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Abstract

This paper explores the registered sexual offender (RSO) residency requirements, restrictions, and issues within Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe counties in Florida. While Florida statute 775.215 does not allow RSOs to live within 1,000 feet of a school, childcare facility, park, or playground, county and local ordinances often impose more restrictive residency requirements. Because of these requirements as well as more extensive residency restrictions on a county and city level, RSOs abiding by the requirements often end up living in clusters and/or colonies like the infamous Julia Tuttle Causeway cluster. As a result, these restrictions create clusters of SROs within socially disorganized areas, higher levels of transient SROs, and SROs who abscond and fail to report. This paper examines, though the use of ArcGIS 10.3, the number of registered RSOs that violate the state statute by where they live; and investigates the hot spots and residency clusters where they are in violation as well as in regulation as it pertains to the statute. Using the baseline of 1,000 feet, there are 905 RSOs (31% of the overall total RSOs) violating Florida statute within the tri-county area of Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe counties.
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Introduction

The subject of sexual offenders (RSOs), where they reside in proximity to schools, parks, as well as anywhere children might congregate, is met with conflicting views as well as heavy restrictions (Levenson & Cotter, 2005). Within Florida, state statute 775.215 (FLRR), residency restrictions for person convicted of certain sex offenses, restricts RSOs from residing within 1,000 feet of schools, parks, playgrounds, or childcare facilities (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2015). However, within each county and city (like Miami-Dade and Broward Counties), more restrictive requirements are often imposed by ordinance to 2,500 feet of schools, parks, playgrounds, child care facilities, bus stops, libraries, and other locations children are likely to congregate (Broward County Sheriff's Office, 2015). These state and local ordinances passed to protect potential victims, mostly children, by prohibiting RSOs contact with target-rich environments (Agan & Prescott, 2014). Even though there have been countless studies which state that excessive residency restrictions actually exacerbate and create “danger zones” of clusters of sex offenders, counties and cities are continuing to pass more stringent residency requirements (Wartell, 2009; Duwe, 2009; Wilson, 2009; Levenson, Ackerman, Socia, ________________
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These overarchign restrictions are producing clusters of RSOs that are ethically complex. Consequently, RSOs abiding by the rules often end up living in clusters like those seen in tent city under the Julia Tuttle Causeway, a street corner in Shorecrest, a trailer park in Allapattah, a parking lot near Hialeah, and more within the Tri-County area (Rabin C., 2014). In most of these instances, the SROs do not have adequate shelter, running water, electricity, or even a bathroom nearby for use (McCoy, 2014). Studies argue that by not allowing RSOs to live in areas near family, employment opportunities, and treatment centers, the likelihood of recidivating and/or failing to register becomes more conceivable (Wilson, 2009; Youstin & Nobels, 2009). Furthermore, some of these RSOs continually get evicted and displaced from one location to another after the city or town installs a park or passes an additional residency law to combat the RSOs from being allowed to live in the area (Wartell, 2009; Duwe, 2009; Wilson, 2009; Levenson, Ackerman, Socia, & Harris, 2013; Skipp & Campo-Flores, 2009).

The purpose of this paper is to probe into the residency restrictions within a tri-county area of Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe counties, discuss forced migration of RSOs due to residency restrictions, examine the hotspots of violators of the residency restrictions, and ascertain where RSOs are living legally according to Florida statute using ArcGIS.

Research Questions

1. Are RSOs living within Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe counties in Florida following the rules by registering and complying with residency requirements by not living within 1,000 feet of a school, child care facility, park, or playground according to FLRR?

2. Within Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe counties in Florida, what clusters of registered RSO residences exist that are in compliance with the state statute? What are the hot spots of those registered RSO residences that violate the 1,000 foot buffer zone?

Background

Florida contains over 70,000 RSOs on the FDLE books (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2015). However, when confined, dead, and deported RSOs are eliminated from this list, approximately 47,000 RSOs remain (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2015). Out of that amount, roughly 4% are listed as transient or have absconded, making it difficult for law enforcement to maintain tabs on this specific population (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2015). However, with county and local laws increasing the prohibited areas to reside, there are a subset of RSOs who would like to obey the law and live in South Florida, but are living on the street and being upheaved and displaced from one area to another (CBS Miami, 2012; McCoy, 2014; Lantigua, 2009; Levenson, Ackerman, Socia, & Harris, 2013; Linhardt, 2009; Rabin, Perez, & Castillo, 2013). Within the past seven years, there have been four high profile instances of city officials and law enforcement in South Florida displacing RSOs from deplorable conditions, like living under a bridge, or a street corner (CBS Miami, 2012; Duwe, 2009; Levenson, Ackerman, Socia, & Harris, 2013; Levenson & Cotter, 2005; Linhardt, 2009; McCoy, 2014; Odzer & Hamacher, 2012; Rabin, Perez, & Castillo, 2013; Rabin, 2014;
Reutter, 2015; Skipp & Campo-Flores, 2009; The Huffington Post, 2012). With local politicians admitting to creating parks and changing residency restrictions to effectively ban RSOs from living in their communities, the American Civil Liberties Union has stepped in to continue the fight against local government on behalf of RSOs (Hearne, 2015). To add to this ever growing high profile regarding the treatment of sex offenders in Florida, Sundance Film Fest winner for documentary in 2015, Pervert Park (Barkfors & Barkfors, 2015) shined the global spotlight on Florida’s RSOs again by portraying everyday life and struggles in a 120 member RSO colony in St. Petersburg, Pinellas County, Florida (Sundance Institute, 2016).

**Federal and State Laws**

In order to look at the residency restriction backlash, one first has to look at the laws, restrictions, and progression of severity of both on a federal and state level. There are three major federal laws that affect RSO registration and a handful of Florida laws, which in combination with federal laws, affect residency restrictions.

**Jacob Wetterling Act (1994)**

In 1994, the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offenders Registration Act passed Congress. This federal law stemmed from the highly media-covered kidnapping, sexual molestation, and murder of Jacob Wetterling by a stranger. The Jacob Wetterling Act created guidelines for tracking sex offenders by states and mandated states to track the residency of sex offenders after their release annually for ten years, or if they convicted of violent sex crimes, they would need to update their residence quarterly for their lifetime (Department of Justice, n.d.).

**Megan’s Law (1996)**

As an amendment to the Jacob Wetterling Act and passed in 1996, Megan’s Law requires law enforcement to notify the community regarding the residences of RSOs (Department of Justice, n.d.). Lobbied for and enacted after a highly publicized rape and murder of Megan Kanaka in 1994 by a neighbor previously convicted of sexual offenses against children. In order to protect the public, each state could then determine what information would be accessible to the public, and how the state residents would receive the information. Such information could include the RSO’s name, address, picture, offense, whether the victim was a minor, status of offender or predator, etc. (Department of Justice, n.d.). In Florida, under FLRR, law enforcement agencies, such as the county or city police, shall notify the public of sexual predator’s residences in a manner they deem fit in order to protect the public (The Florida Legislature, 2015). For sexual offenders and predators in all counties in Florida, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE), keeps a public record of the following: first, middle, and last name, incarceration status, whether they are a predator or offender, race, gender, hair and eye colors, height, weight, birthdate, permanent, temporary, and transient address, if the victim was a minor, and pictures (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2015). In some Florida counties, like Bradford, the Bradford County Police Department installed large red signs outside of homes where sexual predators reside; and deem that by doing so, they are following the public notification clause within FLRR and Megan’s Law (Taete, 2013).
Jimmy Ryce Involuntary Civil Commitment for Sexually Violent Predators’ Treatment and Care Act (1998)

In 1998, the Florida Legislature passed the Jimmy Ryce Involuntary Civil Commitment for Sexually Violent Predators’ Treatment and Care Act, commonly known as the Jimmy Ryce Act. The kidnapping, violent sexual battery, murder, and dismemberment of nine-year-old Jimmy Ryce prompted an outcry for justice and for tougher restrictions for sexual predators (Presley, 1999). The Act allows sexual offenders, upon release from incarceration, placed in custody for further evaluation and possibly civilly committed indefinitely if deemed that they pose a risk for re-offense and held at the Florida Civil Commitment Center in Arcadia, Florida (Correct Care Solutions, n.d.). As of 2014, over 70 men in the Civil Commitment Center are still waiting for civil commitment trials, some waiting as long as ten years to have their day in court (Salzhauer & Gordon, 2014).

Jessica’s Lunsford Act (2005)

Passed in Florida in 2005, with versions adopted by over forty states subsequently, Jessica’s Lunsford Act or Jessica’s Law originated with the kidnapping, rape, and murder of nine-year-old Jessica Lunsford by a career criminal with previous sexual offenses (Frank, 2010). Jessica’s Law established a mandatory sentence of twenty-five years for those committing specified sexual acts against children eleven-years-old and younger (Hawke, 2005). It also requires biannual registration by sexual predators and lifetime electric monitoring for certain offenders (Hawke, 2005).

Lauren Book Child Safety Ordinance (2005)

Passed in 2005 by Miami-Dade County in Florida, The Lauren Book Child Safety Ordinance, commonly referred to as Lauren’s Law, prohibits sexual predators and sexual offenders whose victims were under the age of 16 from residing within 2,500 feet of any school (Miami-Dade County, 2015). In addition, it prohibits RSOs from being in a county or municipal park or child care facility when a minor less than sixteen years old is present unless they are the parent or guardian of a child in the park or dropping or picking up their child registered at the facility (Miami-Dade County, 2015). Soon after its passage, several other cities and counties in Florida followed suit in creating a 2,500-foot restriction, a significant expansion from the state statute of 1,000-foot residency restriction of schools, parks, playgrounds, or childcare facilities (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2015). The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) continues to file suits against Miami-Dade and the City of Miami due to the lack of eligible living locations under the strict ordinance, and the forced inhumane living conditions that the RSOs reside in due to the restrictions (Hearne, 2015).


Passed in 2006 through Congress, The Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act or Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA) constructed a revised formulation of state’s implementation of registration and notification (Department of Justice, n.d.). SORNA expanded jurisdiction to Federally-recognized Indian tribes, increased the number of sex
of offenses that must be attained through registration, and established the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking (SMART Office) within the Department of Justice in order to help expedite and assist states with this updated process (Department of Justice, n.d.). Signed into law on the 25th anniversary of the abduction of six-year-old Adam Walsh from Hollywood Mall located in Hollywood, Florida, The Adam Walsh Act is the most comprehensive legislation with monitored compliance by states. However, to date, only 17 states (including Florida), 3 territories, and 63 tribes successfully fulfilled the SORNA requirements (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2014).

**Recidivism, Rehabilitation, and Residency Restrictions**

Ultimately, registration and residency restrictions guidelines should decrease recidivism as it limits the amount of contact of minors as well as monitor RSOs. However, there are several complex issues when discussing recidivism among RSOs. Recidivism rates might not reflect re-offense rates for several reasons, including that the sex offense might not be reported to law enforcement. Conversely, the RSO might have committed a nonsexual offense, such as parole violation (Przybylski). One of the largest studies of sex offender recidivism, completed by Langan, Schmitt, and Durose (2003), showed that male sex offenders compared to male non-sex offenders released in 1994, in 15 states, that sex offenders had an overall lower rearrests rate, 43%, compared to non-sex offenders at 68%. Of the sex offenders that were released, only 3.5% were reconvicted of a sex crime within that 3 year span of time (Langan, Schmitt, & Durose, 2003). Another large population study of recidivism of sex offenders in comparison to non-sex offenders by Sample and Bray, showed that the overall recidivism rates for sex offenders were lower than most categories of offenders except homicide and property damage (Are Sex Offenders Dangerous?, 2003). Hanson, Harris, Helmus, and Thorton (2013) contend that sexual recidivism among sexual offenders vary based on whether or not they are defined as high risk based on the Violence Risk Scale – Sexual Offender Version (VRS-SO), whether or not they are given exposure to treatment and support, and the period of time they were able to remain offense-free within society, similar to an aging out of crime process.

Even though RSOs comprise of one of the lowest recidivism rates among violent offenders, the majority of experts agree that the likelihood of recidivism increases as SROs are forced to live in socially disorganized areas (Wartell, 2009; Wilson, 2009; Levenson, Ackerman, Socia, & Harris, 2013; Mercado, Alvarez, & Levenson, 2008; Mustaine, Tweksbury, & Stengel, 2006). Residency restrictions often force offenders to live in rural or downtrodden areas, which in turn, limits access to treatment facilities and public resources that are critical in helping reintegration within society (Wartell, 2009; Wilson, 2009). In addition, living within these confines diminishes employment prospects and can create a snowball effect of homelessness and transience (Duwe, 2009; Levenson & Cotter, 2005). The ability to live in a residence with a roof, running water, with their family, to be gainfully employed, and have access to treatment facilities are key components to reducing recidivism among released offenders, especially for SROs (Duwe, 2009; Preston, 2009; Youstin & Nobels, 2009). Below are examples of areas within the Tri-County area of notorious clusters or colonies of SROs within the past several years.
Julia Tuttle Causeway Tent City

One of the most infamous examples of issues with balancing the RSO residency restrictions and actual livable area within Miami, Florida, is the Julia Tuttle Causeway Tent City. Stemming from tightening residency laws in 2005, from 1,000 feet away from schools, playgrounds, and parks to 2,500 feet, Tent City became the home of about 80 RSOs (Lantigua, 2009). Under the Causeway (I-195) between 2006 to 2009, due to strict residency requirements for registered RSOs, a makeshift village of tents and shacks ensued after probation officers would either recommend the camp or drop off newly released sex offenders (Rabin C., 2014). After national exposure and embarrassment, the City of Miami removed the RSOs and installed parks near the area, which would prohibit RSOs from legally living within the area (Bene, 2009).

Shorecrest Street Corner - Little River Pocket Park

After the national embarrassment regarding the Julia Tuttle Causeway tent city, there was still a pervasive issue: not enough places to live as a registered sex offender in the Tri-County area. Between 2011 and 2012, SROs started showing up on an abandoned lot on the corner of 10th Avenue and Northeast 79th Street, the Shorecrest neighborhood (The Huffington Post, 2012). Over twenty RSOs lived there after exhausting other living options. They sleep in cars, chairs or tents overnight and leave at dawn (CBS Miami, 2012). In reaction to and in order to prevent more RSOs from being allowed to live in the neighborhood, Miami-Dade County Commissioner Marc Sarnoff created a small, underfunded, and unattractive park named Little River Pocket Park (Rabin C., 2014). Sarnoff proudly admits to creating the park in order to keep sex offenders out of the community (CBS Miami, 2012).

River Park - Allapattah Trailer Park

In 2013, over 50 RSOs were living in a trailer park in Allapattah. However, The Miami Bridge Youth and Family Services, which houses troubled kids, was within 2,500 feet of the trailer park (Rabin, Perez, & Castillo, 2013). Consequently, probation officers ushered RSOs out of the trailer park (Puls, 2016). Because of the restrictive residence requirements, most of the RSOs moved to a parking lot in Westgate, an industrial area, near train tracks (Rabin C., 2014).

Westgate - Industrial parking lot

Located on NW 71st Street and 36th Court, RSOs sleep in a parking lot in an industrial area with no running water, bathroom, or electricity (McCoy, 2014). Over 200 RSOs now call this parking lot home, at least between the hours of 10p.m. to 6a.m., every night in order to be able to live in an area and not violate their sex offender registration (Reutter, 2015). After this development, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) is continuing to dispute the constitutionality of the county ordinance regarding residency restrictions (Rabin C., 2014; Puls, 2016).
**Pelican Lake Village - Miracle Village**

Conversely, there are communities that are emerging in the wake of a need for housing for RSOs. Established in 1990, Michael 25 Ministries operate and house RSOs in a compound, Miracle Village, on the edge of Palm Beach County in Pahokee, Florida (Matthew 25 Ministries, 2015). Within the community, there is a group of over 250 registered RSOs, some of them displaced after the breakup of the Julia Tuttle Causeway tent city (Matthew 25 Ministries, 2015; Worford, 2013). Matthew 25 Ministries helps to provide low cost, shared rooms, as well as reentry classes and counseling for RSOs (Matthew 25 Ministries, 2015). Miracle Village boasts a 0% recidivism rate, contending that these ex-offenders need the proper tools in order to reenter society successfully (Matthew 25 Ministries, 2015). While this alternative might be more attractive in terms of living conditions, are RSO villages desirable; or are they just another form of prison?

**Data & Methods**

**Data Gathering**

The FDLE maintains a comprehensive listing of RSOs in Monroe, Miami-Dade, and Broward Counties. Within this study, the real time data from FDLE was requested and accessed on November 3, 2015, which detailed the list of registered sex offenders and predators within each county. This list includes sexual predators and offenders, those who have died (kept on file for one year as public notice), who have absconded, who are confined, who were deported, who were released and needed to register, and those under the supervision of the State of Florida through their terms of probation (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2015). While there are statutory and definition differences between registered sex offenders and predators that are linked to the age of the victims as well as the number of instances, for this study, when the term RSO is utilized, both terms are included.

Upon first glance, without any cleaning up, the numbers of registered RSOs for the Tri-County area are Monroe – 243, Miami-Dade – 1682, Broward – 1018. However, due to the nature of this study, the listing was narrowed down to omit any RSOs who were deceased, confined, deported, and those who have absconded, as their location was either: no longer relevant threat to the community or they could not be tracked. As a result, the number of pertinent and trackable registered RSOs were Monroe – 217, Miami-Dade – 1372, and Broward – 896 RSOs per county.

**Geocoding & Buffering Process**

Within the FDLE’s spreadsheet containing the RSO registries, each county, Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe, were isolated onto their own spreadsheet. Further steps included analzyation and cleanup of all of the permanent home addresses (2,485), importing the permanent home addresses into ArcMaps, and geocoding them after completion of an address locator in ArcCatalog by county. Next public, private, and charter schools, child care facilities, parks, and/or playgrounds sites were entered into the map with 1,000 feet buffers; and the
intersection between the buffers and the RSO residences were aggregated by count and maps created.

**Tracking Clusters and Hotspots**

From these results, further maps were created of each county which showed notable clusters within the areas that RSOs were residing in legally, as well as maps that depicted where RSOs resided that violated the FLRR. From the attribute table, clusters are sorted by zip code in order to analyze these clusters more effectively. From each of the clusters, a new data frame was created for each hotspot map, and copied the layers into the new data frame. Furthermore, the creation of extent maps also give perspective to the areas shown.

**Results**

**Tri-County Results**

After creating just the state residency bare minimum of buffer zones of 1000 feet, Broward has 393 violators which constitutes 44% of the total number of RSOs in Broward County, Miami-Dade – 477 violators or 35% of the total number of RSOs in Miami-Dade County, and Monroe County has 35 violators or 16% of the total number of RSOs in Monroe County. Figure 1 shows these findings.

**Broward County Results**

Looking at each county map, residency restriction buffer zones were analyzed for hot spots for violators, as well as where RSOs were living within the parameters of the restrictions. In Broward County, Lauderdale Lakes was a hot spot for violators, while zip code 33306 (Oakland Park) had a cluster of 40 Sex offenders living there, and 33317 (Plantation) had a cluster as well at 31 sex offenders (Fig. 3). In zip code 33306, RSOs are living in a Budget Inn as well as apartment buildings housing several in different units.

In 33317, this cluster, mostly located in Broadview Park, has houses that have a number of offenders living in each one. The houses in Broadview Park are owned by Randy Young, a RSO, who runs a business, Habitat for Sex Offenders, renting rooms to RSOs in allowable areas (Aleksander, 2010). However, once the residents of Broadview Park saw an increase from four to over 100 RSOs living within their neighborhood, Broadview Park has since passed legislation increasing its restricted areas to 2,500 feet like most of South Florida; and an ordinance specifying that only one registered sex offender may live within a dwelling unless related (Aleksander, 2010). Unless they leave the area, the policy change does not affect RSOs currently living there.

**Miami-Dade County Results**

In Miami-Dade County, clusters for violators of the 1,000 feet restriction are located in Brownsville, and just south of 836 East in Little Havana & the City of Miami proper (Fig. 4). Those RSOs that comply with the restrictions (Fig. 5) live in clusters in Zip codes 33147 for West Little River/Westgate, which is an industrialized neighborhood near Hialeah, near the
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aforementioned train tracks, in tents and makeshift shacks. Compliance clusters also exist in 33138 in the Shorecrest/Miami Shores area where SROs live in apartment/duplexes.

**Monroe County Results**

Due to its unique makeup of the Everglades and island chain, commonly referred to as “The Keys,” Monroe is geographically a difficult area; and therefore, only uses a 1,000 feet residential restriction. In some instances, judges have to grant permission for a sex offender to be able to register and reside within an area due to it not conforming to FLRR (Linhardt, 2009). A hotspot for violators for Monroe County clusters (Fig. 6) is Key West. The other largest inhabitable land mass within Monroe count would be Key Largo, 33037, with 28 sex offenders, most of which are in compliance, living in predominantly trailer parks or campgrounds (Fig. 7).
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Registered Sexual Offender (SO) Hotspots Due to Residency Restrictions
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Although policies and laws regarding sex offender residency requirements are designed to protect the next potential victim, when these laws become too restrictive, this borderlines on an ethical dilemma (Levenson & Cotter, 2005; McCoy, 2014; Rabin C., 2014). These tougher restrictions severely limit where sex offenders can live and creates blowback of large communities of RSOs in socially disorganized communities, increasing transient RSOs, demotivating RSOs to register or to continue to register, and possibly prompting them to reoffend (Lantigua, 2009; Mustaine et al., 2006; Palombo, 2015). On more than one occasion, RSOs need to resort to living in tents, makeshift shacks or in clusters. This compromises their ability to reenter society, their recovery, capability to hold down a job, and produce in a meaningful way (Duwe, 2009; McCoy, 2014). In addition, it does not give any real incentive for the RSOs to comply with the law and register (Duwe, 2009; Wilson, 2009).

The problematic issue of finding housing is forcing RSOs to live in temporary locations, classifying them as transient (Florida Department of Law Enforcement, 2015). Consequently, RSOs become increasingly tougher to monitor, which directly opposes the goal behind registering sex offenders and predators (Levenson, Ackerman, Socia, & Harris, 2013; Preston, 2009; Skipp & Campo-Flores, 2009; Worford, 2013; Youstin & Nobels, 2009). These transient SROs are more likely to fail to report their location and are more apt to recidivate over SROs who have a permanent living address (Lantigua, 2009; Levenson, Ackerman, Socia, & Harris, 2013). Designed to decrease sexual offending, registration and strict residency restrictions exacerbate the problem. By incessantly uprooting SROs in the wake of increased restrictions and relegating SROs to live in clusters, colonies, and in areas without basic necessities like running water and a roof, communities are propagating a much larger issue of SROs absconding or reoffending (Lantigua, 2009).

Limitations within this study included: lacking addresses within the FDLE list of RSOs and missing any notation on who was grandfathered into the statute; and therefore, not violating the requirements. In addition, because each city has additional restrictions and guidelines to comprehensively understand the level of restrictions imposed on sex offenders and predators, each county should be deconstructed by city and analyzed with those buffers. Further studies should look at the breakdown of each city and county, versus state restrictions, add an additional layer to the maps to look at affordable housing, and include raster maps to explore concentration of RSOs. Additionally, one might also include looking at the rate of transient RSOs by city in relation to the distance of the buffer zones to determine if the increased buffer zones possibly promote more transient status RSOs over time or based on a policy change.
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Appendix

Table 1.

Number of Registered Sexual Offenders By County (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of Registered Sexual Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.

Population By County (2014 Census Estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.