**Sustainable Justice Principals in Practice Part 1: Case Studies**

**Larry:** My name is Larry Hartman, and welcome to first of two sessions that are focused on sustainability. They are sponsored by the AAJ Sustainability Committee.

We haven’t allocated a lot of time this morning to give you a broad overview of what we’ve been working on. Unfortunately, we don’t have that much time. But there is a lot of information on the website.

If you go to our AAJ website and look for sustainability, you’ll find information that gives you some idea of what we’ve been up to over several years of work in terms of looking at the issue of sustainability in a broader sense towards the goal of 2030 to develop a sustainable justice system, and looking at it in the various scales – society, from the community, from the scale of the facility, and the scale of the human.

We have also been working on goals and metrics for those various scales. We have a handout that is a Reader’s Digest version of these scales, and on the website, we have more information about the guidelines and the development of pretty detailed checklists. You’ll see a flavor of that today as we go through the presentation.

I mentioned the scales are societal, community, facility, and human. You’ll see those themes throughout our presentation. This is part one of two sessions. Today, we’re going to look at those guidelines and apply them to real projects, and test out our goals for these various principles and how they might work and how things are easy to achieve or how things might be more complicated or more complex and more interesting.

Part two is going to be a 30,000-foot level view of the systems from federal, state, and local – a very broad view of our justice systems, and how those might evolve towards sustainability into the future.

Today, our presenters are Frank Greene (Ken couldn’t be here, so Frank will be filling in for his material) Tom Perica, Alan Bright, Raphael Sperry, and Julia Hughes. So, without further ado, Frank.

**Frank**: Thanks, Larry. Welcome to everyone.

This notion of sustainable justice has really come out of a lot of discussions that our group has had, and I think many of the people in the audience have participated in those Saturday workshops and other discussions trying to give greater relevance, depth, and meaning to the notion of the LEED rating system to our work.

I think the people that do justice work are very much inspired by the notion that our buildings improve society, help people, and therefore make society more sustainable, make what we profess as a country – as a people – that government exists for the benefit of people more viable.

Those values really informed this whole discussion that to have a LEED building is great, it’s noble, but really the context that LEED building sits in – literally the city context, but also the system context that the building sits in – really ought to be thought about sustainably.

So we wanted to think at five feet off the ground, at 100 feet off the ground, and maybe at 10,000 feet off the ground to really understand the context for the justice system. That’s a lot of what our discussions have been about.

An excellent example of all of this is the Denver Justice Center. I don’t know how many of you were at convention this year in Denver, but there were quite a number of tours and events both at the courthouse and at the detention center. There were tours and discussions. It was great. It was really lively and fun to have everybody be able to talk about these ideas in a place that, in many ways, exemplifies them. If you weren’t there, too bad. You can hopefully get some of it from this presentation.

The Denver Justice Center is composed of three buildings and a space. It’s a new courthouse, a new detention center, and a new parking garage, post office, and retail structure, which is an unusual building combination and not part of the presentation directly. Most crucially, in many ways, the urban space, the public place that’s formed by these buildings, which has a very powerful identity and message about what all of these buildings are doing in the city.

This long-bar building is the new 35-courtroom courthouse with three levels of court in it. The juvenile court, the lower trial courts, and the trial courts are all in one building.

This is a 1500 bed detention center directly across the street – an urban detention center with no fence around it. The building itself is the secure perimeter.

This is the public plaza that’s in between. The city street that went through was maintained as a through city street but then was paved with materials that are on the sidewalks, so it has the identity of a plaza. It’s like a European piazza that people drive through.

We did try to get rid of the curbs and everything else around the plaza, but the highway department wasn’t really ready to go there. The parking garage and post office building is across the site – built in three phases.

This gives you an idea of the relationship between the buildings. That’s a photograph of the glass wall of the courthouse that you see through most of the time to the courtrooms beyond, but it also reflects the detention center across the street. The nature of those two buildings is, in many ways, a really rich dialog of a very solid detention center and a very open courthouse, although it certainly has very solid elements.

The first piece of this will focus on an evaluation of the courthouse itself. What I mentioned about the transparent wall that faces the public plaza is, of course, backed up by a very solid building, and this idea of layering is, of course, the way courthouses are organized, going from very public to very private as you go from front to back.

To orient you, you can see that the whole site is organized to direct people towards the entrance, because there’s not a colonnade and a pediment to tell you that’s the entrance.

What’s really exemplary – and now we’re up to 30,000 feet – is the planning process that resulted in the Denver Justice Center – all three buildings. It had an extraordinary amount of community involvement in many levels – the justice community, the people who were actually going to work there, and the elected officials who were going to fund the project, that community of the direct stakeholders, but also the surrounding community.

The project sits at the intersection of two developing neighborhoods – the Golden Triangle, the Silver Triangle – and all of those people that had taken the risk and bought downtown, not to mention the developers who were thinking about funding new projects in that area were very interested in the impact that this project would have on real estate values and also livability, so those concerns were very much brought to bear.

The big project had been presented to the voters twice at referendum and had failed twice. Third time was the charm, with the new mayor Hickenlooper getting behind it, but also with the investment that was made in community process, community involvement, numerous meetings, an Urban Land Institute (ULI) study of the whole project, and the expertise and ideas of many of the foremost architects in the area and in the country – there’s a couple of them in this room – who worked on helping to define the project in a way that was going to have a very positive impact not just on the effectiveness of the justice system itself, but on the city as a whole and on the immediate neighborhoods.

The urban design aspect of this was thought to be extraordinarily important. Again, from an architectural standpoint one of the key tenets was that both the detention center and the courthouse must have signature designers as the lead designers. These buildings – again, the detention center and the courthouse – were thought of as buildings that were worthy of the very best architectural design attention, so that they would benefit the city.

What you’re looking at is a format that somewhat excerpts from the checklist system that we have that supplements LEED. What you’ll see is an issue, which is planning process, the goal would be a broad and inclusive stake holder and community involvement in a comprehensive planning process for justice system needs, and then the third would be a metric – there would be things that need to happen – the ways of measuring how the project actually might have achieved that goal based on the issue.

You’ll see this bar across the top for each one of these slides going through. Then underneath, the way this is formatted is that you’ll see the commentary or the evidence to support that this project did in fact achieve the goal.

I should say that there are 47 issues – and Larry has a hand out and anyone that’s still awake at the end of the presentation can come and pick one of these up – and then you’ll see just basically what they are. As we go through this, we selected from them for relevance to projects. Every project is not going to show you 47 different items that they dealt with.

What’s at the bottom of this page is actually the outcome from the visioning session that we initiated and facilitated at the start of the project –these being the major goals that the planning process identified for the project, the elements of the vision and these topic areas of safety, humaneness, fairness, social harmony and prosperity, reduce crime, vibrant places, holistic justice process, city of stakeholders, civic pride.

It was great. These all came from the stakeholder group – the corrections officers, the judges, the public facilities folks – they just cheered us on – and the designers and planners, so very much a community effort.

The next issue is facility siting. The easy thing for the city to have done would have been to build the new courthouse, the new jail out at the Stapleton airport redevelopment area. It’s a giant redevelopment with plenty of land, cheap construction, and it could very well have been the anchor for that new redevelopment. But the community of interest decided that it was so important to the civic center of Denver that the courthouse be downtown where it had always been.

The existing courthouse was a City Beautiful movement courthouse, and the new site was a block away, so there was that commitment to downtown. The goal is locate in a dense walkable area of central importance, with the metric of travel distances and the sites being within an hour of the city and county of Denver, so access and literal and symbolic centrality being very important.

Notice at the top of the page, there’s a scale – society scale, community scale, building scale, and human experience scale. That’s the other thing to look for as we’re going through these slides.

Then co-location: the court and detention facility should be located such that they’re proximate to the services and the community partners who support the justice system so that things would actually be able to be used.

I remember one of the things we were talking about was that someone who has been sentenced to probation would be able to walk out of the building and go across the street, because that’s where the office is that they need to check in to, so that they wouldn’t have to get on a bus and go a mile away or anything else – that all the services that support the justice system would be within the immediate vicinity.

You’ll see graphically, this is the State Capitol, this is the main civic center of Colorado, the city county courthouse building, the Denver Mint, and this is the Justice Center site. See how this is considered to be the civic axis and the other direction is the cultural axis where all the new museums and the new libraries are? Again, enhancing the heart of the city.

Transportation access: any of you who have been to Denver know that it has a marvelous public transit system, including a free bus that goes up and down 16th Street Mall. If you don’t get run over by it, you’ll love it. They don’t stop for anybody. So again, tremendous transportation access, which means that the project notwithstanding the parking garage that was built…

The parking garage was really… I don’t remember what the percentage was, but it was quite a low percentage of the intended use. The vast majority of people come to the courthouse and the detention center by public transit, including bicycles because they have a bike-share system there. Really, the only parking in the whole project is for judges and prisoner transport vehicles, and then a small parking garage. That’s the benefit of all the free access that the existing infrastructure provides is a great benefit.

Now, at facility scale – talking about the building itself. One great goal is resolving this contradiction of security but welcoming – how is it that the building is able to be welcoming, but also have great security both for the people who work there but also for the people who come to the building seeking justice?

The building organization of this very rational working bar, which is where the courtrooms and offices are, has this open layer of public circulation in front of it and then a smaller scale element that welcomes people.

This oval shape is the jury assembly room, which is a low-scale two-story element that sits out on the plaza with the glass wall – you see right in to the jury assembly area, you see the public art there – and it makes it a human-scale gesture that invites people to the front door and shows them that this is a building that is for them, as well as the large glass wall with the views in to the public circulation area showing where the courtrooms are.

As people approach the building across a plaza that’s able to be used seven days a week, they can see how the building is to be used, how the building is to be navigated, and this switch is a welcoming gesture. It’s not a solid masonry building with a little door that you go through and then get on an elevator and press a button and read the numbers on the wall. It’s one that you can directly perceive at various stages as you get to it and understand that it’s a building for the people.

Green building certification: the building is LEED silver. One of the challenges in this project is to get a green roof approved in Colorado – because the rain that falls on your roof, doesn’t belong to you. It belongs by treaty to a farmer or a rancher any number of miles downriver from you.

The project broke new ground in getting an interpretation from the local water authority that if you retained water in a green roof that you are only temporarily detaining it. You weren’t using it to farm your farm instead of irrigating someone else’s farm.

Human scale: healthy staff. Making sure that staff work spaces and staff break spaces were full of daylight and oriented towards views. It’s absolutely the best staff break room I ever saw in my life, and it has a view of the front range of the Rockies that is absolutely spectacular all times of the year.

And then, thermal and visual comfort: yes, it’s an air conditioned building, but the front space, the public zone, during shelter seasons can be naturally ventilated. It’s a nice little trick. Obviously, it’s a smoke exhaust system, because it is a five-story atrium, and the intake vents at the bottom of the atrium can be opened up to allow fresh air in to the space.

If it runs on 25% fan velocity, it’s all naturally ventilated, because Denver tends to be dry and cool. Obviously, for smoke exhaust, it goes to 100%, but it’s a nice way to get that thing that you would never want to be used, the smoke exhaust system, to become a real amenity. It’s quite pleasant.

Its cousin and partner across the street is the Denver Detention Center – as I said, a 1500-bed jail with a wide variety of housing types with in it. It’s directly linked underneath the plaza to the courthouse.

The courthouse itself has very little prisoner delivery capacity. Basically, people from state prison or federal facilities would come directly to the courthouse. Everyone else, every other detainee, would walk through a tunnel underneath this plaza to get to the courthouse.

I should mention that they walk through unescorted. They enter the tunnel on the detention side, and they say, “Okay, when you get to the other side, they’ll let you in.” So just from a staff efficiency standpoint, in both directions, it’s quite good.

Again, the goal of secure and welcoming. The building perimeter is as normal as a building can be. This is the entrance to the vehicular sally port on the back side of the building. It’s a drive-through vehicular sally port. It’s actually neater than a lot of loading docks in a lot of different office buildings. There are no layers of fence to provide additional layers of security, so the building itself is the secure perimeter.

This is what the outside recreation areas look like outside the housing units, and these are windows in to housing units. There are no direct sight lines to the street. The views from the housing units are up to the sky, as are the rec yards. If you didn’t read the sign and know it was a detention center you wouldn’t have any signifiers of that.

Similarly, the entrance experience: walking across a beautiful plaza, going in to a beautiful lobby, the public feels welcomed and invited to use.

At the facility itself, the thought was to treat single-occupancy cells – hard cells – as a scarce resource to be used only when necessary. The majority of the housing would be less expensive, more socially oriented open dormitories.

There’s an incredible mix of housing types within the building – everything from the short-stay high-turnover housing units that are directly off the intake center, all the way up to short-sentence people who might be there for a year. So again, treating expensive individual cells as a scarce resource and working through population analysis to make sure that you have only what you need and don’t over build.

Stress reduction comes from normative environments, comes from people feeling safe. Stress reduction for officer’s results from a number of things – access to services, access to visitation, access to daylight, access to views to nature.

Directly from the housing units, people are able to go out in to a rec yard, they get the borrowed light from the rec yard, and they’re able to see out to the sky and to the mountains. These are eight-bed dormitories within the larger housing unit, and in this case, they’re able to retreat from the whole 50-guy setting into a smaller unit for a little bit more privacy.

In the open booking area… This black wall doesn’t look open, but it’s actually low. When people come to the facility, they sit in a lounge-type setting unless they act out. If they act out, they are put in to cells. The open booking counter is at least as nice as checking in at an airport – probably nicer.

**Participant**: Frank, what’s a simulated view of nature?

**Frank**: A simulated view of nature could be a mural – similar to what was done in Jay’s study. I don’t think they have it in Denver.

Acoustic comfort: the housing units are designed with acoustic-tiled ceilings and carpet in certain areas, and control of the speakers on the TVs to see that the environment is quiet and comfortable and doesn’t require shouting in order to be heard across it. It’s one more element of stress reduction and comfort.

Those are some selected ideas that add up to a sustainable justice project.

**Tom**: Good morning. I’m Tom Perica. I’m talking about the Maricopa county Superior Court’s newest building – the court tower, which is called South Court Tower, in downtown Phoenix. This is a LEED gold building. We’re going to talk about the same topics that Frank talked about but different subtopics, starting with the community scale.

It’s located in downtown Phoenix. Even in the early planning stages, this building was not necessarily going to be there as one large entity. There were discussions about breaking it up and putting it in different parts of the county, but there was a commitment to co-locating all their services in one location to minimize transportation and locate it where the law firms and other court facilities are.

Part of the siting was to integrate it in to a green belt down 3rd Street in downtown Phoenix that uses native vegetation to create a lush and cool effect. It’s also located next to a light rail station, which is new to Phoenix, and the site itself used to be a parking garage.

I’ve heard it not so nicely put that downtown Phoenix is embalmed with parking garages, and this is doing its part by removing one parking garage from downtown Phoenix to actually increase density.

It’s located by shopping and restaurants. It’s also by Arizona State University’s new downtown campus. The court itself has programs with the Cronkite School of Journalism. The law school from ASU is also moving downtown – it’s currently under design – and the Pro Se law library from Maricopa County is most likely moving to that law school to further integrate the law school with the courts.

The building is adjacent to other county services. It’s physically connected to three other courthouses – the county jail itself underground and the county owns an apartment building that is for social rehabilitation of not necessarily all from the courts but for other programs. But it’s all right there as well as inside the building itself. All the services that were on the list are inside that building.

In terms of right sizing, this building has 22 courtrooms, and four of them are called regional court centers and early disposition courts. The purpose of these is that they handle 90% of the arraignments and preliminary hearings of their felony trials here. They do all the negotiations, and they dismiss and resolve most of their cases there, alleviating the need to build more than the other 18 courtrooms that were in the building.

The early-disposition court, which is in the same juryless type courtroom, is for handling low-level drug crimes with alternates to incarceration as the result from what happens in these courtrooms.

This is the RCCEDC floor itself, which really exemplifies the concept of co-location. You don’t even have to go down the street for probation. The public defender and county attorney are all on the same floor as these, so everybody’s just walking. There’s no need to mess with elevators. If someone has to go in to probation, they just walk down the hall. We talked about locating it in a building down the street, but because they actually lose people, by putting everything on one floor, it really increases the efficiency a lot.

Moving in to technology, each of the courtrooms has broadcast television capabilities. Four of the courtrooms are specifically designed for that, with discrete places for television cameras. This area here is an electronic simultaneous translation center on the tenth floor for all the courtrooms. They can translate into 95 different languages. As well, this services 46 courtrooms around the Phoenix area. Lastly, there’s an airport style check in kiosk for all the jurors to facilitate that and to reduce staffing.

We’re focusing in on the facility scale. Like Denver, it’s located on a pedestrian mall. Instead of having a lot of bollards, the security is achieved by raising the building a half a story on a plinth of landscaped terraces that act as the security barrier. It has a very welcoming presence on the street, and it also ties in to that green belt I mentioned at the very beginning. On the other axis, the east-west axis is for tying to the other county buildings that are down the street.

As we move farther in and go into the interior, one of the sustainable justice tenets is a welcoming interior and public art. Even though Maricopa county does not necessarily subscribe to that, we’ve forced it in and built momentum.

We ended up having a national competition and hired an artist who did this major installation in the lobby. We have another artist who did all the terrazzo floors. We also have an educational exhibit in the terrazzo floors that is a grid of the city of Phoenix where the names of the presidents are the names of the streets and all those terrazzo strips end in biographies such as George Washington, so that school kids that are coming there can learn a little bit about them.

One of our consultants who’s not typical on this project was an environmental psychologist from the University of Washington, and she had a major impact on this project. Two things that she really emphasized were way-finding and natural light.

The things that cause so much stress in a courthouse are confusing layouts and how to get from A to B, so the building was designed to have as much intuitive way-finding as possible. But we also had a graphics program that tied the South Court Tower to the three existing buildings that it’s connected to, and then on an automobile scale to the pedestrian scale in front of the building to interior, there’s a consistent graphic that was developed to help people maneuver around this campus.

We have a very large air-conditioned prescreening lobby, which is an important aspect of the building. Prior to this, everybody had to wait out in the heat, and it was really unpleasant. Here you’re waiting in a place where there is public art and friendly guards who are trained to be customer-service-oriented.

Another hidden part of the first floor is… This building is very dedicated to victims’ rights and building facilities within the courthouse that are victim-oriented. The county attorney runs the victims program. There’s a lounge for them on the first floor where they can wait in a secure and living-room-like environment while their waiting for the trials to happen.

We get to the courtroom itself. You can see we have a suite that is not a typical thing outside the courtroom. It’s physically connected where the victims can watch and hear the proceedings of the court or also have the option of going directly in to the spectators’ seating area if they would like. They also have a private rest room.

This was another key feature. We found in interviewing victims advocacy groups that going to the bathroom was the most stressful thing for them, because that’s where they felt the most threatened – going in to those public restrooms, they were completely exposed – so that alleviated a lot of anxiety.

Also off the courtroom, in the red area is a noncontact interview booth where the attorneys can have last-minute consultations with in-custody defendants without having to go back to a central holding area or having possibilities of escape by them being outside of secure zones. It increases efficiency that way.

Stress reduction is a big part of this. Like I said, we did it through the public art and way-finding and also through abundant natural light. This is the jury assembly area, which is very large and is quite spacious with tons of natural light, but it’s also facing north. It’s protected with overhangs, so it’s bright but it’s not uncomfortable. In Phoenix, there are a lot of issues with sun control, but it’s well controlled here.

Again, we use natural light as an intuitive way-finding. Once you get up in the tower, it’s a super simple plan. You’re oriented with your view. Either it’s urban with the skyscrapers or to the mountains in the south, so once you get off the elevators, you know exactly which way you’re going. The waiting areas are all flooded with natural light.

Finally, when you get down to the courtroom level, except for those RCCEDC courtrooms I described at the beginning, all the rest have natural light – a bit of borrowed light over a corridor, bounced off a light shelf over a corridor into the court room, so that you have not direct in-your-eyes sunlight, but you have natural light in the courtroom.

That’s Maricopa in a nutshell. I’m going to turn it over to Alan Bright.

**Alan**: Tom, thank you. Raphael and I are going to talk about the new Public Safety Building in San Francisco.

As you can see in the image here, the facility was actually just beginning construction. You can see the historic brick firehouse that’s going to remain on the site. The building is going to contain now the new police headquarters. Currently, the police headquarters is actually in the Hall of Justice on Bryant Street downtown San Francisco. This will be their new facility to move into a new district.

This area is the Mission Bay area. You can see the ballpark in San Francisco, the baseball field right over there, near the bay in this area. This is the site and the historic building in this area.

Not much has been built yet, but there was a lot of community involvement in the planning of this and where this building will sit. The idea is to be a civic building that’s of a wonderful scale and really very welcoming overall to allow a police facility, a fire facility that shares this area to really be part of the community, to let the community come in to it.

It was important to start to mix with the scale, save some of the historic buildings around there, and get people to actually be part and feel that they’re being welcomed by the police and the fire.

These were some early studies about ultimately where we are today. There are just a couple buildings that are in the neighborhood, and then of course, the historic building on the fire station in the site.

The plan is over the next number of years in the development, there will be a number of buildings four, five, six stories that will line this area, and then ultimately, with our building being there being the hub of that area. Being in a brand new community, it’s important to fit in there, have the community work with us to make sure that the building was part of this overall goal of knitting things together.

One of the things that we’re going to be using the historic brick fire building for – it’s going to stay there – will be a community room. That’s going to be saved. There’s going to be a new plaza that’ll be part of that. The actual firehouse itself will be open to the community to use that building and be part of that. You can see this is the main entry lobby area around that firehouse.

You can see in this image the firehouse and then the blow up of the plaza area – the opportunity for people to use this – and then the entry plaza coming in to the new police headquarters.

One of the things was to really open this building up. Again, it’s a very secure building with the police and the fire in here, but we wanted to make sure that it was a very glassy building that would allow people to see through it, to see what’s going on, to see into the lobbies.

On a security level of scale, as it sits on the street, we did take the parking that’s on the street around it away, so that people couldn’t get too close. The building sits about 50 feet back if you include all of that.

The overall scale of getting lots of glass in and lots of light in was really important, and Raphael is going to talk about some of the daylighting that’s going on in these very narrow footprints – they’re only 60- foot wide in the overall dimension of these footprints – but also making it secure, so the building actually has resistance for blast and for bullet on the glazing on the building.

The idea of some of the early studies was to make this very inviting with all the glass, to be able to see through the building, to see the scale of the building, but to actually make this work for the scale of blast resistance.

 You can see in the mock ups we have here the scale of the glass – you can see the person back in this area. You can see through it, so it’s very inviting for daylight and people seeing, but the actual section to support this that’s a standard section for glazing. There’s another 12 to 14 inches worth of steel back behind it to protect it from blast. It’s definitely allowing people to believe that this is really a building that’s open and inviting, but ultimately it’s a very secure building with structure.

Again, the lobby. This has not been built yet, so we only have renderings of what’s going to be happening to make it very open, very light filled. People will be coming through the historic building and around through the plaza and ultimately in to the building, so it’s very, very open to the community.

With that, I’m going to turn it over to Raphael.

**Raphael**: This is probably the one building where we’re going to talk a little bit about energy and water conservation, which are the more traditional aspects of what sustainability has been. I would encourage you to come to the sustainability workshop on Saturday, so you can continue to learn about and be part of the conversation and help us refine the checklists we’ve done so far. It’s a joint workshop with the research committee.

In San Francisco, this building – which is on track to be LEED gold – has a lot of really terrific features that I wanted to touch on briefly – a lot of green roof areas, which are actually available to the staff as break areas but are also water conservation features. San Francisco is a pretty dry area. We import almost all our water.

In addition to these slides, we have got a great water system that’s providing 100% of the water for toilet flushing, and we’re capturing rainwater for use for the irrigation of these spaces. In a tight urban site, that’s all accomplished with actually fairly large cisterns that subtracted from some of the parking that was needed in the basement level. There’s a big commitment to water conservation in this project.

It’s the first or maybe the second major building in the United States to use an active chilled beam system, which is something I would recommend that you look at, because it also provides for a smaller floor-to-floor section.

Chilled beams are a hydronic system. You’re delivering chilled water rather than chilled air, so you’re saving a lot of fan power that way. You’re also achieving more comfort. It’s a system that mixes radiant cooling delivered from the ceiling with recirculation in the rooms of chilled air, so you can actually have higher comfort with a lot less energy.

The projected energy savings on the total building are 26%. A lot of that is driven from the mechanical side. Arup are the engineers for this. It’s the first time that they’ve deployed it in the United States.

In addition to solar electric on the building, we’re actually doing solar hot water on this building. I’m a fan of that technology. It gets over looked a lot, but I would encourage you to look at it, because there is a significant heating load with a lot of glass on the building, and if you do it right, you can use solar hot water for your domestic hot water as well as for space heating, and you can take some of the edge off your gas use.

Then the daylighting, which is, of course, integrated with the electric lighting system. This building was really challenging. The curtain wall that Alan was telling you about actually faces west. That was because of the urbanism, which was a huge commitment, and that really comes first.

We have that big street, which in this case is Third Street, that we wanted to have the public face for. They wanted to have it there. We had to have glass on that street. It’s facing west, so that’s a huge glare problem. It’s potentially an overheating problem, potentially a security problem. Keeping the floor plates narrow allows you to bring in light from both sides to help balance out some of that.

What you can also see if you look at the space plan, we don’t have the work spaces come straight to the curtain wall. Actually arranging the interior space plan so that they’re spaced for some of the glare to be abated, to provide other furnishing options, and to give people some space away provides some of the security issues that people wanted in the building and allowed us to have the west-facing curtain wall without some of the real problems that it creates. Of course, also, the 50 pound per square foot curtain wall was able to resolve some of the security issues. The fritted glass that cuts down on a lot of the heat gain without reducing the visibility.

On those more traditional green features, this building is one to really pay some attention to. Back to you, Alan.

**Alan**: I want to also share with you a new project that is one of the first projects that’s under the AB 109 realignment in California, where moneys are being taken and put in to the counties to build facilities for inmates, to help to improve their lives, to get them out of jails and actually get in to society.

This is in San Mateo, just right outside of Redwood City in San Mateo County, and this project is was led by a wonderful jail-planning group that’s in Redwood City and for the county of San Mateo by Lieutenant Debbie Bazan.

She said, “I want the perfect design.” When we started this project, she said it has to be perfect, it has to take care of people, and it’s about improving lives throughout their situations. One of the things as we started to develop the project was looking at programs.

Some of the things that she wanted to make sure that we would include would be growing their own food, growing trees, looking at the horticulture they could do, culinary opportunities, training and working with pets so they could actually be with the animals. The animals will be on site, and they’ll be living with them, sleeping with them, caring for them. It’s one of the programs to use for the women who are in the facility.

They have a transitional housing component that’s part of this. They have housing that’s for men and women. We’ll show this in a minute on a larger scale. That zone right there is actually transitional housing. About 88 beds are in this area for men and for women to actually go out every day into work programs, to go into the community, have classrooms, have families come in and be with them. This upper area that you see here in this image, that’s an area for growing things. They will have chickens up there. They’ll be able to have eggs to use in the culinary kitchen.

It’s about getting families together, helping them to get in to the community and go back out in to society. But a very open building that people really want to come to, want to be part of in this area.

On the community scale, if you know a little bit about the bay area, Redwood City sits over in this area, downtown heart is over here. The bay is right out in this area, and our site sits right here. This is 101, and San Francisco Airport is just up the road a little bit from here.

This area is in transition. There’s the idea this is going to be a harbor for boats. More family living will be down through here, and there’s the police facility here right now. There’s a go cart area that you can see in this squiggly line here.

It’s really trying to take the city and move it down across the freeway from a walkway on a roadway down in to this harbor, and this is going to be one of the elements that will really be part of that to tie it all together.

We got together with about nine or ten different groups. We had visioning sessions, with the community, part of the board of supervisors, all the users to actually figure out what scale they wanted, how it would really fit in the area, and that it would be an open building and not a jail-looking building or feeling that it was hard and not open.

You can see just the beginning renderings, the ideas that the very scale of the first is two stories, very open, allowing people to really come in to the building. This is the main part of the building – it’s very public – and then there’s a break and a connection in to the housing. This is the harder housing area back through here, and then 101 is right off to the back side over here. We’ve broken the scale down, made it very inviting to a very glassy entry, and again, allowing friends, family to come up here and be part of this building.

Some renderings of the lobby space. This will open out in to gardens and look out onto nature, so it’s calming. It’s a place where people can sit and wait. There’s a place for children that’s off to this side over here. There’s visitation in this area, but again, trying to make it very open, very light, and then this point where you can actually go upstairs to a community room. The community will be able to come in here during regular hours to actually go upstairs and use community areas.

The dining for the staff is actually one level up on the upper level. They have views out towards the bay. They’re sitting in this arced place right here. This element you see here is a dining opportunity for them that actually opens up in to a secure place, but they can have open air. They can be in the light. They could actually have tables out there. It’s just right off this dining area that’s part of it – and not too far from the chickens.

One of the things that we wanted to make sure, too, is that there was lots of daylight in this facility. What you’re seeing on the left-hand side are early studies about daylight into the place, seeing how much daylight we can get in here, borrowed daylight to get in to this area to make sure that all the spaces had as much as possible.

Early design, we actually had the housing flipped where all of the rooms were on the outside of the building, and then we had an opportunity for the rec area that we carved in to it and had borrowed light.

But about two months into design, we said, “Let’s try something else.” We flipped it so the housing came right inside and opened up the whole outside edge to allow for daylight to come in to the building. All of this is actually natural light coming in to the day room, the rec room, and the housing areas for the actual rooms. The cells are back behind all that getting borrowed light.

There’s a very simple security screen that goes across here. The construction of this building on the facade is very normal. It looks like a normal building with lots of glazing coming in to it. It does not look like a jail.

We are in design right now. They’re beginning to actually do some construction. Layton is working on the project in construction right now, and I believe in about a year, we’ll be able to show some pictures in reality next time.

Thank you.

**Julia**: Hi. I’m Julia Hughes, and I want to talk about the San Diego Women’s Detention Facility in Santee, California, just east of San Diego. This was an over ten-year planning endeavor for the county, and they expertly developed an innovative approach to the care and custody of women for the county.

The goal was that this project could potentially establish a national adult incarceration model based on normative operations and facility design. We’re hoping that this is a game changer, especially for incarcerated women but for adult facilities that are being planned right now in this country.

It’s designed for 1216 beds, which replaces an existing facility on campus. There’s an existing campus back here in this corner of the site, and the replacement is a 45-acre campus that will include 24 buildings. As you can see, it’s modeled on a community college design and a little bit of an operation, as well.

It will facilitate a program-intensive management culture intended to proactively reduce recidivism for the county. This distinctly transformative philosophy inspired the planning and design team to explore principles of choice, change, and accountability. The development of the environment that would support rehabilitative opportunities and safety and security of staff and inmates was the focus of this planning and design process.

The San Diego county sheriff has an existing relationship with a community-based program called Welcome Home Ministries. They recently implemented or re-invented a collaborative program focusing on re-entry, and that aligns with one of our sustainable justice principles for community-based re-entry programming.

The Welcome Home Ministries opened up what they’re calling their Future Achievers In Re-entry (FAIR) program, which is a peer-monitored therapeutic community model that is held in a dedicated dorm in the facility. The women are held and hold each other to a higher standard of behavior and participation. They program together, and they help support each other in their recovery and in their re-entry objectives.

We’ve had really good examples of other projects that describe the planning process. This facility, like many other detention and correctional facilities, was not well supported at first by the community. They really didn’t want the existing facility there, and the thought of such an expansion was controversial. It was challenged by a developer who owned proximate sites that he wanted to develop commercially. The site is also bordered by residential communities – one of them is a gated community.

In 2008, the city sued the county in opposition to the project, because they also wanted to sell the land for commercial development. But the county forged on. They knew this was the right project and it was the right team to do the project, the right objectives, and they carefully chose the right time to go public with the planning and the design intent.

Once construction started a little over a year ago, they held an open house and invited the city, the residents, and other interested community members. We created nice, large-scale renderings and the county group, the sheriff group, and the construction group, were all their onsite to talk about the project, introduce its finer moments, and answer questions that the community had.

We talk a lot about being a good neighbor, and the RFP document referenced very specific EIR criteria and community development criteria that the design had to adhere to, which started with a description of the desired face of the site – what the community would experience being its neighbor. It specified materials and the type of fencing, the type of landscaping that could occur in a specified buffer zone.

The design team focused on the administration and visitation building as its front door – what the visitor would experience coming up to the building. We wanted a residentially scaled administrative building at the beginning of that experience and richly landscaped areas around the parking and the fence – again, reinforcing the desire, the commitment to being a good neighbor to the community.

Secure yet welcoming sustainable goal has been discussed in other project examples. Again, the intent for the entry point in to the administration building was to bring the interior and exterior environment together, blend the materials, blend the textures of those materials, the tones, the experience, and also to provide abundant views in to that entry space that you’re headed towards, and when your inside, have nice views outward.

The cashier’s station was carefully planned. There were competing functional needs for that space. It was a very secure cashier station, it needed to be an open and informative information kiosk, there was staff work space, and it also needed to be accessible to anyone in a wheel chair or with any other challenges.

We went through a couple of iterations of that space but maintained the value of providing as much glazing as possible. It was expensive bullet-resistant glazing, but we wanted to make sure that it was an open and an appropriate reception for any visitor.

One of the facility scale sustainable goals is an appropriate health care program aligned with the National Commission on Correctional Health Care accreditation criteria. This facility has a very supportive health care and mental health care program.

Statistics show that over 85% of these women in the San Diego County are incarcerated primarily as a result of crimes related to mental illness or substance abuse. So the new facility will have 32 mental health beds and 22 mental patient beds intended to accommodate a wide range of health care needs.

The medical services will consist of four distinct components: clinical, medical infirmary, psych outpatient unit, and a clinic and a psych security unit – housing connected. The clinic and medical infirmary components will serve sick inmates and include an isolation area. The outpatient will include a waiting area with private interview rooms and clinical staff offices. The psych security housing unit is probably one of the highest security environments for the housing, and it is connected to the clinic.

Inmate rehabilitation opportunities are – we hope – abundant in this project. The studies show that women socialize differently than men or juvenile inmates, but they also interact with staff differently. We wanted to create an environment that focused on these opportunities of interaction. Social zones were created specifically to focus inward toward the unit for inmate interaction, and small groups of activities could be accommodated either within the housing unit or on the campus around the housing unit.

This is a rendering of one of the minimum-secure environments. The multi-custody housing units are clustered around an exterior courtyard area that integrally connects the interior spaces with the exterior environment and creates these social zones.

The program buildings. This is where the admin building was. There’s a connected pathway to the building programs that include the education building, a library, other services, and training facilities for the inmates.

The main organizational objective for the site design was to create an experience. These women have multiple areas for different types of social activities, as well as the staff. The staff are also able to use different areas of the site for specific functions.

On a human scale, thermal comfort was paramount in the planning process, especially the living environments. One of the biggest challenges in the detention facility is the ability to provide personal control of your environment. We were able to meet those objectives for some of the areas. Other areas, we just reduced cost. We were not able to provide the level of personal control we would have liked. But the sustainable justice objectives are aiming towards those metrics and those targets.

Visual comfort is another human scale issue that we like to address. In housing units where you have a lot of people, especially in dorm configurations, you have multiple activities that need to be accommodated in the same space, especially in the evenings. You have some residents who go to bed early. Sometimes they’re napping during the day.

What we were trying to do was to create different zones or different types of spaces that are used by inmates for different reasons supported by the lighting program. Certainly, we wanted to uplight the ceilings, to use the ceilings as a reflective surface for lights and provide a light and airy feeling around the dorm areas. We projected light off the walls. You can see that we have task surface lighting as well as the night lighting.

Frank mentioned for the Denver jail an objective to provide flexible housing. You have multiple types of classification of inmates, and the sustainable justice objective is to provide specific housing for those inmate needs and to only build the expensive maximum environments that you need.

This project included all of the basic levels in minimum- to maximum-security zones. We had two different versions of the minimum housing units. One was a work-release type housing where the inmates really didn’t spend a lot of time in the units. They didn’t have cells. They had bedrooms. They do a lot of the daily activities offsite or do a lot of programming on the campus. It was designed as a more residential housing. The level 2 housing was also minimum-security environment, but it was a dorm setting, so the inmates had a very different social or community type environment.

Then we had medium housing designed to provide a general population environment. The goal was that the AB 109, the realignment inmates would probably be housed in the medium-security environments. That challenged the design and planning design process to provide the appropriate housing security level within the housing security environment so that the sheriff had the ability to modify the operational approach for whoever was being housed in that facility.

The sense of safety on the human scale is also relative to the inmate’s environment. Is the inmate being housed in an environment that is conducive to that inmate’s rehabilitative approach?

There were three different maximum-security environments that were designed. We have the general maximum population. Then we also have more specific operational segregated population to add – administrative segregation, the protective custody, high-profile and disciplinary segregation housing units. These housing units were consolidated and grouped into a more secure compound area on the site, so it could function as a standalone facility, and the services were centralized within the compound.

The human scale normative environment: we’ve been talking about normative design for years now, and this project was one of the best opportunities to implement those sustainable objectives. As much as we could, in the areas where the bulk of the medium- to minimum-security population was going to spend most of their day, we tried to implement a design approach that emulated a community college setting.

We used the premise that the design is based on what are known to be predicted. It’s predictable, psychological, and physiological responses that people have to their environment. The site and the building architecture were to support a culture of expectations that appropriate and respectful behavior, positive change through hard work and responsibility, respectful interaction with other inmates and staff, personal growth from programs, and ultimately that this culminates in a successful transition back into the community as a productive citizen.

One challenge was to get the operations and maintenance crew on board with some of our interior finishes design concepts. We talked a lot about how they wanted to clean the carpets, how they wanted to clean the floors on the epoxy, and what happens when they have to replace pieces of casework or furniture.

We had a really good team to work with, I have to say. We had really good design ideas, but we were lucky enough, for the most part, to have a maintenance crew who understood the value of color in interior environment, especially in the housing and especially the maximum units.

This is a maximum unit. We started out with probably a palette of eight different colors and tried to create a variation in the walls around the housing cells, around the living spaces. I think we ended up with maybe a three- or four-color palette, crossing our fingers that in a year or two, it doesn’t become one. That was one of the key features of our interiors approach, especially for the housing areas themselves.

**Raphael:** If you’ve been following along at the top, you’ve seen part two, which is the community scale, part three, the facility scale, and part four, the human scale. It’s been hard for us to talk about the societal scale even though we spent a lot of time in the Sustainability Committee talking about what the large-scale impacts are of the work that we do and what is the sustainable justice system? Can we, in fact, continue to do the same business as usual the way it’s going? Will that be sustainable for the indefinite future?

Eric Holder actually said, “No.” When he made his recent announcement, sustainability was one of the things he said. He said, “Treating the drug offenders in the federal system the way we’ve been doing is not sustainable.” Maybe we’ve been channeling Eric Holder for the past couple of years but didn’t even know it – or maybe not.

In some sense, these are evaluation criteria for the whole system that we’re looking at. It’s a way of putting an individual building also in the context of what is the purpose of this detention center or this courthouse? How is it working in the whole jurisdiction in the broader society of which it’s a part? It’s evaluative, it’s also context.

These are some of the metrics that we had been talking about. What is the crime rate in the community? What we did for this session was pull together the different communities we’ve been talking about so we could look at these numbers. I did some of this research.

I could say if you’re interested in this part, please come to the joint workshop on Saturday because in doing this research, I can tell you there are real issues about data quality. Finding any jurisdiction that reports their recidivism rate in the same format for two years in a row so you could tell if it’s going down is not easy. It’s probably not widely done.

It’s great that we’re meeting with the Research Committee, because if you’re interested in this topic, I think it’s a chance for us as architects to reach out to other criminologists perhaps, people who are doing research, professors, trying to understand what the value of our work is. What are our clients achieving? How are our buildings helping them reach their goals? Which design strategies are actually successful? Which ones aren’t? Trying to get the same things, and some of the results here were actually not certainly what I was expecting.

I think the biggest issue is: is the justice system providing safety? Safety is actually different from justice, but it generally is accepted as one of the main goals of what we’re doing. You can measure that through the crime rate, through the recidivism rate.

When we were talking about this in the committee, we said, “Gee, wouldn’t it be great to see those rates going down 20% year over year?” Nobody can achieve that. But I think it will be an interesting discussion to have. On the other hand, we do need to see those things go down substantially. How do we do that and what role are we playing?

Proportionality – which is to say does the punishment fit the crime, and what are the incarceration rates here? This was interesting to research, because it turned out today we were presenting projects that were either courts or county courts or detention centers, local jails.

The jail incarceration rate is different from the state incarceration rate, and by and large, when people are looking at incarceration, they spend a lot more time looking at prisons than they do at jails. When you look at the overall numbers, there are a lot more people in prison than in jail. But in jail, you have a big split between pre-trial and post-trial. I think we could do some refining of these metrics.

There’s a pretty big range in terms of how many people are in jail. Why is it that in Denver you have a lot more people incarcerated than in other counties? That would be interesting to know when you’re looking at how their county jails system is working, because that probably provides some pointers operationally or in terms of space plan and the facilities as to how are you benchmarked?

This was one that we’ve talked about a bunch, and I know it’s been an issue. Linda Bernal was saying that next year’s theme will probably be social justice, and so we’ll probably want to return to this topic of equality. But the goal that our committee had put forward of treating all minority populations with equal dignity and respect as the majority population, and looking at that when you track minority populations – is there what the legal scholars call disproportionate minority contact?

I come from San Francisco, and I thought that that was a very progressive jurisdiction. When I saw this number, that 6% of San Francisco is African-American – it’s actually declining – but 56% of people in the county jail are African-Americans, that was pretty discouraging actually as a San Francisco resident.

It actually probably takes a lot of work to make things come out like that. What role is the justice system playing in that? Because that is one of the outcomes. This is actually a particularly troubling area, and I think every jurisdiction in the country – whether you’re in a red state or a blue state or if you don’t believe in those kinds of states – I think that’s something everybody probably needs to look at.

There’s not really that many encouraging numbers in this sphere for many of these jurisdictions. We can repeat the analysis in any other city or in rural areas and we’ll probably find similar results.

There’s been some interesting projects presented in Canada, with First Nations populations and they have the same story that we do, so it’s really a big issue for justice systems all over North America, maybe worldwide.

This is the last criteria. Again, this is a real data quality area – length of stay is not something that’s widely reported. I think it’s actually an area where we as consultants can start to work with our clients in all the different sectors of the justice system and come up with… If we have consistent numbers and metrics that we actually know how to work with and know how to ask for, that would probably help a lot of our clients.

I’m working right now at UC Berkeley in what’s called Warren Institute, which is actually part of the law school. I’m the first architect they’ve had on their floor and so it’s kind of fun. They get grants to do public-health-oriented but legal assessments of county-level programs, and they can connect all these programs, but it’s not every county is doing it. Some of them have funding for assessment of their criminal justice programs, and some of them just simply don’t fund it. There are great research methodologies that exist, but they’re not widely or consistently implemented.

If AAJ is out there recommending best practices and is familiar on how to help our clients do that kind of work, I think that’s actually real value added to the justice system, and it helps them put their individual buildings in this bigger context. Because there’s actually there’s a lot of cost savings here and there’s actually a better delivery of justice. People are entitled to a speedy time to trial, and how the buildings are laid out and which ones they live in and for how long, those are big issues, and we’re the ones who can help resolve that.

That’s my part of that. Thanks for giving me the time.

**Julia:** We did want to give credit to the planners and architects and other specialists who were part of this successful project. We would like to open up the discussion for Q&A with Melissa.

**Melissa:** First, thank you so much. That was so clearly illustrated, and it’s really valuable. I want to know if by any chance that’s going to be something that gets put on the website or anything like that?

**Julia:** What we’re hoping is to talk more about this at the workshop on Saturday.

**Melissa:**  Yeah. I think it’s a great tool for client education. It was clearly illustrated.

**Julia:** Absolutely. It serves a lot of purposes. This is the first group of case studies. We implore the group out here. We’re really hopeful that we get more interest in developing other case studies. We would love to hear about your projects. We would love you to present your projects next year at the conference.

We’re hoping that all of this information gets combined into a database. What that is and how we’re going to use it is another topic of conversation at the workshop, but accessibility to it is key not just for us, our partners in crime, but also our clients and owners and people who want to learn about how to do more than just building a performance, which we’re all very familiar with.

Frank hit on that at the beginning of the presentation. The LEED certification is the baseline. This is beyond.

**Melissa:** Thank you so much, awesome job. My second comment was – maybe you’re going to talk about this in the next session when you’re talking about systems – I know in the early part **[1:22:28 inaudible]** from Maricopa county, for instance, you talked to the presiding judge and the court administrator about what is sustainable justice, and it was three things. It was about mission, operations, and the building.

I clearly saw that in the examples that you had shown. You might not have talked about it. I think, Julia, you might have talked about those specific things, maybe more than some of the others, but it was clearly represented in what I saw. I don’t know if that’s accurate and maybe you’re going to be talking about that in the second session, those type of things.

**Tom:** Well, it’s a different group. So I don’t know exactly what they’re going to be talking about.

**Melissa:** Oh, it’s a completely different group. I’m sorry. Okay.

**Julia:** Since you brought it up, this was part one. Part two is a systems approach discussion. We’re going to be talking about some of the trends at the local level using San Francisco as an example, at the state level using Massachusetts as an example, and at the federal level. We have three sections to part two. I don’t know if we answered your question.

**Melissa:** Maybe I’ll find out in the second part, but have you… Maricopa county is all about customer service, right? So that’s the mission, which obviously means you want stress reduction, you want accessibility, location, all of it, this goes down. To me, that was very much **[1:23:55 inaudible]**.

**Julia:** Yeah. We’re hanging out, so if you have more questions.

**Frank:** Well just to answer the question in this session a little bit, just from the Denver standpoint. At the outset, in our point of entry to the project, the kick-off meeting was really a visioning session and we outlined the goals for the project, which I think is: what’s our ambition here?

One of the goals was that the project itself would make the city just from an urban design standpoint better because there’s all those development pressure happening around.

The second one was to increase public safety, to make the city safer, because the justice system is going to be somehow more effective internally.

Then, the third was to affect the lives of the people that come into contact with the system to make them better.

All of those things emerged from the discussion and actually ended up in the vision statement for the project. So that idea that the building should be based on this idea of defining the mission and then designing operations that go along with that mission, and only then can you really design the building properly. I think that was a common thread between Maricopa and Denver.

Really, when you’re an architect who starts designing with all of that good stuff as your guide, it’s really a pleasure. Obviously, you have budget, obviously, a building code and other metrics, and a program, but really with that kind of spirit guiding your pencil, so to speak, that’s really the right way to start a project.

**Tom:** I think the process was very similar in the two. We just didn’t outline the second time since it was already outlined in Denver.

**Participant:** How much of that, Frank, really, when you entered into the project, where you had to start to steer that conversation in that direction, where you have to take the lead instead of this being, “This is just going to be a new justice center,” to take that discussion **[86:10 inaudible]**?

**Frank:** Again, in Denver, there had been so much groundwork done prior to our point of entry. HOK and other people had been doing studies, never mind there was very an activist community that had really high aspirations for their project, or they weren’t going to support it and it was going to fail yet again to get funding. There was a lot of pressure on the city county government to elevate the aspiration from the project by the time we got there.

Because I certainly have been involved in other projects that are just about beds, that are just about courtrooms, and “Try to get this much done with this much budget.” Then for us to try to inject this note of best practices, you really working uphill and it’s hard. “We can’t afford that. We can’t possibly afford that.”

That’s where we bring all of our skills of persuasion and “Here’s what they did here” and “Here’s what they did there.” And needless to say, you’re going to fall short in those kind of settings.

I think that’s why in Maricopa, and probably in San Francisco as well, and certainly in Denver, where the client was already there, those are wonderful opportunities.

**Larry:** We’re looking at the guidelines now as a tool. So it’s not just Frank or it’s not Larry going in and talking about these issues, but here’s a document the Academy supports, and it’s still evolving, but it’s more material for us to talk with some backing behind us.

**Participant:** As far as the product you showed, if you had a guideline as what’s being prepared right now, and it was presented to the client as well as the stakeholders, and you put it up there, does it make it a lot easier to sell these things?

**Frank:** Absolutely. I think that’s what Larry is getting at. If it’s gotten an institutional endorsement – the Academy of Architecture for Justice has produced this broader definition of sustainable justice, and even the American Correctional Association has endorsed it, and the AJA and NACM – then it really becomes a guide to good practice that then when you get it to your clients, it’s not justDwightsaying, “Come on, guys. You have to catch up.”

**Julia:** “This is the norm.” That’s the other reason why these case studies are so important and the process of using the checklist, of testing it. We need more input. We would like to hone the checklist, the guide and get it ready for clients and owners to use.

**Participant:** I use it for my staff. I had a project where we were looking at site selections for a new complex for corrections, and it was a good tool, because it made them look at the different points compared to what we already knew as compared to what else we should be concerned with. It was a pretty good tool for us.

**Larry:** Thank you very much for coming.