



## Chapter 2911 Advisory Committee 4-15-2025 Meeting Notes

Meeting began around 1:01 p.m. central time

Page-and-line numbers correspond with the [online rule draft](#), dated 12/3/2024.

### 1. General comments on substance withdrawal and SUD treatment.

---

- Some committee members were concerned that the proposed language reflected mission creep in the rule and that the department should focus only on minimum standards
- Others felt that substance withdrawal is a reality in jails and that the rule should address this reality
- A committee member felt that rule standards shouldn't exceed constitutional rights

### 2. Definitions (2911.0200).

---

- A committee member suggested shortening two of the proposed definitions to leave out language that prescribed clinical recommendations

### 3. Training for custody staff (2911.1300); lines 23.11 to 23.12.

---

- Committee members felt that some of the language should be separated or combined with other proposed training requirements
- A committee member didn't think it was necessary to call out dehydration as a training item
- One committee member commented on possible revisions to suicide training (this topic was discussed at a previous meeting)



1450 Energy Park Drive, St. Paul, MN 55108  
651-361-7200 | [mn.gov/doc/about/rulemaking](http://mn.gov/doc/about/rulemaking)

#### **4. Standardized medical screenings ([revised language](#)).**

---

- There were no comments on the revised language

#### **5. Substance withdrawal ([revised language](#)).**

---

- Committee members were divided on allowing a jail to work with a community-based provider; there were liability concerns (note that this coordination is not required in the proposed language)
- Committee members also discussed the word *assess* because custody staff primarily are responsible for screening and aren't assessing
- A committee member felt that rules shouldn't suggest "good" ideas because this exceeds legal minimum standards and jails will be disciplined by the department
- Another concern was what happens when a medical provider doesn't agree with the standards
- Committee members continued to emphasize that the proposed language is fine for technical suggestions to jails but that the language doesn't belong in the rule; others disagreed
- A committee members emphasized the importance of discharge planning and continuity of care, especially for people with disabilities

#### **6. SUD treatment ([revised language](#)).**

---

- Some committee members don't believe that there should be discretionary rules; others worried that the proposed language was too burdensome and would discourage programs from offering SUD treatment
- Committee members and members of the public believe that the rule should be vague; they also felt the rule was too prescriptive and shouldn't direct a jail's medical on provider how to provide clinical care
- Other committee members felt there was value in this language
- Alternatives to this language were mentioned such as grants to jails or training; also suggested was for the department to wait for broader statewide guidance or standards

## **7. Next meeting.**

---

- The next scheduled meeting is **May 6, 1:00 p.m.-2:30 p.m.** (virtual)

The meeting ended around 2:18 p.m. central time

### **Attendees**

*Advisory committee:* Rick Hodsdon, Pat O'Malley, Shawn Larsen, Margaret Zadra, Andrew Larson, Linda Wolford, Eren Sutherland, Pat Eliassen

*Members of the public:* Around 50 people