

Questions for the Record from Rep. Nehls of Texas for Director Peters
“Oversight of the Federal Bureau of Prisons”
November 7, 2023

1. Was BOP inmate Peter Langan ever provided with facial hair removal surgery?
2. Can you provide the committee with a copy of the settlement between inmate Peter Langan and the BOP?
3. How many BOP inmates are in the process of receiving gender surgeries?
4. How much has the BOP spent on gender surgeries and treatments in FY2018, FY19, FY20, FY, 21, FY22, and FY23?
5. How much did the BOP’s Transgender Executive Council (‘TEC’) receive in funding for FY2023?
6. For a minimum of seven years, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) has consistently received insufficient funding from the Bureau of Prisons. NIC plays a crucial role in assisting over 3,000 local jails nationwide, processing around 11 million individuals annually, which amounts to an inmate population 18 times larger than the combined federal and state prison populations. Despite BOP having an annual budget of approximately \$8 billion, their funding for NIC stands at only \$15.6 million for FY23 and a mere \$14.6 million for FY24. Can you please clarify how NIC is considered a priority for the BOP, and why, in light of this ongoing underfunding, Congress should refrain from transferring NIC under the Office of Justice Programs (OJP)."
7. Congress placed NIC under the BOP in the 1974 Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Act. Later, to coordinate the provision of federal assistance to state and local agencies, Congress created the Office of Justice Programs in 1984. NIC, like other program offices within OJP, shares a mission that primarily focuses on supporting state and local governments. Earlier this year, NIC and the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) jointly published the Guidelines for Managing Substance Withdrawal. Given these factors, would you agree that NIC has more in common with OJP's offices than with BOP?

Questions for the Record from Ranking Member Nadler of New York for Director Peters
“Oversight of the Federal Bureau of Prisons”
November 7, 2023

1. The First Step Act of 2018 implemented a dyslexia screening protocol for incarcerated individuals based on evidence from a study that found nearly half of inmates in a Texas prison suffered from dyslexia, and 80 percent were functionally illiterate. Inadequate screening for symptoms lends itself to higher overall rates of unidentified dyslexia – the most common cause of illiteracy. Preventative correctional education improves inmates’ ability to obtain employment and creates greater economic opportunity post-release. A study by the Rand Corp found that incarcerated individuals who participate in correctional education programs are 43 percent less likely to recidivate than those who did not participate in similar preventative efforts. When left untreated, dyslexia can result in reduced economic mobility for incarcerated people when they are released from the prison system, as well as increased rates of reoffending or recidivism.

Director Peters, I remain concerned that the Federal Bureau of Prisons has not adequately leveraged clinical expertise in implementing a dyslexia screening program as required by the First Step Act of 2018 and funded \$1.2 million in the FY23 consolidated appropriations bill. BOP is required to incorporate an evidence-based, low-cost, readily available dyslexia screening program into the risk and needs assessment system in accordance with First Step Act, including the screening for dyslexia during the prisoner intake process and each periodic risk reassessment of a prisoner. Director, can you share with the committee the status and results of implementing an evidence-based dyslexia screening program? Does such program incorporate proven psychometrics for validity that meets the requirements of the First Step Act? Is it developed internally or externally by experts who have proven experience in creating clinical screening tools? Please elaborate on your timeline for implementation.