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New immigrants to the United States confront boundaries in a unique way as they pursue careers, education, and citizenship in a new community and establish themselves within the national framework. Boundary regulation allows the government to retain order and safety within federal buildings, and project an identity of stability. While the perception of a strong, impenetrable boundary is deliberately created, it psychologically intimidates and keeps people out. This perception could be altered by opening up the architectural boundary and integrating community spaces to allow immigrants full participation in the civic realm. The aim of this thesis is to redefine the notion of boundary in a federal immigration building in order to modify the immigrant experience. It reconsiders public access in a federal building by questioning its singular typology. Through the insertion of a second typology, a community center, it explores circulation paths and other methods to monitor public interaction and thereby creates a hybrid typology.

The design intervention minimizes and filters boundaries, specifically through the design of a hybrid immigration services and community center in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Converging transportation paths and a public housing super block create dead ends at the site’s perimeter, detaching it from adjacent neighborhoods. Rooted in an immigrant gateway neighborhood, the design proposal links to existing paths, increases sight lines to downtown Minneapolis, and provides clear navigation through the diverse program elements. The building envelope blurs with the landscape and extends active community space throughout the site to further incorporate it as a public resource for assistance, gathering, and community activities. An approachable, porous boundary between new immigrants and the national government will ameliorate the disconnection between civic and cultural life.
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This thesis discusses how boundaries affect communication between federal institutions and the individual within global, national and local contexts. Since 9/11, terrorism and issues of security have altered the boundaries of public and governmental spaces. Blockades, lengthy building setbacks from public streets, and moats have been designed for federal buildings to increase national security. Federal architecture often expresses the government’s self perception while diminishing the relationship between the government and its citizens.

The hybrid design proposal incorporates the program of a secure federal immigration services center and a community recreation and education center. This document will define the theoretical principles of boundaries, examine boundaries in public architecture, and analyze the dialogue between national immigration services and needs of the local community.

Boundaries will be defined by their affect on communication, individual behavior, and sociocultural hierarchies. Henri Lefebvre’s writings on the production of social space, coupled with Michel Foucault’s writings on authority and micro practices of power, will shape the dis-
between freeways, light rail transit and a towering mega-block of public housing. Many Somali refugees and incoming immigrant populations reside in the public housing complex. The surrounding infrastructure creates many dead-end routes to adjacent neighborhoods.

The design proposal will work to ameliorate the strong site boundaries and the sense of security within federal buildings. Sight lines between downtown Minneapolis and the Cedar Riverside towers will be created. Boundaries will divide, unite, and be gathering spaces. The circulation and progression of spaces will determine the user accessibility. The diverse program elements will be organized in clusters of community education, community recreation, formal federal services and informal federal services. The path uniting these elements will play a crucial role in creating multiple zones of experience between casual and secure interactions. Layered materials and stratified spaces will form a porous boundary between the government and the community.

At the architectural scale, the programmatic and boundary conditions of existing federal buildings and community buildings will be analyzed. The federal buildings to be analyzed will be the Main Building at Ellis Island, the United Nations Headquarters, the Oklahoma City Federal Building, the Reichstag Parliament Building, and the Dutch Embassy in Berlin. The community and cultural buildings to be analyzed will be the Kiro-San Observatory, the Yokohama Terminal, and the Norwegian National Opera. The existing facilities to be replaced by the design proposal are the immigration services building in Bloomington, MN and the Brian Coyle community center in Minneapolis, MN.

The design proposal site is located in the Cedar Riverside neighborhood of Minneapolis, Minnesota. The site itself is remnant park land.
Figure 2.1. Sketch of boundaries and their possible solutions
Personal Boundaries

Boundaries shape the urban and architectural context while the perception of boundaries can acutely shape an individual’s experience of space. Henri Lefebvre’s conjectures on the “Production of Space,” namely social space, are inseparable from the creation of boundaries. In the chapter titled “Spatial Architectonics,” Lefebvre explains the production of social space beginning with the base unit of human occupation. In addition to occupying space with the physical body and the perception of the body, an individual occupies and indicates space by demarcation, orientation and gestural movements.\(^1\) Demarcation and orientation are influenced by the natural and built environment while gestural movements are sociocultural influences that affect personal boundaries. Boundaries can affect individuals by preventing visibility or mobility across them.

Communication between individuals takes place at varying distances dependant on “socially constructed boundaries.” These physical boundaries are influenced by cultural and situational norms.\(^2\) Personal

---

boundaries are determined by the comfortable distance between two people. Edward T. Hall, an anthropologist, researched the distances at which people from different cultures defined ranges of communication. He found that an individual’s perception of their spatial ownership determined their minimum personal space. Hall recognized personal distance in one culture may be public distance in another culture.

All five senses were analyzed for their impacts on cultural norms in Hall’s research, but vision was found to play a primary role. Western societies use vision to determine common distances of interaction. Figure 2.2 is a diagram showing personal boundaries based on perceptions of a native born American citizen. The variables in Hall’s research included eye focus and voice volume. The degree of authority held by sight lines results in three general conditions: no sight lines, one-way sight lines, and two-way sight lines. Common intents for these sight lines are observation, supervision and discipline.

---

Figure 2.4 represents Jeremy Bentham’s concept of the Panopticon, which combines separation, inspection, and timed routines in a strategy of individual subjection. The Panopticon is a correctional environment where individuals are separated and categorized into cells around a central authoritative point. In this spatial arrangement, communication is one directional because a guard observes the prisoner without the prisoner’s knowledge. The prisoner lacks the ability to see the authority and his fellow prisoners which causes the prisoners to self-govern. Michel Foucault cites this as an example of the disciplinary gaze which produces power over an individual. “The mystery of power is founded in this paradoxical relationship between absence and presence.”

---
In his book, *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Michel Foucault sees discipline as a method of arresting unpredictable actions. Discipline is not only an action but a technology, because it can be used in multiple ways with multiple targets and “assures infinitesimal distribution of the power relations.” Discipline begins with identification and documentation of individuals. Organizing space based on these principles affects the efficiency of both individuals and societies. Disciplinary technology can hold power over individuals or give individuals the power to perform tasks and be productive. The development of the modern prison resulted in a way to rehabilitate an individual by reprogramming his thoughts and actions.

**Urban Edges**

The edges of urban contexts transform the experience of entering and exiting the city. Many theorists wrote about urban boundaries and their corresponding socio-cultural cues and meanings. Jane Jacobs and Stephen Boeri of the research group “Multiplicity” defined boundaries by their spatial qualities. Jacobs looked at the physical boundaries as delineations, which primarily affect pedestrian movement through the city. Stephen Boeri recognized that boundaries can be both an edge and a movement vector. Amos Rappoport and Kevin Lynch discussed how socio-cultural spatial cues are embedded in boundaries and affect perceptions of the city. Henri Lefebvre and Peter Marcuse explained how boundaries reflect, affirm, or enforce socio cultural hierarchies.

In *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Jane Jacobs developed theories on the successes and failures of urban planning. Jacobs described an edge as “the perimeter of a single massive or stretched-

---

out use of territory.” Spatial boundaries that manipulate the urban fabric include the edge of a landform, the line of infrastructure, or the borders of large tracks of land like a university or a dilapidated neighborhood. Freeways terminating the flow of pedestrian traffic is one example of infrastructure creating an urban edge. This results in dead-end streets and diminished activity levels at the pedestrian scale. Multiple instances of impenetrable boundaries within a neighborhood decrease fluid pedestrian connections to adjacent neighborhoods.

Jacobs asserted that the varying degrees of activity on sidewalks and public circulation paths create varying levels of safety, contact, and social assimilation. Activity levels on public paths are kept at a steady level daily and seasonally when there is a combination of residential, business, and commercial uses. Frequent pedestrian activity ensures a sense of safety in a neighborhood.

Stefano Boeri studied boundaries with the intent of understanding the progress of social change. Boeri catalogued six techniques termed “border devices,” based on characteristics of flow and control: enclosures, pipes, funnels, folds, sponges, and phantom limbs. Pipes are the connecting paths between two places, but have limited entry points and impassible barriers. Major vectors of transportation are identified as “pipes.” Funnels direct and segregate flows of movement through a space. Folds are residual spaces created by the overlapping of two disparate activities or entities. Both funnels and folds are instances of an occupied boundary rather than a confronted obstacle. Sponges draw people across neighborhood boundaries for their specific program. Civic plazas or shopping centers are examples of sponges.

Amos Rapoport wrote about social cues and variables affecting the perception of boundaries. Social cues are commonly accepted physical qualities of a space that are understood to have a specific cultural meaning. Variables affecting boundary perception include time of day, weather, lighting conditions, and relative human activity. Opacity, a social cue, often infers private space while transparency often infers public space.

The concentration of populations and social cues “leads to differences in domains of privacy, patterns of access, and degrees of pen-


7 Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 32.

8 Ibid., 260.

Territories are bounded spaces regulated by social cues and include or exclude people over time. Boundaries and their corresponding social cues determine if territories are identified as private, communal, or public. Designed urban and architectural boundaries are selectively permeable, because there is control over behavior, access, and resources within each territory.

Through the memories of boundary experiences, city residents create complex mental maps of cities and neighborhoods. Kevin Lynch identified three primary spatial types as nodes, seams, and junction points. Nodes are the transfer points between two forms of transportation, where decisions about orientation or direction are made. Junction points are interstices along boundary lines, which can take many forms including linear crossings, overlaps, and folds. The visual and physical continuity of paths are crucial for understanding social cues and their organization.

Edges of infrastructure can disturb sight lines and movement paths across them. Kevin Lynch argued that freeways act both as paths and edges for travel and distinctive neighborhood borders. The freeway disconnects from its immediate surroundings, making navigation through a city difficult. When a neighborhood is fragmented by infrastructure edges, both positive and negative social cues are strengthened as identifying markers of the neighborhood.

Landmarks are special cultural cues denoting paths, districts and navigation for an individual within a city. A landmark has a distinct form and high contrast with nearby elements. Landmarks play a crucial role in the public’s perception of neighborhoods and the creation of their mental maps. Furthermore, Henri Lefebvre wrote that landmarks are reflective of social hierarchies. Lefebvre stated that societal monuments offer an image of the institution, which an individual can understand their own membership or participation.

In the article, “Walls of Fear and Walls of Support,” Peter Marcuse discusses walls as physical boundaries and their socio-cultural implications. Boundaries and their corresponding meanings shift depending on the populations occupying either side. The dualistic nature of walls

---


12 Lynch, The Image of the City, 80.

13 Lefebvre, The Production of Space, 220.
reflect fears held by the population and produce fear simply from the wall’s presence. During the 20th century, constructed boundaries became less obvious and obtrusive, moving away from the medieval fortress typology. Boundaries now have a multitude of forms such as green belts around institutions, stucco walls announcing a gated community, and chain-link fences that are closely linked with socioeconomic changes. Although modern boundaries are less visible, cities remain divided by “intangible walls” that are “internalized by force and custom.”

### Breaking Boundaries

Homogenous boundaries are defensible and stable because they are highly impenetrable. Stability created by boundaries can offer safety, control, comfort, and identity to a community or space. The identity of a space is intertwined with its naturally occurring and constructed boundaries. Architecturally, to be effective for human use, the boundary must break or contain a passage. Doors and windows are examples of portals within architectural boundaries. They have dualistic qualities because their appearance and function changes from one side of the boundary to the other. Increasing amounts of portals and interceptions decrease the boundary’s ability to separate and contain.

Porosity in architecture can manifest itself physically and visually to include voids, views, and mobility through a material or space. The etymological origins of pore are in the Greek word poros which means “passage”. Another definition for pore is “a small interstice admitting absorption or passage of liquid”. The interstice within a medium facilitates a relationship between two distinct spaces or events.

To be porous is to be “full of pores”. In scientific terms, porous refers to the amount of openings that allow air or water to permeate a material. The pores in soil, or air pockets, allow organic particles and water to flow through them to create a balanced mix of nutrients for plants. Deciduous trees are another example of organic porosity. Air and light pass through the loosely clumped branches to allow nutrients to reach singular leaves. Porous boundaries are a medium for

---

exchange of air, light, people, and information.

Digital networks can have porous characteristics which allow information to be quickly exchanged. Delineations of space still exist even in seemingly non-spatial settings such as wireless information exchange and global exchange. Unpredictable global changes can easily intercept boundaries intended for security and stability. Natural disasters and terrorist acts are irregular and unpredictable to even the most fortified barricade.

Architecture in the modern world must navigate the effects of both physical space and global exchange to develop effective boundaries or effective porous conditions. The United States government has developed many strategies using the full scope of boundaries to regulate flows of immigrants entering the country. People that cross the national geopolitical borders must enter at certain checkpoints to be identified and authorized. Boundary regulation allows the government to retain order and safety within the country, while projecting an identity of stability. While the perception of a strong, impenetrable boundary is deliberately created, it psychologically intimidates and keeps people out. In federal buildings, this perception could be altered by opening up the architectural boundary and integrating community spaces to allow immigrants full participation in the civic realm.
BOUNDARIES IN CIVIC ARCHITECTURE

The complex dialogue across boundaries is particularly interesting as it reveals the public’s role in federal and cultural buildings. To demonstrate the levels of public interaction and control as a result of boundaries, architectural precedents were evaluated and compared based upon a common set of variables. These include security checkpoints, one and two-way communication points, public paths, visible and invisible architectural boundaries, and superimposed boundaries.

Figure 3.1. Ellis Island Main Building
Super Imposed Boundaries

Michel Foucault argued that the general spatial organization of buildings over the last century identifies closely with that of a factory. Partitioning spaces to regulate individuals has been deployed in hospitals, military barracks, schools, and immigration facilities. A hierarchy of efficiency and individual productivity determines the organization of the partitioned spaces. Partitioned and visibly controlled spaces diffuse circulation and possible communication between those in adjacent spaces. Communication between peers is cut off severely to eliminate spread of disease, unruly behavior, or possible retaliation.

Foucault believes that obedience lies in the operational links of individuals to spaces. This means that discipline can be exerted by monitoring an individual’s relationship to authoritative supervision, adjacent spaces, and other individuals.¹ The identification of individuals is crucial in securing the physical and technological boundaries of separation and order. Superimposed boundaries are technological accessories used solely for the inspection and identification of individuals.

Efficient spatial organization is often used alongside superimposed boundaries to identify and authorize persons in federal buildings. Ellis Island, the Oklahoma City Federal Building, and the United Nations Headquarters utilize a combination of observational and organizational methods to ensure a sense of security. The first federal immigration complex at Ellis Island coupled grand architectural presence with winding chain link dividing ropes. In the late 20th and early 21st century, federal buildings were designed to be secure from many different terrorist threats. The Oklahoma City Federal Building was designed with sophisticated security technologies, like blast resistant walls, following the tragic Oklahoma City bombing in 1995. In contrast, the United Nations Headquarters in New York had ad-hoc superimposed boundaries, like exterior metal detection tents, installed after the nation changing terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001.

Ellis Island

The first federal immigration service center was constructed near New York City on Ellis Island, located near the Statue of Liberty. The building designs on Ellis Island were the first federal means of organizing an official immigration system and its architectural embodiment. The first immigration building on Ellis Island opened in 1894 and but

¹ Foucault, Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison, 146-150.
The spatial progression from ferry to registry room

unfortunately burned to the ground in 1897 because of its timber construction. The Main Building’s replacement, which opened in 1900, was built with steel, brick, and stone but incorporated the French Renaissance style and primary design features of the original building. Immigrants were interviewed, documented, and approved to enter the country at Ellis Island until it closed as an immigration facility in 1954. It later reopened as a museum to American heritage in 1990.

The complete spatial progression of the Main Building, from exterior to interior, was designed to leave a grand impression of America on new immigrants. The architectural style and high vaulted ceilings were intended to allude to grandness, while a series of ropes and iron railings were designed to organize and efficiently process the hundreds of thousands of immigrants passing through the island each year. The Main Building provided efficient techniques for the federal government to selectively control the flow of immigrants into the country. Like a railroad station of the time, the Main Building at Ellis Island concerned itself with collecting and distrib-

---

ground floor. After abandoning their personal and physical culture, immigrants climbed a flight of steps and entered into the expansive Registry Room filled with natural light. While the newcomers were climbing the stairs, non-uniformed doctors observed them from the top and bottom of the staircase. From this vantage point, doctors were able to monitor immigrant’s gait to determine health, and pull them out of line for examinations.4

As people moved efficiently through lines on the main floor, immigration officials were able to observe their every move from balconies

The metal and rope barricades installed for security and authorization reasons were superimposed boundaries. They did not relate to the architecture of the grand hall and were a contradiction to the grand expanse of space with its arches and high ceilings. When the corrals and roped lines are removed, shown in figure 3.4, the space’s mood brightens as control points and organizational tension have been eliminated. Leisurably observation in the wide open hall have replaced the ordered and factory like efficiency of the previous era.

*United Nations Headquarters*

Superimposed boundaries have been applied to the original 1950’s design of the United Nations Headquarters in New York City. After the terrorist attacks of 9/11, the security checkpoints for the Secretariat and the General Assembly Building were moved outside of the original buildings. Metal detection, identification, and authorization occur in white tents at the exterior of the architectural entrances. Located as autonomous objects, the white tents are a symbol of authority and

---


security. While high visibility security has increased, the Headquarters remain exposed to low visible security risks. One of these risks is a freeway tunnel where automobiles, and the subsequent risk of car bombs, travel beneath the Secretariat without special authorization. This occurs while pedestrians experience extensive security clearance at the main entrance of the Secretariat.

**Oklahoma City Federal Building**

The architecture of the Oklahoma City Federal Building employs advanced technology and unseen security measures specifically laid out in Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPED) techniques. Following the bombing in 1995, security standards for federal buildings were increased. CPED is a series of security strategies based upon behavioral science which include territoriality, natural surveillance, activity support, and access control.7

The entrance to the Oklahoma City Federal Building exemplifies CPED techniques in public access and security. The lobby is a central control point where visitors are filtered from the North and South entrances. Security checkpoints occur after passing through the initial lobby. Blast resistant walls create this transition zone so that any activities which could occur in the lobby would not affect the rest of the building.8

The United Nations Headquarters and the Oklahoma City Federal Building control the flow of people through secure boundaries which include operations of identification, detection, and distance. When writing about surveillance in the United States, Adrian Parr argues that “9/11 has simply become the excuse to increase and legitimate the


interpretation and construction of space solely in terms of security.”⁹ Spatial partitioning, established sight lines, and architectural technolo-
gies, like blast resistant walls are legitimized by making federal build-
ings more secure. All three buildings utilized superimposed boundar-
ies like corrals, highly visible security tents, and metal detectors to
enforce regulation in addition to the architecture.

Global Counters Local

In contrast to the prototypical, single control point of the Pan-
opticon, the post structuralist world has many centers of control and
blended peripheries. Paul Virilio chronicles the progressive change
of boundary perception in his article, “The Overexposed City.” Vir-
ilio’s primary argument is that temporal occupation has become more
important than spatial occupation in the technological world. People
sit in front of a technological interface which is capable of diminishing
spatial boundaries across the world.

Virilio is critical of the technological interface which causes the city
to be “overexposed.” He asserts that, “There is no plenum: space is not
filled with matter. Instead, an unbounded expanse appears in the false
perspective of the machines’ luminous emissions.”¹⁰ Virilio claims that
architecture used to be the substance of the city but now it only con-
tains a vast array of communication and exchange technologies. Virilio
also argues that modern boundaries are the digital interfaces where a
constant exchange of information occurs. Technology can defy visible
spatial boundaries while still retaining control over individuals. Global
connections become as or more important than local connections.


The Dutch Embassy in Berlin, designed by Office of Metropolitan Architecture (OMA), is a prime example of extensive global connections with little access for local public engagement. The office spaces that exchange information to the Netherlands are arranged with blurred architectural boundaries. Consulate offices, ambassador offices, meeting spaces, exercise rooms and visitor apartments make up the program of the embassy. The Dutch Embassy was completed in 2003 and is located on the north bank of the Spree River. The streets running parallel to the embassy lead to a dead end at the Spree River. This location, along with the sloped and winding courtyard, prevent cars from nearing the building. Only pedestrians can cross the paved plaza between the embassy and the Spree River.

The embassy is technically 8 stories high, but has 24 levels that are slightly offset from one another. The various spaces are connected by one continuous path of ramps and stairs. Rem Koolhaus of OMA depicts the complex plan-section organization of the embassy with an
“unfolding trajectory.” The trajectory represents office spaces in groupings at varied points along one long path. The “trajectory” is then folded upon itself to form the 8 complete stories of the cube.11

To visit the consulate office, Dutch citizens must enter the property on Monastery Street, and then follow a ramp down into the office space. The public section of the consulate office consists of a waiting area along with informal and formal interviewing areas. The overlapping “trajectory” is disconnected from public access at the consulate level. To enter the office spaces from Monastery Street, one must follow a ramp up and around the building to the Embassy’s courtyard. From Monastery Street and the Spree River, the Embassy appears to have transparent or beacon like qualities where parts of the ramped path extend out from the face of the cube. Where it projects, the glass is single layered and does not have applied frit or shading, allowing clear views into the ramped spaces.

The ambassador’s private meeting room, clad in red glass, projects from the cube and hovers authoritatively over the courtyard. The courtyard and the interior reception area are watched over by security

personnel at the secure double lock doorway. Reception and the meeting space can be explored without passing through the secure double lock system. Once past the double door space, proctored by security personnel, government personnel may begin the journey on the winding path through office spaces, fitness areas, cafes and residences. These office spaces contrast the rigid consulate office below with seamless connections and unrestricted flows of communication.

“Visible boundaries, such as walls or enclosures in general, give rise for their part to an appearance of separation between spaces where in fact what exists is an ambiguous continuity.” The architecture of the embassy is representative of the ambiguous continuity inherent in global flows. Although there are few architectural boundaries within the linked trajectory space, the Embassy as a whole is cut off from public access. Boundary creation keeps pace with the inter-connectivity of global space. They will not cease to exist, but rather take on new spatial and transpatial forms. Continuous boundary evolution contrasts the utopian view of the individual being able to float above the restrictions and bounds of society in a digitally connected world.

**Spectacle: Public Exposure**

“Transparency is a flattening process characterized by the exacerbation of indifference and the indefinite mutation of social domains.”

Henri Lefebvre wrote that social space is driven by visual character which is repeated and reproduced in urban and architectural contexts. Norman Foster used visual transparency as a design tool to express democratic transparency in the Reichstag Parliament Building. In early design phases, Foster spoke of this claim. The Reichstag “should be publicly accessible, open and ‘transparent.’ Public and politicians should meet and interact, see and be seen…the result is a very tangible expression of democracy.” The quality of transparency, especially with glass, is a common tool used in architecture to express openness of the government and represent democracy.

**Reichstag Parliament Building in Berlin**

The Reichstag Parliament Building was renovated in 1999 by Norman Foster and Partners in Berlin, Germany close to where the Berlin Wall once stood. The renovation included the construction of a

---

12 Chaslin, *The Dutch Embassy in Berlin by OMA/ Rem Koolhaas*, 39
13 Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, 87.
14 Diken, “Zones of Indistinction,” 45.
15 Ibid., 47.
new dome, enlarging the parliament chamber, and refinishing all of the interior spaces. Foster also designed a public roof plaza, where citizens could view the Parliament Chamber through an all glass dome. Politicians, citizens, and the press can enter side-by-side through the main entrance into the reception area. The politicians and the press can also enter from three additional side entrances.¹⁷

Instead of reversing hierarchical power relations, the design facilitates cross observation of citizens and representatives. The Reichstag Parliament Building has many transparent boundaries that prescribe movement through the building. The two-way observation is glorified by emphasizing the citizen’s experience with transparency. Glazed walls border each side of the reception and security area, which allow views into the building while preventing movement through the building. Citizens without specific authorization can travel to the roof top plaza via a glass elevator.¹⁸

Figure 3.12. Transparent boundaries allow for constant two way observation of the public and Parliament representatives

Figure 3.13. The public is ushered up and around the main Parliament Chamber


¹⁸ Ibid., 53
The primary spectacle is the dome itself. A winding ramp follows the perimeter of the glass dome walls affording views of the city and views of the people climbing the ramps. At the base of this dome is a smaller glass dome, which creates the ceiling for the Parliament chamber. The public and representatives can catch a glimpse of each other through the glass of this smaller dome. The press area is located at the base of the second interior dome, sandwiched vertically between the public roof plaza and the parliament chamber. From here, the press can view the public and the parliament representatives without being seen. Hidden from the arena of spectacle, the press have an all-seeing, panoptic view.

In the Reichstag, the architecture may appear aesthetically different than the original imperial building, but the social and power relations have not been altered. Lefebvre argues that, “Visibility does not imply decipherability of social relations.” Kim Dovey agrees with this assertion when he states that structures of ideology hidden beneath new aesthetics retain an even greater power. This statement holds true because of human’s dependency on the visual aspect of our spatial environment. If the power structure is left unrecognized, an individual could not realize his or her part in a more elaborate organization of authority. Transparent boundaries may be a symbol of democracy, but not its manifestation.

**Framing Communication**

The Kiro-San Observatory, designed by Kengo Kuma, and the Yokohama Terminal, designed by Foreign Office Architects, have elements that frame the visitor’s view out without allowing others to see in. Although the architecture does not facilitate cross observation, hidden cameras retain 24 hour one-way observation.

**Kiro-San Observatory**

The Kiro-San Observatory was constructed in 1994 on the top of Mount Kiro located in Yoshiumi, Japan. The Observatory challenges the definition of observatory by hiding within a mountain, instead of being perched upon one. Kuma saw the design as an “anti-object,” being a minimal obstruction set within the natural landscape. Visitors to the Kiro-San Observatory have a panoptic view towards the land-
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scape without the feeling of being watched. To reverse this relationship, hidden cameras record visitors and screens inside the observatory display the images. This one-way communication experienced in two different ways is best described as, “the individual, who feels empowered by the experience of viewing, is simultaneously disempowered by the reality of being viewed.”

Yokohama Terminal

The Yokohama Terminal, designed by Foreign Office Architects, is a passenger terminal for local and international cruise ships. Construction was completed in December, 2002 along the shore of Yokohama, Japan. The terminal is a long rectangular pier, stretched between singular entry points at land and sea. The entry points are controlled, but once at the terminal, visitors can move fluidly between three levels of program, because of porous and overlapping boundaries. Automobiles are relatively hidden because parking and driving paths are on the first floor.

Interchanging spaces and paths on the roof and ticketing levels

---

also exist in the most secure space of the International Customs Area. International ships dock at the terminal only 25 times a year so the customs area was designed to double as an event space.\textsuperscript{22} Although customs is centrally located on the pier, paths are securely separated as domestic ships dock at the west side of the pier and international ships dock at the east side of the pier. The customs area has a similar architectural treatment as the ticketing and lounge area, but is more secure due to the isolation of paths.

The public has 24 hour access to the undulating 3rd floor roof covered with Ipe wooden planks. The amphitheater spaces designed with Ipe planks are adjacent to green spaces along the central roof path. Delicately detailed steel railings form the boundaries that constrain movement along the paths. Foreign Office Architects did not want the terminal to compete with the city skyline so a low lying form was

\textsuperscript{22} Osanbashi Yokohama International Passenger Terminal. http://www.osanbashi.com/en
Terminal visitors are exposed to 24 hour viewing by the public via the Terminal’s web site. Views of the city and incoming ships are framed by the experiential paths. The grandeur of the cruise ships is not diminished by the port itself, but intensified by its flattened form.

The Yokohama terminal successfully overlaps paths of movement without forcing one path to yield to the other. Each mode of transportation can retain its own speed and flow. There is not a beginning or end point within the pier but multiple looping and overlapping paths that bring the passengers to the correct gate. The Yokohama Terminal and the Kiro-San Observatory clarify the impacts of transpatial communication as the architecture is separated from the continuous camera observation.

**Spectacular Journey**

**Norwegian National Opera**

The Norwegian National Opera is an example of continuous pathways and the celebration of spectacle. The ballet and opera center was completed in 2008 in Oslo, Norway and was designed for the Norwegian Building Government Agency. The design has elements of spectacle similar to the Reichstag and elements of public engagement similar to the Yokohama Terminal. The Norwegian National Opera is
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secluded at the edge Oslo but, once the building is reached, there are few boundaries preventing visibility or mobility around the building. Pedestrians from downtown must cross one long bridge over the freeway to reach the opera. After visitors have arrived on site, they can move freely through and around the building.

The shifting planes of the opera’s roof allow pedestrians to experience the tactile qualities of floor, wall, and roof. The opera is essentially a rectangle oriented parallel to the city and the sea, and designed with framed views of both. Public spaces extend over and are housed in the sculptural section of the building. They are located on the west end of the building and the back of house spaces are located on the east. The inner workings of the opera, such as practice rooms, set displays, and offices, are inaccessible to the public and hidden from display in the rectilinear section of the building. The exterior forms of these spaces face the sea and are boxlike instead of flowing and amorphous.27 Large expanses of glass walls facilitate cross communication from the interior to the exterior along the perimeter of the building. Visitors walking on the public sloped roofs can simultaneously view out to the Norwe-

gian landscape and in to people gathering in the lobby.

**Evolving Transparencies**

The frequency, intensity, and communicative abilities of boundaries have evolved in government funded public architecture. Technologies have advanced from superimposed rope boundaries at Ellis Island to advanced metal detection systems at federal office buildings, embassies, parliament buildings and transportation hubs. Advanced technologies, like closed circuit cameras, have a prominent role in observation and control even when the architecture appears fluid and seamless. Many boundaries still exist to partition public spaces from government spaces. There is a fine line between preventing, enabling, and overexposing communication from the public to the government in federal architecture.

![Diagrammatic section at opera](image1)

![Diagrammatic floor plan of opera at level 1](image2)

Figure 3.24. Diagrams of Norwegian National Opera
MULTIPLE DIALOGUES

The way national governments welcome immigrants and new citizens is a reflection of global, national, and local boundaries. I will be analyzing how this public to government relationship is represented and embodied through boundaries at the architectural scale. This condition is studied through a hybrid building program of a secure federal immigration services center and a porous community center. First, I will discuss the community for which the building is designed, the Cedar Riverside neighborhood in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The neighborhood's historical, sociocultural, and physical qualities make it an ideal location to explore boundary implications. Second, I will describe the federal organization that addresses immigration in the national framework, the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. Third, I will describe the existing buildings for the specific community and federal organizations of Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Figure 4.1. The hybrid program of federal center and community center
Figure 4.2. View of Downtown Minneapolis from Cedar Ave Bridge
Dialogue with the Community

*Infrastructure, Culture, and Disjuncture*

According to the Brookings Institute, there are six designations of immigrant gateways in the United States which are based on the time period of peak use. Gateways were designated by the time period they were most popular and include: former gateways (early 1900’s), continuous gateways, post World War II gateways, emerging gateways (past 20 years), re-emerging gateways (early 1900s and past 20 years), and pre-emerging gateways (past 10 years). The Minneapolis - St. Paul area is in the “re-emerging gateway” category because of its relatively high percentage of foreign born persons who resided in the state from 1900-1930, relative inactivity until the 1980’s, and then rapid increase in the foreign born from the 1980’s to 2010.\footnote{The Brookings Institution. “The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways.” The Living Census Series (February 2004): 1} Minnesota was one of fifteen states where the foreign born population increased by over 200% between 1990 and 2009.\footnote{Migration Policy Institute. “Source: Minnesota Fact Sheet.” 2010 American Community Survey and Census Data on the Foreign Born by State. http://www.migrationinformation.org/datahub/state.cfm?ID=MN. (Accessed October 20th, 2011) : 1} The state of Minnesota was designated a settlement area for refugees from Somalia and has attracted the largest Somali refugee population in the United States. One third of the Somalis in Minnesota arrive directly from refugee camps and two-thirds relocate to the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul after living in another state.\footnote{The Minneapolis Foundation. “Immigration in Minnesota: Discovering Common Ground.” October 2004. http://www.minneapolisfoundation.org/uploads/CuteEditor/Publications/Community/ImmigrationBrochure.pdf}

The Cedar Riverside neighborhood is like an island within Minneapolis, MN. The neighborhood has a strong identity with many nicknames ranging from “Snoose Boulevard” and the “Crack Stacks” to
“Little Somalia.” It is distinct within the city of Minneapolis because of its extreme physical boundaries which separate pedestrians from easy passage to the remainder of the city. Interstate 35W and Interstate 94 sever the neighborhood from downtown Minneapolis, which is only 12 blocks away. Three major institutions, University of Minnesota, Augsburg College, and Fairview Hospital occupy the east half of the neighborhood closest to the Mississippi River. The western half, closest to Interstate 35W, consists primarily of high density residential towers with several commercial and cultural buildings. The design proposal’s site is located on the far western edge of the neighborhood. The closed off nature of the neighborhood has inspired both cultural enclaves and idealistic New Urbanist developments.

The street grid of Minneapolis was originally oriented parallel to the Mississippi River instead of traditional North - South. Railroad tracks were located along the banks of the river north of downtown and a railroad track ran between the Cedar Riverside neighborhood and downtown. The Cedar Riverside Neighborhood historically hosted many incoming populations including Swedish, Norwegian, Czech, and Irish. During the early 1900’s Swedish and Norwegian immigrants were the predominant population of the neighborhood. The primary
street running through Cedar Riverside was nicknamed “Snoose Boulevard” after the traditional snuff commonly used at the dance halls.\textsuperscript{4}

In 1965, the interstates were constructed in Minneapolis with a convergence point just west of the Cedar Riverside neighborhood. Although disconnected from the remainder of Minneapolis, the overall continuity of the neighborhood was not disrupted. The late 1960’s also saw an expansion of the Universities and hospitals which took over residential land to the west for their expansion. The community isolation caused by the interstates made the neighborhood an ideal candidate for the New Town - In Town urban renewal funded by the Housing Authority\textsuperscript{5}.

The 1960’s left Cedar Riverside’s economy decaying and its housing dilapidated. The city of Minneapolis visioned the new Cedar Square West development proposal, later known as Cedar Riverside Plaza, as a chance to renew the city. The revitalization was seen as positive for all of Minneapolis, and therefore, the residents of the neighborhood were not thoroughly consulted on the construction of the new

\textsuperscript{4} Judith A. Martin, Recycling the Central City: the Development of a New Town-in Town, (Minneapolis: Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at University of Minnesota, 1978): 11

\textsuperscript{5} Martin, Recycling the Central City: the Development of a New Town-in Town, 17
The private developer of the new housing, Cedar Riverside Associates (CRA), wanted to attract populations that attended the neighborhood’s institutions whom were primarily non-residents. These included students, families, hospital employees, and professionals. This was intended to completely alter the economic profile of the neighborhood. The housing density of the neighborhood was intended to drastically change from 12 units per acre to 125 units per acre with the new development.

The development was propelled by Cedar Riverside Associates
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until the majority of land was acquired and additional funding was needed for construction. Next, the developers consulted the local housing authority and finally, the National Housing Authority. With the approval of the National Housing Authority, the development grew into a large master plan consisting of five neighborhoods centered around a commercial area. Minnesota architect, Ralph Rapson, worked closely with CRA and the housing authority to develop the master plan as well as the implementation of Phase 1. The intent was to develop a “New Town-in Town”, which meant designing a town-like community within an existing city. The master plan would constitute the first New Town-In Town development and the first use of Title VII funds for subsidized housing in the country.8

Phase 1 was constructed in the early 1970’s, with its first residents in 1973. After construction, the developers defaulted on their loans and the residents of the community sued the local housing authority for not involving them in the design process from the beginning.9 These actions halted all further phases of the master plan. The eleven buildings that make up Cedar Riverside Plaza are on the National Historic Registrar for
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Figure 4.9. Building aggregation in Cedar Riverside neighborhood
More than 40% of the neighborhood’s population is foreign born compared to 7.1% statewide. The neighborhood has retained diverse cultural institutions, shops, and restaurants. During the 1980’s, institutions were established that represented the neighborhood resident population including the Korean Service Center, the African Development Center, People’s Center Health Services and the Brian Coyle Center.

Buildings within the neighborhood are aggregated based on building type and define specific areas within the community. The architectural patterns and material qualities of the buildings reinforce the sectors. The three institutional complexes in the neighborhood, standing five to twenty stories tall, were built with a similar brick. Commercial and cultural venues in the neighborhood are two to three stories tall and constructed in brick. This sector of buildings add character to the neighborhood with brightly colored signs and elaborate murals painted on the brick exteriors. Government buildings, located across Interstate 35W in downtown Minneapolis, are fourteen to twenty-four stories tall and consist of brick, stone, and glass curtain walls. Residential
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The image above shows concrete barricades and fences bounding the pedestrian in.

The images below show fences being used in the commercial areas along Cedar Avenue.

Figure 4.12. Unfinished qualities of Cedar Riverside neighborhood
buildings within Cedar Riverside are the most varied with two to three story single family homes with wood siding alongside concrete multi-family housing towers ranging from six to thirty stories tall.

Bright colors and multilingual signs distinguish this neighborhood as a diverse community, especially in relation to the remaining Twin Cities. Although colorful, the neighborhood feels unfinished, especially in the area closest to the proposed site. Unfinished qualities are apparent in a skyway that abruptly ends before reaching over the street and empty plots of land (figure 4.12). Part of its unfinished quality derives from the absence of the remaining phases of the “New Town-In Town” master plan. Fences and barricades throughout the neighborhood protect people from the surrounding interstate infrastructure. Multiple dead ends make it confusing to walk and drive through the neighborhood. Overall, there is a quality of being stranded in the area.

Raised plazas and vegetated courtyards are common at the Cedar Riverside Plaza towers and at the major institutions of University of MN, Augsburg College, and Fairview Hospital. Currie Park is a large green space with trees, recreational fields, and a playground adjacent to the Cedar Riverside Plaza. Trees line the single family residential
CONNECTIONS AND PATHS TO THE CITY
- entry points to interstates
- entry points to light rail transit
- main access points and busy streets

CEDAR AVENUE: PEDESTRIAN FOCUSED CORRIDOR

Figure 4.14. Transportation in Cedar Riverside neighborhood
streets throughout the neighborhood.

The demographics, education levels, and incomes among the people residing in the neighborhood contrast the surrounding neighborhoods. Peter Marcuse proposed five divisions of the city: the dominating city, the gentrified city, the suburban city, the tenement city, and the abandoned city. Cedar Riverside has elements of both the dominating city in the universities, and the tenement city in the public housing. The dominating city has boundaries of ramparts which serve to protect established wealth and power. The tenement city consists of ethnic enclaves where communities unite because of their differences from mainstream society. The tenement city is affected by sociocultur-
al boundaries like ethnicity, language, and custom that set them apart from other communities along with the bleak exterior of the public housing.\textsuperscript{11}

Although the Cedar Riverside neighborhood is surrounded by transportation, there are few access points. The city has designated Cedar Avenue as a pedestrian corridor because it has documented that 46\% of Cedar Riverside residents do not own a vehicle.\textsuperscript{12} To arrive at work, 39\% of residents drive alone, 19\% ride public transportation, and 27\% walk.\textsuperscript{13} This makes public transportation and pedestrian zones crucial to the wellbeing of the neighborhood. Mass transit light rail runs through the southwest corner of the area. Another path of light rail is currently being constructed known as the Central Corridor and will run along the northwest edge of the site. The light rail allows the fastest access to downtown and the surrounding city.

Michael Sorkin defines traffic as the relationship between speed and flow, which is most efficient when constant.\textsuperscript{14} One example of traffic in the traditional sense is too many cars on the freeway resulting in slower speeds. Traffic is important because transportation infrastructure is one of the primary public spaces in cities today. As technology advances, the fastest transportation technology becomes privileged over the slowest. Pedestrians must yield to automobiles, which must yield to trains. This system of “conflict avoidance” segregates transportation paths, which further segregates cities in the name of efficiency.\textsuperscript{15} This segregation is present in the Cedar Riverside neighborhood, as the automobile is the privileged form of transportation.

Long winters and freezing temperatures are hallmarks of life in Minnesota. The primary design strategies for the region address keeping heat inside by protecting from harsh northern winds, and allowing sunlight in during the winter months. Snow usually covers the ground for four months of the year and temperatures average 15 degrees in January and February. Minnesota has a heating climate therefore summer months design strategies, like shade and natural ventilation, are


\textsuperscript{12} City of Minneapolis Department of Community Planning & Economic Development. “Cedar Riverside Small Area Plan: Building Connections”

\textsuperscript{13} City of Minneapolis Department of Community Planning & Economic Development. “Cedar Riverside Small Area Plan: Building Connections”. Approved by the Minneapolis City Council. April 18, 2008.


\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 2-4.
secondary priorities for the building design.

The site’s micro climate is affected by its urban context and extensive infrastructure surrounding it. Sun and wind exposure is on the north side because the interstates run along the north and northwest perimeters of the site. The site is quite open, so warming sunlight from the south could also be achieved with the right orientation. The site is just far enough from the tall residential towers to not be affected by their shadow lines.

*Existing Community Center in Cedar Riverside*

The existing Brian Coyle Community Center is a hub for the Cedar Riverside neighborhood and was constructed in 1997. The Brian Coyle center is one of four neighborhood centers in Minneapolis supported by the non-profit organization, Pillsbury United Communities (PUC). PUC is a community focused organization that provides human services in Minneapolis neighborhoods. At the Brian Coyle Center, PUC assists immigrants within the community in various ways including education and citizenship test preparation. One of the many
services offered is a program titled Refugee Self-Sufficiency which is designed to help new refugees find employment. The community center houses many advocacy groups and provides social spaces such as a cafeteria and a gymnasium. Community organizations can host meetings and youth can play sports in the gymnasium. Figure 4.19 shows the importance of security for those living in this community as security cameras and a guard monitor the main entry. In addition to PUC at the Brian Coyle Center, cultural venues, such as theatres organizations, partner with community organizations within the neighborhood.

Extensive research was conducted and a Small Area Plan was produced for the Cedar Riverside neighborhood in 2008 by the City of Minneapolis. Guidelines and recommendations were provided for issues of economic development, bicycle and pedestrian travel, transportation and parking, institutions, public spaces and parks, and public safety and housing. The committee acknowledged that communication and human services were not addressed in the plan. The design for a federal immigration services center would help address human services in a comprehensive manner.


17 City of Minneapolis Department of Community Planning & Economic Development. “Cedar Riverside Small Area Plan: Building Connections”
Dialogue with the Nation

*Immigration, Control, and a Hierarchy of Experiences*

Citizenship and the nation forming are deeply entrenched within the ruling government and geopolitical borders. Although a nation is made up of people from many social, economic, and cultural backgrounds, the majority group develops the symbols, emblems, and architecture which represent the values of the nation.¹ The architecture of federal buildings has always been involved in representing the inherent social and power relations of the era. Immigration services buildings are prime examples which demonstrate the fluctuating nature of values, the meaning of citizenship in a democracy, and the first impressions the United States gives to newcomers.

Within federal architecture, the General Services Administration (GSA) participates in the design process by hosting competitions and enforcing a similar standard for all federal buildings. The GSA’s overall mission statement is to foster an effective, sustainable, and transparent government.² Under the Design Excellence Program, established in 1994, the GSA adopted values for federal architectural design including an avoidance of an official style and an incorporation of artworks by living Americans. There is no official style; however, the GSA states that federal buildings shall “reflect the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American National Government.”³

The government organization that currently serves legal immigrants is the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) under the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). USCIS is one of three components under the DHS which addresses the coordination of
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immigration and national security concerns regarding persons entering the country. Immigrant flows to the United States are monitored by the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and the US Customs and Border Protection (CBP). USCIS Immigration field offices and service centers are located in metropolitan areas across the United States and are the primary facilities for their operations. Although immigration service centers are not on the front lines of enforcement and detainment at the US border, security is still a primary concern for those using the buildings on a regular basis such as federal employees.

The physical spaces associated with USCIS are mainly office workplaces where employees process information with the primary goal of providing services to immigrants. In the USCIS’s Strategic Plan for 2008-2012, one of USCIS’s goals was to provide more customer oriented facilities, in more convenient places, that offer the full range of immigration and naturalization benefits in one location.\textsuperscript{4} A challenge to the USCIS and the buildings they occupy is the volatile nature of immigration flows due to policy change, natural disasters, and political unrest around the world. Although there have been more restrictive immigration policies in the last decade, the overall immigrant population of the United States has increased from 7.9% of the total population in 1980 to 12.9% of the total population in 2010.\textsuperscript{5} USCIS must adjust its staffing levels to match immigration flows creating a staff of full time, part time and temporary employees. The facilities must easily adapt to these changing circumstances. Another USCIS goal is to “adopt a customer-centered approach to service delivery, which will provide a clear, consistent, and universal picture of each customer in order to guide risk assessment, adjudication of benefits, as well as pro-


Federal employees would be the most consistent users of the building. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and non-profit organizations (NPOs) cultivate relationships within local communities that connect with the broader goals of the federal component, the USCIS. Both of these organizations help facilitate the immigration benefits and naturalization process by advocating for the individual immigrants and immigrant communities. The majority of native born citizens would see the immigration services center from the opposite side of the boundary, as an outsider to the process. The architecture of the immigration center would represent a symbol of immigration rather than frequent utility for citizens.

Immigrants living in the USCIS field office’s region have obligatory and sometimes voluntary reasons to visit these service centers. Immigrants are identified by the US government as temporary residents, refugees, asylees, and permanent residents. Each identified type may have different reasons for coming to the US or be in different stages of residing there. The many reasons for immigration to the US include but are not limited to education or economic opportunities, safety, and family reunification.

A uniting factor between all immigrants is the abandonment of their previous locality, including its architecture and institutions. For refugees and asylees, the move is less voluntary because of volatile conditions in their native country. Some factors that produce barriers for immigrants are their economic standing, their experience with government in their country of origin, and their English proficiency. Their ethnicity, clothing, and rituals could also lead to discrimination by the majority population. The above factors, among others, have an effect on how immigrants incorporate to society. Attaining citizenship means acquisition of the English language, knowledge of the country’s history, values, and political process as well the renouncement of the immigrant’s former country.

The USCIS operations are affected by the activities and procedures of other federal organizations and the structures, designs, and security measures of other federal building types. Two events that altered the course of immigration policy and federal building design were the
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Oklahoma City Bombing on April 19th, 1995 and the international terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center Towers and the Pentagon on September 11th, 2001. The Oklahoma City Bombing resulted in enhanced security measures in federal buildings to prevent further attacks. The events of September 11th altered the organizational hierarchy of immigration services by regrouping the branches of the INS under the new Department of Homeland Security. This separation meant that the physical action of crossing the border and entering the US was held by a different organization than the one handling incorporation and naturalization to the US. These events increased security measures beyond the individual building scale to alter the number of immigrants welcomed into the country, and the popular perception of newcomers to the country.

Since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, the US borders have experienced infrastructure and facilities investment in the form of fences, walls, and systematic border crossing stations.\footnote{Teddy Cruz, “Border Tours,” in \textit{Indefensible Space}. ed. Michael Sorkin, (New York: Routledge, 2008) : 115} While defensive actions are emboldened, the facilities that welcome immigrants into American society have been left mostly untouched and remain insensitive to human occupation and interaction. In many federal buildings, the office component is emphasized while security measures and architectural dominance diminish the public’s interaction and accessibility to services. The social divisions and boundaries enforcing security create an uninviting environment for individuals during repeat visits to immigration field offices.

\textit{Existing USCIS Center in Minnesota}

The current USCIS service office for the three state region of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota is the St. Paul Field Office located in Bloomington, MN. The services center is located in a multi-use office building which also leases space to other sectors of the Department of Homeland Security and immigration law offices. The generic brick office building is one of four in the office park between the Mall of America and the Minneapolis - Saint Paul International Airport.

The main entrance to the Department of Homeland Security is overseen by two security guards. One guard sits at a desk immediately inside the entrance and another guard watches from a balcony above. Visitors must immediately communicate the purpose for their visit upon entry. Immigration services are accessed from a separate exterior
door away from the main entrance. This entrance is secured by several guards and one must proceed through metal detection within the first ten feet of entry. Moving this office into a Minneapolis neighborhood would help satisfy one of the USCIS’s goals for 2008-2012, which was to provide more accessible, scaled, and community centered facilities.
HYBRID TYPOLOGY

Programming

The design proposal is made up of federal, community, and shared program elements. Qualitative and quantitative needs for the spaces were charted to determine overall building organization. An emphasis was placed on understanding the activity adjacencies and entry processes for the range of visitors from federal employees to community residents.

In order to arrive at the design proposal’s hybrid typology, existing federal and community typologies were analyzed for their experiential zones. Circulation between programmatic elements and experiential security points were diagrammed in this process. The ways in which identification and authorization are performed in existing buildings determine the five zones. Zone one is an open space, equal to a public sidewalk, where no identification is required. Individuals identify themselves to a receptionist in zone two. In zone three, individuals are able to attend scheduled meetings or classes. Individuals must go through additional screening which include metal detectors or equivalent devices in zone four. Zone five is for employee and special authorization access only.

The majority of activities in typical community centers require individuals to check in with a receptionist and determine the visit duration. Individuals visiting a typical federal building must pass through screening at entry. In certain federal buildings, citizenship ceremonies are the only activity that occurs without additional screening. Special security badge authorization is required to access employee offices and confidential materials. In many ways, security is the prominent experience of current federal buildings.
TYPICAL COMMUNITY TYPOLOGY

Figure 5.1. Experiential zones of community typology
Figure 5.2. Experiential zones of federal typology
HYBRID TYPOLOGY

Figure 5.3. Experiential zones of a hybrid typology
In the design proposal, accessible community spaces are interspersed with secure federal spaces. Secure federal spaces, like employee offices, are compartmentalized while social federal spaces such as cafes, meeting rooms, and waiting spaces are no longer restricted by secure access. These social spaces become part of the public and semi-public mixture of community spaces surrounding the secure space. This opens up the building to a variety of visitors who can experience the majority of spaces without special security measures. Programmatic efficiency is increased because cafes and meeting rooms can be shared between federal staff and community members. Visitors can snack in the cafe or rest on exterior terraced seating and watch a soccer game while waiting for their appointment instead of sitting in a dedicated waiting area. Infrequent citizenship ceremonies can take place in the gymnasium where daily basketball games are played. The incorporation of community elements refocuses the experience to the porous boundary while leaving the secure boundary intact.
### SPATIAL AGGREGATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Brian Coyle Center in Cedar Riverside (SF)</th>
<th>Technology Access Foundation and Community Center (SF)</th>
<th>Irving CIS office (SF)</th>
<th>Proposed Cedar Riverside CIS and Community Center (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria - Support</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Interview Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Interview Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library - records</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Space</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office-Community Staff</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office-Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms- Public</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms- Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Rooms</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Hallway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>28,150</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>33,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>30 spots</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>128 spots for employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>150 spots total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256 spots for public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECURE SPACES**

Figure 5.5.  Square footage chart based on precedent analysis
### Activity Use: Type of Visitor and Frequency of Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISITORS</th>
<th>Multiple Entries Per Day</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Days a Week</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>3-6 months</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Visually From a Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College age Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and Maintenance Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Collectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail, package deliverers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Automobile drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light rail commuters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus riders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees of other institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- Residents
- Non-residents
- Either

Figure 5.6. Frequency of use based on visitor type

### Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>After school tutoring</th>
<th>Appointments</th>
<th>Ceremonies</th>
<th>Community Organization Meetings</th>
<th>Farmers Market</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Lunch breaks</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Trash Pick-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TIME**

| 7:00 AM  | Wednesday            |
| 8:00 AM  |                      |
| 9:00 AM  |                      |
| 10:00 AM |                      |
| 11:00 AM |                      |
| 12:00 PM | Monday through       |
| 1:00 PM  | Monday through       |
| 2:00 PM  | Friday               |
| 3:00 PM  | Monday               |
| 4:00 PM  | through              |
| 5:00 PM  | Monday               |
| 6:00 PM  | through              |
| 7:00 PM  | Friday               |
| 8:00 PM  |                      |

Figure 5.7. Frequency of activities based on time of day
Figure 5.8. Activity analysis based on noise levels and movement levels

Figure 5.9. Activity analysis based on degree of social interaction and degree of scheduled interaction
Schematic Design

The goal of the design proposal is to create an approachable, porous boundary condition between new immigrants and the national government. Grounded in research on boundary conditions and public architecture, four strategies are employed to achieve the design goal. The first strategy is to create a hybrid building, weaving community focused programs into the federal building. The second is to maintain appropriate federal security measures, while minimizing experiential security points. The third is to clarify sight lines and movement paths within the building and neighborhood. The fourth strategy is to filter the boundaries within experiential zones through opacity, transparency, and perforations.

The design solution resulted in an aggregate village scheme, which contrasts the modernist simplicity and concrete opacity of the Cedar Riverside Plaza development. Concrete is used for the consistent column grid underlying the aggregate scheme because it is the predominant material used in the Cedar Riverside housing development and surrounding infrastructure. Columns lift the experiential path through diverse community and federal spaces to various heights in order to capture views of the city above the light rail ramps. Large openings between clusters of interior classrooms allow day light to filter to the ground and create small gardens. The perforated building envelope blurs with the bermed landscape to create sports fields, terraced seating, and guided passages.
Figure 5.10. The federal tower anchors the surrounding clusters of educational and recreational spaces. The central location allows waiting spaces to blend with active community spaces.
Figure 5.11. Map of transportation paths converging at site
DAY LIGHT GUIDING THE CIRCUITOUS PATH

Figure 5.12. The design proposal links to existing paths and ameliorates dead-end conditions at site perimeter

Figure 5.13. The route through the building is guided by natural light

Natural light from a slatted wood ceiling acts as a guide through the winding circulation path. Transparent glass walls at the ends of ramped paths frame views out towards the city.
Figure 5.14. Design of federal services cluster
AGGREGATE CLUSTERS

Community Education Cluster
- ramp to community center entry that is directly connected to the second floor of the Cedar Riverside Plaza
- community entry and community employee offices
- meeting spaces, classrooms, and library

Community Recreation Cluster
- soccer field
- gymnasium that doubles as ceremonial space
- cafe and large group meeting space

Figure 5.15. Design of community education and community recreation clusters
Figure 5.16. The federal tower and the elevated linear path align with the Cedar Riverside towers and the convergence point of the light rail ramps.
Figure 5.17. Landscape is blurred with the building envelope to soften the boundary when approaching the community education cluster from the bus stop.

Figure 5.18. Structures made of metal mesh, concrete, and glass rise above an undulating landscape.
AN APPROACHABLE, POROUS BOUNDARY

Figure 5.19. A large opening within the community education cluster creates a small park area and brings daylight to the interior
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