

117TH CONGRESS }
1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
117-

ONE STOP SHOP COMMUNITY REENTRY PROGRAM ACT OF
2021

JULY --, 2021.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of
the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. NADLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

_____ VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 3372]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 3372) to authorize implementation grants to community-based nonprofits to operate one-stop reentry centers, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose and Summary.....	2
Background and Need for the Legislation.....	3
Hearings.....	11
Committee Consideration.....	12
Committee Votes.....	12
Committee Oversight Findings.....	16
Committee Estimate of Budgetary Effects.....	16
New Budget Authority and Tax Expenditures and Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate.....	16
Duplication of Federal Programs.....	16
Performance Goals and Objectives.....	16
Advisory on Earmarks.....	17
Section-by-Section Analysis.....	17

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

H.R. 3372, the “One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2021,” would fill a critical void in reentry services by providing resources for state and local jurisdictions to make grants to establish a more centralized process for assisting individuals who are reentering their communities after a period of incarceration. The one-stop shop model that this legislation promotes would aim to provide complete reentry services to address the critical elements of the reentry process that promote long-term reentry success. Notably, the one-stop centers would include support personnel, who themselves are formerly incarcerated individuals, to provide direct support for recently released individuals. In addition, where reentry services may not logistically be able to be placed in a single geographic location, this legislation authorizes the Attorney General to fund States and local jurisdictions to establish 24/7 reentry service assistance hotlines that direct recently released individuals to appropriate reentry resources.

When Congress passed the landmark Second Chance Act, it demonstrated its commitment to provide housing, employment assistance, substance abuse treatment and other related services to returning individuals with the goal of reducing recidivism. H.R. 3372 would go a step further by ensuring that returning citizens can more effectively access services such as those funded through the Second Chance Act, as well as other community-funded reentry programs.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

There are currently over 2.1 million people incarcerated in local, state, and federal correctional facilities. This number represents a more than 500% increase in the incarcerated population over the last 40 years.¹ Over 95% of people currently incarcerated will eventually be released back to their communities.² In fact, approximately 600,000 people are released from custody every year.³ At the end of 2016, an estimated 4.5 million adults were under community supervision, which includes probation or parole.⁴ Reentry services are essential for this population, to ensure that these individuals transition smoothly out of jail and prison and to keep recidivism to a minimum.

The recidivism rates for individuals leaving prisons remain high, and a large number of those released from prison will ultimately find themselves back in the criminal legal system. A 2018 study found that 83% of people released from prisons in 2005 were arrested at least once during the nine

¹ Wendy Sayer & Peter Wagner, *Mass Incarceration: The Whole Pie*, PRISON POLICY INITIATIVE, <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2019.html>; The Sentencing Project, Trends in U.S. Corrections U.S. State and Federal Prison Population, 1925-2017 (2019), <https://www.sentencingproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Trends-in-US-Corrections.pdf>.

² John J. Gibbons & Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, CONFRONTING CONFINEMENT: A REPORT THE COMMISSION ON SAFETY AND ABUSE IN AMERICA'S PRISONS 11 (May 2006), https://www.vera.org/publications/confronting-confinement_

³ E. Ann Carson, *Prisoners in 2016*, BUR. OF JUST. STATS 10 (Jan. 2018), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p16.pdf>.

⁴ Danielle Kaeble, *Probation and Parole in United States 2016*, BUR. OF JUST. STATS, <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=6188>.

years following their release.⁵ Of those released from state prisons, 44% were arrested at least once in the year immediately following their release.⁶ A similar study on recidivism among federal offenders found that almost half of these returning individuals were rearrested at least once during an eight-year follow-up.⁷ Most of the rearrests occurred within the first two years after release, with the median time to rearrest being 21 months.⁸

Lack of access to resources upon release leads to a cycle of rearrest and reincarceration that some scholars call the “revolving door” to prison.⁹ This cycle of recidivism has tremendous financial consequences—the United States spends over \$80 billion dollars a year on incarceration—not to mention the human toll it takes on families and communities.¹⁰ The cycle of release, rearrest, and reincarceration¹¹ also costs state and local communities over \$100 million in policing and judicial administration costs.¹²

A. Unique Challenges Facing Returning Citizens

While some returning individuals have a release plan, many people are released from custody

⁵ Mariel Alper, & Matthew R. Durose, *2018 Update on Prisoner Recidivism: A 9-Year Follow-up Period (2005-2014)*, BUR. OF JUST. STATS (Jun. 21, 2016), <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5642>.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ Kim Hunt & Robert Dumville, *Recidivism Among Federal Offenders: A Comprehensive Review*, U.S. SENTENCING COMM. 3 (Mar. 2016), https://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/research-and-publications/research-publications/2016/recidivism_overview.pdf.

⁸ *Id.* at 5.

⁹ PEW CENTER ON THE STATES, *State of Recidivism: The Revolving Door of America's Prisons* 7 (Apr. 2011), https://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/uploadedfiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/reports/sentencing_and_corrections/staterecidivismrevolvingdooramericaprison20pdf.pdf.

¹⁰ Melissa S. Kearney, *et al*, *Ten Facts About Crime and Incarceration in the United States*, THE HAMILTON PROJECT (May 2014),

https://www.hamiltonproject.org/papers/ten_economic_facts_about_crime_and_incarceration_in_the_united_states/.

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Friedman, Barry, *We Spend Over \$100 Billion a Year on Policing. We Have No Idea What Works*, WASH. POST, March 10, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2017/03/10/we-spend-100-billion-on-policing-we-have-no-idea-what-works/>.

with only their personal property, little money, and no place to go.¹³ The result of not having a reentry plan can be ruinous. In the last decade, policymakers have begun to measure the effects of reentry on returning individuals, their families, and their communities. Studies show that most people enter the prison system with low levels of education, limited work experience, substance abuse issues, and mental health infirmities, and that these same issues are still present when a person is released from prison.¹⁴ Without appropriate reentry services to assist them, many returning citizens find themselves back in the criminal justice system.¹⁵ Indeed, even those individuals who are released with a comprehensive reentry plan still face many unique challenges reintegrating into society.

1. Many Housing Options Are Out of Reach for Returning Citizens

Finding a safe and secure place to live is crucial to successful reintegration into society.¹⁶ The first month after release is a particularly important period, “during which the risk of becoming homeless and/or returning to criminal justice involvement is high.”¹⁷ Options for reentering individuals can be limited.¹⁸ Securing safe and stable housing often poses a significant challenge for

¹³ Jocelyn Fontaine & Jennifer Biess, *Housing as a Platform for Formerly Incarcerated Persons*, URBAN INSTITUTE 2, 5-7 (Apr. 2012), <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/25321/412552-Housing-as-a-Platform-for-Formerly-Incarcerated-Persons.PDF>.

¹⁴ Baer, Demelza, *et al.*, *Understanding the Challenges to Prisoner Reentry; Research Findings from the Urban Institute’s Prisoner Reentry Portfolio*, URBAN INSTITUTE 2 (Jan. 2006), <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/42981/411289-Understanding-the-Challenges-of-Prisoner-Reentry.PDF>.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ Lucius Couloute, *Nowhere to Go: Homelessness Among Formerly Incarcerated People*, PRISON POLICY INITIATIVE (Aug. 2018), <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/housing.html> (“Stable housing is the foundation of successful reentry from prison.”).

¹⁷ COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS, *Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council Charting the Safe and Successful Return of Prisoners to the Community* 272 (2005), <https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/report-of-the-re-entry-policy-council-charting-the-safe-and-successful-return-of-prisoners-to-the-community.pdf>.

¹⁸ Jocelyn Fontaine & Jennifer Biess, *Housing as a Platform for Formerly Incarcerated Persons*, URBAN INSTITUTE 2-5 (Apr. 2012), <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/25321/412552-Housing-as-a-Platform-for-Formerly-Incarcerated-Persons.PDF>.

returning individuals. The private rental market is off-limits to many returning citizens because of the lack of affordable housing options in most major cities.¹⁹ Even if someone has sufficient income to afford private market rent, many landlords refuse to rent to people with criminal records.²⁰ Additionally, people with certain criminal records are often barred from public housing.²¹ These bans on public housing assistance keep formerly incarcerated persons from reuniting with their families because many local public housing agencies will evict or deny housing to an entire household if one family member has a prior conviction.²² As a result, many returning citizens end up at homeless shelters, as a last resort.

The overall lack of housing options has profound effects on the entire prisoner reentry process and contributes to the cycle of incarceration. One study showed that homeless individuals who had access to stable housing were significantly less likely to recidivate,²³ while those without access to housing were more than twice as likely to commit another crime within the first 12 months of release.²⁴

2. Barriers to Employment Increase Recidivism

Steady employment has been shown to help returning citizens gain economic stability and

¹⁹ Brenda Richardson, *America's Affordable Housing Crisis is Only Getting Worse*, FORBES, Jan. 31, 2019.

²⁰ Mireya Navarro, *Federal Housing Authorities Warn Against Blanket Bans on Ex-offenders*, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 4, 2016.

²¹ 42 U.S.C. 13663 (2018)(excluding certain sex offenders from public housing); *see also* 24 C.F.R. 982.553(a) (2020).

²² Rebecca Vallas, et al, *Removing Barriers to Opportunity for Parents with Criminal Records and Their Children*, CTR. FOR AM. PROGRESS 10 (Dec. 2015), <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/09060720/CriminalRecords-report2.pdf>.

²³ Julian M. Somers *et al.*, Urban Inst., *Housing First Reduces Re-Offending Among Formerly Homeless Adults with Mental Disorders: Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial*, PLOS ONE 1, 6-8 (Sept. 2013), <http://www.plosone.org/article/fetchObject.action?uri=info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0072946&representation=PDF>.

²⁴ Lornet Turnbull, *Few Rentals for Freed Felons*, SEATTLE TIMES, Nov. 29, 2010, <https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/few-rentals-for-freed-felons/>.

reduce recidivism.²⁵ While many formerly incarcerated people want to work, they face tremendous challenges when seeking employment.²⁶ One frequently encountered barrier to employment is the lack of formal education or job training and limited work experience of some returning individuals. People in prison have lower levels of education and limited work experience than the general population.²⁷ The statistics are troubling; 41 percent of those in state and federal prisons do not have a high school diploma, compared with 18 percent of the general population.²⁸ While 48 percent of the general population has some college education, only 24 percent of people in federal prisons have a similar education level.²⁹ Further, while incarcerated, they are unable to work and gain job skills, are removed from their communities, and experience a disruption in social connections that would help them obtain a job upon release.³⁰

Having a record of a prior criminal conviction poses another hurdle to finding stable employment. In most states, people with criminal convictions are categorically barred from obtaining certain occupational licenses for employment, such as for work as cosmetologists, barbers, teachers or mortgage brokers.³¹ This is the case even if the license has nothing to do with the nature of the prior conviction.³² Even when an occupational license is not a prerequisite, employers' general

²⁵ Lucius Couloute & Daniel Kopf, *Out of Prison & Out of Work: Unemployment Among Formerly Incarcerated People*, PRISON POLICY INITIATIVE (July 2018), <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/outofwork.html>.

²⁶ *Id.* (“[I]ncarcerated people are unemployed at a rate of over 27% — higher than the total U.S. unemployment rate during any historical period, including the Great Depression.”).

²⁷ Caroline Wolf Harlow, *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, Education and Correctional Populations*, Bur. Just. Stats. 2, 10 (Jan. 1, 2003), <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ecp.pdf>.

²⁸ *Id.* at 1.

²⁹ *Id.* at 2.

³⁰ John Schmitt & Kris Warner, *Ex-Offenders and the Labor Market*, CTR. FOR ECON. & POLICY RESEARCH 8 (Nov. 2010), <http://cepr.net/documents/publications/ex-offenders-2010-11.pdf>.

³¹ Allyson Fredericksen & Desiree Omli, *Jobs After Jail, Ending the Prison to Poverty Pipeline*, ALLIANCE FOR A JUST SOC’Y (2016), https://jobgap2013.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/ajs_job_after_jail_report_final_pdf.pdf (noting that on average, states have 123 restrictions on the type of work that those with felony convictions may engage in); Chidi Umez & Rebecca Pirius, *Barriers to Work: People with Criminal Records: Improving Access to Licensed Occupations for Individuals With Criminal Records*, NAT’L CONF. OF ST. LEG. (Jul. 17, 2018), <https://www.ncsl.org/research/labor-and-employment/barriers-to-work-individuals-with-criminal-records.aspx>.

³² *Id.* at 19, 35.

reluctance to hire people with criminal records serves as an additional barrier to employment.³³ For instance, one study found that only 40 percent of employers would “definitely” or “probably” hire someone with a criminal conviction, especially for a job that involves handling money or dealing with customers.³⁴

Given these challenges, it is not surprising that the unemployment rate for formerly incarcerated people is five times higher than the rate for the general population.³⁵ Three in four formerly incarcerated individuals remain unemployed one year after release.³⁶ And, for those returning citizens who do get jobs, they are more likely to work part time and earn lower wages. A report from the Brookings Institution found that one year after release, about half of returning citizens earned less than \$500 and only 20 percent earned more than \$15,000.³⁷

Despite these many challenges, the majority of returning individuals want to work and believe that having a job after release is an important factor in helping them stay out of prison.³⁸ Indeed, as the data show, returning individuals who participate in structured reentry programs have a better chance of finding and maintaining full-time employment.³⁹

3. People with Mental Health Disorders Are Overrepresented in Prison Populations

³³ Schmitt, *Ex-Offenders and the Labor Market*, *supra* note 29, at 8.

³⁴ *Id.* at 10.

³⁵ Lucuis Coulote & Daniel Kopf, *Out of Prison and Out of Work*, PRISON POLICY INITIATIVE (Jul. 2018), <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/outofwork.html>.

³⁶ AM. CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, *Back to Business: How Hiring Formerly Incarcerated Job Seekers Benefits Your Company* 4 (2017), https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/field_document/060917-trone-reportweb_0.pdf.

³⁷ Adam Looney & Nicholas Turner, *Work and Opportunity Before and After Incarceration*, BROOKINGS INST. 7 (Mar. 14, 2018), <https://www.brookings.edu/research/work-and-opportunity-before-and-after-incarceration/>.

³⁸ Demelza Baer, et al., *Understanding the Challenges to Prisoner Reentry; Research Findings from the Urban Institute's Prisoner Reentry Portfolio*, URBAN INST. 2, 4 (Jan. 2003).

³⁹ See e.g., Aaron Yelowitz and Christopher Bollinger, *Prison-to-Work: The Benefits of Intensive Job Search Assistance for Former Inmates*, CIVIC REPORT, No. CTR. FOR STATE & LOCAL LEADERSHIP 96 (Mar. 2015) (finding that a job assistance program that quickly placed individuals in jobs reduced the rates of recidivism).

People with mental illnesses make up a significant portion of the prison population.⁴⁰ Because of this, our nation's corrections institutions are often, collectively, considered the biggest provider of mental health services in America.⁴¹ For example, the Los Angeles County Jail, the Cook County Jail, and Rikers Island each hold more people with mental health disorders than any psychiatric hospital currently operating in the United States.⁴² While only 18 percent of the general population has been diagnosed with a mental health disorder, among the prison population, that number is between 30 and 40 percent.⁴³

Despite these numbers, few people in prison actually receive appropriate mental health services while serving a prison sentence.⁴⁴ Researchers point to insufficient screening and limited resources as explanations for the paucity of mental health services in prisons.⁴⁵ One study showed that only 52 percent of inmates who were taking medication for a mental health condition prior to incarceration actually received medication during their period of incarceration.⁴⁶ Without proper medication, these individuals were more likely to have disciplinary problems while incarcerated and the resulting punishment, including solitary confinement, can exacerbate these mental health

⁴⁰ TREATMENT ADVOCACY CTR., *Background Paper: Serious Mental Illness Prevalence in Jails & Prisons* (Sept. 2016), <https://www.treatmentadvocacycenter.org/evidence-and-research/learn-more-about/3695#:~:text=Overall%2C%20approximately%2020%25%20of%20inmates,have%20a%20serious%20mental%20illness.>

⁴¹ Jennifer M. Reingle Gonzalez & Nadine M. Connell, *Mental Health and Prisoners: Identifying Barriers to Mental Health Treatment and Medication Continuity*, AM. J. OF PUBLIC HEALTH, Vol. 104. No.12 (2014).

⁴² Cynthia Zubritsky, et al., *Breaking the Cycle of Recidivism: From In-Jail Behavioral Health Services to Community Support*, J. OF CRIM. & FORENSIC STUDIES, Vol. 1 Issue 2, 1 (2018), <http://www.bc-systemofcare.org/test/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/ChancesR-JOCFS180010.pdf>.

⁴³ Heather Stringer, *Improving Mental Health for Inmates*, American Psychological Association, MONITOR ON PSYCHOLOGY. Vol 50. No. 3 March (2019); Nat'l Alliance on Mental Illness, *Mental Health By the Numbers*, <https://www.nami.org/mhstats> ("19.1% of U.S. adults experienced mental illness in 2018 (47.6 million people)").

⁴⁴ Jennifer M. Reingle Gonzalez, & Nadine M. Connell, *Mental Health and Prisoners: Identifying Barriers to Mental Health Treatment and Medication Continuity*, AM. J. OF PUB. HEALTH, Vol. 104. No.12 (2014).

⁴⁵ *Id.*

⁴⁶ *Id.*

conditions.⁴⁷

Returning citizens with mental health conditions often do not fare any better once they are released. Many corrections institutions do not assist those about to be released in making arrangements for their care upon release.⁴⁸ Without these preparations, many recently released prisoners leave corrections facilities without referrals to mental or physical health providers in their communities or even an adequate supply of necessary medication.⁴⁹

When returning individuals do not receive appropriate mental health treatment in prison, and are released without a plan for follow-up care, they are at higher risk of recidivism.⁵⁰ For those with a diagnosed mental health disorder, a 2014 study showed, the rates of recidivism were between 50 to 230 percent higher than for people without a mental health diagnosis.⁵¹

B. Recent Efforts to Ease Reentry for the Formerly Incarcerated

In recent years, governmental organizations have recognized that targeting services to returning citizens results in lower rates of recidivism leading to safer and stronger communities. Both on the national level and in the states there have been significant efforts to provide services specifically to recently released persons. Congress' effort to assist and promote reentry programs nationwide is codified in the Second Chance Act.

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ Kamala Malik-Kane, *Returning Home Illinois Policy Brief, Health and Prisoner Reentry*, URBAN INST. 2-3 (Aug. 2005), <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/42876/311214-Returning-Home-Illinois-Policy-Brief-Health-and-Prisoner-Reentry.PDF>.

⁴⁹ Jeffrey Draine, & Daniel Herman, *Critical Time Intervention for Reentry From Prison for Persons with Mental Illness*, PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES 1-2 (Dec. 2007), <https://ps.psychiatryonline.org/doi/full/10.1176/ps.2007.58.12.1577>.

⁵⁰ See e.g. Christine Herman, *Most Inmates With Mental Illness Still Wait For Decent Care*, NPR (Feb. 3, 2019), <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2019/02/03/690872394/most-inmates-with-mental-illness-still-wait-for-decent-care>.

⁵¹ Gonzalez & Connell, *Mental Health and Prisoners*, *supra* note 43.

In 2008, President George W. Bush signed into law the Second Chance Act.⁵² This landmark bipartisan piece of legislation authorized grants to government agencies and nonprofit organizations to provide housing, employment assistance, substance abuse treatment, and other related services to returning citizens with the goal of reducing recidivism.⁵³ As originally enacted, the law authorized \$165 million for federal, state, and local agencies, as well as for non-profit organizations working on prisoner reentry.⁵⁴ Since 2009, more than 800 grants have been awarded to various entities to provide reentry services.⁵⁵

Congress most recently reauthorized the Second Chance Act in the First Step Act of 2018 and authorized \$85 million through 2023.⁵⁶ While the Second Chance Act grants have been awarded to various entities to provide reentry services, a large portion of the grants have been distributed to state and county entities.⁵⁷ The Second Chance Act has highlighted the importance of funding reentry programs and has awarded numerous grants to organizations, but many returning citizens still have a difficult time accessing critical reentry services. For example, in many cities, reentry programs are in different places, sometimes physically far from each other, making it difficult to obtain all the needed services, such as job training and mental health treatment, in an expeditious and efficient manner.

HEARINGS

For the purposes of clause 3(c)(6)(A) of House Rule XIII, on May 13, 2021, the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security held a hearing entitled, “Juvenile Justice

⁵² Second Chance Act of 2007: Community Safety Through Recidivism Prevention, Pub. L. No. 110-199 (2008), 34 U.S.C. § 60501 (2018).

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ Second Chance Act, *supra* note 52.

⁵⁵ NAT. REENTRY RESOURCE CTR., *The Second Chance Act: Fact Sheet* (Apr. 2018), <https://csgjusticecenter.org/jc/publications/fact-sheet-the-second-chance-act/>; Second Chance Act, *supra* note 51.

⁵⁶ First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391 (2018).

⁵⁷ *See e.g.*, NAT. REENTRY RESOURCE CTR., *The Second Chance Act* (July 2018), https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/July-2018_SCA_factsheet.pdf.

Pipeline and the Road Back to Integration,” that highlighted the number of challenges formerly incarcerated juveniles face upon their release. The Subcommittee heard testimony concerning early intervention strategies for at-risk youth, developing appropriate confinement settings, and rehabilitation programs that will ease reentry when sentences are over.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On July 21, 2021, the Committee met in open session and ordered the bill, H.R. 3372, favorably reported without an amendment, by a roll call vote of 31 to 8, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE VOTES

In compliance with clause 3(b) of House Rule XIII, the following roll call votes occurred during the Committee’s consideration of H.R. 3372:

1. An amendment offered by Mr. Tiffany that would make a state, Indian tribe, or unit of a local government that defunds a police department ineligible for grants under H.R. 3372 was defeated by a rollcall vote of 14 in favor to 20 against. The vote was as follows:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

House of Representatives

117th Congress

Amendment # 3 () to HR 3372 offered by Rep. Tiffany

PASSED
 FAILED

	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Jerrold Nadler (NY-10)		✓	
Zoe Lofgren (CA-19)		✓	
Sheila Jackson Lee (TX-18)		✓	
Steve Cohen (TN-09)			
Hank Johnson (GA-04)		✓	
Ted Deutch (FL-22)			
Karen Bass (CA-37)		✓	
Hakeem Jeffries (NY-08)		✓	
David Cicilline (RI-01)		✓	
Eric Swalwell (CA-15)			
Ted Lieu (CA-33)		✓	
Jamie Raskin (MD-08)		✓	
Pramila Jayapal (WA-07)		✓	
Val Demings (FL-10)		✓	
Lou Correa (CA-46)		✓	
Mary Gay Scanlon (PA-05)		✓	
Sylvia Garcia (TX-29)		✓	
Joseph Neguse (CO-02)			
Lucy McBath (GA-06)		✓	
Greg Stanton (AZ-09)		✓	
Madeleine Dean (PA-04)		✓	
Veronica Escobar (TX-16)		✓	
Mondaire Jones (NY-17)			
Deborah Ross (NC-02)		✓	
Cori Bush (MO-01)		✓	
	AYES	NOS	PRES
Jim Jordan (OH-04)			
Steve Chabot (OH-01)	✓		
Louie Gohmert (TX-01)			
Darrell Issa (CA-50)	✓		
Ken Buck (CO-04)	✓		
Matt Gaetz (FL-01)	✓		
Mike Johnson (LA-04)			
Andy Biggs (AZ-05)	✓		
Tom McClintock (CA-04)	✓		
Greg Steube (FL-17)	✓		
Tom Tiffany (WI-07)	✓		
Thomas Massie (KY-04)	✓		
Chip Roy (TX-21)			
Dan Bishop (NC-09)	✓		
Michelle Fischbach (MN-07)	✓		
Victoria Spartz (IN-05)	✓		
Scott Fitzgerald (WI-05)			
Cliff Bentz (OR-02)	✓		
Burgess Owens (UT-04)	✓		
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
TOTAL	14	20	

2. A motion to report H. R. 3372 was agreed to by a roll call vote of 31 to 8. The vote was as follows:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

House of Representatives
117th Congress

Final Passage on: HR 3372

PASSED
 FAILED

	AYES	NOS	PRES.
Jerrold Nadler (NY-10)	✓		
Zoe Lofgren (CA-19)	✓		
Sheila Jackson Lee (TX-18)	✓		
Steve Cohen (TN-09)			
Hank Johnson (GA-04)	✓		
Ted Deutch (FL-22)	✓		
Karen Bass (CA-37)	✓		
Hakeem Jeffries (NY-08)	✓		
David Cicilline (RI-01)	✓		
Eric Swalwell (CA-15)	✓		
Ted Lieu (CA-33)	✓		
Jamie Raskin (MD-08)	✓		
Pramila Jayapal (WA-07)	✓		
Val Demings (FL-10)	✓		
Lou Correa (CA-46)	✓		
Mary Gay Scanlon (PA-05)	✓		
Sylvia Garcia (TX-29)	✓		
Joseph Neguse (CO-02)	✓		
Lucy McBath (GA-06)	✓		
Greg Stanton (AZ-09)	✓		
Madeleine Dean (PA-04)	✓		
Veronica Escobar (TX-16)	✓		
Mondaire Jones (NY-17)			
Deborah Ross (NC-02)	✓		
Cori Bush (MO-01)	✓		
	AYES	NOS	PRES
Jim Jordan (OH-04)			
Steve Chabot (OH-01)	✓		
Louie Gohmert (TX-01)	✓		
Darrell Issa (CA-50)	✓		
Ken Buck (CO-04)		✓	
Matt Gaetz (FL-01)			
Mike Johnson (LA-04)	✓		
Andy Biggs (AZ-05)		✓	
Tom McClintock (CA-04)	✓		
Greg Steube (FL-17)		✓	
Tom Tiffany (WI-07)		✓	
Thomas Massie (KY-04)		✓	
Chip Roy (TX-21)		✓	
Dan Bishop (NC-09)		✓	
Michelle Fischbach (MN-07)			
Victoria Spartz (IN-05)	✓		
Scott Fitzgerald (WI-05)		✓	
Cliff Bentz (OR-02)	✓		
Burgess Owens (UT-04)	✓		
	AYES	NOS	PRES.
TOTAL	31	8	

COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

In compliance with clause 3(c)(1) of House Rule XIII, the Committee advises that the findings and recommendations of the Committee, based on oversight activities under clause 2(b)(1) of House Rule X, are incorporated in the descriptive portions of this report.

COMMITTEE ESTIMATE OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of House rules XIII, the Committee adopts as its own the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND TAX EXPENDITURES

With respect to the requirements of clause 3(c)(2) of House Rule XIII and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and with respect to requirements of clause (3)(c)(3) of House Rule XIII and section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has requested but not received from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office a budgetary analysis and a cost estimate of this bill.

DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(5) of House Rule XIII, no provision of H.R. 3372 establishes or reauthorizes a program of the federal government known to be duplicative of another federal program.

PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Committee states that pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of House Rule XIII, H.R. 3372 would allow the Office of Justice Programs to contract with a nonprofit specializing in analyzing data with regard to reentry services to support grantees with data collection and provide administrative support to grantees so that they may fully abide by the grant conditions. Pursuant to the bill, the Attorney General would be required to provide an annual report to Congress that includes data and performance goals on those served by the one-stop centers.

ADVISORY ON EARMARKS

In accordance with clause 9 of House Rule XXI, H.R. 3372 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of House Rule XXI.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The following discussion describes the bill as reported by the Committee.

Sec. 1. Short Title. This section establishes the short title as the “One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2021.”

Sec. 2. Community Center Grant Program. Section 2 of the Act authorizes the Attorney General to make implementation grants available for creating one-stop community reentry centers.

Application Requirements. Subsection (b) outlines the application requirements for grantees to apply for one-stop community reentry center grants. To qualify, all applicants must collaborate with community leaders who work with the formerly incarcerated and their families to identify the needs of those who the grantee proposes to serve and to determine how to best meet their needs. Applicants must also provide plans to account for beneficiary transportation from service to service if

feasible, outline a process by which the grantee can continue to support beneficiaries if they move, and describe how recipients of grant funding plan to comply with grant performance objectives. Additionally, applicants must, to the extent practicable, identify State, local, and private funds available to supplement the funds received under the Act.

Preference. Subsection (c) would require the Attorney General to award these grants to applicants who intend to employ those who have been formerly convicted or incarcerated and have completed any court-ordered supervision, to the extent allowable by law, and to employ such formerly incarcerated individuals in positions of responsibility.

Evaluation and Report. Subsection (d) instructs the Attorney General to contract with a nonprofit specializing in analyzing data regarding reentry services to support grantees with data collection and provide administrative support to grantees so that they may fully abide by the grant conditions. Pursuant to this section, the Attorney General would be required to provide an annual report to Congress that includes data on those served by the one-stop centers.

Definitions. Subsection (e) provides definitions for eligible entity; one stop community reentry center; reentry services; community leader; and success rate. The definition of the term reentry services includes job placement, job training, vocational and technical training placement, housing placement assistance, assistance to apply for benefits or entitlements, financial counseling, substance abuse treatment, and case management.

Authorization for Appropriations. Subsection (f) authorizes the appropriation of \$10 million each fiscal year from 2021 to 2025 and requires that the Attorney General equitably award the grants among the geographical regions and between urban and rural populations, including Indian Tribes.

Sec. 3. Grants for Assistance Hotlines. Section 3 of the bill authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to States, tribes, and units of local government to establish 24/7 reentry service

assistance hotlines. This section would require that each grant award last no more than five years. The Attorney General is authorized to expend \$1.5 million for each fiscal year from 2021 to 2025 for the reentry hotline program. In awarding grants, this section also requires the Attorney General to give preference, to the extent authorized by law, to applicants who employ those who have been formerly convicted or incarcerated and have completed any court-ordered supervision.

Hotline Requirements. Subsection (b) outlines the grant requirements. Under this section, funded hotlines must direct callers to reentry services, keep personally identifiable information confidential unless otherwise authorized by callers, and be accessible to those who are limited English proficient and who are individuals with disabilities. These hotlines would also have the ability to engage with individuals over text. Finally, this subsection would require that hotline operators be trained and knowledgeable about reentry services and other relevant information.