



Facility Inspection Report Issued By The Minnesota Department of Corrections Pursuant to MN Statute 241.021, Subdivision 1

Inspection and Enforcement Unit, 1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200, St.Paul MN 55108
Telephone: 651-361-7146 Fax: 651-642-0314 Email: ie-support.doc@state.mn.us

INSPECTION DETAILS FOR:

Martin County Jail

Address: 201 Lake Avenue, Fairmont, MN 56031

MN Governing Rule: 2911 Local Adult Detention Facilities

Inspection Type: Biennial **Inspected By:** Jen Pfeifer – Detention Facility Inspector **Inspected on:** 06/10/2020 to 06/29/2020

Inspection Method: Facility tour, staff and resident interviews, employee and resident file reviews, and related documentation reviews.

Officials Present During Inspection: Jail Administrator Tanya Rathman; Sheriff Jeff Markquart

Officials Present for Exit Interview: Jail Administrator Tanya Rathman

Issued Inspection Report to: Jail Administrator Tanya Rathman; Sheriff Jeff Markquart; County Administrator Scott Higgins; Regional Manager Dayna Burmeister

RULE COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

Rule Chapter	Requirement Type	Total Applicable	Total Compliance	Total Non Compliance	Total Compliance With Concerns	Compliance Rating	Substantial Compliance Result/Criteria
2911	Mandatory	125	122	1	2	99.20%	Compliance rating of 100%
2911	Essential	102	101	1	0	99.02%	Compliance rating of 90%

TERMS OF OPERATION

Authority to Operate: conditional approval **Begins On:** 05/01/2020 **Ends On:** 04/30/2022 **Facility Type:** Jail
Placed on Biennial Status: Yes **Biennial Status Annual Compliance Form Due On:** 04/30/2021
Delinquent Juvenile Hold Approval: 6 hrs **Certificate Holder:** Martin County Sheriff's Office
Special Conditions: None.

Approved Capacity Details **Operational Capacity is calculated as a percent of Approved Capacity beds.*

Bed Type	Gender	Approved Capacity	%Operating Capacity	Operational Capacity	Bed Details	Conditions
Secure	Coed	32	80	25.60	None.	None.

RULE COMPLIANCE DETAILS

Chapter 2911 - Mandatory Rules Not In Compliance**Total: 1**

1. 2911.5000 POST ORDERS; FORMAL INMATE COUNT; WELL-BEING CHECKS. Subpart 5. Well-being.

A facility shall have a system providing for well-being checks of inmates. A written policy and procedure shall provide that all inmates are personally observed by a custody staff person at least once every 30 minutes. Thirty-minute checks should be staggered. If a well-being check does not occur due to an emergency, it must be documented in the jail log and have supervisory review and approval. More frequent observation is required for those inmates of a special need classification who may be harmful to themselves. Examples of inmates of a special need classification include those classified as potentially suicidal, or as mentally ill, or those experiencing withdrawal from drugs or alcohol.

Inspection Findings:

It was noted that well-being checks are being completed too fast and were at times over the 30 minute time frame allowed by the rule.

Corrective Actions:

Ensure that all well-being checks are being conducted according to the rule and that if a well-being check is late that the staff are documenting the reason. It is recommended that the jail administration create a system for auditing well being checks, document the findings and follow up with staff when needed.

Response Needed By: 07/31/2020**Chapter 2911 - Essential Rules Not In Compliance****Total: 1**

1. 2911.3100 INMATE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS. Subpart 7. Recreation plan.

The facility administrator or designee shall have a plan providing opportunities for physical exercise and recreational activities for all inmates consistent with the facility's classification and design. Class I facilities are exempt from this requirement. The plan shall include policies and procedures necessary to protect the facility's security and the welfare of inmates. Policy and procedure shall provide: A. inmates with access to recreational opportunities and equipment, including seven hours of physical exercise or recreation outside the cell and adjacent dayroom areas per week; B. recreational opportunities a minimum of five days per week; C. indoor space and equipment for active recreational activities in all Class II to Class VI facilities; D. outdoor recreational space and equipment for outdoor recreational programming in all Class VI facilities. The space and equipment shall be provided in a manner consistent with the facility's security classification; E. passive and active recreation needs and equipment for a variety of inmates consistent with the facility's classification and offenders served. As an example, activity needs of geriatric, disabled, or geriatric and disabled offenders shall be addressed; F. inmates in segregation with a minimum of one hour a day, seven days a week, of exercise outside the inmates' cells, unless security or safety considerations dictate otherwise; and G. discretionary access by inmates on segregation status to the same recreational facilities as other inmates unless security or safety considerations dictate otherwise. When inmates on segregation status are excluded from use of regular recreation facilities, the alternative area for exercise used shall be documented.

Inspection Findings:

The space for recreation is adequate for smaller groups of inmates but at this time it is not being used for any type of active recreation.

Corrective Actions:

There is no space available in the facility to increase the size of recreational space without a major remodel or new construction.

Response Needed By:**Chapter 2911 - Mandatory Rules In Compliance With Concerns****Total: 2**

1. 2911.0300 INTENDED USE AND NONCONFORMANCE WITH RULES Subpart 2. Nonconformance, unsafe, unsanitary, or illegal conditions.

When conditions do not substantially conform or where specific conditions endanger the health, welfare, or safety of inmates or staff, the facility's use is restricted pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 241.021, subdivision 1, or legal proceedings to condemn the facility will be initiated pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 641.26 or 642.10.

Inspection Findings:

See Physical Plant Concerns.

Corrective Actions:

It is still strongly recommended that the elected officials of Martin County and Jail Administration consider the planning for the future public safety needs of Martin County.

Response Needed By:

2. 2911.3700 EMERGENCIES AND UNUSUAL OCCURRENCES. Subpart 1. Emergency plan.

A facility shall have a written disaster plan. The plan shall include policies and procedures designed to protect the public by securely detaining inmates who represent a danger to the community or to themselves when the facility must be evacuated in total. The plan shall also include: A. location of alarms and fire fighting equipment; B. an emergency drill policy as follows: (1) at least annual drills at all facility locations; and (2) drills shall be conducted even when evacuation of extremely dangerous inmates may not be included; C. specific assignments and tasks for personnel; D. persons and emergency departments to be notified; E. procedure for evacuation of inmates; and F. arrangements for temporary confinement of inmates.

Inspection Findings:

There has been no annual drills completed at this time due to restrictions around the COVID-19 pandemic.

Corrective Actions:

Provide documentation to the Department of Corrections when these drills have been completed. Must do so by December 31, 2020.

Response Needed By:

INSPECTION COMMENTS

Physical Plant Concerns:

The Martin County Jail was built in 1974 and the life expectancy for a facility this size is on average 25 years. Double bunking has also reduced the life expectancy of this facility with added use. The majority of physical plant deficiencies have been documented in past inspection reports and cannot be resolved without the planning of a new jail facility. The concerns are listed below:

- 1) There is a strong concern with the route the staff members take to escort an inmate to court. The route taken presents significant safety concerns due to inmates' being escorted in unsecure public areas with no camera coverage which may negatively affect the safety and security of the facility. It is recommended additional camera coverage be added to monitor the route taken to court. Staff members would then have someone watching if a problem arose while escorting someone to court. This has been address in previous inspections.
- 2) The security electronics in the control room have not been updated and are antiquated and it has become increasingly difficult to find replacement parts.
- 3) The communication system is obsolete and only allows staff to address the inmates. If an inmate would need a jail staff member, they have to either knock on the door or use the kiosk.
- 4)The lock mechanism are old and replacement parts are being increasingly difficult to find. Should the jail become unable to find replacement pieces for inoperable locks these areas of the jail will not be authorized for inmate housing or use.
- 5) The jail is not A.D.A. compliant. Any inmate with physical disabilities needs to be housed in another facility.
- 6) G cell, this is the isolation cell that is used when a person is brought in and is uncooperative or aggressive. The door to this cell blocks the hallway and makes it difficult for staff to enter this cell. It is recommended the door be changed to a sliding door which would allow staff to enter safely.

7) Recreation and program space is limited for their inmate population.

Most notable from a physical plant standpoint is the lack of support space and poor sight lines. The recreation space and program space that is available no longer meets the needs of the facility population. The lack of visibility into the day spaces and living units makes the physical plant staff intensive.

Despite the physical plant concerns, the jail administrator has made significant improvements in the overall operations of the facility. Policy and procedures have been updated to mirror current practices. There appears to be cohesiveness with the jail staff and they were knowledgeable and helpful during the inspection.

It was recommended in the previous 4 inspections that the Martin County Jail be reduced to a 90 day facility based on physical plant deficiencies and operational concerns. Because of the significant positive operational changes that have been made, it is no longer being recommended to the Commissioner of Corrections to move forward with reducing the jail to a 90 day hold facility.

However, due to the physical plant constraints and the lack of program space, it continues to be the recommendation that the elected officials of Martin County continue to plan to address the public safety concerns and plan for a long term solution to meet the requirements of the Department of Corrections Chapter 2911 rules for Detention Facilities.

The facility will be placed on biennial inspections.

JJDP A Compliance

Compliance Report for the Monitoring Facilities Pursuant to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002.

On June 10,2020, a Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act audit was conducted for Martin County. Martin County had previously lost the ability to hold juveniles securely in 2008 due to poor separation from adults and inadequate monitoring space for juveniles. In December 2010, Martin County had regained the ability to hold delinquent juvenile in a secure setting. The juvenile hold ability is limited to 6 hours before and 6 hours after a delinquent juvenile is brought to court.

There are three core requirements that are looked at during our facility review. Those core requirements are Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO), Removal of Juveniles for Adult Jail and Adult Lockups (Jail Removal), and Sight and Sound separation. Martin County does not process juveniles through the Statewide Supervision System, all juvenile records are kept on a juvenile record list. The Martin County Jail processed 11 juveniles during the allowed reportable time. All data entries on the log were reviewed.

The findings are as follows:

Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO): I did not find any violations of the facility holding status offenders in the jail.

Jail Removal: I did find any violations.

Sight and Sound Separation: The conference room location allows for proper sight and sound separation from adults. The route taken to court holding is questionable due to the public visibility. The only route available is through the open lobby and outside to the courthouse, no other alternative routes are available.

The facility does not participate in any "Scared Straight" programs for any youth that are under public authority.

Court Holding: Martin County does not have secure holding in the court house.

Based on the documentation that I reviewed, Martin County had no violations of the JJDP Act.

Report completed By: Jen Pfeifer – Detention Facility Inspector

Signature: _____

Jennifer Pfeifer