


N A A T A P

Native American and Alaskan Technical Assistance Project



# PROJECT GUIDE: Existing Facility Evaluations

*Part of A Series of Guides for Planning, Designing  
and Constructing Adult and Juvenile Correctional and  
Detention Facilities on Tribal Lands*

The Native American and Alaskan Technical Assistance Project (NAATAP) was created pursuant to an interagency agreement between the National Institute of Corrections and the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

National Institute of Corrections

Morris Thigpen, Director  
Larry Solomon, Deputy Director

320 First Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20534  
(800) 995-6423

Bureau of Justice Assistance

Domingo S. Herraiz, Director  
Mark Roscoe, Branch Chief

810 Seventh Street NW  
Fourth Floor  
Washington, DC 20531  
(202) 616-6500

Prepared under National Institute of Corrections Cooperative Agreement 04S07GIU2 with Justice Planners International LLC (JPI), 29 Donnybrook Drive, Demarest, NJ 07627 and 1179 Clifton Road, Atlanta, GA 30307. principals: Shelley Zavlek and Mark Goldman.

## Purpose

The purpose of each NAATAP Guide is to communicate substantive information concerning a range of subjects that are relevant to the development of adult and juvenile detention and correctional facilities in Indian Country. This series of guides grew out of a recognition that there were common concerns and questions being raised by Tribes and consultants developing new correctional facilities on Native lands throughout the country. The guides seek to provide research and information on issues of common concern to the Tribes. These guides also seek to document the knowledge and experience gained by Justice Planners International LLC (JPI) while providing technical assistance to tribes engaged in the facility development process.

## Acknowledgements

JPI acknowledges the assistance of the many consultants who contributed their expertise in the preparation of this series of guides. These materials were developed and reviewed by individuals with diverse backgrounds, expertise and experience in planning and design of juvenile and adult correctional and detention facilities, as well as analysis, design and operation of justice programs, facilities and systems on a local, state and national level.

Points of view and opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or affiliated agencies. The information is not to be taken as a warranty or representation for which JPI assumes legal responsibility. Any use of this information must be determined by the user to be in accordance with the policies of the user's organization and with applicable federal, state and tribal laws and regulations.

N A A T A P

Native American and Alaskan Technical Assistance Project

**PROJECT GUIDE:**  
Existing Facility Evaluations

**Author**

Cheryl Fuller and Justice Planners International LLC (JPI)

JPI Project Staff: Shelley Zavlek and Mark Goldman, Principals;  
Anthony H. Jones and Joshua LeFrancois, Associates

## Overview

A thorough evaluation of an existing correctional facility is important for two critical reasons: (1) to determine if it would be worthwhile to renovate and/or expand the existing facility, and (2) to determine which elements of the existing facility work well for the users (and might be incorporated in the construction of an addition or a new facility); and which elements need to be changed, or improved, or eliminated altogether. Both reasons are explained below.

1) **To determine if the facility is a “keeper.”** Once the requirements for a new facility (i.e. number and types of beds and housing units, areas for programs and services, etc.) are determined, it is wise to then conduct a thorough facility evaluation, before any further decisions are made. The evaluation must include a variety of people who can collectively understand the building and functions, from maintenance personnel to management, security and treatment staff, architects and engineers. It will help to determine if the existing facility, through renovation and/or expansion, can fulfill the requirements that the tribe originally agreed upon.

As an example, if an evaluation indicates that all program and support areas are sufficient for the total number of juveniles or adult inmates that are projected to require incarceration in the next 10 to 20 years, and that existing sleeping rooms meet standards but are too few in number, then adding more housing units should be seriously considered. If, on the other hand, the results of the facility evaluation reveal that the conditions of all areas are far below Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and American Correctional Association (ACA) standards, that there is too little space for all functions, or that the site will not permit expansion, then renovation/expansion should be ruled out and options for building a new facility should be explored more seriously.

2) **To learn from the facility.** An evaluation of an existing facility should be made even when it is obvious without it that renovation/expansion is not the best option. A thorough evaluation can be instrumental in helping to plan and design or conceptualize elements of a new facility. On one hand, lessons may be learned about what NOT to repeat in the new facility. On the other hand, even in

the worst facilities, it is likely that there will be some design or operational elements that the Tribe may wish to repeat.

This guide focuses on the first reason for evaluating an existing facility: to determine its future. Whether the evaluation leads to a decision to renovate/expand or to build a new correctional facility, a thorough walk-through and comprehensive evaluation will be extremely useful in helping the Tribe's project team think specifically about how that building or its replacement should function.

The evaluation will help the tribe meet its corrections-related goals and needs. The evaluation will also address what sorts of spaces would best support the facility's mission, objectives, users, functions, services, and programs. Major issues addressed in the evaluation are safety, security, and treatment.

The first step in determining whether an existing facility can support future use is to conduct a needs assessment, a process that profiles the current inmate population and projects needs in terms of numbers and categories of pre-adjudicated/pre-sentenced and adjudicated/sentenced offenders appropriate for an array of alternatives to incarceration, and those who require incarceration. Once it is determined which categories and numbers of each should be incarcerated, then appropriate programs, services, and operational requirements may be determined. Identifying the populations, programs and operational requirements will help to determine what spaces and other physical resources are required. Consider the following questions:

- To what extent does the existing facility meet the current and projected needs?
- Can it safely house the projected populations by number and category (e.g., there may be enough beds, but there is no way to separate juveniles from adults)?
- Can it accommodate necessary programs and services?
- Can it meet Tribal and national correctional standards and guidelines (including BIA and ACA)?
- Can it meet required building codes and fire/life/safety regulations?
- Are the building's engineering and security systems and infrastructure in good condition and operating efficiently?

- Is the design staff efficient? Does it facilitate management, supervision, and communication between staff and inmates/residents?
- What would be the approximate cost of renovation and expansion compared with new construction for both initial costs and operational costs?

Proceeding on with a detailed facility evaluation will answer these and many other questions. The Tribe can then decide if the existing facility is adequate "as is," if a new facility is needed, or if some combination of reuse, renovation, expansion and new construction will adequately suit its needs for the present and foreseeable future.

This guide addresses the following four issues:

1. When to evaluate an existing facility.
2. Who should participate in the evaluation?
3. How should the evaluation be conducted?
4. What decisions should follow the evaluation?

## When to Evaluate an Existing Facility

It is imperative that the Tribe knows what conditions the facility must meet before embarking on a careful evaluation. A thorough needs assessment must always precede the final facility evaluation; however, less formal evaluations can take place again and again throughout the planning and design process. The needs assessment will identify:

- A spectrum of non-custody and custody options appropriate for various categories of pre-sentenced/pre-adjudicated alleged offenders and sentenced/adjudicated offenders;
- Profile of the population that requires incarceration;
- Projected numbers of alleged and convicted offenders who require incarceration;
- Number of beds needed;
- Types of beds (adult, juvenile [and ages within this category], male, female, intake, longer term, minimum/medium/maximum security, transitional/work release/half-way house, and perhaps drug/alcohol treatment units);
- Security level requirements (based on behavior within the facility, offense, and historical information);

- Medical, mental health, substance abuse, and other treatment needs;
- Academic, vocational, life skills, and/or work program needs.

Tribal decision-makers should agree on the duration of time over which the facility is intended to operate. For example, is the Tribe looking to meet a projected population need 15 to 20 years into the future? Or are there circumstances dictating that the target is to meet the need for only 5 to 10 years out? New policies, the institution of specific programs, changing demographics and other variables frequently cause shifts in need. Limited funds and/or a phased approach to meeting the need may mean that the facility under consideration will, at least initially, address a short-term rather than long-term need. Each of these factors should be thoroughly considered. Whatever the determination may be, the current and projected needs must be established and agreed upon before the formal facility evaluation can be properly and effectively conducted.

When the needs have been identified and a consensus has been reached among the project team members, it is safe to begin the facility evaluation. The evaluating team will be far more attentive to the details that can make or break a successful facility.

## Who Should Participate in the Evaluation

**The Team.** A careful facility evaluation requires a number of participants with a wide array of skills and areas of expertise. No one person, regardless of the number of years of experience, number of academic degrees or professional credentials, or familiarity with the facility, can be capable of completing a comprehensive evaluation by himself or herself.

The evaluation requires a team approach with a leader who will guide the team in establishing a schedule, clarifying the tasks of each evaluator, collecting and analyzing the evaluation information and presenting it to decision-makers in a format that will help them consider the feasibility of various facility options. In addition to the team leader, the evaluation team should include correctional facility plan-

ners, facility operators, plant operations/maintenance personnel, architects and engineers. Depending on the facility’s design and operational goals, it may also be helpful to include specialists, such as treatment program operators, security system specialists, and hazardous materials specialists. With many evaluations, the team is split into two multidisciplinary groups – one group to look at the facility with respect to operational effectiveness and one group to conduct the physical plant audit.

Facility deficiencies present themselves at varied levels of obviousness. Sometimes such deficiencies are glaring and readily seen by the casual observer. This would be clear in the case of severely crowded conditions, obvious states of disrepair or makeshift program spaces. Other deficiencies may be less obvious to a casual observer, but well known to facility managers because they impact daily operation, security and programs. Still other problems may be understood best by the maintenance staff, and identified because of frequent requests to repair aging plumbing or mechanical systems. Finally, there may be building conditions that do not appear to be obvious problems to the building occupants, but which are severe code violations, e.g. serious fire/life/safety issues or conditions that would limit accessibility of disabled persons. All of these issues must be considered when determining the conditions, positive characteristics, and inadequacies of a particular facility.

**Employees, Inmates & Visitors.** Although the evaluation team include some “users” – notably facility operators and maintenance personnel involving others who use the facility will enhance the amount and quality of the data. In addition to providing more information, interviewing and/or surveying staff often improves their outlook and their acceptance of decisions made about the future of the facility. Interviewing and/or surveying inmates/residents provides data from a very different perspective and, ideally, corroborates and supplements other findings.

Other “users” should be considered for involvement in the facility evaluation for specific parts of the existing facility. For example, families and other visitors should help evaluate the visiting area, food service staff should participate in the assessment of the kitchen, and health care staff or contractors should take part in the evaluation of health service areas.

**Operations Personnel.** Participants in the operational review should include the facility manager, security and treatment staff, a BIA representative if BIA staffs the facility, correctional facility planners and/or an architect familiar with correctional projects, and any other appropriate operators. Their responsibility is to assess:

- How well the facility design supports the mission and objectives of the facility;
- Which areas of the facility work well;
- Which areas do not work well, impeding the ability to provide programs or services consistent with the facility goals;
- Whether areas unsuitable for their current use would be better suited to another use;
- Whether specific programs and operations of the facility would work better if the facility were designed more appropriately;
- Which areas of the facility provide, or fail to provide, the appropriate levels of security and safety;
- Which areas of the facility meet, or fail to meet, current BIA and ACA operational standards and guidelines for adult and/or juvenile justice facilities.

Careful documentation of the evaluation results of this group can serve two purposes. First, these findings will feed into the determination of whether or not the existing facility should continue to be used “as is,” or if it should be renovated or entirely replaced. Second, if a decision to renovate or replace the facility results from the evaluation, the information from this evaluation group can provide preliminary information to document current operations and functional space requirements. In addition, it will be useful as the basis for the development of an operational and architectural program for the new or renovated facility.

**Design & Maintenance Specialists.** An audit of the physical plant should be conducted to determine the soundness of the building and the condition of its systems. The participants in this evaluation group should, at a minimum, include the plant maintenance staff, an architect and engineers. The group may also include a fire marshal, a health or sanitation official or other specialists. This audit team should assess the condition of the facility, the capacity and condition of the infrastructure (water, sewer, electricity, etc.) and the potential remaining life cycle for the facility and its building systems, including anticipated

maintenance issues/costs. The audit should also include an evaluation of whether or not the facility complies with applicable, mandated codes and regulations, as well as BIA and ACA design standards. These types of issues include:

- Building and fire/life/safety codes;
- Seismic (earthquake) requirements;
- Local weather/environmental conditions (snow loads, wind loads) requirements;
- Disabled accessibility requirements;
- Health care/treatment licensing or requirements;
- All other relevant BIA and ACA standards and requirements.

*Note:* Whereas the operational review should follow the needs assessment, it is possible that much of this physical plant audit may occur during the needs assessment phase rather than following it. The soundness of the building for continued use may be determined before specific operational requirements are known. Once the needs are determined, the suitability of the building for a particular use can be assessed.

## How to Conduct a Facility Evaluation

**Preparation.** Team members should have a clear understanding of the facility mission, goals, codes, regulations, guidelines and standards that the Tribe must meet or desires to meet. Then, the first step is to review available background materials. Depending on the disciplines of the participants, these materials may include:

- Previous needs assessments;
- Facility inspection reports made by the fire marshal, BIA, health and sanitation department, or other officials;
- Site plans and as-built drawings;
- Maintenance logs;
- Reports on attempted and completed suicides, fires, escapes, disturbances, and so forth;
- Any other documents that will give an historical perspective of the facility and previous evaluation efforts.

**Issues and Areas of Consideration.** There are a number of issues to be addressed by the facility evaluators. Some relate mostly to operational

concerns, others deal mostly with the physical plant. It might be helpful at this point to review material that has been used successfully in corrections planning for other jurisdictions. One such excellent resource is the series of Corrections Planning Handbooks developed by The Board of Corrections (BOC) of the State of California to assist California's counties in planning adult and juvenile detention facilities. In particular, Handbook Four: Determining the Feasibility of Developing a Facility, which includes a section entitled "Evaluate Existing Facilities for Continued Use," gives detailed suggestions. This section describes nine general focal areas that would be appropriate for organization of issues and areas of evaluation for any correctional facility evaluation, although specific jurisdictions or facilities may warrant additional focal areas. These areas and some sample related questions are as follows.

### Building Soundness and Adaptability.

- How adequate are structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems for current use?
- Is there expansion capability for increased load or additional equipment?
- Which walls are load bearing and which could be easily moved to reconfigure space?

### Fire and Life Safety.

- Are building materials in inmate/resident areas fire resistant?
- Does the facility meet BIA requirements and applicable codes regarding number and locations of egress points, fire and smoke alarms, extinguishers and sprinklers?
- If not, is it feasible to make necessary modifications?

### Security and Safety.

- Does the layout of the site and building afford the kind of circulation and surveillance required for the population it currently houses or may need to house?
- Is there appropriate perimeter security around areas occupied by inmates/residents?
- Are there appropriate control points as inmates/residents move

around the facility for daily activities?

- Are building materials suitable for the particular kinds of activity and security needs?
- Does the design of the facility encourage or limit the kind of staff/inmate interaction that provides safety for both staff and inmates/residents?
- Are there suitable alarm and communication systems for the current or projected levels of custody?
- If the facility is not sufficiently safe and secure, what changes are needed to make it so?

### Separation of Inmates/residents.

- If the facility houses both adult inmates and juvenile residents, is there complete sight and sound separation between them?
- Is there visual separation between male and female sleeping and showering areas in both juvenile and adult areas (if the facility has both)?
- Is there the ability to provide appropriate separation of other groups depending on number of inmates/residents, types of inmates/residents or program needs?
- Is the facility flexible enough to accommodate fluctuations in population?
- Are centralized or decentralized service and program areas (e.g. dayroom, dining, medical, education and treatment areas) adequate in size for the number of inmates/residents?
- Are there adequate physical and acoustical separations between areas to manage and control populations in case of a disturbance?

### Comfort and Human Conditions.

- Is there adequate ventilation, heating and cooling?
- Is there natural light in all housing areas?
- Are the light levels appropriate for sleep, work and surveillance?
- Is there too much noise in housing areas, program areas or staff areas?
- Do sleeping, dining and living areas meet BIA and ACA standards for square footage per inmate/resident?
- What is the condition of materials and furnishings in inmate/resident-areas?



- Do staff areas (dining/break room, locker rooms, toilets, briefing/training) provide an environment that supports recruitment and retention of staff?

#### Programs and Services.

- Is there adequate space for basic detention functions (intake, sleeping, food service, laundry, programs and administration)?
- Do recreation areas provide adequate space for a variety of activities, and meet ACA and BIA space standards?
- Do both the size and layout of spaces support current and desired programs, which may include academic education; life skills; drug and alcohol education, counseling and treatment; self-help groups, and other counseling?
- Is there adequate and appropriate space for non-contact and contact visiting?
- Is there adequate acoustical separation of noisy areas from those that require quiet, e.g. are noisy recreation and vocational/industrial areas away from counseling and treatment areas?
- If the facility will need to house a larger population, can program areas as well as housing capacity be expanded to accommodate that increase?

#### Sanitation.

- Can housing, intake, dining and food preparation areas be properly cleaned?
- Are bathing and personal hygiene areas adequate in size, properly ventilated and suitably separated from other areas?
- Can vermin be prevented from entering living areas and areas of food preparation, dining and storage?
- Are there adequate restroom facilities for both inmates/residents and staff in housing, program, service and recreation areas?

#### Layout.

- Are adjacencies and circulation paths among facility areas logical and efficient?
- Can inmates/residents move logically from one area to another, e.g. is sick call near or easily accessible from housing?
- Does the site support a safe separation of pedestrian and vehi-

cle traffic, e.g. can deliveries from outside vendors be made without crossing inmate/resident circulation paths?

- Would a more efficient layout support better inmate/resident supervision, reduce the time required for staff and inmates/residents to travel from area to area, and make more efficient use of existing staff or allow fewer staff to adequately operate the facility?

#### Scale.

- Is the scale of portions of the facility too “institutional”?
- If so, could large areas be subdivided or reconfigured to provide both smaller and more manageable groups?

**Methods and Tools.** There are a variety of methods and tools that evaluators use to collect information that may attest to the soundness and/or continued usefulness of an existing facility. Most may be used for both the operational review and the physical plant audit, although the content and emphasis will vary depending on the area of evaluation and the procedures with which the evaluators are comfortable. Some useful methods and tools are described briefly below.

**1. Advance Questionnaire.** Before a site visit and occupant interviews, evaluators may distribute a questionnaire to managers and other building occupants regarding the effectiveness of their areas. General questions that are suitable for any area include:

- What about the spaces in your facility works well?
- What building characteristics do not work well and detract from functions and activities?
- If you had the ideal facility and all the resources you need, how would the building differ from what you now have?

These questions will help occupants prepare for evaluator interviews by encouraging them to think critically about their areas, the condition of their space and how it supports or hinders their operation.

**2. Individual Interviews.** The evaluators may conduct individual interviews with the facility administrator, managers and/or staff. While the

administrators may have a better understanding of the “big picture” goals, line staff who work in a space day in and day out may have very specific knowledge of problem areas and suggestions for making improvements.

**3. Inmate/Resident Group Interview.** To broaden the understanding of how well the existing facility functions, there should be interviews with groups of inmates and/or residents. While this procedure may be considered controversial, it can be a highly valuable resource for learning about the inner workings or daily life within the jail or detention facility. When the facility has both juveniles and adults, these two populations should be interviewed separately. Many of the same issues that are part of the operational review and the physical plant audit should be addressed in group interviews – but from the perspective of other “users.” Examples of questions to consider asking inmates/residents are as follows:

- In which ways does the building contribute to treatment programs? In which ways does the building interfere with or detract from treatment programs?
- How does the design of the housing units reinforce positive behaviors? How does the design help address those who act out?
- Where in the building do inmates/residents feel safe? Where in the building do inmates/residents feel vulnerable or unsafe?
- Does the temperature in the building stay fairly constant? Are some areas too cold or too warm? If so, which areas?
- How are lighting levels? Bright enough to read? Dark enough to sleep at night?

It is often very useful to interview a group of three to five other users at a time. The comments of one interviewee may stimulate the thinking of the others and users may come up with ideas collectively that they wouldn't have thought of individually.

**4. Walkthrough/Touring Interview.** A walkthrough allows evaluators to interview the staff and other users in their own space. This method builds on the idea that “a picture is worth a thousand words.” It is often easier for evaluators to understand a problem that building users may be having with their facility if the evaluators are able to actually see the space rather than have it described to them. Whether it is a work flow, size, durability, equipment or materials issue, seeing the

space in use is generally more effective than just hearing about it in an interview conducted away from the space in question.

**\*\* Notes regarding all kinds of interviews:** Some believe that it is best to have an administrator present at each interview, whether it is an individual, group or touring interview. That person can see where the staff comments fit relative to Tribal and facility goals and provide a reality check if widely different ideas are received about a single space or operation. Staff input is invaluable regarding specifics of the space or operations; they “live” in that space daily and have the best knowledge of how it suits their existing needs. But sometime they are “stuck” in their current ways of doing things, lack a vision of different ways of operating or don't know that the administration intends to create new programs or significantly change the operating philosophy. The presence of an administrator at all interviews can provide evaluators with a broader view of operations beyond the potentially narrower perspective of line staff users. On the other hand, administrators' presence can bias the responses of others.

**5. Observation of Operations.** Rather than just interviewing staff in a conference room and hearing about or visualizing how a space works, evaluators can often gain critical information about the way a facility affects operations by taking time to observe the space in use. This method is especially useful to evaluators who want to know about activities that require careful procedures, involve movement from one area to another or that affect lots of inmates/residents, e.g. the intake process, dining activities, linen exchange and clothing distribution, movement of both visitors and inmates/residents to visiting, etc. Taking time to observe operations, making notes during the observation, and then debriefing with staff is a valuable evaluation method. It is more time-consuming than other methods and should be used selectively.

**6. Inspection of the Physical Plant and Building Systems.** Engineers, architects and other technical specialists should make a careful inspection of the physical plant with the facility maintenance staff. This would include a review of the condition of walls, roofs, mechanical units, plumbing fixtures, electrical panels and systems, telecommunications equipment, and alarm systems. These technical evaluators can learn much from careful inquiries of maintenance staff who know the history of the facility, are aware of plant modifications and repairs that

have been made, and hear ongoing complaints, if any, from building occupants about the building.

**7. Measurements and Photos.** The technical specialists may choose to take measurements of various building characteristics or elements during their inspection of the physical plant. Some tools that may be especially useful include: tape measure to assess sizes of rooms, doorways, equipment and disability accessible clearances; a light meter to determine foot-candles and measure the light available against standards and guidelines for task lighting; a thermostat to measure temperature; and a sound meter to determine decibel levels, especially in areas like counseling rooms or classrooms that require quiet but may be located adjacent to noisier areas. A digital camera is also a good tool to help record the existing conditions or specific problem areas.

**8. Checklists.** Different evaluator groups will develop different planning and evaluation checklists depending on the building or operational elements they are tasked with evaluating. The previously referenced California BOC Handbook regarding facility evaluation includes a sample checklist of facility areas and issues to consider. Portions of the checklist follow this section. This sample list shows the range of both general and very specific areas that should be considered. The Tribe’s facility may not include all of these areas, and it is unlikely that any single evaluator will assess all of the elements included on the list. However, a checklist of this kind is a means to consolidate the findings of all the evaluation team members and determine the number and magnitude of the facility’s problems.

Notice that the checklist includes a column to rank the level of concern about a particular area, assigning a number to each area and issue. For example, “5” might be assigned to those areas with problems essential to solve if the facility will continue to be used, while “1” might be assigned to areas with no deficiencies that need consideration if the facility will continue to be used. A thorough evaluation should include prioritizing the problems and ranking the seriousness of the concerns. Clearly, fire/life/safety issues, security breaches or code violations must have a higher priority for attention than irritating, but not life-threatening, building elements that compromise but do not endanger operations, such as a noisy HVAC system.

## Evaluation Checklist<sup>1</sup>

If your Tribe has more than one type of area (such as two differently configured housing units), make copies of this form so that each can be evaluated.

Area and Issue	Yes?	Rank	Existing Problems Description	Potential Solutions Description
<b>Housing Units</b>				
Fire Sprinklers throughout				
Smoke alarms throughout				
Fire Alarm System throughout				
Fire Resistant materials				
Fire exits				
Fire resistant furnishings				
Dayroom				
- Size				
- Proximity to cells				
- Adequate for dining				
- Adequate for activities				
- Furniture				
Cells/rooms or dorms				
- No. of cells/rooms				
- No. of beds				
- Ability to separate by classification				
- Secure from other inmates/residents				
- Provisions for wheelchair access				
Heating, ventilation, air conditioning				
Lighting quality (glare, etc)				
- Quality (foot-candles)				
Natural light (sun)				
Noise level				
Toilets				
- Quantity				
- Condition				

<sup>1</sup> For many but not all areas or components within a correctional facility

Continued

If your Tribe has more than one type of area (such as two differently configured housing units), make copies of this form so that each can be evaluated.

Area and Issue	Yes?	Rank	Existing Problems Description	Potential Solutions Description
- Modesty				
- Location				
Showers				
- Quantity				
- Condition				
- Modesty				
- Location				
Access to plumbing chases				
Ability to relocate walls				
<b>Program Areas</b>				
Outdoor recreation				
Indoor recreation				
Academic classrooms				
Confidential interview space				
Individual counseling				
Group counseling				
Areas for self-help groups, treatment, counseling				
<b>Visiting Areas</b>				
Non-contact visits				
Contact visits				
Attorney interview space				
Public parking				
Public reception				
Public waiting				
<b>Medical Areas</b>				
Medical exam rooms				
Outpatient provisions				
Inpatient provisions (if any)				
Secure medicine storage				

Continued

If your Tribe has more than one type of area (such as two differently configured housing units), make copies of this form so that each can be evaluated.

Area and Issue	Yes?	Rank	Existing Problems Description	Potential Solutions Description
<b>Intake Areas</b>				
Sallyport (vehicular)				
- Sufficient size				
- Secure				
- Surveillance				
Search/intox				
Booking				
Property Storage				
Holding (inc. detox/safety)				
Processing (fingerprint, photo, shower)				
Supervision				
Interviews/line-up				
Court staging				
<b>Security &amp; Control</b>				
Housing Units				
Corridors				
Program Areas				
Kitchen/loading dock				
Public areas				
Perimeter				
<b>Administrative Areas</b>				
Offices				
Other spaces (conference, records, etc.)				
Staff parking				
Security				
Access (public lobby, etc.)				
<b>Staff Areas</b>				
Training				

Continued

If your Tribe has more than one type of area (such as two differently configured housing units), make copies of this form so that each can be evaluated.

Area and Issue	Yes?	Rank	Existing Problems Description	Potential Solutions Description
Restrooms				
Lockers				
Breaks/meals				
<b>Food Service</b>				
Fire Sprinklers throughout				
Fire alarm system throughout				
Sufficient power				
Supervision of workers				
Ventilation				
Cold and dry storage				
Cleanliness				
Vermin control				
Convenience to dining				
<b>Laundry</b>				
-Sufficient power				
-Sufficient space				
-Ventilation				
Trash Disposal				
<b>Facility-wide Concerns</b>				
Structural soundness				
Adequacy of plumbing				
Circulation				
-Efficiency				
-Security of routes				
-Convenience				
-Adjacencies among areas				
Electrical system				
-Safety				
-Adequacy				

<sup>1</sup> For many but not all areas or components within a correctional facility

**Continued**

If your Tribe has more than one type of area (such as two differently configured housing units), make copies of this form so that each can be evaluated.

Area and Issue	Yes?	Rank	Existing Problems Description	Potential Solutions Description
-Emergency power				
Fire Sprinklers throughout				
Smoke alarms throughout				
Fire alarm system throughout				
Fire resistant materials				
Fire exits				
Security				
-From within				
-From outside				
-Communications				
-Provisions for violent inmates				
Provisions for wheelchair accessibility				
Scale				
On-site storage				
Housekeeping provisions				
<b>Other Areas and Concerns</b>				
(Etc.)				

## Decisions That Follow the Evaluation

The results of the facility evaluation will feed into the Tribe's decisions about the appropriateness of the existing facility in relation to the projected needs. After gathering all the information from team members and prioritizing physical plant deficiencies, the team should make recommendations regarding the continued use of the facility. The recommendations may include the following:

- Use the existing facility “as is”
- Use the current facility differently, (e.g. relocate/switch programs or inmates/residents to more suitable areas within the facility)
- Make minor or major renovations to the facility
- Make minor or major additions to existing buildings at the facility
- Construct a new building at the existing facility site
- Abandon the existing facility and relocate to an entirely new site
- A combination of some of the above

The next phase of facility planning should include an analysis of the feasibility of these various options. The facility evaluation will have laid the groundwork for determining which option or combination of options is most practical and cost effective and will position the Tribe to decide its next steps.

## Facility Evaluation Bibliography

A Guide to Conducting Healthcare Facility Visits, Craig Zimring, 1994.

Building Evaluation Techniques, George Baird, John Gray, Nigel Isaacs, David Kernohan, Graeme McIndoe, Editors, 1996.

Corrections Planning Handbooks, Board of Corrections, State of California. June 1999.

Planning and Design Guide for Secure Adult and Juvenile Facilities, Leonard R. Witke, AIA, Editor. 1999.

“Post-Occupancy Evaluation: Fast Feedback for Planners,” Cheryl Fuller and Rita Fuhr-Hunt, Corrections Today, April 1988.



**ALSO AVAILABLE:**

**Project Guide:** Adult Correctional Facility Design Resources

**Project Guide:** Alternatives to Incarceration of Offenders

**Project Guide:** Assessment of Project Status  
& Technical Assistance Needs

**Project Guide:** Best Practices - In-Custody Programs  
for Juveniles and Adults

**Project Guide:** Design Review

**Project Guide:** Existing Facility Evaluations

**Project Guide:** Objective Classification Analysis

**Project Guide:** Population Profiles, Population Projections  
and Bed Needs Projections

**Project Guide:** Selecting an Architect-Developing  
RFQs and RFPs

**Project Guide:** Site Selection

**Project Guide:** The NEPA Land Use Process for Proposed  
Development of Correctional Facilities in Indian Country

**Project Guide:** Tribal Justice System Assessment