



HF 3496
February 25, 2026

Chairs Novotny and Moller and members of the committee,

The Minnesota Justice Research Center writes in opposition to HF 3496.

Paying restitution is a crucial component of the justice system. When assessed reasonably, it can hold offenders accountable and aid victims. However, the collection of restitution should not divert supervision agents from their main job of public safety.

The Minnesota Rehabilitation and Reinvestment Act rewards positive actions rather than just punishing negative behaviors. Through earned supervision abatement, agents can lower their active caseloads and concentrate on those crucial first few months of a person being released from prison, a time when we know that releasees are at the most danger of being the victims of a crime, overdosing, or recidivating.

Currently, supervision agents in Minnesota are forced to spend too much of their valuable time on people who have been out of prison for years and reintegrated into society. Instead, through the incentive programs of the Minnesota Rehabilitation and Reinvestment Act, they can focus on those initial high-risk days and months and create safer communities.

We have spoken with many supervision agents across the state and they tell us they need:
More housing options
More effective substance abuse programs
More employers willing to take second chances

They have never told us that they should be actively supervising clients who have been law-abiding for years because they have not paid their restitution.

In short, HF 3496 makes Minnesota less safe by making supervision agents bill collectors rather than people dedicated to reentry and public safety.

-Will Cooley, Policy Director, Minnesota Justice Research Center