth J. Letourneau & Barry R. Burkhart, *Development and Psychometric Properties of the Concerns About Juvenile Sex Offender Registration and Notification Questionnaire (C-JSORNQ)*. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* (2020) (final version available at 18 *SEXUALITY RESEARCH & SOCIAL POLICY* 397 (2021)); Elizabeth L. Jeglic, Cynthia Calkins Mercado & Jill S. Levenson, *The Prevalence and Correlates of Depression and Hopelessness among Sex*

Offenders Subject to Community Notification and Residence Restriction Legislation, 37 JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE 46 (2011); Jill S. Levenson & Leo P. Cotter, *The Effect of Megan's Law on Sex Offender Reintegration*, 21 JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY CRIMINAL JUSTICE 49 (2005); Jill S. Levenson, David A. D'Amora & Andrea Hern, *Megan's Law and Its Impact on Community Re-entry for Sex Offenders*, 25 BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES & LAW 587 (2007), Richard Tewksbury & Elizabeth Mustaine, *Stress and Collateral Consequences for Registered Sex Offenders*, 15 JOURNAL OF PUBLIC MANAGEMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY 215 (2009)).

⁷⁹ Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 85 (citing to Danielle J.S. Bailey & Jennifer L. Klein, *Ashamed and Alone: Comparing Offender and Family Member Experiences with the Sex Offender Registry*, 43 CRIMINAL JUSTICE REVIEW 440 (2018)).

⁸⁰ Elizabeth J. Letourneau, *Juvenile Registration and Notification Are Failed Policies That Must End*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 173-174 (citing to HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH, RAISED ON THE REGISTRY: THE IRREPARABLE HARM OF PLACING CHILDREN ON SEX OFFENDER REGISTRIES IN THE U.S. (2013), available at: <https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/05/01/raised-registry/irreparable-harm-placing-children-sex-offender-registries-us>; Andrew J. Harris, Scott M. Walfield, Ryan T. Shields & Elizabeth J. Letourneau, *Collateral consequences of juvenile sex offender registration and notification: Results from a survey of treatment providers* 28 SEXUAL ABUSE: JOURNAL OF RESEARCH AND TREATMENT 770 (2016); Elizabeth J. Letourneau, Cindy M. Schaeffer, Catherine P. Bradshaw & Kenneth A. Feder, *Preventing the Onset of Child Sexual Abuse by Targeting Adolescents with Universal Prevention Programming*, 22 CHILD MALTREATMENT 100 (2017)).

⁸¹ See Jill S. Levenson, *Integrating the Etiology of Sexual Offending into Evidence-Based Policy and Practices*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 150, 153-157.

⁸² Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 85 (citing to Jill S. Levenson & Richard Tewksbury, *Collateral Damage: Family Members of Registered Sex Offenders*, 34 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE 54 (2009)).

⁸³ Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 85 (citing to Danielle J.S. Bailey & Jennifer L. Klein, *Ashamed and Alone: Comparing Offender and Family Member Experiences with the Sex Offender Registry*, 43 CRIMINAL JUSTICE REVIEW 440 (2018); Jill S. Levenson & Richard Tewksbury, *Collateral Damage: Family Members of Registered Sex Offenders*, 34 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE 54 (2009); Richard Tewksbury & Jill S. Levenson, *Stress Experiences of Family Members of Registered Sex Offenders*, 27 BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES & THE LAW 611 (2009)).

⁸⁴ Kelly M. Socia, *The Ancillary Consequences of SORN*, in SORN LAWS: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION 85-87 (citing to Danielle J.S. Bailey & Jennifer L. Klein, *Ashamed and Alone: Comparing Offender and Family Member Experiences with the Sex Offender Registry*, 43 CRIMINAL JUSTICE REVIEW 440 (2018); Jill S. Levenson & Richard Tewksbury, *Collateral Damage: Family Members of Registered Sex Offenders*, 34 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE 54 (2009); Richard Tewksbury & Jill S. Levenson, *Stress Experiences of Family Members of Registered Sex Offenders*, 27 BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES & THE LAW 611 (2009)).

⁸⁵ *Prevention*, NATIONAL SEXUAL VIOLENCE RESOURCE CENTER, <https://www.nsvrc.org/prevention> (last visited September 23, 2024).