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The number of beds drives the facility program.

Every one has something to say about it:
- Prosecutor
- Judiciary
- Probation
- County Board Members
- Facility Administrators
DETENTION FACILITY REQUIREMENTS

- Pull a number out of the air
- Take our best guess
- Forecast - or project future beds ease requirements
  - based on statistical modeling
  - based on past activity
The traditional approach is:

- **Passive**: we can’t control our destiny
- **Static**: no change in current practices
- **Costly**: relies on construction to solve the problem
- **Not sustainable!**
Evidence-based planning and design:

- shapes the future, rather than reacts to it
METRICS

- Evidence-based planning and design:
  - Reduces the number of beds required
  - Reduces capital construction costs
  - Reduces energy and operating costs
  - and ........
Promotes positive outcomes for individuals and communities
HOW MANY BEDS?

- Data Analysis
  - Admissions
  - Average Length of Stay
  - Average Daily Population

- Baseline projections

- Population profiles

- System practices
BEDSPACE PROJECTION METHODOLOGIES

- Statistical relationship between jail activity and some predictor variable
  
  - e.g. “if the county population at-large increases, then jail activity will increase”
Statistical relationship between past jail activity and future jail activity

- e.g. “historical growth rates in jail admissions, census will continue in the future”
The detention profile analysis:

- Identifies opportunities for reducing bedspace demand by identifying populations who may be appropriate for alternatives to secure detention
- Identifies system policies and practices impacting the use of secure detention
- Identifies the type of secure beds required to address inmate risk/need classifications
Union County Juvenile Detention Center
WHO IS IN THE FACILITY?

Prior Detainments

- One: 21%
- Three or More: 15%
- None: 54%
- Two: 9%

Offense

- Theft: 12%
- Violation of Probation: 27%
- Serious Violent: 13%
- Drug: 21%
- Other Non-violent: 15%
- Weapon: 1%
- Assault: 8%
- Family Crisis: 2%
FINDINGS

- About 20% detained for violent offenses
- 54% have no previous detention history
- 21% detained on drug charges
- 27% are probation violators
Average Days Detained by Dispositional Status

WHO IS IN THE FACILITY?

% of Population

- Post-Family Crisis: 3%
- Post-Awaiting Transport to TSB: 8%
- Post-Awaiting Placement: 35%
- Pre-Juveniles Waived: 3%
- Pre-Other: 52%

Avg. Days Detained

- Post-Family Crisis: 37 days
- Post-Awaiting Transport to TSB: 72 days
- Post-Awaiting Placement: 110 days
- Pre-Juveniles Waived: 281 days
- Pre-Other: 30 days

Dispositional Status
FINDINGS

- Average length of detention: 25 days
- Average length of stay for post-dispositional program placement: 110 days
- Average length of stay for probation violators held after disposition: 100 days
DETENTION BEDSPACE PROJECTIONS: BASELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Post-Await Placement</th>
<th>Post-Transport to TSB</th>
<th>Post-Family Crisis</th>
<th>Waived</th>
<th>Pre-Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SYSTEM ANALYSIS

- Key Juvenile Justice Stakeholders
  - Detention Center
  - Judiciary
  - Family Court
  - Probation
  - Prosecutor
  - Public Defender
  - Youth Services Bureau
  - Local Hospital
  - Division of Youth and Family Services
  - Juvenile Justice Commission
FINDINGS

- Additional detention capacity is needed
- Few resources for multi-problem, special need juveniles
- Case flow “bottlenecks”
- Perceived lack of alternatives for probation violators
- Impact of post-dispositional youth on detention
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>BEDSPACE SAVINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mis-use of Detention</td>
<td>Develop Intake / Assessment Instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few Detention Alternatives</td>
<td>Expand Detention Alternatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Case Management</td>
<td>Implement Multi-Disciplinary Team Approach</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Many Youth Awaiting Placement</td>
<td>Establish Maximum Length of Stay</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baseline Bedspace Requirement: 90 Beds

Juvenile Justice System Improvements: Saves 15 Beds

New Juvenile Detention Center: 75 Beds
METRICS: IMPACT ON YOUTH AND COMMUNITY

- Reduced inappropriate admissions
- Expanded probation continuum
- More alternatives to detention
- Improved services for youth
- Lessen the exposure to detention
15 fewer beds =

- A smaller building footprint
- 1 less housing unit
- 12,000 GSF less bricks and mortar
- 2 fewer toilets, showers, sinks
- 16% less water consumption
- 16% less energy consumption
METRICS: POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

- An environment conducive to positive youth development
  - Normative
  - Community connections
  - Programs and services
  - Good neighbor
Sullivan County Jail
WHO IS IN THE FACILITY?

Legal Status
- Sentenced: 60.6%
- Pre-Trial: 39.4%

Bail Amount
- >20000: 46%
- 10001-20000: 13%
- 5001-10000: 8%
- 1000-5000: 15%
- Other: 13%
- NA: 5%

Additional Charges
- No: 81%
- Yes: 19%
PRE-TRIAL SUPERVISION PROGRAM

- Eligibility Criteria
  - Superior & District Court cases
  - Pre-trial status
  - In jail 10 days or more
  - Non-violent offense
  - Bail not to exceed $10,000
  - County resident
  - No additional charges pending
WHO IS IN THE FACILITY?

75% High to moderate risk

Substance Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drugs of Choice</th>
<th># Users</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecstasy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxicontin</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methadone</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS

- High incidence of serious, long-tern substance abuse
- Limited opportunities for work release programming, especially for females
- Limited opportunities for drug abuse treatment
- Inter-relationship between the two
### INMATE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Segregation</td>
<td>Single occupancy; one hour out of cell; Managed individually</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake / Reception</td>
<td>Single occupancy; Limited programming</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Single occupancy; Limited programming</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Multiple occupancy - sub-units; Full programming; Flexible management small/large groups</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Multiple occupancy - open plan; Full programming; Includes inside workers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Release</td>
<td>Multiple occupancy - open plan; Outside of secure perimeter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Multiple occupancy - sub-units; Specialized separate programming</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Unit</td>
<td>All populations (above) except work release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>** Totals</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SULLIVAN COUNTY JAIL FACILITY OPTIONS DEVELOPMENT
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WORK RELEASE UNIT
MINIMUM SECURITY UNIT
METRICS: BUILDING IMPACT

- 72% of beds are dormitory
  - Less bricks and mortar
  - Fewer doors
  - Less hardware
  - Fewer toilets
METRICS: IMPACT ON INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY

- Expanded treatment for substance abusers
- Greater success rates for work release inmates
- Reduced recidivism in the long term
Denver Detention Center
KEY PLANNING AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

- Admissions Activity
- Risk / Need Classification
ADMISSIONS ACTIVITY

How Many?

How Long?
High volume, fast turn-around
  – Upwards of 150 admissions daily
  – 40% released within 24 hours

Need sufficient capacity and efficient flow
  – Keep police, courts, inmates moving
  – Minimize movement to the housing units
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Custody</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Segregation</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Seg w/ Mental Health Needs</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Custody</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Adjustment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Classification</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 138  \times 10\% U.F. = 152
# SPECIAL MANAGEMENT POPULATION

## CLASSIFICATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION CATEGORY</th>
<th>48-BED UNIT CONFIGURATION</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Segregation</strong></td>
<td>(2-24 bed) sub-unit</td>
<td>23-hour lock-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Seg, most MH/AS/Med</td>
<td>Physical barrier between sub-units</td>
<td>One at a time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some PC, Corrective Custody</td>
<td>Direct supervision preferable</td>
<td>No interaction with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclass, Awaiting Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td>No interaction between sub-units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Management</strong></td>
<td>(2-24 bed) sub-unit</td>
<td>May be at risk in General Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most homosexual</td>
<td>Physical barrier between sub-units</td>
<td>May be out in groups within same sub-unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some PC</td>
<td>Direct supervision preferable</td>
<td>No interaction between sub-units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Need</strong></td>
<td>(4-12 bed) sub-unit</td>
<td>Special MH needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some homosexual</td>
<td>Discreet sub-units</td>
<td>Increased MH Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some MH</td>
<td>In-direct supervision</td>
<td>May be out in groups within same sub-unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some PC</td>
<td>Proximity to Med/MH services</td>
<td>No interaction between sub-units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Housing Unit and Bedspace Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Level</th>
<th>Beds / Unit</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Single Cell</th>
<th>Double Bunk</th>
<th>8-man Dorm</th>
<th>Open Dorm</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Housing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake Housing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum*</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF UNITS</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF INMATES</th>
<th>144</th>
<th>448</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>640</th>
<th>1488</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of &quot;Rated&quot; Capacity</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Isolation</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL # OF INMATES</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>470</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>640</th>
<th>1516</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

DSD snapshot/requirements: 161 pre-trial felons housed in double bunking
Snapshot assumes remaining pt felons are medium to be housed in 8-bed or open dorms (50/50 split)
Snapshot assumes pt misdemeanants are minimum designations - all in open dorms
* One Unit "unassigned" at 4/25 meeting re-designated as minimum
METRICS: BUILDING IMPACT

- From a double-bunked facility to a variety of housing unit responses
- 50% dormitory housing
- Fewer toilets, sinks, showers
- Fewer doors, less hardware
- More compact housing unit footprint
double-bunk chase in front
double-bunk
gang chase
special needs
single cell
gang chase
8-bed cell

gang chase
open dormitory
selected housing unit option

8-bed cell

open dorm

double bunk

special needs

POETIC PRAGMATISM
2011 Academy of Architecture Justice National Conference
CELEBRATING CREATIVE, COST EFFECTIVE, AND FUNCTIONAL DESIGN FOR JUSTICE FACILITIES
Smaller
Smarter
Greener
Kinder
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