

Office of Inspector General

Inspection and Enforcement Unit

1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200 | St. Paul, MN 55108 Main: 651.361.7200 | Fax: 612.473.5009 | Email: ie-support.doc@state.mn.us

May 13, 2025

Sheriff Brett Mason Le Sueur County Jail 435 E Derrynane Street Suite 1100 Le Center, Minnesota 56057

Re: Inspection Report Inspection Findings Response

This letter is in response to the emails received on April 15 and 16, 2025 from yourself and Le Sueur County Jail Administrator Jeremy Swenson, in response to the Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC) Inspection Report issued on April 9, 2025.

Before I discuss DOC's further review, I do want to quickly clarify the difference between the findings and corrective actions outlined in an inspection report (which are governed by rule) and correction orders (which are governed by statute). The findings and corrective action ordered in inspection reports, as well as special incident review letters and death review letters, are compliance orders as outlined in Minn. R. 2911.0300, subp. 4. These orders are for the correction of standard deficiencies noticed in more routine inspections of facilities. The DOC issues corrective action so that facilities can address noncompliance with minimum standards and avoid formal licensing sanctions. Because correction action plans are not a formal sanction and in no way constrict a facility's license, a facility can only appeal the timeline to correct the deficiencies and has no right to appeal the substance of the DOC's findings. *See* Minn. R. 2911.0300, subp. 6.

When a facility does not substantially conform to minimum standards and is not making substantial progress towards substantial conformance, however, the DOC may issue formal sanctions, like correction orders or conditional license orders, as outlined in Minn. Stat. § 241.021, subd. 1a. In those instances, the facility can seek reconsideration of the order. Minn. Stat. § 241.021, subd. 1e.

In this particular instance, however, the DOC reviewed the inspection findings and responses from Le Sueur County and requested and reviewed additional documentation and video. I appreciate you brining this to my attention so I can ensure we are applying fair and consistent standards that ensures the health, safety and well-being of individuals. The I & E Unit is committed to continuing open and honest communication.

After reviewing all materials, the DOC has made the following determinations for mandatory rule violations 1, 2, 4, and 5:

- 1. 2911.2525 Admissions: Violation stands;
- 2. 2911.3700 Emergencies and Unusual Occurrences: Violation stands;
- 4. 2911.5550 Locks and Keys: Violation stands; and
- 5. 2911.7000 Tuberculosis Screening, Separation of Inmates with Infectious Disease: Violation stands.

Review of the additional video submitted to the DOC that was not provided at the time of initial review showed a different angle of well-being checks being conducted. Therefore, the DOC has made the following determination for mandatory rule violation 3:

• 3. Post Orders: Formal Inmate Count: Well-Being Checks: Violation rescinded; inspection report will be amended.

After review of the notes from the inspection, and documentation submitted following the inspection, the DOC has also made the following determination for essential rule violation 1:

• 1. 2911.7300 Fire Inspection: violation rescinded; inspection report will be amended.

Thank you,

Kristi Strang

Kristi Strang, Director Inspection and Enforcement Office of Inspector General Minnesota Department of Corrections

Cc: Jail Administrator, Jeremy Swenson, Le Sueur County JailI&E FileMike Garland, MN Department of Corrections, Inspector General