

# SENATE BILL REPORT

## SB 6325

---

---

As Reported By Senate Committee On:  
Human Services & Corrections, February 1, 2006

**Title:** An act relating to establishing residences for sex offenders.

**Brief Description:** Establishing residences for sex offenders.

**Sponsors:** Senators Regala, Kline, Fairley, Stevens, Rasmussen and McAuliffe.

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:** Human Services & Corrections: 1/19/06, 2/1/06 [DPS].

---

### SENATE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES & CORRECTIONS

**Majority Report:** That Substitute Senate Bill No. 6325 be substituted therefor, and the substitute bill do pass.

Signed by Senators Hargrove, Chair; Regala, Vice Chair; Stevens, Ranking Minority Member; Brandland, Carrell and McAuliffe.

**Staff:** Kiki Keizer (786-7430)

**Background:** Legislation passed in 2005 prohibits an offender sentenced to a "two-strikes" offense against a minor victim from living within an area of 880 feet (two blocks) of a public or private school. The residential restriction set out in the 2005 law was to be effective for the duration of the offender's term of community custody.

The 2005 legislation, including the residential restriction, terminates on July 1, 2006.

**Summary of Substitute Bill:** The sunset clause on SHB 1147, which established residential restrictions for certain convicted sex offenders, is repealed. The state statute pre-empts local laws.

**Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill:** The sunset clause on SHB 1147, which established residential restrictions for certain convicted sex offenders, is repealed. The state statute pre-empts local laws. The title is amended.

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Not requested.

**Committee/Commission/Task Force Created:** No.

**Effective Date:** Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

**Testimony For:** There should be a consistent standard statewide for these kinds of restrictions to avoid a patchwork of geographic areas with varying standards. If the standard is not uniform, it is likely to have the effect of driving sex offenders to unincorporated county land.

It is important to create places where people can live and begin dealing with the problem of homeless offenders, who cannot be adequately supervised. We shouldn't make it more difficult to supervise people who put us all at risk.

**Testimony Against:** State pre-emption of local government does not take local conditions into account. Having zones where offenders are not allowed to live may increase law enforcement workload and the corresponding cost of enforcement.

**Who Testified:** PRO: Jean Wessman, Washington Association of Counties; Jennifer Shaw, ACLU of Washington.

CON: Wayne Tanaka, City of Issaquah; Tammy Fellin, Washington Association of Cities.