

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

September 2013



Developed by The Glen Price Group
719 El Cerrito Plaza
El Cerrito, CA 94530
www.glenpricegroup.com
510.528.1558

Produced under contract to the Seattle Police Foundation
www.seattlepolicefoundation.org

Table of Contents

A Overview 3

A.1 Deliverables 4

A.2 Key Outcomes and Framework 4

A.3 Identified Support 5

A.4 Potential Challenges 6

 A.4.a Funding..... 6

 A.4.b Collaboration 6

 A.4.c Scope of Services..... 6

 A.4.d Accessibility 7

A.5 Key Findings 8

A.6 Conclusions and Key Recommendations..... 8

B Domestic Violence in Seattle 10

B.1 Extent of Domestic Violence in Seattle 10

B.2 Strengths of the Current System 11

B.3 Challenges Facing the Current System 13

B.4 Other Local Factors 14

C The Family Justice Center Model 16

C.1 The Family Justice Center Model 16

C.2 Family Justice Center Outcomes and Challenges..... 18

 C.2.a Outcomes 19

 C.2.b Challenges..... 21

D The Family Justice Center Model in Seattle 24

D.1 Seattle Family Justice Center Scenario Planning..... 24

 D.1.a FJC Staffing Descriptions..... 26

 D.1.b Stakeholder Response to Proposed Scenarios..... 26

D.2 Framework for Improved Outcomes 27

D.3 Forecasting Outcomes and Return on Investment 28

E Financial Impact and Sustainability 30

E.1 Cost Projection Assumptions 30

 E.1.a Operating Cost Projection Assumptions..... 30

 E.1.b Capital Infrastructure and Development Cost Projection Assumptions..... 31

 E.1.c Revenue and Sustainability Projection Assumptions 31

 E.1.d Year 1 Phased-in Cost Assumptions..... 32

E.2 Cost Projections 33

 E.2.a Operating Cost Projections..... 33

 E.2.b Capital Infrastructure and Development Cost Projections..... 34

 E.2.c Phased-in Year 1 Cost Projections..... 35

F Strategic Planning Design and Timeline 36

Attachments

- Attachment 1: City of Seattle 2013-2015 Domestic Violence Response Strategic Plan**
- Attachment 2: Feasibility Analysis Methodology**
- Attachment 3: Stakeholder Survey and Interview Results**
- Attachment 4: Cost Projections**
- Attachment 5: Family Justice Center Promising Practices**
- Attachment 6: Summary of Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement Benefits**

A OVERVIEW

In January 2013, the City of Seattle’s Domestic Violence Prevention Council adopted the 2013-2015 Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence Strategic Plan.¹ One of the action items it identified was exploring the possibility of establishing a multidisciplinary service center for survivors of domestic violence based on the Family Justice Center model.² The Family Justice Center Workgroup was convened by the Seattle Human Services Department in February 2013 to perform this task.

With the support of the Seattle Police Foundation and the City of Seattle, the Family Justice Center Workgroup retained the Glen Price Group to conduct a feasibility analysis designed to present the potential benefits and challenges of establishing a multidisciplinary service center for survivors of domestic violence in Seattle, drawing upon the knowledge and experience of key stakeholders.^{3,4} This resulting Feasibility Analysis document is the result of that work and contains the findings, recommendations, and opinions of the Glen Price Group.⁵

The primary objective of this feasibility analysis is to assist stakeholders in Seattle in answering this question, *“Would co-location and the service approach provided by a Family Justice Center model yield improved outcomes for victims and their families?”* The analysis seeks to help stakeholders determine whether or not a Family Justice Center (FJC) would yield significant outcomes with a satisfactory return on investment through a preliminary analysis of:

1. The extent of domestic violence in the city;
2. The current service delivery system;
3. Support for a potential Family Justice Center; and
4. Specific outcomes that could potentially be delivered by an FJC in the City of Seattle.⁶

This work enables the City of Seattle and its key partners to analyze the case for developing a Family Justice Center and determine whether to commit to a strategic planning process with the ultimate goal of launching and implementing an FJC in Seattle (see Table 1).

¹ See Attachment 1: City of Seattle 2013-15 Domestic Violence Response Strategic Plan.

² See the National Family Justice Center Alliance Website for more information:
<http://www.familyjusticecenter.org/index.php/the-family-justice-center-approach.html>

³ See www.glenpricegroup.com

⁴ While the family justice center model has been utilized to provide comprehensive services to survivors for a range of family violence issues including sexual assault, child abuse, and others, the scope of this Feasibility Analysis focused on domestic violence as a starting point for study and potential action in the City of Seattle.

⁵ See Attachment 2: Feasibility Analysis Methodology

⁶ The name “Family Justice Center” is used throughout this document as a placeholder for the sake of consistency. The name “Family Justice Center” is currently used in the Seattle area for a detention facility, and Seattle’s potential co-located service center for victims of domestic violence and related crimes would have a different name.

Table 1: FJC Study and Implementation Phases	
FJC Study and Implementation Phase	Key Questions - Topics
Feasibility Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would a Family Justice Center in Seattle yield improved outcomes for victims and their families? • What is the case for a Family Justice Center in Seattle? • Should the City of Seattle commit to strategic planning for a Family Justice Center?
Strategic Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and Mission • Key Goals, Objectives, and Indicators of Success • Launch pathway and first year implementation plan • What are the roles and responsibilities of each partner?
Launch and Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we continually improve services to victims and families? • How do we continue to develop the strength of our partnerships and support base? • How do we continue to sustain and grow the new service model?

A.1 Deliverables

The key deliverables of this feasibility analysis include the following:

- ✓ A “Resource Inventory,” summarizing the results of phone interviews and an online survey with key stakeholders;⁷
- ✓ A preliminary analysis of partnership and programmatic opportunities and challenges;
- ✓ A preliminary budget and funding analysis including potential FJC staffing, structure, scenarios, and the identification of potential funding sources; and
- ✓ A set of recommendations for consideration by Seattle FJC partners for future action.

A.2 Key Outcomes and Framework

Government and non-profit partners are investigating the feasibility of establishing a co-located center for victims of domestic violence (DV) in Seattle based on the Family Justice Center model in order to realize the following primary outcomes:

- ✓ Increased victim safety and increased domestic violence reporting;
- ✓ Increased numbers of successful prosecutions;
- ✓ Reduced numbers of case dismissals for victim-related reasons;
- ✓ Reduced recidivism in domestic violence cases;
- ✓ Increased public awareness of domestic violence;
- ✓ Increased access to and utilization of domestic violence services; and
- ✓ Increased funding and funding sources for domestic violence services.

The FJC model seeks to generate these outcomes through a strategic collaboration between law enforcement, prosecution, government, and non-profit service providers that involves:

- ✓ Providing easily accessible, comprehensive services to victims of domestic violence in one location;

⁷ See Attachment 3: Stakeholder Survey and Interview Results.

- ✓ Coordination and co-location of services and resources including law enforcement, prosecution, victim advocacy, civil-legal assistance, protection-order assistance, counseling and support services, childcare, and possibly other services, such as mental health, job training, and life skills;
- ✓ Comprehensive, culturally competent, and multi-lingual community outreach;
- ✓ Coordinated education, intervention, and prevention initiatives that increase public awareness of domestic violence and of the services available; and
- ✓ Sharing of promising practices between partners through open communication and shared training.

The potential development of an FJC aligns with the following focus areas, goals, and action items from the Seattle Domestic Violence Prevention Council's Criminal Justice Subcommittee's *2013-2015 Domestic Violence Strategic Plan: Seattle's Criminal Justice Response*:⁸

- ✓ **Focus Area:** The Seattle criminal justice response enhances victim safety
 - **Goal:** A Seattle Family Justice Center (FJC) is established, incorporating both the criminal justice response and community-based victim services
- ✓ **Focus Area:** Identify opportunities to improve the criminal justice system
 - **Goal:** A Seattle Family Justice Center is the primary hub for the criminal justice response to domestic violence

A.3 Identified Support

Stakeholder surveys and interviews conducted for this feasibility analysis have provided valuable information regarding the assets, strengths, and concerns of local stakeholders involved with the issue of domestic violence (DV).⁹ Respondents to the survey and interviewees shared a common interest in improving the community's capacity to provide accessible, coordinated services to DV survivors. There was a strong, shared perception that the establishment of a Family Justice Center would be a good use of resources, benefit survivors of domestic violence, and improve coordination of services, along with agreement that it could potentially improve offender accountability.

Surveys and interviews indicate strong support for the establishment of an FJC across a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including domestic violence survivors, DV service providers, other government agencies, law enforcement, and social service agencies. Many stakeholders also agree that creation of an FJC should be a priority for the criminal justice system, community service providers, and elected leadership. A significant majority of service providers who were surveyed and interviewed stated that their organization would be interested in offering services either onsite at a new Seattle FJC or offsite through a referral system.

In terms of general benefits from the creation of a Family Justice Center in Seattle, survey and interview participants indicated that they felt an FJC would improve collaborative service delivery, bring attention and funding to the issue of domestic violence, and could be part of a broader approach to helping survivors of domestic violence in Seattle. A substantial proportion of the survey respondents indicated that

⁸ See Attachment 1: *City of Seattle 2013-15 Domestic Violence Response Strategic Plan*.

⁹ See Attachment 3: Stakeholder Survey and Interview Results.

based on their own knowledge, their organization would be interested in participating in a strategic planning process to develop a Family Justice Center.

A.4 Potential Challenges

Stakeholder surveys and interviews also identified a broad range of potential challenges. These fell into four primary areas: funding, collaboration, scope of services, and accessibility.¹⁰

A.4.a Funding

Both survey and interview participants identified financial considerations as a concern, both for the FJC itself and in relationship to the financial status of the participating organizations. Some respondents expressed concerns about the capacity of community-based agency partners to serve both their own clients and to provide services at the co-location site. Others questioned whether the creation of an FJC would result in spreading already limited domestic violence resources even thinner, rather than creating a multiplier effect. Many of the financial concerns focused on long-term sustainability.

With regard to funding issues, it has been the experience of many existing FJCs that co-location of partners has resulted in opportunities to leverage additional resources to support FJC operations. On the other hand, some FJCs have faced closures or significant cutbacks in services due to the failure to maintain sustainable funding, demonstrating the need for a well thought out sustainability plan.

In the implementation of the FJC model elsewhere, a common approach has been for several partners to assume administrative and programmatic leadership for the FJC, while other organizations provide in-kind support for center operations. Additional costs can include facilities, operations management staff, and data collection, analysis, and reporting. For the purpose of this Feasibility Analysis, several general cost scenarios for the establishment of an FJC in Seattle were developed to assist stakeholders and policy makers in a cost-benefit analysis.¹¹

A.4.b Collaboration

A second set of concerns focused on the investment required to establish the necessary partnerships to create an FJC. Establishing trust among the potential partners was named as an important issue, given the reality that some of their organizational missions may be perceived as conflicting with one another. Barriers to establishing trust need to be openly addressed. Given the high level of commitment required from collaborating organizations, some also raised questions about whether the necessary buy-in from key stakeholders could be attained. Some interviewees described a history in the community of unpopular programs being forced upon service providers by linking funding to those programs, creating a concern that an FJC could replicate this pattern.

A.4.c Scope of Services

Many stakeholders raised their concern that a Family Justice Center focused exclusively on domestic violence would be too limited in scope. There is concern that this limited scope would prevent truly comprehensive service delivery to victims, or

¹⁰ See Section C.2.b for more detailed analysis of challenges faced by Family Justice Centers.

¹¹ See Attachment 4: Cost Projections.

might even deter some victims who do not identify primarily as victims of domestic violence. These stakeholders would prefer to treat the family comprehensively and holistically, since family violence frequently includes the physical and/or sexual abuse and neglect of children in the household, as well as adult sexual violence.

For the purpose of this feasibility analysis, the decision was made to focus primarily on providing services and resources to victims of domestic violence and elder abuse crimes. However, it is possible that the scope of services could expand over time if an FJC is opened in Seattle.

A.4.d Accessibility

Accessibility represents a fourth area of challenge identified by stakeholders. For some, the expected downtown location would be hard to reach for residents of particular neighborhoods, and potentially pull services provided by community-based organizations out of their local communities. An additional concern includes a perceived lack of support from minority communities and the potential exclusion of marginalized communities, which could limit their access to FJC services. Key informants also raised concerns that the presence of law enforcement and prosecution could make undocumented immigrants and other marginalized populations reluctant to visit a Family Justice Center.¹² These concerns present an argument for why an FJC should not be located in a government-owned building.

Conversely, some organizations indicated their desire to be located in or very close to government-owned buildings to ensure accessibility for the populations they serve. The King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, for example, expressed the need to locate their Protection Order Advocacy Program in close proximity to the King County Courthouse to ensure that victims are able to access the resources available at the courthouse, including certified court interpretation services. Moving the Protection Order Advocacy Program farther away from the King County Courthouse would result in a significant reduction in services to marginalized victims seeking assistance with protection orders. For these reasons, discussion about where the FJC will be physically located must include all key partners and a final decision should have very broad support.

A decision to move forward with strategic planning intended to establish a Family Justice Center would not in itself eliminate the potential challenges that exist in the areas of financing, collaboration, scope, and accessibility. A commitment to partner together must include a commitment to the ongoing hard work of communication, innovation, and entrepreneurship required to make an FJC successful. It would require agencies and departments to co-locate and collaborate in a way that is, to date, unprecedented in the City of Seattle. Partner agencies would need to be flexible throughout the strategic planning process, and work collectively to develop a strategic plan that addresses their many needs and concerns. Strengthening collaborative capacity would need to be a central feature of the strategic planning process necessary to launch an FJC.

¹² A recent comprehensive evaluation study of California Family Justice Centers, "Final Evaluation Results-Phase II California Family Justice Initiative-Statewide Evaluation," EMT Associates, April 2013, noted that none of the eight sites evaluated required victim involvement in the criminal justice system or cooperation with law enforcement in order to access services, and none shared information about the victim's case with law enforcement without permission of the victim.

A strategic planning process will also need to address many issues and obstacles that organizations would face in co-locating, particularly for those organizations that also serve populations outside of the City of Seattle itself.

A.5 Key Findings

The results from surveys, interviews, and stakeholder meetings indicate significant general support for the establishment of a Family Justice Center and provide the basis for the following key findings:

- ✓ A substantial majority of interview and survey respondents indicated an interest in participating in a strategic planning process to establish a Seattle Family Justice Center. The key stakeholders needed to comprise the nucleus of a Family Justice Center also indicated a strong willingness to co-locate, noting that their actual ability to do so would be dependent upon the ultimate design of the FJC and their financial capacity to serve as an FJC partner.
- ✓ Questions about the financing of the FJC need to be carefully addressed, using realistic projections of income and expenses. At the same time, the co-location of personnel can create a strong foundation for Family Justice Center sustainability and result in significant leveraged resources.
- ✓ Collaborative development needs to be a key component of the planning effort, so that all partners feel that their concerns are being addressed, and that they have a voice in decisions in areas such as funding, facility, staffing, and policy.
- ✓ A strategic planning process would need to take seriously the issue of the accessibility of services for minority and marginalized communities and seek to learn from the experience of other FJCs in this area.
- ✓ As the outcomes of other FJCs have shown, a Family Justice Center has the potential to yield significant outcomes in the City of Seattle: increased safety for victims, increased numbers of successful prosecutions, increased support for domestic violence services, and reduced domestic violence injury and homicide.¹³ The potential reduction in case dismissals and reduced recidivism creates the potential to generate a significant return on investment within the legal and criminal justice systems.

The future viability of a potential Seattle Family Justice Center would depend, in part, on the identification of a site that meets agreed-upon criteria for cost, location, and configuration. Because facility costs represent a significant portion of the FJC's projected budget, its sustainability would be greatly enhanced if a site were made available at low or no cost to the FJC.

A.6 Conclusions and Key Recommendations

On the basis of the surveys and interviews, data analysis, and meetings with stakeholders, the key conclusion of this study is the recommendation *that the City of Seattle engage a broad group of stakeholders in a strategic planning process in order to develop and implement a Family Justice Center in Seattle*. This work should incorporate the following recommendations:

¹³ See Section C.2.A.

- ✓ Efforts to develop an FJC should be deeply rooted in the historical successes and existing strengths of the community.
- ✓ An FJC should offer accessible services to all victims of domestic violence, including those from marginalized populations or those who choose not to participate in the criminal justice system.
- ✓ Planning should focus on priority initiatives that lead to improved victim safety, offender accountability, and service delivery outcomes.
- ✓ The development and operation of an FJC should be sustainably funded through new resources or collaborative use of existing resources and, at a minimum, should not reduce current service delivery levels.
- ✓ An FJC should be housed in a victim-friendly site in close proximity to the King County Courthouse and public transportation.
- ✓ An FJC should provide truly integrated services with appropriate staffing levels to ensure success.¹⁴
- ✓ The goal of a strategic planning process should be to develop an action plan while simultaneously developing the FJC's overall purpose, vision, and mission, with buy-in and ownership from the community.
- ✓ The strategic planning process should approach strategic planning and fund development and sustainability as integrated efforts.
- ✓ An important focus of the strategic planning process should be the creation of a timeline and detailed plan for securing large foundation, state, and federal grants in support of the capital and operational needs of the FJC.
- ✓ Initial partners/services co-locating at the center should include, at a minimum: the Seattle Police Department (Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse Unit and Victim Support Team); the Seattle City Attorney's Office (Domestic Violence Unit); the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office (Domestic Violence Unit, Protection Order Advocacy Program, and Elder Crimes Unit); advocates from community-based agencies including Consejo and the Salvation Army; childcare services; and civil legal services.^{15,16}

¹⁴ See Section D.1.

¹⁵ See Table 7.

¹⁶ Consejo and the Salvation Army are included in this list because of their participation in the Co-location Project (see Section B.2).

B DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN SEATTLE

This feasibility analysis seeks to ascertain whether or not an FJC would yield significant outcomes with a satisfactory return on investment for key stakeholders through a preliminary analysis of the extent of domestic violence in the city, the current service delivery system, and specific outcomes that could potentially be delivered by an FJC in the City of Seattle.

B.1 Extent of Domestic Violence in Seattle

Domestic violence represents a serious and growing crime in Seattle. As depicted in Table 2, DV-related aggravated assaults have increased by 60% from 2009 to 2012 while other aggravated assaults have declined by 2% during that same time.¹⁷ Simultaneously, DV-related aggravated assaults as a proportion of total aggravated assaults have risen. In 2009, DV-related aggravated assaults contributed to just under one quarter (24%) of all aggravated assaults in Seattle, but in 2012, that number had risen to over one-third (34%).¹⁸ It is important to note that this increase in DV-related aggravated assaults is partly related to a new law that changed the classification of assault in the second degree (strangulation) from a misdemeanor to a felony offense. This change was implemented to improve offender accountability in order to better protect victims from their abusers.¹⁹

Table 2: Aggravated Assaults in Seattle²⁰

	Year				% Change
	2009	2010	2011	2012	
DV aggravated assaults	460	502	649	734	60%
Other aggravated assaults	1485	1471	1478	1449	-2%
Total aggravated assaults	1945	1973	2127	2183	12%
% DV	24%	25%	31%	34%	

In 2012 alone, the Seattle Police Department received 10,085 calls to 911 dispatch related to DV, documented 7,644 DV related police reports, and made a total of 6,807 DV-related arrests.²¹ Seattle did not have any domestic violence homicides in 2012.²² However, there were 12 DV homicides in other parts of King County in 2012.²³

¹⁷ See <http://www.komonews.com/news/crime/Domestic-violence-rates-surgin-in-Seattle-as-other-assaults-fall-215694591.html>.

¹⁸ Seattle Police Department, Crime Statistics, “Domestic Violence-Related & Other Aggravated Assaults in Seattle, 2009-2012.”

¹⁹ King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office. See: <http://www.komonews.com/news/local/Prosecutor--New-law-causes-spike-in-domestic-violence-cases-215946981.html?tab=video&c=y>.

²⁰ Seattle Police Department, Crime Statistics, “Domestic Violence-Related & Other Aggravated Assaults in Seattle, 2009-2012.”

²¹ City of Seattle Human Services Department, Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Prevention, May 28th, 2013.

²² It has been suggested that the lack of DV homicides in Seattle is due largely to the excellent trauma care centers in the city and their ability to treat critically injured patients.

²³ City of Seattle Human Services Department, Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Prevention, May 28th, 2013.

During this same year, 1,188 misdemeanor DV cases and 1,076 felony DV cases were filed by the City Attorney and King County Prosecutor, respectively. (In Seattle, the City Attorney's Office prosecutes all misdemeanor domestic violence cases while the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office prosecutes all felony cases. Accordingly, statistics from the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office are representative of the entire county.)

In 2012, 602 misdemeanor cases were dismissed. Roughly one third (34.55%) of dismissed misdemeanor cases were dismissed due to a non-cooperative witness.²⁴ In 2004, the Supreme Court ruling in *Crawford v. Washington* changed the methods for determining whether out-of-court statements can be used as evidence in court. One result of *Crawford* has been that if a victim refuses to testify against the perpetrator in a domestic violence case, it is far less likely that the victim's statement made out-of-court about the incident will be admissible evidence against the perpetrator. Because it is not uncommon for a victim of domestic violence to be the only witness to the assault, it is more difficult to prosecute these cases if the victims are not willing to cooperate.

Other factors to consider when examining domestic violence in Seattle are the alarming trends in recidivism in the State of Washington. A recent study on recidivism trends of DV offenders in Washington State found that when compared to non-DV offenders, DV offenders in Washington are more likely to have a criminal history, have more violent and assault charges, and be classified as higher risk to reoffend. This study also found that DV offenders have higher rates of recidivism than non-domestic violence offenders.²⁵

B.2 Strengths of the Current System

Seattle has a history of collaboration between the city, law enforcement, prosecution, elected officials, and community-based agencies, which has fostered mutual respect between these various partners. A significant majority of survey respondents identified existing relationships and partnerships as the most important community asset that a potential FJC serving Seattle could draw upon.²⁶ Specific strengths include the dedicated DV units in law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, the Co-location Project, the Victim Support Team, the network of community-based agencies, and the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Protection Order Advocacy Program.

Dedicated Domestic Violence Units

In recent years, the criminal justice system in Seattle has made steps towards prioritizing domestic violence victim safety and offender accountability while developing relationships among government agencies and community-based agencies. The Seattle Police Department (SPD), City Attorney's Office, and King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office each have specialized units dedicated to domestic violence and related crimes, demonstrating the existing commitment to justice for victims of DV. Many of these units are already collaborating through the Co-location Project described below.

²⁴ City of Seattle Human Services Department, Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Prevention, May 28th, 2013.

²⁵ "Recidivism Trends of Domestic Violence Offenders in Washington State," Washington State Institute for Public Policy, August 2013.

²⁶ See Attachment 3: Stakeholder Survey and Interview Results.

“[The co-location project] has improved my performance and my ability to create effective case reports – I know what the trial attorneys want and what to gather up-front.” – Interview Participant

Co-location Project

The current co-location of staff from the King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office and Seattle City Attorney’s Office along with advocates from the Salvation Army and Consejo Counseling and Referral Services within the Seattle Police Department’s Domestic Violence Unit has proven to be highly successful. This co-located project enables advocates, prosecutors, and law enforcement to work together to

better address the needs and concerns of victims. This project, along with the Victim Support Team, has allowed for a more coordinated and comprehensive response to DV crimes across the city.

Victim Support Team

The Seattle Police Department also works to connect DV victims to services through the Victim Support Team (VST). The VST was developed in 1996 and has grown into a viable program which trains and coordinates community volunteers to provide crisis intervention, support, and resources to domestic violence victims and their children at crime scenes directly following DV incidents.

Currently, over 100 people volunteer for the VST, fostering innovative partnerships with community, police, and prosecution agencies. The VST provides officers an added resource in handling domestic violence calls, freeing them to focus on the investigation. The presence of the VST community volunteers helps break isolation and helps victims feel supported by their community. The VST also helps to address the gap between the time a police report is taken at the incident of the crime and the time the case is assigned to a unit within SPD for follow-up.²⁷

“The Victim Support Team is a great model of successful cross-over between community-based services and the law enforcement system – it is connected to law enforcement but its primary objective is to give victims the emergency supports they need and get them connected to community based services. This is a good starting place for future collaboration.” – Interview Participant

Network of Service Providers

The robust network of community-based agencies in Seattle and King County provide a multitude of critical services for victims of DV and their families. In 2012, a significant number of services were provided to victims of domestic violence:²⁸

- 3,252 victims of domestic violence received *advocacy services*
- 1,106 victims found refuge in *emergency shelters*
- 187 victims were placed in *transitional housing*

Many of the community-based agencies in the region are members of the King County Coalition Against Domestic Violence. The mission of the Coalition is, “To work to end domestic violence by facilitating collective action for social change. In countywide public policy and education efforts, the Coalition provides leadership on behalf of

²⁷ See <http://www.seattle.gov/police/vst/volunteer.htm> for more information on the Seattle Police Department’s Victim Support Team.

²⁸ City of Seattle Human Services Department, Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Prevention, May 28th, 2013.

community based victim service agencies and their allies. The Coalition strives to represent the diverse interests of victims and survivors of domestic violence.”

Protection Order Advocacy Program

The Protection Order Advocacy Program is a program within the Domestic Violence Unit of the King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office. The program provides advocacy services to over 2,500 victims in its Seattle office each year, 60% of which reside in the City of Seattle. The Protection Order Advocacy Program has been in effect for over twenty years and is one of the most robust prosecutor-led programs of its kind in the country. The program is currently located in the King County Courthouse in downtown Seattle where victims have access to certified court interpreters.²⁹

B.3 Challenges Facing the Current System

Despite significant strides to improve the domestic violence response and service delivery system in Seattle, there are still challenges to successful collaboration between community-based organizations and the criminal justice system, and a lack of availability of services to victims.

Divide between Law Enforcement/Justice System and Community Based Organizations

Despite efforts to bridge the gap between community-based agencies and the criminal justice system in recent years, there is still a cultural divide. These agencies have different, and sometimes competing, missions that can create conflict despite the shared goal of reducing domestic violence in the community. The surveys and interviews showed that some representatives of community-based agencies have lost trust in the criminal justice system and have difficulty collaborating with law enforcement as a result.

Law Enforcement Challenges

In the early 2000s, the criminal justice system in Seattle received significant criticism regarding the silos that existed between agencies. In the years since, the Seattle Police Department, City Attorney’s Office, and King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office have made great strides to break down barriers to collaboration in order to improve efforts to increase victim safety and hold offenders accountable, such as the formation of the VST and the co-location of community-based advocates with the SPD. However, it is not always possible to fully collaborate when different agencies are housed in separate facilities. Based on the experience of those involved with the Co-location Project, it is believed that the full co-location of multiple agencies would greatly increase the effectiveness of the City’s domestic violence response and bring more public attention and resources to crimes of domestic violence.

“If Seattle had a family justice center with a ‘one stop’ approach, then more people could be assisted and our facility would refer victims to the ‘one stop’ services of the Seattle Justice Center. I offer my services as an advocate on a case-by-case basis and as time permits. Many people ‘fall through the cracks’ due to one person helping many.” - Survey Respondent

Lack of Capacity

The results from the interviews and survey evidenced that service capacity is a major issue facing community agencies in Seattle.

²⁹ See www.protectionorder.org

Organizations are often forced to turn away victims due to limited financial resources and personnel, which can result in victims having to visit several organizations before receiving all needed services. While community-based service providers are coordinated in several ways, it often appears to victims that services are uncoordinated due to the lack of capacity. Participants in the stakeholder survey and informant interviews rated the statement, “survivors of family violence in Seattle currently receive the full range of services they need,” very low (interview: 1.9 out of 4; survey: 2.02 out of 4), and many participants indicated that their low rating was due to the general lack of capacity of community-based agencies.

“Seattle has a vibrant and dedicated community of people from all aspects of the social service world, but the services are separate and complicated to understand and access. One central place for a victim to come to, where they could speak with a person who could give them comprehensive options for their particular situation, could be an incredible benefit for the people in our community.” – Survey Respondent

Difficult to Navigate

Survey and interview results suggest that the current system can be difficult to navigate for victims. As a result victims do not always receive fully comprehensive, wrap-around services and offenders are not always held accountable for their crimes. In survey results conducted for this Feasibility Analysis the statement, “Family violence offenders are held accountable by the current system,” received a lower average rating from survivors of domestic violence than any other statement included in the survey (1.36 out of 4). It is believed that many victims fall through the cracks or give up hope because they are not able to navigate the complex system. There is often a limited window of time in which victims of domestic

violence are willing or able to leave their abusive partners, and if victims are unable to obtain adequate levels of support rapidly it is often much more difficult later to make the decision to leave.

B.4 Other Local Factors

In the view of many stakeholders, downtown Seattle is an ideal location for a potential Family Justice Center for several reasons, including its proximity to the courts and the fact that it is the county seat. Additionally, many buildings downtown have vacant space that could potentially be utilized for an FJC. However, some stakeholders indicated that they did not think it made sense to have victims go to an FJC downtown when there are readily accessible community-based services available in their neighborhoods. Since Seattle is a largely neighborhood-based city, an FJC in downtown would need to conduct targeted outreach and provide transportation assistance to populations in more distant neighborhoods.

Some agencies provide services to populations outside of the City of Seattle, and it is important that these services are not sacrificed or diminished in an attempt to bolster services in the City of Seattle. The King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office, for example, provides services to 17 other cities other than Seattle across North and East King County, with a total population of more than 500,000.³⁰ It is critical that services

³⁰ Includes Burien, Bellevue, Kirkland, Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, Mercer Island, Redmond, Woodenville, Issaquah, Medina, Sammamish, Snoqualmie, Bothell, and additional cities and unincorporated areas.

to this diverse mix of urban, suburban, and rural populations are not reduced in order to support a Seattle-based facility. Some stakeholders suggested that it might be beneficial to examine the feasibility of creating remote video-conferencing sites in different communities where victims could meet with FJC partners through video-conferencing.

Another unique challenge for the City of Seattle is that the City Attorney's Office is responsible for prosecuting all misdemeanor domestic violence crimes while the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office is responsible for all felony domestic violence crimes. Similarly, the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office is responsible for all protection orders and the King County Courthouse is the primary location where residents of Seattle can petition for protection orders with the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office. For this reason, if the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office Protection Order Advocacy Program is co-located at the FJC, it will compound the need for the FJC to be accessible and in close proximity to the King County Courthouse.

C THE FAMILY JUSTICE CENTER MODEL

C.1 The Family Justice Center Model

The Family Justice Center model, first implemented in San Diego, California, has been established throughout the country and around the world, with the intent of helping local communities maximize the use of existing resources through improved collaboration and partnership. There are currently over 80 operating Family Justice Centers (or similar models) and over 100 communities in some stage of planning for a Family Justice Center or a similar co-located, multi-disciplinary approach in the United States and other countries.³¹ While the programs at each Family Justice Center vary considerably as each responds to local conditions, assets, and challenges, they all function as comprehensive support centers for victims of family violence and their children, where multi-disciplinary teams of professionals are co-located to provide coordinated responses.³² This coordination is primarily achieved through the co-location of existing personnel. All Family Justice Centers seek to involve multi-disciplinary partners in integrated service delivery models for victims and survivors. While the term “one-stop” has often been used to characterize a Family Justice Center, this term may raise unrealistic expectations, given that FJC partners sometimes offer services offsite. The term “gateway” may be a more appropriate way to characterize the FJC as a single-point-of-entry for service delivery.

In October 2003, the United States Department of Justice, through the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), launched the President’s Family Justice Center Initiative (PFJCI). The PFJCI supported the establishment of 15 Family Justice Centers in urban, rural, suburban, and tribal communities across the United States. While these FJCs have widely differing sources of support, and operate under diverse conditions, they were asked to align with several required and suggested core principles (see Table 3).

Table 3: President's Family Justice Center Initiative–Core Principles	
Required	Co-Location of Law Enforcement
	Co-Location of Local Domestic Violence Programs
	Co-Location of Prosecutor
Suggested	Partnerships with Probation, Community-Based Organizations, and Military (if applicable)
	Comprehensive Legal Services
	Central Intake System and On-Site Information Sharing That Protects Victim Confidentiality
	On-Site Advocacy for Victims (and counseling as requested); Advocates Available to Provide Personal Safety Planning
	Strongly Encouraged: On-Site Interfaith Chaplaincy Program
	Provide Culturally and Linguistically Competent Services
	Limited On-Site Forensic Medical Services
	On-Site Childcare
	Assistance with Transportation in an Emergency and on an As Needed Basis
	Volunteer Component That Includes DV Training
	Site Location Is Identified
	Facility Safety Plan That Protects Victims and Staff

³¹ Family Justice Center Alliance, <http://www.familyjusticecenter.org/>

³² The term “family violence” refers to domestic violence, sexual assault, elder abuse, dating violence, and stalking crimes.

These core principles have played an important role in guiding the development of subsequent Family Justice Centers nationally and internationally.³³

While the Family Justice Center model has achieved documented success in a number of areas, it is important to note that the model is not considered appropriate for all communities and that establishing and operating an FJC involves significant challenges. The model is not recommended for settings in which government and law enforcement agencies lack a history of collaboration and specialization in addressing family violence. A Family Justice Center is also unlikely to be successful if local law enforcement does not prioritize thorough investigations, early intervention prosecution strategies, and heightened victim safety in partnership with community-based domestic violence organizations.

While family justice centers share common goals and core principles, each one includes a different mix of partners and services based upon the unique needs and resources of the local community. Table 4 identifies the services and resources provided at a few sample Family Justice Centers.

Center Name	Available Services and Resources
Alameda County Family Justice Center (Oakland, CA) ³⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crisis Intervention • Survivor Support • Victim Advocacy • Legal Assistance Services • Medical care and mental health counseling for victims and children impacted by family violence • Employment assistance and information and referral to other community services • Law enforcement investigation and prosecution of offenders • Protection Order Services
Crystal Judson Family Justice Center (Tacoma, WA) ³⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil legal services • Victim support in criminal cases • Safety Planning • Protection Orders • Access to Department of Social and Health Services • Access to Division of Child Support Services • Information for Military Members and Veterans • Spiritual Support • Sexual Assault Information • Immigration Information • Support Groups and Counseling • Emergency Housing Information • Domestic Violence Medical Clinic Referrals • Transportation Assistance • Teen dating violence resources • Law enforcement investigation and prosecution of offenders

³³ See Attachment 5: Family Justice Center Promising Practices.

³⁴ See <http://www.acfjc.org/> for more information.

³⁵ See <http://www.aplaceofhelp.com/> for more information.

Table 4: Examples of Services Available at Family Justice Centers	
Center Name	Available Services and Resources
<p>Family Justice Center Sonoma County (Santa Rosa, CA)³⁶</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy • Chaplaincy Program • Childcare Room • Redwood Children’s Center for victims of child sexual abuse • Client Technology Area • Assistance with Clothing • Victim Services • Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services • Survivor Groups and/or Therapy Services • Immigration Services • Intake Assessment • Legal Advocacy • Resource Center • Access to a Safe House • Safety Planning • Transportation Assistance • Law enforcement investigation and prosecution of offenders
<p>Solano County Family Justice Center (Fairfield, CA)³⁷</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crisis Intervention • Safety Planning • Assistance with Restraining Order Applications and Court Accompaniment • Victims of Crime/Victim Witness Assistance • Assistance with Clothing • Confidential Victim Advocacy • Access to Domestic Violence Shelter Services • Referrals for Adult and Child Counseling • Victim-Survivor Empowerment Program • Pro Bono Legal Services • Forensic Medical Unit • Adult and Child Therapeutic Services • Law enforcement investigation and prosecution of offenders

C.2 Family Justice Center Outcomes and Challenges

In 2005, Congress recognized the importance of the Family Justice Center model and included FJCs as a “purpose area” in Title I of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Several VAWA grant programs, including the “Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program,” provide support for the development and operation of Family Justice Centers.³⁸ The United States Department of Justice, through its Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), has identified the Family Justice Center model as a best practice in the field of domestic violence intervention and prevention services.

³⁶ See <http://www.fjcsc.org/> for more information.

³⁷ See <http://www.co.solano.ca.us/depts/fvp/fjc/default.asp> for more information.

³⁸ Seattle currently receives funding from the Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program, which is utilized for four regional initiatives including the Co-located Community Based Advocate project. If the pending application is funded, the city will not be eligible to re-apply for Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies funding until 2016, and would need to discuss allocation of grant funding with currently funded grant sub-recipients. See <http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/ovwgrantprograms.htm> for a full list of OVW grant programs.

C.2.a Outcomes

According to the OVW, documented and published FJC outcomes include: reduced homicides; increased victim safety; increased autonomy and empowerment for victims; improved offender prosecution outcomes; reduced fear and anxiety for victims and their children; reduced recantation and minimization by victims when wrapped in services and support; increased efficiency among service providers through the provision of collaborative services to victims; increased prosecution of offenders; and increased community support for the provision of services to victims and their children.³⁹

In 2012-13, **Eight Family Justice Centers in California** were evaluated in what may be the most comprehensive study of FJCs to date.⁴⁰ The study produced a number of important findings regarding the results achieved by FJCs. Among the centers, more than two-thirds of domestic violence cases filed (68%) resulted in a conviction, well above the average of roughly 50% reported in other studies of domestic violence cases, and above the 56% conviction rate identified in a study of 16 large urban counties. Just 10% of cases were dismissed, in contrast to a 33% dismissal rate for domestic violence cases in the same study of 16 large urban counties. At the same time, 43% of domestic violence cases were filed in court, which falls below the average arrest prosecution rate of 64% for similar cases in a 2009 National Institute of Justice review of 120 studies in 44 states.⁴¹ An average of 90% of survivors using the FJCs accessed at least one service beyond intake, with an average across the centers of 1.3 to 4.4 services accessed.⁴² Survivors interviewed in the study also identified a total of 35 different ways that co-location of services was beneficial to them, with the top five including: a safe and supportive environment, all-in-one location of services, legal and therapeutic services provided together, receiving needed help and information, and receiving emotional support, resulting in “a whole system approach that is greater than the sum of its parts.”⁴³

“The number of victims we are serving has increased by about 10% [since opening the FJC] and we’ve strengthened our working relationship with many more service partners. Most importantly, we’ve strengthened our relationship with the community at large. When the announcement of our grand opening hit the newspapers, we had individual community members calling to ask if we needed donations and if we needed volunteers. It has been great!” – Carolyn Wold, Solano County Family Justice Center

New York City opened its first Family Justice Center in downtown Brooklyn in 2005 and serves an average of 1,000 clients per month. Building on the success of their first FJC, New York opened a second Family Justice Center in Queens in July 2008, and a third in the Bronx in 2010. The city’s Family Justice Center Initiative is part of its overall effort to reduce domestic violence and provide comprehensive services to victims. New York City reports that as a result of its focus on the domestic violence

³⁹ “The President’s Family Justice Center Initiative: Best Practices”, United States Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women, February 2007.

⁴⁰ “Final Evaluation Results-Phase II California Family Justice Initiative-Statewide Evaluation,” EMT Associates, April 2013

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 50.

⁴² Ibid, p. 22.

⁴³ Ibid, p. 64.

issue, family related crimes have declined by 21% and intimate partner homicides have declined by 51% citywide over a period of six years.⁴⁴

The Alameda County (CA) FJC reports significant improvements in offender accountability through: 1) Increased reporting of domestic violence cases, indicating increased victim confidence in the system, which has been gained in part through co-location of advocates, services, and law enforcement/prosecution; 2) Improvements in the quality of law enforcement investigations, which law enforcement and prosecution representatives directly attribute to their co-location; and 3) Improvements in prosecution outcomes including increases in felony filings, felony convictions, misdemeanor convictions, and reductions in case dismissals following filing.⁴⁵

Several indicators tracked by the Alameda County District Attorney’s office provide evidence for the impact of the Family Justice Center. Table 5 illustrates the percentage of cases dismissed by the District Attorney’s office for victim-related reasons. Dismissals in felony cases dropped 40% from 2006 to 2009 (from 31% of cases to 18.68%), and dismissals for misdemeanor cases declined 65% during the same period (from 55% to 19%).⁴⁶

	Year			
	2006	2007	2008	2009
Felony	31%	23%	18.87%	18.68%
Misdemeanor	55%	36%	22%	19%

Table 6 demonstrates an increase in participation on the part of the victim in DV cases. According to the Alameda County District Attorney’s office, “these numbers have risen significantly since the launch of the ACFJC due to the support and services provided to victims of domestic violence at the Family Justice Center.”⁴⁷

Indicator	Year	
	2005	2010
% of felony domestic violence cases charged with victim participation	69%	87%
% of misdemeanor domestic violence cases charged with victim participation	45%	90%
% of domestic violence cases filed as felonies	13%	43%

The research base also indicates that convictions reduce domestic violence recidivism.⁴⁹ The Alameda County District Attorney’s Office has seen a significant

⁴⁴ City of New York, Office of the Mayor, “Mayor Bloomberg, Queens District Attorney Brown and Domestic Violence Commissioner Jimenez Celebrate the Opening of New York City’s Second Family Justice Center,” press release, July 15, 2008.

⁴⁵ All data cited in this section appear courtesy of the County of Alameda District Attorney. We wish to express special thanks to District Attorney Nancy O’Malley and her team for providing ready access by the authors to a wealth of data only part of which is presented here.

⁴⁶ These victim-related reasons for case rejection include: Victim declines to prosecute, victim not credible, victim requests no prosecution, victim unavailable, and victim uncooperative.

⁴⁷ 2010 Annual Report, Alameda County District Attorney’s Office, page 22.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

increase in conviction rates on felony domestic violence jury trials since opening the ACFJC.⁵⁰

Alameda County has also experienced a dramatic drop in domestic violence homicide, from 17 cases in 2002 to 3 in 2011, a decrease concurrent with the opening and the first six-years of FJC operations, and with the establishment of effective Domestic Violence (DVRT) and Sexual Assault (SART) Response Teams.

Since the opening of the FJC, Alameda County has also experienced a significant increase in support for family violence services in the form of increased federal, state, corporate, foundation, and individual donor support. *Over \$2 million dollars* in new financial support for family violence services has been secured, leveraging the considerable new in-kind contributions made by FJC partners estimated at over \$10 million dollars annually.

C.2.b Challenges

The experience of Family Justice Centers across the country has also identified challenges that need to be recognized and addressed. These challenges need to be carefully weighed as part of the process of determining whether to establish an FJC. Partners to an FJC planning process need to have a clear understanding of what they are committing themselves to as they make the decision to join with others in this approach to addressing family violence.

Investment Required of FJC Partner Organizations

One of the primary challenges is the time and energy that must be invested in relationship building by partner organizations. The high level of collaboration that is key to the successful operation of an FJC necessitates frequent communication about important issues. Partners must take part in shared decision-making regarding policies, strategies, budgets, and facility. This requires the active involvement of leadership and staff on an ongoing basis.

Impact on Accessibility of Services for Racial Minorities and Immigrants

Regarding the accessibility of services, concerns have been expressed about the impact that the Family Justice Center model may have on access to services for women of color and those who are undocumented or without legal residence.⁵¹ Studies have shown that women of color tend to be reluctant to seek help from governmental institutions in cases of domestic violence, and it has been argued that the more institutionalized structure that FJCs represent may create an additional deterrent for these individuals. Part of the concern is that traditional legal and social service institutions are frequently designed to serve the needs of majority individuals, and those who are racial or sexual minorities are at greater risk in interacting with these institutions. For example, women of color or LGBT parents are more likely to lose custody for “failure to protect” their children from domestic violence. Women who are undocumented or who lack legal residency may not want to see their partner jailed or deported, which may be seen as a greater risk when services are integrated. Anecdotal

⁴⁹ Lois A. Ventura and Gabrielle Davis, “Court Case Conviction and Recidivism,” *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 255-277 (2005).

⁵⁰ 2010 Annual Report, Alameda County District Attorney’s Office, page 24.

⁵¹ “Justice for Whom? An Intersectional Evaluation of Family Justice Centers,” by Celeste Montoya, Joanne Belknap, Hillary Potter, Social Science Research Network, 2010.

information from FJC partner agency staff, as well as survivor focus groups in the California statewide evaluation, indicates that women from these marginalized populations may be accessing FJC services at a lower rate, and suggests that further studies should include those who have not accessed a Family Justice Center.⁵² The California study did show that once members of these and other groups accessed FJC services, issues such as immigration status, criminal justice history, and substance abuse/mental health needs were not barriers to service access.⁵³

It is important to note that many Family Justice Centers are designed and constructed so that victims do not come in contact with law enforcement unless they specifically choose to do so. In some cases, law enforcement offices are located on a completely separate floor from other victim services with a separate entrance. In a similar vein, many law enforcement personnel choose not to wear their uniforms onsite at the FJC to create a more welcoming and victim-friendly environment.

Recruitment of Effective Leadership

The success of a Family Justice Center is strongly tied to the effectiveness of its leadership in bringing together widely diverse partners to work together on a shared mission.⁵⁴ Hiring and retaining leaders or managers with the skills necessary to manage the complex organizational demands posed by a multi-agency partnership has proven to be an ongoing challenge for many FJCs. An effective leader or manager should have a broad knowledge of the field of family violence, while also understanding the activities and organizational culture that impact the work of the partners, including the legal, counseling, housing, child welfare, public assistance, and criminal justice settings. While the leader or manager may have previous experience in one of these areas, it is essential that the leader not give preference to one partner or service area over another. An effective FJC leader or manager must also possess extraordinary facilitation and collaborative development skills.

Making the Transition from Co-Location to Integration of Services

While co-location is a crucial component of the FJC model, simply housing multiple DV-related organizations within a single site does not guarantee success. Partners in a newly established FJC face a multitude of decisions that need to be negotiated with regard to facility use, allocation of funding, staffing, scheduling, data sharing, and client confidentiality. The willingness of partners to be flexible and to invest time in the negotiation process contributes significantly to the ultimate success of an individual FJC. Ultimately, the ability of FJC partners to integrate services and resources determines the ability of the FJC to realize outcomes that are fundamentally different from the status quo.

Moving from Startup to Sustainability

As the fundraising information for the Alameda County Family Justice Center indicates, some FJCs have been very successful in securing ongoing resources to support their work. However, many FJCs have found it difficult to identify sustainable

⁵² “Final Evaluation Results-Phase II California Family Justice Initiative-Statewide Evaluation”, EMT Associates, April 2013, p. 120.

⁵³ Ibid, p. 121. See also “Marginalized Women’s Voices About a Proposed ‘Family Justice Center:’ A Focus Group and Collaborative Study.” Belknap, Potter, & Montoya, University of Colorado at Boulder. PowerPoint Presentation. American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting, November 2008.

⁵⁴ See Attachment 5: Family Justice Center Promising Practices.

sources of funding and create a strong and diverse financial foundation. For example, the Family Justice Center in Hillsborough County, Florida, was forced to close its doors in August 2013 when it was unable to maintain a stable source of funding. These challenges to long-term sustainability arise from multiple roots. Public agencies may find it difficult to provide ongoing funding for the core operations of an FJC. Family Justice Centers have proceeded cautiously in their fundraising, not wanting to impinge upon the existing support received by partners. Foundations and individual donors may prefer to contribute to more specifically defined services, and need to be educated about the Family Justice Center model. A number of federal grant programs directed specifically to Family Justice Centers have provided important continuing support for the model, but FJCs will need to continue to work together to develop best practices for identifying and cultivating funding sources. The concept of Family Justice Centers may be new to institutional, corporate, and individual donors and development of startup and sustainable funding may require additional effort and donor education, especially in the early years.

D THE FAMILY JUSTICE CENTER MODEL IN SEATTLE

While there is strong support for a potential Family Justice Center in Seattle, there are different views on what it should look like. In order to facilitate discussion on potential options, several different operational scenarios have been developed to compare the different levels of service delivery and integration that could be offered at the Seattle Family Justice Center.

D.1 Seattle Family Justice Center Scenario Planning

A co-located center based on the FJC model could take a variety of forms in Seattle. Three possible victim-centered scenarios have emerged as a result of feedback from various stakeholders across the city (see Table 7). **Each scenario builds on the one before it, progressively moving to greater levels of service delivery and integration.** These scenarios are examples of different operational configurations **for illustrative purposes only.** If the decision is made to move forward with strategic planning for an FJC, it is possible that different elements of each scenario could be combined, or an entirely new scenario could emerge. Three potential scenarios are outlined below: 1) Initial Co-Location; 2) Core Operations; and 3) Comprehensive Services.

Scenario 1: Initial Co-Location

This scenario includes the minimum components needed to develop a co-located service center for victims of DV. This scenario includes co-locating the agencies that are involved in the Seattle Co-location Project with the addition of a dedicated Center Coordinator to focus on the operations and sustainability of the FJC. This scenario also includes childcare services for the children of DV victims while they are onsite at the FJC.⁵⁵

While many of the Family Justice Center outcomes and promising practices described earlier were associated with a more robust, full-service model, a more basic model of operations could still prove to be beneficial and enhance the existing collaboration and services provided by agencies co-located within SPD.

Scenario 2: Core Operations

This scenario builds upon Scenario One with the addition of a Navigator and Front Desk/Reception staff person.⁵⁶ The Navigator would guide victims through the variety of services offered at the FJC to guarantee that the victim receives a truly comprehensive suite of services customized to his or her needs. This scenario would also include the co-location of civil-legal service providers as well as other community based advocacy organizations.

Scenario 3: Comprehensive Services

This scenario represents a full-service Family Justice Center model, with several dedicated staff members focused on FJC operations and comprehensive service delivery for victims. This model also adds additional co-located community-based agencies, and could include additional resources such as immigration services, mental health services, physical health services, and financial empowerment services.

⁵⁵ No programmatic decisions have been made regarding what types of childcare services would be provided on site at an FJC.

⁵⁶ Please see section D.1.a for brief staffing descriptions.

Table 7: Potential Family Justice Center Scenarios			
	Scenario 1 – Initial Co-location	Scenario 2 – Core Operations	Scenario 3 – Comprehensive Services
FJC Staffing (coordination and support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Center Coordinator 	All Scenario 1, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Front Desk/Reception Lead Navigator 	All Scenario 1 and 2, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office/Data Manager Additional Navigator(s)
Co-located Partners and Services (onsite partner agencies and services available onsite at the FJC) ⁵⁷	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seattle Police Department <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Domestic Violence & Elder Abuse Unit Victim Support Team Current Co-located Advocates from Community-based agencies Seattle City Attorney <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Domestic Violence Unit King County Prosecutor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Domestic Violence Unit Protection Order Advocacy Program Elder Crimes Unit Childcare services⁵⁸ 	All Scenario 1, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Civil legal services Additional community-based advocates 	All Scenario 2, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional community-based advocates Immigration services Mental Health services Physical Health services (forensic and other) Financial empowerment services
Shared Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared entrance/reception Shared waiting rooms Shared counseling space Shared space for other services Small conference space 	All Scenario 1, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional conference space 	All Scenario 2, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training room

⁵⁷ Specific services to be provided will be determined during the Strategic Planning Process. Services may include those provided by other Family Justice Centers, as described in Table 4.

⁵⁸ Childcare services are not currently provided by the co-located partners listed in Scenario 1. A strategic planning process would need to address potential childcare service models as well as funding for childcare services.

D.1.a FJC Staffing Descriptions

The FJC staffing positions listed in Table 7 are based on staffing models for existing FJCs in other communities. These positions include:⁵⁹

- ✓ **Center Coordinator:** facilitates the smooth flow of daily operations. Provides key leadership in sustainability planning, revenue generation, community outreach, and partnership development and collaboration.
- ✓ **Navigator:** as the central point of contact for clients and liaison with on-site and off-site partners, the Navigator plays a key role in the provision of services at an FJC. The Navigator facilitates a multi-disciplinary approach to case management and promotes inter-agency collaboration.
- ✓ **Front Desk/Reception:** responsible for assisting clients when they first call the FJC or walk in for services.
- ✓ **Office/Data Manager:** provides administrative support to the Center Coordinator. Gathers and analyzes data, drafts reports, and prepares survey questionnaires and other documents. Facilitates the effective integration of outcomes monitoring, information gathering, and reporting.

D.1.b Stakeholder Response to Proposed Scenarios

On August 16, 2013, 53 stakeholders from across Seattle and King County gathered to consider and analyze the feasibility of a Family Justice Center in Seattle. They worked in small and large groups to review the scenarios above and respond to the following questions:

1. What aspects of the scenarios do you appreciate?
2. Which require further scoping?
3. In what ways could the scenarios be enhanced to further meet the needs of victims/survivors?

During the group discussions, it became evident that stakeholders strongly preferred the more integrated service delivery models offered in Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 and did not believe that Scenario 1 would be successful or beneficial. Many likened Scenario 1 to the status quo, and indicated that it would not be a wise investment to simply re-locate the existing co-located partners in a new building. Similarly, stakeholders expressed the opinion that having only one FJC specific staff position in Scenario 1 would not provide adequate staff support. Stakeholders agreed that the diverse group of services provided in Scenario 3 would best meet the needs of the majority of clients.

Stakeholders were provided several other opportunities throughout the day to discuss their wishes and concerns for a potential FJC in Seattle. Additional key points emerging from these discussions included:

- ✓ It is essential for a potential Family Justice Center to truly focus on the needs of victims/survivors.
- ✓ It is critical to carefully communicate about the presence of law enforcement and prosecution onsite and explain that interaction with law enforcement is not mandatory or a prerequisite for clients at the center. It is also important to

⁵⁹ These staffing positions are suggestions, and no programmatic decisions have been made about staffing at this time.

develop trust between the community-based agencies and the criminal justice system, which will demonstrate that potential FJC clients can trust the criminal justice system as well.

- ✓ It is important to remain flexible in the planning processes for a family justice center.
- ✓ Some services will benefit from centralization while others may best be left decentralized.
- ✓ It is important for stakeholders to continue to be engaged throughout this process, especially if the decision is made to move forward with strategic planning.
- ✓ Because facility costs represent a very significant portion of the FJC's budget, its sustainability would be greatly enhanced if a public or private partner would purchase or make available at no cost a site for the FJC. If this were to happen, the public agency budgets currently being dedicated to lease payments should be applied to the FJC's operational costs.
- ✓ It is important to include training room(s) and a training coordinator in any potential FJC scenario.
- ✓ Further programmatic discussion is needed about the different possible models for childcare services at an FJC. Some suggested that it should be included as part of FJC staffing in order to guarantee success.
- ✓ Translation and interpretation services must be included in an FJC.
- ✓ Outreach and communication are critical to the success of an FJC and there should be a concentrated effort to engage marginalized populations in the community.
- ✓ The name "Family Justice Center" should not be used.
- ✓ One group questioned whether the Navigator position was duplicative since there will be advocates onsite at the FJC.
- ✓ Some groups had questions about "who would own the front door?" Several stakeholders wanted to include the option for a community-driven FJC effort and/or a governance model based on a community organization(s) being the fiscal/programmatic lead for the FJC.
- ✓ Secure video conferencing might help onsite partners reach out to victims in different neighborhoods or in distant areas of the county who are unable or unwilling to come to an FJC as well as access service providers who are not onsite.

D.2 Framework for Improved Outcomes

In 2005, the President's Family Justice Center Initiative commissioned Abt Associates to analyze the potential for specifying and measuring Family Justice Center outcomes.⁶⁰ Utilizing the foundation developed by Abt, in conjunction with the data analyzed in relation to family violence issues and the current system response in Seattle, the following framework has been proposed as the foundation for the future design of FJC programmatic elements in Seattle (see Table 8). A strategic planning process should include the identification of specific targets for priority outcomes.

⁶⁰ "Evaluability Assessment of the President's Family Justice Center Initiative," Abt Associates, 2005.

Table 8 : Framework for Improved Outcomes		
Outcome	Measures	Data Sources
Victim Safety		
Increased victim safety, increased DV reporting	Number of DV-related calls to 911 dispatch	Police call logs before and after FJC
Reduced number of DV-related aggravated assaults	Number of DV-related aggravated assaults	Police data and records
Offender Accountability		
Reduced number of case dismissals for victim-related reasons	Numbers of case dismissals for victim-related reasons	City Attorney and King County Prosecutor data and records
Strength of Service Delivery System		
Increase access to and utilization of DV services	Number of victims receiving DV advocacy and legal services from FJC and each partner	Client data tracking
	Percentage of victims accessing multiple victim services	Client data tracking
Increased public awareness of DV	Knowledge about/attitudes towards DV	Community survey
	Knowledge about/attitudes toward DV services, including FJC	Community survey
Increased funding amounts and sources for DV services	Amount of funding received and number of sources	Budgets of FJC and FJC Partners

D.3 Forecasting Outcomes and Return on Investment

Predicting specific outcomes and their relationship to return on investment for a Seattle Family Justice Center is difficult to do prior to the development of an implementation plan. It is also difficult to quantify the profound return on investment to society of reducing the human cost to survivors and their families and breaking the cycle of family violence. However, starting with the assumption that an FJC serving the city of Seattle will operate in alignment with the best practices that have been established in the field, including the co-location of law enforcement, prosecution, and advocates, potential benefits can be illustrated based upon the experience of existing Family Justice Centers.

Reduction in Dismissals

Family Justice Centers throughout the country have documented a reduction in domestic violence case dismissals following the establishment of an FJC in the community. This is particularly significant in light of the fact that most existing FJCs were initiated in a post-Crawford environment where, as described above, it has become more likely for cases to be dismissed when a victim chooses not to testify. As the data cited from the California Statewide evaluation indicates, the dismissal rate for

cases in communities with an FJC was 10%, in comparison with a dismissal rate of 33% in a study of 16 urban communities without an FJC.⁶¹

In Alameda County, total dismissals in domestic violence cases have been reduced significantly since the FJC opened, which the District Attorney and Oakland Police Department directly attribute to the improved quality of investigations achieved through their co-location at the FJC and the increased levels of support being received by victims.⁶² Increased efficiency in Seattle's criminal justice system (as indicated in part by decreased dismissal rates) would greatly heighten the impact of the significant investments that are currently being made in investigation, arrest, and prosecution in Seattle.

Reduction in Recidivism

Rapid, successful prosecution efforts can provide additional potential return on investment as a result of reductions in recidivism, due to fewer repeat calls and arrests of the same individual by law enforcement. As discussed earlier, research has shown that higher conviction rates lead to reductions in recidivism by domestic violence perpetrators, reducing the total number of incidents of domestic violence. While the recent evaluation of California FJCs does not include direct data on recidivism, the conviction rate of 68% for domestic violence cases exceeded the 56% rate from a study of 16 large urban counties, and the average of roughly 50% reported in other studies of domestic violence cases.⁶³ This represents another area where a Seattle Family Justice Center could potentially realize a significant return on investment.

Reduction in Homicides/Aggravated Assault Cases

As indicated in the data for the Alameda County Family Justice Center, the number of domestic violence related homicides has dropped precipitously since the establishment of the FJC, going from 17 in 2002 to 3 in 2011. While the impact of FJCs on domestic violence homicides has not been widely studied, and the decline in the number of these events in Alameda County is likely due to multiple factors, this represents another area of potential return on investment from the establishment of an FJC. It is widely agreed that the cost of a single homicide to the local community and to society as a whole runs into the millions of dollars.⁶⁴ While Seattle has had the good fortune not to have experienced recent DV homicides (a fact which some stakeholders attribute to the availability of excellent trauma care), there were 734 DV-related aggravated assault cases in 2012, many of which resulted in substantial and life threatening injury to the victim(s).⁶⁵ A small reduction in the number of aggravated assault cases could produce substantial savings in criminal justice and other costs.

⁶¹ "Final Evaluation Results-Phase II California Family Justice Initiative-Statewide Evaluation," EMT Associates, April 2013, p. 50.

⁶² As shown in Table 4, dismissals decreased by 65% for misdemeanors and 40% for felonies in Alameda County between 2006 and 2009.

⁶³ "Final Evaluation Results-Phase II California Family Justice Initiative-Statewide Evaluation," EMT Associates, April 2013, p. 50.

⁶⁴ "The Cost of Crime to Society: New Crime-Specific Estimates for Policy and Program Evaluation", Kathy E. McCollister, Michael T. French and Hai Fang, *Drug and Alcohol Dependency*, April 1, 2010.

⁶⁵ Seattle Police Department, Crime Statistics, "Domestic Violence-Related & Other Aggravated Assaults in Seattle, 2009-2012."

E FINANCIAL IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

E.1 Cost Projection Assumptions

For the purpose of feasibility analysis, preliminary financial projections have been made in order to allow City of Seattle decision makers to weigh the potential outcomes of a Family Justice Center versus the costs. The projections are divided in to two categories – annual operating costs and one-time capital and infrastructure development costs – and are rooted in the following assumptions:

E.1.a Operating Cost Projection Assumptions

(See Tables 9, Page 33)

- ✓ Initially, potential costs will be divided among the City of Seattle, King County, and the Seattle Police Foundation.⁶⁶ Organizations co-locating personnel will be provided with space at no cost but government agencies will continue to allocate any operational costs they are currently incurring (including office lease and support expenses).
- ✓ Scenario 1 includes the most basic level of operations needed to initiate services, with Scenarios 2 and 3 progressively moving towards a more comprehensive service model.
- ✓ At a minimum, the current operations of the Seattle Police Department's Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse Unit (including the Victim Support Team (VST) and advocates from the currently co-located community-based agencies), the City Attorney's Domestic Violence Unit, and the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office (including the Domestic Violence Unit, Protection Order Advocacy Program, and Elder Crimes Unit) will be moved to the Family Justice Center.⁶⁷
- ✓ Current levels of support for the existing Co-location Project will remain stable (Note: The "Co-location Project" refers to the current co-location of staff from the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office and Seattle City Attorney's Office along with advocates from the Salvation Army and Consejo Counseling and Referral Services within the Seattle Police Department Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse Unit).
- ✓ All organizations co-locating personnel at the FJC will potentially provide in-kind services for the FJC's operations including, for appropriate agencies, assisting with client intake on a rotating basis.
- ✓ The costs associated with ongoing outcomes tracking and service monitoring will be borne by the FJC. All organizations co-locating at the FJC and those working with the FJC on an offsite referral basis will participate in the FJC's data tracking and monitoring system, which will be designed to provide necessary levels of client confidentiality.
- ✓ The estimate cost per square foot/month is based on an average of the highest estimated cost (\$40/ft²/year) and the lowest estimated cost (\$20/ft²/year) for space in downtown Seattle. However, the cost per square foot may be lower depending on facility location and available space.

⁶⁶ King County is not able to allocate additional funding for this project at this time.

⁶⁷ As noted in Section D.1.b, stakeholders in attendance at the August 16th Stakeholder Workshop indicated that they did not prefer this minimal approach to FJC operations.

E.1.b Capital Infrastructure and Development Cost Projection Assumptions

(See Table 10, Page 34)

- ✓ Initial capital improvements to the facility will be limited to those necessary for security and those needed to create program, training, and administrative spaces.
- ✓ For Scenario 1 (Initial Co-location) 17,830 ft² will be necessary to co-locate the Seattle Police Department's Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse Unit (including the VST and advocates from the co-located community-based agencies), the City Attorney's Domestic Violence Unit, and the King County Prosecutor's (including the Domestic Violence Unit, Protection Order Advocacy Program, and Elder Crimes Unit).
- ✓ The Workstation Costs estimate assumes that new phone systems, office furnishings, copiers and fax machines, and computer systems will be purchased. Should used or existing equipment be available, these costs will diminish substantially.
- ✓ Capital improvements will include creating the necessary Internet infrastructure to establish confidential data and communications systems.
- ✓ Security systems will be installed to ensure appropriate levels of security for victims and on-site partner staff.

E.1.c Revenue and Sustainability Projection Assumptions

(See Tables 9, Page 33)

- ✓ Funds currently dedicated to lease payments for the Co-location Project will be used to offset either the FJC's lease payments or other operational costs.
- ✓ Organizations co-locating staff at the FJC will be responsible for all salary, benefits, and any other personnel costs associated with their staff person(s), which will help provide ongoing program sustainability while demonstrating to potential funders the significant level of resource leveraging already underway. Where existing staff is not sufficient, and/or services are not currently funded, additional revenues may be required for program support costs.
- ✓ The FJC will engage in an aggressive fund development program targeting both private and public sources for funding to cover operating and capital costs not covered by current funding streams.
- ✓ In executing these fund development efforts, the FJC will not compete for funding with partner organizations but will instead seek to develop those sources of funding that would respond more favorably to the larger scale, city-wide proposals generated by the FJC (e.g., large state and federal grants, major statewide and national foundations, etc.).

E.1.d Year 1 Phased-in Cost Assumptions

(See Table 11, Page 35)

For the purpose of scenario planning, key assumptions were made about the “ramp-up” of FJC costs during Year 1, a period in which significant planning work would need to be executed to establish the FJC:

- ✓ Projected expenses will be phased in gradually (see Table 11 for a model of how costs during year one would start incrementally and gradually increase based on experience and need).
- ✓ Quarter 1 operating expenses assume that appropriate center staff would be hired by the end of Quarter 1 and would be in place, with an office, for the last month of Quarter 1. Quarter 1 capital expenses account for the relevant workstation costs for center staff.
- ✓ Quarter 2 operating expenses account for a full quarter of center staffing expenses as well as proportional operating expenses, gearing up for the opening of the center. The combined capital expenses between Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 account for 10% of capital costs.
- ✓ Quarter 3 operating expenses account for a full quarter of center staffing expenses as well as proportional operating expenses. Quarter 3 capital expenses account for 70% of all capital costs in an aggressive timeline for capital and infrastructure development.
- ✓ Quarter 4 operating expenses account for a fully operational center starting in the first month of Quarter 4. Quarter 4 capital expenses account for the remaining 20% of all capital costs to complete the capital and infrastructure development. While this could be accomplished with an aggressive planning and implementation effort, it would be contingent on a number of factors, including identifying and securing a suitable site.

E.2 Cost Projections

Based on the assumptions above, the following cost projections are presented for analysis purposes only. The spreadsheets provided as Attachment 3 contain additional detail in relation to these projections.

E.2.a Operating Cost Projections

Table 9 represents the total projected operating costs in Year 1 of operations based on the assumptions in Section E.1.a and assuming that the FJC is fully operational starting Day 1 of Year 1.

Table 9: Operating Cost Projections				
		Scenario 1 – Initial Co- location	Scenario 2 – Core Operations	Scenario 3 – Comprehensive Services
Space Needs (ft²)		17,390	20,100	22,675
# of co-located partner staff members		86	96	106
Annual Operating Costs	Staffing	\$112,251	\$242,588	\$438,621
	Facility Rental	\$521,700	\$603,000	\$680,250
	Communications and IT	\$56,700	\$56,700	\$56,700
	Consultants and Contractors	\$50,000	\$70,000	\$90,000
Annual Operating Costs Subtotal		\$740,651	\$972,288	\$1,265,571
Current Annual Operating Costs⁶⁸		\$394,958	\$394,958	\$394,958
Net New Annual Operating Costs⁶⁹		\$245,693	\$577,330	\$870,613

⁶⁸ The Current Annual Operating Costs are based on cost/square foot/year. This is based on actual square footage and cost/square footage data from the SPD; actual square footage data from the City Attorney's Office; estimated cost/square feet data for the City Attorney's Office and King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office; and estimated square footage data for the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office.

⁶⁹ The Net New Annual Operating Costs are calculated by subtracting the Current Annual Operating Costs from the Annual Operating Costs Subtotal. These totals represent the total new operating costs for the model scenarios.

E.2.b Capital Infrastructure and Development Cost Projections

Table 10 contains the total one-time capital infrastructure and development cost projections that will occur in Year 1 of operations based on the assumptions in Section E.1.b.

Table 10: Capital Infrastructure and Development Cost Projections				
		Scenario 1 – Initial Co- location	Scenario 2 – Core Operations	Scenario 3 – Comprehensive Services
Capital and Infrastructure Development Costs	Security Systems	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
	Workstation Costs	\$430,000	\$480,000	\$525,000
	Facility Development	\$251,025	\$291,250	\$339,500
	IT Infrastructure	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
Total Capital and Infrastructure Development Costs		\$716,025	\$806,250	\$899,500

E.2.c Phased-in Year 1 Cost Projections

Table 11 represents one model for phasing in the operating and capital costs for an FJC over the first year of center operations based on the Assumptions listed in Section E.1.d. The operating expenses represent net new operating expenses and the capital expenses represent one-time expenses that will occur in Year 1 of operations.

Table 11: Phased-in Year 1 Cost Projections			
	Scenario 1 – Initial Co- location	Scenario 2 – Core Operations	Scenario 3 – Comprehensive Services
Quarter 1			
Operating Expenses	\$11,087	\$17,214	\$25,593
Capital Expenses	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$15,000
Quarter 2			
Operating Expenses	\$29,890	\$66,348	\$121,469
Capital Expenses	\$66,603	\$70,625	\$74,950
Quarter 3			
Operating Expenses	\$29,890	\$66,348	\$121,469
Capital Expenses	\$501,218	\$564,375	\$629,650
Quarter 4			
Operating Expenses	\$29,890	\$66,348	\$121,469
Capital Expenses	\$143,205	\$161,250	\$179,900
Total Year 1	\$816,781	\$1,022,508	\$1,289,499
Total Operating Expenses	\$100,756	\$216,258	\$389,999
Total Capital Expenses	\$716,025	\$806,350	\$899,500

F STRATEGIC PLANNING DESIGN AND TIMELINE

A primary recommendation of this Feasibility Analysis is that the City of Seattle proceed with a detailed strategic planning effort to launch its Family Justice Center. During this phase of development, the focus of FJC development will shift from a discussion of “whether” Seattle should establish an FJC to “how” this should be done. Experience to date with Family Justice Centers around the country have demonstrated that FJCs are most successful when they approach strategic planning and fund development as integrated efforts. The potential for successful fund development is fortified by a close link to a well-articulated strategic plan, and strategic planning activities are more achievable when linked to potential funds and resources.

The goal of a strategic planning process should be to develop an action plan while simultaneously establishing the FJC’s overall purpose, vision, and mission with buy-in and ownership from the community. An aggressive resource development effort should be developed at the same time and implemented as an integral piece of the strategic plan.

Two principal objectives are proposed for the strategic planning process:

1. Complete a **Strategic Plan** for the next 18 months of FJC development with a strategic target of FJC opening within one year, during the course of a 4-month collaborative strategic planning process.⁷⁰
2. Develop a **fund development work plan** that identifies diverse potential funding sources.

Implementation of the strategic planning process should include attention to the following:

- ✓ Organization and facilitation of public forums and or focus groups that elicit stakeholder views and input for the planning process.
- ✓ Organization and facilitation of focus groups and surveys that elicit victim/survivor views and input for the planning process.
- ✓ Ongoing efforts to strengthen collaboration among key stakeholders.
- ✓ Development of communications tools providing ongoing access to a Strategic Plan website and related resource materials designed to streamline communication, coordination, and collaboration between key stakeholders.
- ✓ Utilization of easily accessible, user-friendly planning tools such as the:
 - GPG “GOALS” (Goals, Objectives, Activities Linked Strategically) matrix, providing a coherent and user friendly tool for the purposes of planning, managing/implementing, and evaluating work outcomes; and
 - GPG Gantt Chart, providing a helpful tool for monitoring time-bound expected results and clarifying roles and responsibilities.
- ✓ A clearly determined process for mutually monitoring, assessing, and evaluating work progress, outcomes, and results for organizational learning and reporting.
- ✓ Discussion and decision-making around key programmatic elements of the FJC, including the determination of onsite FJC partners and services, a governance model, and the organizational structure for the FJC.

⁷⁰ A key factor influencing the timing (and sustainability) of FJC opening will be the identification and procurement of a suitable site.

- ✓ Discussion and decision-making around a physical location for the FJC that meets the needs of the co-located partners and is accessible for victims of DV throughout the community.

Table 12 provides a summary of the suggested key phases for this work.

Table 12: Suggested Planning Process for Development of Strategic Plan			
Month	Key Topics	Participants	Engine Group
1	Vision Mission Key Goals Work Group Formation Partner Roles and Responsibilities Teambuilding	Policymakers All stakeholders External supporters	Identify and contact stakeholders Review planning products
2	Objectives Indicators of Success Partner Roles and Responsibilities Teambuilding	Work groups	Participate in and lead work groups Review planning products
3	Activities and Operations Planning Partner Roles and Responsibilities Teambuilding	Work groups	Participate in and lead work groups Review planning products
4	Community Review Launch Plan Partner Roles and Responsibilities Teambuilding	Policymakers All stakeholders External supporters	Identify and contact stakeholders Review planning products
Potential work groups: Program service planning, site planning, sustainability, monitoring and evaluation, and others TBD.			

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

Attachments

Table of Contents

Attachment 1: City of Seattle 2013-2015 Domestic Violence Response Strategic Plan	2
Attachment 2: Feasibility Analysis Methodology	10
Attachment 3: Stakeholder Survey and Interview Results	12
Attachment 4: Cost Projections	51
Attachment 5: Family Justice Center Promising Practices	64
Attachment 6: Summary of Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement Benefits	67

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

Attachment 1: City of Seattle 2013-2015 Domestic
Violence Response Strategic Plan

2013-2015 Domestic Violence Strategic Plan: Seattle’s Criminal Justice Response Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

The 2013-2015 *Domestic Violence Strategic Plan: Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence* builds upon the ongoing efforts of the City of Seattle to achieve a bold vision – that Seattle will become a community where there is no domestic violence. The response to domestic violence within our community includes a broad spectrum of intervention and prevention initiatives carried out by numerous agencies, all of which are designed to address the comprehensive needs of a domestic violence survivor. This proposed plan is the continuation of Seattle’s efforts to reflect upon and improve our criminal justice system’s response to domestic violence, which comprises a narrow range of interventions and services. The graphic below provides a visual representation of the strategic plan, including purpose, focus areas, guiding principles and factors critical to success.

Purpose	To provide a direction for the continuous review and improvement of the City of Seattle’s criminal justice response to domestic violence.
Focus Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victim safety • Batter accountability • Systems improvement
Guiding Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration – fosters regional collaboration and relationship-building within and across systems • Results – focused strategies and impactful results • Balance – innovative, new initiatives balanced with day-to-day work • Flexibility – an evolving document that is responsive to emerging trends, new ideas and opportunities • Realistic – funding sources and time constraints are considered when prioritizing objectives and tasks
Critical Success Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to using evidence-based and/or best practices • Relationships are important and valued • Pride of ownership among stakeholders • Innovation and willingness to identify new ideas and a place for problem solving • Institutionalize system improvements • Support and collaborate with other regional and state-wide initiatives

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Seattle's first Domestic Violence Strategic Plan was launched in 1998 and was the first effort to look at a systemic response to domestic violence in Seattle. This first strategic plan resulted in such accomplishments as the creation of the Police Department's Victim Support Team. Subsequently, the city embarked on a comprehensive assessment of Seattle's criminal justice system, which resulted in the city's second Domestic Violence Strategic Plan 2005-2009. The 2005-2009 plan identified eight strategic areas: Advocacy, Batterer Intervention, Firearms, Investigation, Prosecution, Sanctions, Special Populations, and Victim Defendants. The accomplishments resulting from this include the implementation of the High Risk Offender program in the City Attorney's Office. With the development of the 2010-12 plan the criminal justice planners wanted the plan to be flexible and less task and more outcome centered in order to allow the participants the flexibility to incorporate emerging trends and best practices into the work. The 2010 plan resulted in the development of a Co-located Community-Based Victim Advocate within the Seattle City Attorney's Office and the Seattle Police Department to ensure easier access to victim services for those survivors participating in the criminal justice system.

FUTURE DIRECTION

The Criminal Justice subcommittee of the Seattle Domestic Violence Prevention Council served as a Strategic Plan work group. The Criminal Justice subcommittee is made up of representatives from Seattle's three main criminal justice agencies – Seattle Police Department, City Attorney's Office, and Seattle Municipal Court – as well as representatives from a number of community-based agencies, including the King County Coalition Against Domestic Violence. The members of this subcommittee met routinely throughout 2012 to review the existing strategic plan and identify what had been accomplished and what needed continued focus. Numerous items, such as the response to identified victim defendants and the development of a coordinated response to intimate partner elder abuse were identified to carry over onto the 2013-2015 plan as the group did not feel that goals had been satisfactorily achieved from the existing plan. The planning group also held two retreats where a mini SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis of Seattle's criminal justice response was conducted, identifying strengths, weaknesses and opportunities in the current system. The planning committee also reviewed feedback from a community stakeholder's meeting held by the Seattle Human Services Department Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention staff in May of 2012. The stakeholders identified many areas of improvement throughout the criminal justice system based on their client's experiences. This feedback was provided to the strategic plan work group and was utilized throughout the process in identifying new priorities. The result was a list of recommendations for main focus areas for the plan, goals the next plan should attempt to achieve, and the steps necessary to accomplish those goals.

DISTINGUISHING FACTORS

Significant progress has been made in Seattle's response to domestic violence as a result of the previous strategic planning initiatives undertaken by the city. Many of the initiatives identified on previous plans are now routine practice. The criminal justice planners felt strongly that the

current plan needed to focus not on the continuation of existing accomplishments, but rather on implementing innovative solutions to identified real-life challenges. The planning committee recognized the barriers faced by the partners in the criminal justice system and community based agencies in attempting to meet the expanding needs for services with smaller available resources. Due to this, the planning committee worked with the intent that the 2013-2015 plan be more narrowly focused on realistic goals which would achieve the largest impact.

The proposed 2013-2015 plan aims to accomplish goals within three specific focus areas – victim safety, batterer accountability, and system improvement. These three focus areas have considerable overlap with the previous strategic plans, with one major exception: the 2013-2015 plan does not include a focus on prevention. While prevention is arguably one of the most impactful means of addressing domestic violence, the purpose of this strategic plan is to focus on the criminal justice response and those individuals responsible for implementing the initiatives within it do not engage in prevention work. Prevention will continue to be a focus of the initiatives implemented by the Seattle Human Services Department, but not within the context of the criminal justice response strategic plan.

Through the 2013-2015 plan, the City of Seattle aspires to have a functional and realistic document that is capable of responding to emerging trends, innovative ideas, and opportunities for development. The criminal justice planners have strived to develop a plan that is flexible, and impactful which inspires them to achieve the desired outcomes, and ultimately moves Seattle closer to the realization of our community's potential as a city free of domestic violence.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

The Criminal Justice Committee has dedicated considerable time and attention to the development of this plan. Thank you to the members of the committee for the effort, reflection and desire to improve the criminal justice response for victims that inspired these goals. The Criminal Justice Committee includes:

- Merrill Cousin, King County Coalition against Domestic Violence (KCCADV)
- Lt. Deborah King, Seattle Police Department Domestic Violence & Elder Abuse Unit (SPD)
- Cindi Williams, Seattle City Attorney's Office Domestic Violence Unit (CAO)
- Julie Huffman, Seattle City Attorney's Office Domestic Violence Unit (CAO)
- Joni Wilson, Seattle Municipal Court (SMC)
- Leslie Grow, Seattle Women's Commission (SWC)
- Burns Peterson, Associated Council for the Accused (ACA)
- Kristen Kleinsasser, The Salvation Army (TSA)
- Pam Smith-Mentz, New Beginnings (NB)
- Jessie Beck, Consejo Counseling and Referral Services (Consejo)
- Dusty Olson, Seattle Human Services Department (HSD)

2013-2015 Domestic Violence Strategic Plan: Seattle's Criminal Justice Response

❖ Focus Area: The Seattle criminal justice response enhances victim safety

Goal	Action Items	Lead Agency
Victims who interact with the Seattle criminal justice system have access to community-based domestic violence services	Expand co-located community advocate program to accommodate additional referrals	SPD/HSD
	Co-located advocate coordinating with other community-based agencies in a co-advocacy model to ensure greater victim access to the criminal justice system	Salvation Army
High-risk domestic violence cases are identified and receive additional focus on victim safety	Develop multidisciplinary high risk response team which includes victim services providers	Criminal Justice Committee
	Develop victim services response to the identification of high risk cases through the risk assessment project	Criminal Justice Committee
	Include risk information on referrals to co-located advocate to ensure heightened response to victims	SPD/CAO/Salvation Army
Immigrant and refugee victims and/or with limited English proficiency have access to the criminal justice system	Explore technology solutions to the lack of trust/access to interpreters in marginalized communities	SPD
	Promote the use of the Peace In the Home Helpline in order for LEP victims to access culturally specific resources	HSD
	Explore co-location advocacy model with community-based agencies serving marginalized populations	SPD/HSD
A Seattle Family Justice Center (FJC) is established, incorporating both the criminal justice response and community-based victim services	Develop a mission statement and values which focus on victim safety & services, not just criminal prosecution	Family Justice Center (FJC) Workgroup
	Involve community-based victim services program with planning, development and implementation	FJC Workgroup
	Participate in training on FJC model development	FJC Workgroup

❖ ***Focus Area: Batterers are accountable for their actions***

Goal	Action Items	Lead Agency
Systems coordinate in order to hold batterers accountable	Identify and recruit additional representatives of systems to participate on the Criminal Justice Committee	HSD
	Explore obtaining access to the King County Information Systems for Judicial Officers, Prosecutor's and Probation in order to access information regarding protection orders	SMC
	Support legislative efforts that provide sanctions and/or progressive sentencing for repeat domestic violence offenders	HSD
Alternatives to traditional batterers intervention models are investigated	Explore the successful use of screening protocols prior to treatment recommendations in other jurisdictions and if promising develop screening tools for use within Seattle Municipal Court	SMC
	Educate members on alternative treatment modalities through a variety of methods, including but not limited to literature reviews, program research, consultation, and trainings	HSD
Validated risk assessment tools are utilized to formulate case response and decisions	Develop interdepartmental procedures for the use of the actuarial-based risk assessment tool	SPD/CAO
	Coordinate current risk assessment processes and responses between criminal justice departments	SPD/CAO/SMC
	Launch electronic sharing of risk assessment information currently funded in 2012 GEAP proposal	SPD
No contact orders and Protection orders are adequately enforced	Continued training for advocates in order to aid victims in obtaining proper orders and documentation to ensure enforcement	KCCADV
	Explore technology fixes to ensure that patrol officers have routine access to protection order information	SPD
	Explore expansion of Protection Order Enforcement and Tracking Project to include civil protection orders to ensure real-time access to computer based information to enforce civil protection orders	SPD/HSD
	Regional training for judicial officers, criminal justice staff and advocates on the issue of conflicting court orders	CAO/SMC
Prosecutors have access to sufficient information to make informed in-custody filing decisions	Develop procedures to ensure Prosecutor's access to Judicial Access Brower System	CAO
	Develop technology to allow digital downloads of 911 recordings so they are easily accessible by Detectives and Prosecutors	SPD
	Ensure victim contact is made prior to in-custody filing decisions in order to provide input	CAO/Salvation Army

A coordinated response to the findings of the 2012 WSIPP report on the effectiveness of batterer's intervention is formulated	Determine how the WSIPP findings compare to the population at Seattle Municipal Court	SMC
	Determine if a consistent court response between Seattle Municipal Court and King County Superior Court is necessary or desirable	CAO/SMC
	Identify additional DV Court research in courts with a similar approach as SMC and compare findings and recommendations	HSD/SMC
	Include BIP providers receiving City of Seattle funding through the Indigent Batterers Treatment voucher program in formulating response	HSD

❖ **Focus Area: Identify opportunities to improve the criminal justice system**

Goal	Action Items	Lead Agency
A Seattle Family Justice Center is the primary hub for the criminal justice response to domestic violence	Identify a City department to take the lead on the development of a Family Justice Center	Criminal Justice Committee
	Develop a Family Justice Center (FJC) work group focused on the establishment of a Family Justice Center	Criminal Justice Committee
	Participate in training on FJC model development	FJC Workgroup
	Identify a combination of public and private funding to ensure program self-sufficiency	HSD/Seattle Police Foundation
	Identify space that would meet the needs of the public and providers	FJC Workgroup
Limited English proficient domestic violence victims have increased understanding and engagement with the criminal justice system	Identify and recruit marginalized community partners to serve as members of the Criminal Justice Committee	HSD
	Engage in a targeted outreach campaign to increase knowledge of service and the criminal justice system within communities	SPD
The Seattle criminal justice response is culturally competent	Develop policies to address the impact on Seattle Police Department of the federal Secure Communities program	SPD
	Identify and recruit marginalized community providers to serve as members of the Criminal Justice Committee	HSD
	Explore the rights of the Seattle Police Department to refuse immigration detainers when placing offenders into King County Jail	SPD

Victims charged with domestic violence crimes (victim defendants) receive fair and just treatment by the criminal justice system	Explore current services available in the community for women who are incarcerated or have been criminally charged	HSD
	If none currently exists, work with a community based program to establish DV services for women who are incarcerated or have been criminally charged	HSD
	Review policies and protocols regarding criminal justice response to victim defendants	SPD/CAO/SMC
	Make training on the issue of victim defendants a priority for judicial officers, criminal justice responders and victim advocates	HSD
Coordination occurs across jurisdictions and disciplines in order to improve the response to domestic violence	Increase information sharing between Seattle & King County criminal justice agencies focused on policies and procedures, not just individual cases	SPD/CAO
	Community-based and System-based advocates have increased opportunity to network and cross-train through regularly scheduled activities	KCCADV
	Continue implementation of the Protection Order Enforcement and Tracking Project which is a computer based information sharing system that enables the tracking of criminal No Contact Orders issued by Seattle Municipal Court.	SPD
A coordinated system response is in place to address cases of intimate partner elder abuse	Expand co-location model to include Adult Protective Services worker within Seattle Police Department Elder Abuse Unit	SPD
	Increase coordination between Aging & Disability Services Victim Advocate and the Elder Abuse Unit	HSD
	Explore additional opportunities to increase collaboration between the criminal justice system and senior services	SPD/HSD

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

Attachment 2: Feasibility Analysis Methodology

ATTACHMENT 2: FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The Feasibility Analysis was developed throughout a four-month process that included document and information review, regular meetings of the Core Planning Team, a stakeholder survey and informant interviews, and in-person stakeholder meetings. The Feasibility Analysis contains the findings, recommendations, and opinions of the Glen Price Group (GPG).

Document and Information Review (May-August): GPG reviewed background materials both initially to inform the design of the process and set the context for this work, and continuously throughout the process as needed. As part of this process, GPG also conducted informal interviews with Executive Directors from various Family Justice Centers in California and Washington.

Regular Planning Meetings (May-August): GPG held weekly meetings with the Core Planning Team, representing the City of Seattle Human Services Department, Seattle Police Department, Victim Services Team, Salvation Army, King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, and the Seattle Police Foundation. This group helped plan for and analyze the results of various stakeholder engagement activities, and also reviewed drafts of the Feasibility Analysis document itself.

Stakeholder Survey and Informant Interviews (May-July): GPG designed and launched an online stakeholder survey. A total of ninety-eight individuals completed the survey, representing domestic violence service providers, government agencies, survivors of family violence, law enforcement, social service providers, and others.

Simultaneous to the survey, GPG carried out a series of twelve interviews with key informants representing community-based service organizations, law enforcement, prosecution, legal aid, the City of Seattle Department Human Services, and the King County Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

GPG compiled and analyzed the results of the survey and interviews, which helped to inform both in-person stakeholder meetings as well as the final Feasibility Analysis (See Attachment 3: Stakeholder Survey and Interview Results).

In-person Stakeholder Meetings (July-August): On July 11, 2013, GPG facilitated a discussion with the Family Justice Center Work Group to further involve the workgroup in advancing the Feasibility Analysis.¹ The objectives for this meeting were:

1. Review the scope of work and work plan for the Feasibility Analysis;
2. Review results of the survey and interview processes;
3. Provide input on the framing of key Feasibility Analysis topics; and
4. Provide input on agenda development for the August stakeholder meeting.

On August 16, 2013, GPG facilitated a larger meeting with fifty-three community stakeholders. The purpose of this meeting was to support key stakeholders to consider and analyze the feasibility of a Seattle Family Justice Center (FJC). The objectives for this meeting were:

1. Continue building positive stakeholder relationships;
2. Continue building understanding of our current context and the FJC model;
3. Review and provide feedback on key elements of the draft Feasibility Analysis; and
4. Clarify follow-up.

¹ The Family Justice Center Work Group was convened by the City of Seattle Department of Human Services to help explore the feasibility of a Family Justice Center in Seattle as per the City of Seattle 2013-15 Domestic Violence Response Strategic Plan (See Attachment 1). A smaller group of representatives from the FJC Work Group formed the Core Planning Team.

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

Attachment 3: Stakeholder Survey and Key Informant Interview Results

Contents	
META-SUMMARY	13
STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESULTS	18
Executive Summary	20
Themed Results	23
KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW RESULTS	38
Executive Summary	39
Themed Results	41

META-SUMMARY

1. Introduction

In January 2013, the City of Seattle's Domestic Violence Prevention Council adopted the 2013-2015 Criminal Justice Response to Domestic Violence Strategic Plan. One of the action items contained within the plan was exploring the possibility of establishing a multidisciplinary service center for survivors of domestic violence based on the Family Justice Center model.¹ Currently a Family Justice Center Workgroup, convened by the Seattle Human Services Department is undertaking this task.²

With the support of the Seattle Police Foundation and the City of Seattle, the Family Justice Center Workgroup is moving forward with a feasibility analysis process designed to analyze the potential benefits and challenges of establishing a multidisciplinary service center for survivors of family violence in Seattle.³ The Glen Price Group (GPG) has been retained to assist with this process, drawing upon the knowledge and experience of key stakeholders.⁴

As part of this work, GPG conducted phone interviews with 12 key informants identified by the Family Justice Center Workgroup. Interviewees represented community-based service organizations, law enforcement, prosecution, legal aid, Seattle Human Services, and the King County Coalition Against Domestic Violence. GPG also developed and distributed an online survey among stakeholders in the City of Seattle and surrounding areas, which was responded to by 98 participants.⁵

This document summarizes the results of the interviews and survey, including emerging themes and key points as identified by the Glen Price Group.

2. Key Emerging Theme Areas Across Survey and Interview Results

As outlined below, analysis of survey and interview results revealed themes in three key areas: program, partnership, and resource development:

a. Program Development

- Positive inclination towards co-location (based on initial understanding of FJC model), if specific concerns are addressed.

¹ Please visit the National Family Justice Center Alliance Website:

<http://www.familyjusticecenter.org/index.php/the-family-justice-center-approach.html>

² The name "Family Justice Center" is currently used in the Seattle area for a detention facility, and that the name of Seattle's co-located services for survivors of domestic violence, elder abuse, and related crimes will have a different name. However, for the purposes of this survey and until a new name is selected, our use of the term "Family Justice Center" will refer to the model defined by the Family Justice Center Alliance.

³ The initial focus of this feasibility analysis will be services for survivors of Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse, but this could expand to include survivors of other crimes over time. For the purpose of this survey, the term "family violence" was used to describe domestic violence and elder abuse.

⁴ See www.glenpricegroup.com for more information.

⁵ See page 6 of the Survey Results for a breakdown of the affiliations of survey respondents

- 23 survey respondents interested in providing both onsite and offsite services
- 10 survey respondents interested in providing onsite services alone
- Many would like to learn more about what a family justice center would look like in Seattle.
 - “I am open to the possibility that a family justice center might be a good thing for Seattle, but I do not yet have enough information that convinces me that this is the case.”

b. Partnership Development

- Efforts to develop a family justice center build upon existing successful collaborative efforts and strong networks of service providers in Seattle.
 - The top community asset identified by respondents in the survey was existing relationships/partnerships
 - Emphasis on the importance of fostering greater trust, understanding, and collaboration amongst stakeholder groups

c. Resource Development

- Given limited resources and capacity, informants recommended that a family justice center should “create a bigger pie” and at a minimum should not take away resources from existing services.
 - Survey respondents ranked funding as the number one challenge/obstacle to a potential FJC
 - Informants recommended collaborative resource development as a way to address financial barriers

3. Selected Quantitative Results – Spectrum of Agreement

Survey participants were asked to rate the following statements on a scale of strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD). Each response was given a value (SA=4, A=3, D=2, SD= 1) and the average (Avg.) was calculated based on this scale. An average of 4 means that the majority of respondents strongly agreed with the statement while an average of 1 means that the majority of respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. An average of 2.5 represents a neutral position (neither agree or disagree).

a. Current services for survivors of family violence in Seattle: From my perspective...

Statement	Affiliation ⁶						
	Interview	Survey					
	All (average)	All ⁷ (average)	DV Services Provider (average)	Other Govt. Agency (average)	Survivors (average)	LEA ⁸ (average)	Social Services – Non-DV (average)
Services for survivors of family violence in Seattle are readily accessible at this time	2.41	2.55	2.46	2.73	2.17	2.92	2.50
Services for survivors of family violence are well coordinated at this time	2.45	2.42	2.32	2.33	2.18	2.33	2.30
Survivors of family violence in Seattle currently receive the full range of services they need	1.9	2.02	2.04	2.13	1.67	2.17	2.10
Family violence offenders are held accountable by the current system	2.2	2.00	1.88	1.93	1.36	2.17	2.17

⁶ Affiliation groups based on survey responses to “Please indicate your affiliation(s).” Survey respondents were allowed to select more than one affiliation. The affiliations listed here represent the most selected affiliations in the survey results.

⁷ Represents the average response of all survey respondents.

⁸ Law Enforcement Agency

b. Potential benefits of a Family Justice Center in Seattle: From my perspective...

Statement	Affiliation ⁹						
	Interview	Survey					
	All (average)	All ¹⁰ (average)	DV Services Provider (average)	Govt. Agency (average)	Survivors (average)	LEA ¹¹ (average)	Social Services – Non-DV (average)
A family justice center in Seattle would benefit survivors of family violence	3.41	3.27	3.43	3.56	3.29	3.83	3.09
A family justice center in Seattle would be an effective use of resources	3.39	3.11	3.20	3.40	3.00	3.83	3.00
Developing a family justice center should be a priority for Seattle	3.15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Development of a family justice center in Seattle should be a priority for the criminal justice system	N/A	3.09	3.13	3.19	3.08	3.67	2.91
Development of a family justice center in Seattle should be a priority for community service providers	N/A	3.10	3.26	3.38	3.00	3.75	3.00

⁹ Affiliation groups based on survey responses to “Please indicate your affiliation(s).” Survey respondents were allowed to select more than one affiliation. The affiliations listed here represent the most selected affiliations in the survey results.

¹⁰ Represents the average response of all survey respondents.

¹¹ Law Enforcement Agency

Seattle FJC Feasibility Analysis Stakeholder Survey and Key Informant Interview Results
Meta-Summary

Statement	Affiliation ⁹						
	Interview	Survey					
	All (average)	All ¹⁰ (average)	DV Services Provider (average)	Govt. Agency (average)	Survivors (average)	LEA ¹¹ (average)	Social Services – Non-DV (average)
Development of a family justice center in Seattle should be a priority for the community's elected leadership	N/A	3.17	3.26	3.25	3.08	3.83	3.00

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

Stakeholder Survey Results

Summer 2013

Note: The enclosed survey results reflect the opinions of the individual respondents, and not necessarily those of their organizations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents **2**

Executive Summary **3**

 1. Methodology 3

 2. Who Completed the Survey? 3

 3. Spectrum of Agreement 3

 4. Emerging Themes and Priorities 4

Themed Results **6**

 1. Please indicate your affiliation(s)..... 6

 2. Name of organization (if applicable)..... 7

 3. What is your organization’s geographic focus?..... 7

 4. Please indicate your level of existing knowledge for the following: 8

 5. What have been the most successful collaborative/partnership efforts addressing family violence issues in Seattle? (emerging themes)..... 8

 6. What do you think contributed to their success? (emerging themes and key points) 8

 7. What types of services do you see as critical for a potential family justice center to offer in Seattle? 9

 8. Collaborative partners involved in the family justice center can offer services either onsite at the family justice center location or offsite on a referral basis, or in both of these modes. If Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center, based upon your knowledge to date, would your organization like to offer services: 10

 9. What types of services for survivors of family violence and their families are currently available from your organization? 11

 9B. If Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center, what types of services for survivors of family violence and their families would be available onsite from your organization? 12

 10. If Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center, what additional ways would you see your organization contributing to and participating in the operations and development of a family justice center? 13

 11. What challenges/obstacles would a potential family justice center serving Seattle need to address? 13

 12. What do you see as the most important community assets that a potential family justice center serving Seattle could draw upon? 14

 13. In your opinion, which specific organizations would be most important to involve in a potential family justice center? 14

 14. Current services for survivors of family violence in Seattle: From my perspective..... 15

 15. Potential benefits of a family justice center in Seattle: From my perspective... 16

 16. Future participation in a potential family justice center: From my perspective... 17

 17. Please use the space below to provide any other comments or suggestions not already covered in earlier parts of this survey as desired (emerging themes and key points). 18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Methodology

The online survey contained a mix of open response, multiple choice, and spectrum of agreement questions, all of which were optional. The survey was anonymous and the Glen Price Group received and processed all responses.

The open response questions were individually reviewed to capture emerging themes. Participants were encouraged to select all responses that applied to them in the multiple choice questions, which were then tallied. The responses to the spectrum of agreement questions were tallied and the average level of agreement was calculated for each statement when appropriate.

2. Who Completed the Survey?

A total of ninety-eight individuals completed the survey. The survey respondents represented domestic violence service providers, community members, government agencies, survivors of family violence, law enforcement, social services providers, homeless service providers, elder service providers, mental health providers, and many other organizations.

3. Spectrum of Agreement

(see questions 14-16 below for responses by affiliation)

Survey participants were asked to rate the following statements on a scale of strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD). Each response was given a value (SA=4, A=3, D=2, SD= 1) and the average (Avg.) was calculated based on this scale. An average of 4 means that the majority of respondents strongly agreed with the statement while an average of 1 means that the majority of respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. An average of 2.5 represents a neutral position (neither agree or disagree).

1. Current services for survivors of family violence in Seattle: From my perspective...

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	Avg
Services for survivors of family violence in Seattle are readily accessible at this time					
All Respondents	5	42	37	4	2.55
Services for survivors of family violence in Seattle are well coordinated at this time					
All Respondents	5	30	47	4	2.42
Survivors of family violence in Seattle currently receive the full range of services they need					
All Respondents	2	12	60	14	2.02
Survivors of family violence in Seattle currently receive culturally competent services					
All Respondents	5	39	37	5	2.51
Family violence offenders are held accountable by the current system					
All Respondents	3	15	48	21	2.00

a. Potential benefits of a family justice center in Seattle: From my perspective...

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	Avg
A family justice center in Seattle would benefit survivors of family violence					
All Respondents	37	45	6	3	3.27

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	Avg
A family justice center in Seattle would improve coordination of services to survivors of family violence					
All Respondents	37	45	6	3	3.27
A family justice center in Seattle would be an effective use of resources					
All Respondents	34	39	10	7	3.11
A family justice center in Seattle would improve offender accountability outcomes					
All Respondents	24	45	14	5	3.00

b. Future participation in a potential family justice center: From my perspective...

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	Avg
Based on my current understanding, I support the development of a family justice center in Seattle					
All Respondents	41	38	7	7	3.22
Development of a family justice center in Seattle should be a priority for the criminal justice system					
All Respondents	32	37	14	5	3.09
Development of a family justice center in Seattle should be a priority for community service providers					
All Respondents	33	39	10	7	3.10
Development of a family justice center in Seattle should be a priority for the community's elected leadership					
All Respondents	39	34	10	7	3.17

4. Emerging Themes and Priorities

a. Survey respondents were asked to identify successful collaboration/partnership efforts addressing family violence issues in Seattle, and why they were so successful. Emerging themes include:

- 1) Trust and open communication
- 2) Willingness to work together and learn from one another
- 3) Respect for different interests
- 4) Shared goal/focus of serving the needs of victims/survivors
- 5) Collaboration and involvement of multidisciplinary stakeholders

b. Survey respondents were asked to identify the types of services they see as critical for a potential family justice center to offer in Seattle. The top seven services identified include:

- 1) Advocacy and social services for survivors of domestic violence
- 2) Emergency housing/shelter referrals
- 3) Culturally-specific services
- 4) Legal advocacy
- 5) Childcare services
- 6) Civil legal representation
- 7) Protection order assistance

- c. When asked if their organization would like to offer services at a potential family justice center in Seattle,**
- **10** individuals indicated that based on their knowledge to date, their organization would like to offer services **onsite at the family justice center**;
 - **15** individuals indicated that based on their knowledge to date, their organization would like to offer services **offsite at their own location**; and
 - **33** individuals indicated that based on their knowledge to date, their organization would like to offer services **both onsite and offsite**.
- d. Respondents collectively created a list of 77 organizations that would be most important to involve in a potential family justice center**
- e. Survey respondents were asked to identify challenges/obstacles that a potential family justice center serving Seattle would need to address. The top five challenges/obstacles identified include:**
- 1) Funding
 - 2) Collaborative resource development
 - 3) Relationship building among partners
 - 4) Safety and security
 - 5) Buy-in from potential partners
- f. Survey respondents were asked to identify existing community assets that a potential family justice center serving Seattle could draw upon. The top four community assets identified include:**
- 1) Existing relationships/partnerships
 - 2) Political support
 - 3) Financial resources
 - 4) Media/communications

In a closing open-ended question survey respondents provided a range of opinions that have been themed as concerns, support, and suggestions:

- g. Concerns about a potential family justice center, included:**
- 1) Lack of support from minority communities and concern about exclusion of marginalized communities
 - 2) Survivor safety
 - 3) Accessibility
- h. Emerging themed opinions in support of a potential family justice center, included:**
- 1) A family justice center approach would improve collaborative service delivery to survivors of family violence
 - 2) A family justice center would bring attention and funding to the issue of family violence
 - 3) A family justice center would be part of a broader approach to helping survivors of family violence in Seattle
- i. Suggestions for a potential family justice center, included:**
- 1) Expand to include services for survivors of all types of family violence
 - 2) Expand shelters and housing services for survivors
 - 3) Provide further information on what a family justice center might look like

THEMED RESULTS

This section provides a complete summary of all responses to survey question in the sequence in which they were asked.

General Information

1. Please indicate your affiliation(s)

(choose all that apply)

Affiliation	#
Domestic violence services	32
Community member	31
Other government agency	17
Survivor of family violence	14
Law enforcement	12
Social services – non DV specific	11
Other	11
Homelessness service provider	9
Elder services	8
Mental health	8
Education	6
Batterers’ treatment provider	5
Funder	5
Hospital/health care	5
Municipal or Superior Court	5
Other community service agency	5
Sexual assault services	5
King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office	3
Probation	3
Seattle City Attorney’s Office	3

Other:

- Recently with ELAP
- Thriver (Survived SA/DV/MH/Addiction and the dysfunctional programs/systems)
- Prostitution survivors’ services
- Property Management
- Long Term Care Ombudsman
- Human Services Dept.
- City of Seattle
- Attorney / Administrator KC-OPD
- Public Defense social work
- Anti Human Trafficking Services Domestic Violence Specialist Consultant

2. Name of organization (if applicable)

- ACA
- Aging and Disability Services
- API Chaya
- City of Seattle (2)
- City of Seattle - Human Services Dept.
- Dept of Veterans Affairs Medical Center- Geriatric Services
- ELAP
- Interim CDA
- King County Coalition Against Domestic Violence
- King County Department of Community and Human Services
- King County Department of Public Defense
- King County Long Term Care Ombudsman Program
- King County Office of Public Defense
- LifeWire
- Low Income Housing Institute (3)
- NAVOS Mental Health - DV Survivor Program
- New Beginnings (3)
- New Futures, Navos Mental Health, Seattle Women's Commission
- NW Network of BTLG Survivors of Abuse
- Public Health Department
- Salvation Army
- Seattle City Attorney's Office
- Seattle Human Services
- Seattle Municipal Court
- Seattle Municipal Court Probation Services
- Seattle Police Department (4)
- Seattle Police Department Victim Support Team and Organization for Prostitution Survivors
- Seattle Police Domestic Violence Unit
- Seattle Police Foundation
- Senior Services (2)
- Salvation Army
- SPD Victim Support Team (7)
- The Cascade Women's Program
- The Salvation Army - Catherine Booth House
- Thrivers Action Group (d/b/a TAG)
- University of Washington School of Nursing
- Virginia Mason Medical Center
- Wellspring Family Services (3)

3. What is your organization's geographic focus?

Option	#
The City of Seattle and other areas in King County	34
The City of Seattle	32
Other	8
Not Applicable	7
King County (outside of Seattle)	5
Washington State	5
A specific neighborhood or community in King County (outside of Seattle)	2
A specific neighborhood or community in Seattle	1
Multi-state	1
National	1
International	1

Other:

- Western Washington

- We do also serve woman and children fleeing from out of the county and state
- Local to global
- King County and South Washington

Current Knowledge

4. Please indicate your level of existing knowledge for the following:

VK = Very Knowledgeable; SK = Somewhat Knowledgeable; NK = Not Knowledgeable

Statement	VK	SK	NK
The needs of family violence survivors	61	25	10
Survivor services currently provided in Seattle	49	38	9
Law enforcement in Seattle	44	46	6
Seattle’s system for offender accountability (prosecution)	31	44	21
The family justice center model	26	43	27

Successful Collaboration and Partnership

5. What have been the most successful collaborative/partnership efforts addressing family violence issues in Seattle? (emerging themes)

- Co-location of advocates, law enforcement, and prosecutors
- King County Coalition Against Domestic Violence
- Collaboration between community based service providers
- Victim Support Team
- The City’s support of programs that focus on referrals to community DV programs
- Efforts to provide advocacy and/or support for victims of domestic violence in later life/elder abuse
- Interdisciplinary/interagency training activities and meetings
- Domestic Violence and Mental Health Collaboration
- Children’s Domestic Violence Response Team
- Specialized service delivery

6. What do you think contributed to their success? (emerging themes and key points)

- Trust and open communication**
 - Shared principles of trust, a strong willingness to join together, and ongoing formal and informal agreements build on trust are fundamental to success.

- b. Willingness to work together and learn from one another**
 - An openness to learning new information and seeing things from a different perspective
- c. Respect for different interests**
 - A respect and appreciation for the different – often contradictory- interests of victims, police, community agencies, etc.
- d. Shared goal/focus of serving needs of victims/survivors and community and willingness to look at issues and service delivery from the point of view of the survivor**
 - Sharing the same overarching goal of serving victims
 - Willingness of programs to work cooperatively for the benefit of the survivors and their children
 - Allowing survivors to inform us about their needs and then working cooperatively to meet those needs
- e. Collaboration and involvement of multidisciplinary stakeholders/ strong network of service providers**
 - Addressing issues collaboratively that no single organization can tackle
 - Acknowledgment that one agency cannot serve all due to limitations or resources, and understanding that collaboration with external partners is the only way to ensure that those gaps are met
 - Knowing our limits/where others could be serving some better, knowing the skills of other organizations and community members
 - Coordinated services
 - Focus on community response to DV and inclusion of broad spectrum of stakeholders in process
- f. Strong leadership/organizational abilities**
- g. Capacity to do the work (adequate staffing and funding)**
- h. Co-location**
 - Proximity of service providers
 - Co-location provides more opportunity to understand each other’s roles/resources, and allows more timely assessment of victims’ needs and risk assessment of the suspect
- i. The people and agencies involved in this work are passionate and committed**

Seattle FJC Feasibility

7. What types of services do you see as critical for a potential family justice center to offer in Seattle?

(multiple selection, choose at most seven answers)

Option	#
Advocacy and social services for survivors of domestic violence	80
Emergency housing/shelter referrals	55

Option	#
Culturally-specific services	54
Legal advocacy	51
Childcare services	47
Civil legal representation	44
Protection order assistance	44
Court representation	39
Case management	36
Advocacy and social services for survivors of elder abuse	29
Mental health services	29
Financial services for survivors	27
Employment and job training services	22
Immigration assistance	21
Emergency transportation	17
Other (see below)	12
Medical services	10
Spiritual support	3

Other (emerging themes and key points):

- Substance use issues support
- Long term housing referrals
- Batterer intervention
- Supervised visitation and exchange
- All of the above

8. Collaborative partners involved in the family justice center can offer services either onsite at the family justice center location or offsite on a referral basis, or in both of these modes. If Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center, based upon your knowledge to date, would your organization like to offer services:

(choose all that apply)

Option	#
Onsite at the family justice center	10
Offsite at our own location	15
Both onsite and offsite	33
We don't believe at this time that we will be offering either onsite or offsite services to the family justice center	7
Not applicable	30
Other	17

Comments (emerging themes and key points):

- Systems and interested agencies may provide on-site services or need office space for community-based providers to meet with clients as needed. Some clients may not want to access services down the hall from law enforcement or come to downtown for services, but rather a more warm and friendly environment of community-based social services agencies.

- On-site services to victims is paramount to have a 'one stop' to enable them to move forward without transportation, financial worries. How am I going to get to the offsite service? How am I going to pay for it? Who will take care of the kid while I go? How can I find the energy/courage to pick the phone and ask for help. A "one stop" facility should connect without outside providers to come to the facility on a daily or weekly basis to assist victims. Case management is key to keep victim from being/feeling overwhelmed.
- In the victim's own home
- On-site only if transportation is available for survivors

9. What types of services for survivors of family violence and their families are currently available from your organization?

(choose all that apply)

Option	#
Advocacy and social services for survivors of domestic violence	41
Emergency housing/shelter referrals	35
Protection order assistance	31
Advocacy and social services for survivors of elder abuse	28
Legal advocacy	27
Not applicable	27
Case management	25
Culturally-specific services	25
Emergency transportation	23
Other (see below)	17
Financial services for survivors	16
Mental health services	16
Immigration assistance	15
Childcare services	10
Court representation	9
Employment and job training services	9
Medical services	8
Spiritual support	5
Civil legal representation	4

Other (emerging themes and key points):

- Substance Use Issues support
- Information about what a victim/survivor should expect from the Batterers' Intervention Services, including limitations BIPs operate under
- Housing related services
- Social service referrals
- Prevention curriculum for youth
- Counseling for children impacted by DV
- Kids Club for children impacted by DV
- Referrals for civil representation
- Legal clinic
- Parenting education
- Infant mental health
- Home visiting for eligible families

- WIC
- Criminal investigations
- Women and children’s support groups
- Victim advocacy within the criminal justice system
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families-office advocacy

9B.If Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center, what types of services for survivors of family violence and their families would be available onsite from your organization?

(choose all that apply)

Option	#
Not applicable	36
Advocacy and social services for survivors of domestic violence	25
Protection order assistance	21
Emergency housing/ shelter referrals	18
Case management	16
Culturally-specific services	16
Advocacy and social services for survivors of elder abuse	15
Emergency transportation	15
Other (see below)	15
Legal advocacy	14
Mental health services	10
Immigration assistance	8
Court representation	7
Civil legal representation	5
Financial services for survivors	5
Childcare services	4
Spiritual support	4
Medical services	3
Employment and job training services	2

Other (emerging themes and key points):

- If Seattle had a family justice center with a 'one stop' approach, then more people could be assisted and our facility would refer victims to the "one stop" services of the Seattle Justice Center. My services as an advocate is on a case-by-case basis and as time permits. Many people "fall through the cracks" due to one person helping many.
- Housing related services
- Home visiting for eligible families; WIC
- Criminal investigations
- Advocacy within the criminal justice system
- Additional onsite services would likely vary, depending upon the array of services coordinated among the partners. It would likely be most efficient and least confusion for survivors to coordinate the services and minimize duplication onsite.
- Unsure at this time

10. If Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center, what additional ways would you see your organization contributing to and participating in the operations and development of a family justice center?

(choose all that apply)

Option	#
Participate in a strategic planning process	45
Participate in cross-training	43
Provide cross-training	43
Provide volunteer services	22
Not applicable	22
Provide access to our network	21
Assist with fund development	13
Other	11
Contribute to facilities costs	6
Contribute to operational costs	5

Other (emerging themes and key points):

- Unsure at this time
- Provide expertise from UW School of Nursing or Health Sciences faculty and graduate students to do either clinical rotations and/or focus their capstone project work to contribute to needs of FJC

11. What challenges/obstacles would a potential family justice center serving Seattle need to address?

(multiple selection, choose at most five answers)

Option	#
Funding	65
Collaborative resource development	39
Relationship building amongst partners	37
Safety and security	36
Buy-in from potential partners	35
Systems to guarantee confidentiality	33
Assurances that partners will not compete for the same funding	32
Uncoordinated services	25
Outreach to survivors	24
Resistance to change	24
Political support	22
Transportation for survivors	21
Other	11

Other (emerging themes and key points):

- Many survivors, especially those from marginalized communities, will not feel comfortable accessing the family justice center if it includes law enforcement
- Maintaining options and rights of survivors who do not want to be part of the criminal justice system.

- Racism and other forms of oppression, inherent in institutions
- Maintaining autonomy of agencies
- Addressing the challenges of co-locating legal interventions and community based supports
- Making the case that this investment would be the best way to meet the needs of the community considering the current lack of capacity of the DV advocacy service system and human services in general.
- Competition for resources
- Actively refraining from redirecting the bulk of city or county monies to a family justice center and instead continuing to support community based services

12. What do you see as the most important community assets that a potential family justice center serving Seattle could draw upon?

(choose all that apply)

Option	#
Existing relationships/partnerships	74
Financial resources	35
In-kind resources	27
Media/communications	35
Political support	47
Systems to guarantee confidentiality	21
Technology that improves services to survivors	34
Other	5

Other (emerging themes and key points):

- Evidence-based outcomes studies

13. In your opinion, which specific organizations would be most important to involve in a potential family justice center?

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Asian Counseling and Referral Service (ACRS) | 15. Communities Against Rape and Abuse |
| 2. Adult Protective Services | 16. Consejo |
| 3. Advocate | 17. Courts (municipal and superior) |
| 4. ADWAS | a. Court Liaison |
| 5. Aging and Disability Services | 18. CPS |
| 6. Animal Control/Veterinarians | 19. Crisis Clinic |
| 7. API Chaya | 20. DAWN |
| 8. Asian and Pacific Islander Family Safety Center | 21. Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) |
| 9. Behavioral health | 22. DV agencies |
| 10. Benefits assistance | 23. Eastside Legal Assistance Program (ELAP) |
| 11. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation | 24. Emergency feeding program |
| 12. Case management | 25. Family Bar Association |
| 13. Child welfare agency | 26. Family Connections |
| 14. City of Seattle contracted BIP providers (NAVOS, Asian Counseling and Referral Service, Wellspring Family Services) | 27. Funders |
| | 28. Head start/child development |
| | 29. Hospitals |

- 30. Housing
- 31. Human Services
- 32. Judges from all jurisdictions in King County and surrounding counties
- 33. Juvenile Justice
- 34. KCBA
- 35. King County Coalition Against Domestic Violence
- 36. King County Prosecutors Office
 - a. King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office Protection Order Advocacy Program
- 37. King County Protection Order Advocacy Program
- 38. King County Sexual Assault Network
- 39. King County Sexual Assault Resource Center (KSARC)
- 40. King County Sheriff
- 41. Legal Voice
- 42. Lifetree
- 43. Lifewire
- 44. Mental Health
- 45. Municipal Court Probation Services Domestic Violence Unit
- 46. Muslim Housing Services
- 47. New Beginnings
- 48. Northwest Immigrant Rights Project (NWIRP)
- 49. Northwest Immigrant Services
- 50. Northwest Justice Project
- 51. Northwest network
- 52. Northwest Network of GLBT Survivors of Abuse
- 53. Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs
- 54. Political supporters
- 55. Probation
- 56. Public Defenders
- 57. ReWA
- 58. Salvation Army
- 59. School district
- 60. Seattle City Attorneys' Office
- 61. Seattle Housing Authority
- 62. Seattle Mental Health
- 63. Seattle Police Department
- 64. Seattle Women's Commission
- 65. Senior Services
- 66. Shelters
- 67. Social Service Providers
- 68. Solid Ground
- 69. Sound Mental Health (Children's Domestic Violence Response Team)
- 70. Systems-Based Legal Advocates (PO Advocates and those in Prosecutors' or Police offices)
- 71. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
- 72. Victim Support Team
- 73. Washington State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
- 74. Wellspring
- 75. WVEE
- 76. YMCA
- 77. YWCA

14. Current services for survivors of family violence in Seattle: From my perspective...

Survey participants were asked to rate the statements in questions 14, 15, and 16 on a scale of strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD). Each response was given a value (SA=4, A=3, D=2, SD= 1) and the average (Avg.) was taken based on this scale using the number of respondents (n). An average of 4 means that the majority of respondents strongly agreed with the statement while an average of 1 means that the majority of respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. An average of 2.5 represents a neutral position (neither agree or disagree).

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	n	Avg
Services for survivors of family violence in Seattle are readily accessible at this time						
All Respondents	5	42	37	4	88	2.55
DV Services	1	10	15	0	26	2.46
Other Gov. Agency	1	9	5	0	15	2.73
Survivors	0	3	8	1	12	2.17

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	n	Avg
Law Enforcement	1	9	2	0	12	2.92
Social Services	0	5	5	0	10	2.50
Services for survivors of family violence in Seattle are well coordinated at this time						
All Respondents	5	30	47	4	86	2.42
DV Services	1	6	18	0	25	2.32
Other Gov. Agency	0	5	10	0	15	2.33
Survivors	0	2	9	0	11	2.18
Law Enforcement	1	2	9	0	12	2.33
Social Services	1	1	8	0	10	2.30
Survivors of family violence in Seattle currently receive the full range of services they need						
All Respondents	2	12	60	14	88	2.02
DV Services	0	4	19	3	26	2.04
Other Gov. Agency	1	2	10	2	15	2.13
Survivors	0	0	8	4	12	1.67
Law Enforcement	1	1	9	1	12	2.17
Social Services	0	2	7	1	10	2.10
Survivors of family violence in Seattle currently receive culturally competent services						
All Respondents	5	39	37	5	86	2.51
DV Services	1	8	16	1	26	2.35
Other Gov. Agency	1	4	9	1	15	2.33
Survivors	0	5	5	1	11	2.36
Law Enforcement	2	5	5	0	12	2.75
Social Services	0	2	7	1	10	2.10
Family violence offenders are held accountable by the current system						
All Respondents	3	15	48	21	87	2.00
DV Services	0	3	17	6	26	1.88
Other Gov. Agency	1	1	9	4	15	1.93
Survivors	0	0	4	7	11	1.36
Law Enforcement	0	4	6	2	12	2.17
Social Services	0	4	6	2	10	2.17

15. Potential benefits of a family justice center in Seattle: From my perspective...

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	n	Avg
A family justice center in Seattle would benefit survivors of family violence						
All Respondents	37	45	6	3	92	3.27
DV Services	15	13	2	0	30	3.43
Other Gov. Agency	10	5	1	0	16	3.56
Survivors	5	8	1	0	14	3.29
Law Enforcement	10	2	0	0	12	3.83
Social Services	4	5	1	1	11	3.09
A family justice center in Seattle would improve coordination of services to survivors of family violence						
All Respondents	37	45	6	3	91	3.27
DV Services	12	16	2	0	30	3.33
Other Gov. Agency	8	8	0	0	16	3.50
Survivors	5	7	1	0	13	3.31

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	n	Avg
Law Enforcement	10	2	0	0	12	3.83
Social Services	3	6	1	1	11	3.00
A family justice center in Seattle would be an effective use of resources						
All Respondents	34	39	10	7	90	3.11
DV Services	11	16	1	2	30	3.20
Other Gov. Agency	8	5	2	0	15	3.40
Survivors	4	6	2	1	13	3.00
Law Enforcement	10	2	0	0	12	3.83
Social Services	4	5	0	2	11	3.00
A family justice center in Seattle would improve offender accountability outcomes						
All Respondents	24	45	14	5	88	3.00
DV Services	7	16	5	1	29	3.00
Other Gov. Agency	6	7	2	1	16	3.13
Survivors	4	7	0	1	12	3.17
Law Enforcement	6	3	3	0	12	3.25
Social Services	1	7	1	2	11	2.64

16. Future participation in a potential family justice center: From my perspective...

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	n	Avg
Based on my current understanding, I support the development of a family justice center in Seattle						
All Respondents	41	38	7	7	93	3.22
DV Services	16	12	2	1	31	3.39
Other Gov. Agency	8	8	0	1	17	3.35
Survivors	5	5	2	1	13	3.08
Law Enforcement	10	2	0	0	12	3.83
Social Services	6	3	0	2	11	3.18
Development of a family justice center in Seattle should be a priority for the criminal justice system						
All Respondents	32	37	14	5	88	3.09
DV Services	10	15	4	1	30	3.13
Other Gov. Agency	7	6	2	1	16	3.19
Survivors	5	5	2	1	13	3.08
Law Enforcement	8	4	0	0	12	3.67
Social Services	3	5	2	1	11	2.91
Development of a family justice center in Seattle should be a priority for community service providers						
All Respondents	33	39	10	7	89	3.10
DV Services	14	13	2	2	31	3.26
Other Gov. Agency	7	8	1	0	16	3.38
Survivors	5	4	3	1	13	3.00
Law Enforcement	9	3	0	0	12	3.75
Social Services	5	3	1	2	11	3.00
Development of a family justice center in Seattle should be a priority for the community's elected leadership						
All Respondents	39	34	10	7	90	3.17

Statement	SA	A	D	SD	n	Avg
DV Services	14	13	2	2	31	3.26
Other Gov. Agency	7	7	1	1	16	3.25
Survivors	5	5	2	1	13	3.08
Law Enforcement	10	2	0	0	12	3.83
Social Services	5	3	1	2	11	3.00

Closing Question

17. Please use the space below to provide any other comments or suggestions not already covered in earlier parts of this survey as desired (emerging themes and key points).

Concerns about potential family justice center

- a. **Lack of support from minority communities/concern about exclusion of marginalized communities**
 - I'm concerned there isn't support in the minority communities
 - I worry about some of the marginalized members of our community being left out by either self-selection or status.
- b. **Funding**
 - I'm concerned that there isn't funding to do this right
 - It is not clear that a Family Justice Center approach is the most effective and efficient use of resources
- c. **Survivor Safety**
 - Survivors are concerned about encountering batterers at the center. This must not become a location for stalking survivors.
- d. **Focus on Criminal Justice**
 - If the focus is solely on the criminal justice component, I am a bit concerned that victims might either not be able to, or feel unable to access the center unless they press charges on their abuser. I think a family justice center would need to provide social and human services on site as well as address criminal justice issues
- e. **Concern around model**
 - I have very serious concerns about the development of a FJC in Seattle. I am not convinced that a "one stop shop" approach is a good thing for survivors, particularly in terms of advocacy services and other service providers maintaining autonomy from the criminal system and law enforcement. It is critical that survivors are ensured confidentiality and I have doubts as to a FJC's ability to ensure this.
- f. **Not a top priority**
 - I think there are other issues facing Seattle that need more attention.
 - I am more interested in projects that would increase the capacity of community-based agencies and the overall human services system and those that would work toward addressing the conditions the lead to widespread domestic violence.

g. Accessibility

- I am most concerned about is the accessibility regarding travel and parking. People from South County will have a difficult time getting downtown without bus tickets or gas money
- I'm concerned with the location. It has to be easy access for the survivors to travel back and forth as well as the employees to utilize public transportation options.

Support for potential family justice center

a. A family justice center approach improves collaborative service delivery to survivors of family violence

- A family justice center approach is an important next step to improve our response.
- Seattle has a vibrant and dedicated community of people from all aspects of the social service world, but they are separate and complicated to understand and access. One central place for a victim to come to, where they could speak with a person who could give them comprehensive options for their particular situation would be an incredible benefit to the people of our community.
- I think a coordinated social response to the crime of domestic violence is a good idea and could increase cooperation among agencies which, if done well, could improve services to victims and provide better perpetrator accountability.
- A Family Justice Center would be one important step towards increasing the cohesion of the coordinated community response to domestic and family violence.

b. Opportunity to address family violence

- A family justice center may offer the opportunity to address family violence with a more informed and community-based approach, with better outcomes and a focus on prevention.

c. A family justice center would bring attention and funding to the issue of family violence

- FJC would bring the issue of DV to the attention of the greater Seattle/King County community, which is greatly needed. No one seems to care about the rising DV Aggravated Assaults in Seattle. I believe a FJC will shine a very bright light on the much-neglected issue and serve as a rallying point for the community and elected officials.
- It will bring in more funding for victim services.

d. A family justice center would help resolve conflicts and problem areas

- Any issues that seem problem areas or conflicts now would I think be addressed when all parties are working collaboratively on a FJC.

e. A family justice center is part of a broader approach to helping survivors of family violence

- This is not the only solution, but one of many and certainly a need for victims of DV, whom we are working to help
- It is important to note and keep stating that the FJC will not be the only game in town. There is enough work for everyone and being connected with each other is very important.

Suggestions and requests for potential family justice center

a. Expand to include services for survivors of all types of family violence

- Please consider partnering with efforts of child advocacy centers/children's mental health as you move forward. Many DV survivors also have children who could benefit from advocacy and support.
- The effort to treat violence within the family should include violence between adults as well as the abuse of children in the household: physical, sexual, and neglect. We should make every effort as a community to treat the whole family comprehensively and holistically. There are many important and successful institutions and agencies that work to improve the response to family violence in this community.

b. Expand shelters and housing services for survivors

- Housing is one thing that is crucial to victims, and sadly something we often lack. I hope that by creating a family justice center, we might be able to encourage other shelters to expand as well.

c. Services

- Decisions about which services to include and the structure of such services should be based on evidence-based cost/benefit analysis and a more complex understanding of the dynamic of family violence.
- Assuming this could also include a supervised visitation center?

d. Need more information on what a family justice center might look like

- I am open to the possibility that a family justice center might be a good thing for the community, but I do not yet have information that convinces me that this is the case.

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

Key Informant Interview Results

Summer 2013

Contents:

Executive Summary	2
Themed Interview Results	4
Appendix 1: Key Informants Interviewed	10
Appendix 2: Interview Protocol	11

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Interview Results: Spectrum of Agreement Questions

In addition to open-ended questions described further below, interview participants were asked to rate the following statements on a scale of strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD). Each response was given a value (SA=4, A=3, D=2, SD= 1) and the average (Avg.) was taken based on this scale. An average of 4 means that the majority of respondents strongly agreed with the statement, while an average of 1 means that the majority of respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. An average of 2.5 represents a neutral position (neither agree or disagree).

Statement	Number of responses (n)	Average Response
Services to survivors of family violence in Seattle are readily accessible at this time.	11	2.41
Services for survivors of family violence in Seattle are well coordinated at this time.	11	2.45
Survivors of family violence in Seattle currently receive the range of services they need.	10	1.9
Family violence offenders are held accountable by the current system.	10	2.2

Statement	Number of responses (n)	Average Response
A family justice center in Seattle would benefit survivors of family violence.	11	3.41
A family justice center in Seattle would improve partner coordination of services to survivors of family violence.	9	3.44
Developing a family justice center in Seattle would be an effective use of resources.	9	3.39
Developing a family justice center in Seattle would improve offender accountability outcomes.	9	3.22
Developing a family justice center should be a priority for Seattle.	10	3.15

2. Interview Results: Overarching Themes from Open-Ended Questions

- a. Key informants are positively inclined to co-locate staff from their organizations onsite at a potential family justice center.
- b. Efforts to develop an FJC build upon existing successful collaborative efforts to address domestic violence in Seattle.
- c. There is a strong network of service providers in Seattle who are deeply committed to their work, creating positive results for survivors in a difficult environment.

- d. Informants raised concerns about the capacity of community-based organizations to serve survivors at a family justice center location in addition to their home organization location. Given limited resources, informants recommended that a family justice center “create a bigger pie” and at minimum not take away resources from existing services.
- e. Informants raised concerns about the accessibility of a family justice center located downtown.
- f. Informants raised concerns that undocumented immigrants and other marginalized populations will not feel comfortable going to a family justice center where law enforcement is present.
- g. Informants would like to learn more about what a family justice center in Seattle would look like.

THEMED INTERVIEW RESULTS

This section provides a **summary** of the important themes and data emerging from interviews conducted with 12 key informants in the City of Seattle regarding the feasibility of establishing a Family Justice Center serving survivors of family violence.¹ The numbered sections below follow the sequence of questions asked of interviewees.

1. What do you believe is one key accomplishment of the City of Seattle in the area of family violence?
 - a. City has been a leader in encouraging/supporting development of services and interventions.
 - b. The City has taken this seriously - made a variety of efforts to address this issue effectively.
 - c. Innovative law enforcement approach
 - d. Dedicated staff in a variety of positions
 - e. DV Prevention Council
 - f. DV Mental Health Collaboration
 - g. Coordinated services
 - h. Victim support team, full-time staff and volunteers
 - i. Partnering with agencies involved in DV response and working to create a coordinated effort
 - j. Training officers and detectives

2. What collaborative/partnership effort(s) addressing family violence issues in Seattle has/have been most successful?
 - a. DV Mental Health Collaboration
 - b. Stand alone DV unit
 - c. Co-located victim support team
 - d. Network of human services exist in Seattle and King County
 - o “something like a FJC could organically allow these relationships and understandings to grow”
 - e. Peace in the Homes
 - f. King County Coalition
 - g. Multi-lingual access line

¹ For a list of interviewees, please see Appendix 1; for the interview protocol used, please see Appendix 2.

3. Follow-up: What elements of the collaboration/partnership caused this effort to be successful?

- a. Leadership
 - o “There’s no substitute for people at the top who get it and care.”
- b. Putting collaboration first
- c. Dedicated resources
- d. Shared information allowed participants to grow their understanding of partners and issues and led to more productive and useful work

4. Please rate the following statements on a scale of 1-4 (1= strongly disagree, 4= strongly agree) based on your perspective (Comments only)

a. “Services to survivors of family violence in Seattle are readily accessible at this time”

Average response: 2.41

- a. Demand exceeds capacity
- b. Services available but not well-coordinated or accessible
- c. No case management
- d. System requires the survivor to name DV as prime issue – for some, it is not

b. “Services for survivors of family violence in Seattle are well-coordinated at this time”

Average response: 2.45

- a. Not a lot of coordination yet
- b. Primary barrier is capacity

c. “Survivors of family violence in Seattle currently receive the range of services they need”

Average response: 1.9

- a. Access to services depends on how many barriers the survivor has to overcome – language, transportation, documentation, housing, etc.
- b. A lot of unmet need
- c. Civil legal is a huge gap

d. “Family violence offenders are held accountable by the current system.”

Average response: 2.2

- a. System limited in its ability to hold offenders accountable
- b. Lack of training and resources for law enforcement
- c. DV treatment has been the goal – has it been effective?

- d. Prosecution is not always what the victim wants or considers in the best interest of family
5. What types of services are most critical for a potential FJC to offer in Seattle?
- a. Immediate access to safe shelter
 - b. Legal services
 - c. Place/guide to enter criminal justice system if survivors choose
 - d. Access to basic needs: diapers, food, childcare, transportation
 - e. Strategies to obtain long-term housing
 - f. Employment training/education
 - g. Medical and mental health services
 - h. Guidance in navigating the system
 - i. Financial planning/guidance
6. Follow-up: What organizations/city/county departments would you see providing these services?
- a. Government: Courts, Legal System, Public Safety, and SPD
 - b. Private Non-profits
 - c. Salvation Army
 - d. YWCA
 - e. Consejo
 - f. REWA
 - g. API Chaya
 - h. Dawn
 - i. New Beginnings
 - j. ADWAS
 - k. Immigrant services organizations
 - l. Washington DV Coalition
7. What do you see as the most important assets in Seattle that a potential FJC could draw upon? (Assets include organizations, financial resources, and in-kind resources)
- a. Community rich in accessible financial resources
 - o Foundations
 - o Businesses

- b. Direct service providers/CBOs with their own resources (concern noted that CBOs should not be marginalized or cannibalized by the proposed FJC).
- c. Police Department: work with community, knowledge of DV, expertise
- d. City Attorney and King County Prosecutor
- e. Strong and engaged network of committed people
- f. History of collaboration between city, elected officials, and CBOS
- g. Victim support team model

8. What challenges/obstacles would a potential FJC serving Seattle need to address?

- a. Trust among various parties, especially considering that missions of each party may be in some conflict with others. Removing barriers to trusting relationships.
- b. Making the case for the FJC. Why is co-location important? Practical. Meets a need. Expand and increase resources to DV survivors. Better use of resources. Is this a solution looking for a problem?
- c. Financing the FJC. Financial issues for participating agencies.
- d. Location. CBOs wanting to provide services in their communities vs. concentration of services in downtown core. Need for location near courthouse.
- e. Lack of capacity –How do you take something that is spread very thin and spread it thinner?
- f. History in community of unpopular programs forced on providers by tying funding to them
- g. Sense of urgency – how high a priority is this?

9. Follow-up: What do you see as potential ways to address these challenges/obstacles?

- a. Mission. How the FJC is being sold. Raising the visibility of DV and expanding awareness about appropriate community response, not just law enforcement and shelters.
- b. Removing mistrust through greater understanding of people and programs involved. Creating connections.
- c. Effective planning and implementation process. Involvement of all parties. CBOs to have some real power in decision-making.
- d. Partnering to expand resources.
- e. Long-term commitment from law enforcement
- f. Defining the nature of police presence in FJC, “under the radar.”
- g. Look at what has been learned elsewhere.

10. If Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center, what ways would you see your organization contributing to and participating in the operations and development of a family justice center?
- a. Provide law enforcement and criminal justice services
 - b. Unclear
 - c. Significant participation, co-located
 - d. Involved, not co-located
 - e. At the table, deciding values, rules, tenants
 - f. Serving as convener, thought partner
 - g. Draw on our history of community based, bilingual services
11. The sustainability of the FJC model is built in part on the co-location of personnel using partners' existing resources. At this point, without making any commitments, if Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center would your organization consider co-locating staff at the FJC?
- a. Absolutely, the Co-location project has been very successful and we would like to continue this work
 - b. Strong possibility – depending on structure. Need to ensure that organizations are not siloed
 - c. Option to create third nonprofit to run the family justice center that all organizations would work for
12. Follow-up: Why or why not?
- a. Criminal justice is a cornerstone to victim safety
 - b. Open to work through logistics to make it work
13. Follow-up: What issues would need to be addressed for effective co-location?
- a. Shared vision, ground rules, decision-making, collaboration, respect
 - b. Secure place/connections for each organization
 - c. Location – tension between downtown (near courthouse) and communities
 - d. Parking
 - e. Childcare
14. Please rate the following statements on a scale of 1-4 (1=strongly disagree, 4=strongly agree) based on your perspective

a. “A family justice center in Seattle would benefit survivors of family violence”

Average response: 3.41

- a. Giving people access to more services makes sense.
- b. Some would benefit, but not all
- c. Networking, collaboration is what people are leaning towards

b. “A family justice center in Seattle would improve partner coordination of services to survivors of family violence”

Average response: 3.44

- a. Immediate access and referrals
- b. Timely solutions help people stay on board
- c. Cannot be a competitor to NPOs

c. “Developing a family justice center in Seattle would be an effective use of resources”

Average response: 3.39

- a. Provides structure for collaboration and potential best use of resources
- b. Pot is finite

d. Developing a family justice center in Seattle would improve offender accountability outcomes.

Average response: 3.22

- a. Don't know
- b. Not main focus – main focus is therapeutic for victim

e. Developing a family justice center should be a priority for Seattle.

Average response: 3.15

- a. Unclear
- b. Want to build on police department and city attorney interest in this – better for victims in the long run

15. What would you see as the most critical next step for determining whether to move forward with the development of a FJC?

- a. Identify the NGOs and government agencies involved and get them to the table; develop a shared vision; start hammering out some of the details; steering committee
- b. Lay out a plan that people can see and understand; key components, key measures; step-by-step – several decision points

- c. Develop a sense of enthusiasm, possibility, urgency
- d. Identify sustainable funding

16. Any other comments, questions, and/or advice?

- a. Look at this from the user’s perspective - what do they need?
- b. Be expansive about definition of domestic violence. Include elder abuse, same sex couples.
- c. Find a way to put people’s fears and worries to rest.
- d. Make it easy for the community to embrace this.
- e. Look at other entities, models, but in the end, make something unique that is designed to meet the needs of our community.

APPENDIX 1: KEY INFORMANTS INTERVIEWED

Name	Organization	Title/Position
1. Merrill Cousin	King County Coalition Against DV	Executive Director
2. Darby DuComb	Seattle City Attorney’s Office	Chief of Staff
3. Nicole Freutel	Seattle Police Department	DV Detective
4. Jaimie Garcia	Consejo	Executive Director
5. Peter Holmes	Seattle City Attorney's Office	City Attorney
6. Kristen Kleinsasser	Salvation Army	Co-located Advocate
7. Catherine Lester	Seattle Human Services	Interim Director
8. Dana Libby	Salvation Army	Captain
9. Jim Pugel	Seattle Police Department	Interim Chief
10. Liz Santiago	New Beginnings	Program Manager
11. Dan Satterberg	King County Prosecutor's Office	County Prosecutor
12. Leslie Savina	Northwest Justice Project	Supervising Attorney

APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Introduction:

Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed for the Seattle family justice center feasibility analysis.

- This should take about 45 minutes or less
- This is an anonymous interview and your comments will not be attributed to you by name
- Your comments will be aggregated with others but not attributed to you
- Your name will be listed in an appendix as one of the persons interviewed for this project

We are interviewing a number of individuals with different perspectives of family violence services in Seattle in order to inform the development of a feasibility analysis. Your responses will help determine the viability of opening a family justice center (FJC) in Seattle.

In order to complete the feasibility analysis, we will need to understand the level of interest from potential partners. No decisions have been made at this point, and the purpose of the feasibility analysis is to determine if and how the formation of a FJC in Seattle will add value and be viable.

We realize that the name “Family Justice Center” is currently used in the Seattle area for a detention facility, and that the name of Seattle’s co-located services for survivors of domestic violence, elder abuse, and related crimes will have a different name. However, for the purposes of this interview and until a new name is selected, our use of the term “family justice center” will refer to the model defined by the [Family Justice Center Alliance](#).

The initial focus of this feasibility analysis will be services for survivors of domestic violence and elder abuse, but this could expand to include survivors of other crimes over time. For the purpose of this interview, the term “family violence” will be used to describe domestic violence and elder abuse.

Interview Questions:

1. Without being humble, what single accomplishment are you personally (**as an individual**) most proud of in your work to date with family violence issues in Seattle?
2. Without being humble, what do you see as the strengths that your **organization** brings to work with family violence issues in Seattle?
3. What do you believe is one key accomplishment of the City of Seattle in the area of family violence?
4. What collaborative/partnership effort(s) addressing family violence issues in Seattle has/have been most successful?

- What elements of the collaboration/partnership caused this effort to be successful?
5. Please rate the following statements on a scale of 1-4 (1= strongly disagree, 4= strongly agree) *based on your perspective*
- Services to survivors of family violence in Seattle are readily accessible at this time
 - Rating:
 - Comments:
 - Services for survivors of family violence in Seattle are well coordinated at this time
 - Rating:
 - Comments:
 - Survivors of family violence in Seattle currently receive the range of services they need
 - Rating:
 - Comments:
 - Family violence offenders are held accountable by the current system
 - Rating:
 - Comments:
6. What types of services are most critical for a potential FJC to offer in Seattle?
- What organizations/city/county departments would you see providing these services?
7. What do you see as the most important assets in Seattle that a potential FJC could draw upon? (assets include organizations, financial resources, relationships, etc.)
8. What challenges/obstacles would a potential FJC serving Seattle need to address?
- What do you see as potential ways to address these challenges/obstacles?
9. If Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center, in what ways would you see your organization contributing to and participating in its operations and development of a family justice center?
10. The sustainability of the FJC model is built in part on the co-location of personnel using partners' existing resources. At this point, without making any commitments, if Seattle were to move forward with the development of a family justice center, would your organization consider co-locating staff at the FJC?
- Why or why not?
 - What issues do you believe need to be addressed for effective co-location?

11. Please rate the following statements on a scale of 1-4 (1=strongly disagree, 4=strongly agree) *based on your perspective*

- A family justice center in Seattle would benefit survivors of family violence
 - Rating:
 - Comments:
- A family justice center in Seattle would improve coordination of services to survivors of family violence
 - Rating:
 - Comments:
- Developing a family justice center in Seattle would be an effective use of resources
 - Rating:
 - Comments:
- Developing a family justice center in Seattle would improve offender accountability outcomes
 - Rating:
 - Comments:
- Developing a family justice center should be a priority for Seattle
 - Rating:
 - Comments:

12. What would you see as the most critical next step for determining whether to move forward with the development of a FJC?

13. What, if any, articles, reports, or other sources of data should we include in our research for the feasibility analysis?

14. When you think of a name for a possible FJC, what is the first thing that comes to mind for you?

15. Do you have any other comments, questions, and/or advice?

Developed by the Glen Price Group

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

Attachment 4: Cost Projections

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections**

Worksheet Name	Description
Scenarios	Overview of the three scenarios, including FJC coordination and support staff, co-located partners and services, facility size, annual operating costs, and capital and infrastructure development costs. Budget information is drawn from the Budget Details Worksheet.
Budget Details	Facility space calculator and line item budget. The facility space calculator includes details for shared or common space, and draws from the Square Footage Calculator worksheet to determine space requirements for workstations/offices.
Square Footage Calculator	Square foot requirements for offices and workstations, organized by organization/agency. The three columns with "Xs" indicate inclusion of an office/workstation in a scenario.
Current Costs	Approximation of current operating costs based on cost per square foot/year.
Year One Expense Phases	Overview of one model for phased-in approach to operating and capital costs over four quarters of Year 1. Operating costs support FJC staff only and reflect phased in hiring schedule.

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Scenarios**

Seattle FJC Scenario Planning: Annual Operating and One-Time Capital Investments

For the purpose of high-level feasibility analysis, the potential expenses for the launch of the Seattle Family Justice Center are detailed below in the form of both: 1) Operating; and 2) One-time Capital Investments. The "operating" expenses are those costs which would be net new expenses for the partners and would require new funding on an ongoing basis. The one-time capital investments represent infrastructural costs that would, in most cases, need to be made once only. Both of these types of costs are viewed in three potential scenarios: 1) Initial Co-location; 2) Core Operations; and 3) Comprehensive Services.

Scenario	Scenario 1 - Initial Co-location	Scenario 2 - Core Operations	Scenario 3 - Comprehensive Services
FJC Staffing (coordination and support)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center Coordinator 	<p>All Scenario 1, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Front Desk / Reception • Lead Navigator 	<p>All in Scenario 2, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office/Data Manager • Additional Navigator(s)
Co-located Partners and Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seattle Police Department • Seattle City Attorney • King County Prosecuting Attorney • Victim Support Team • Salvation Army Co-located Advocate(s) • Consejo Co-located Advocate(s) • Protection Order Assistance • Childcare services 	<p>All in Scenario 1, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil legal • Additional Advocacy services 	<p>All in Scenario 2, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Community Based Advocates • Immigration services • Mental Health services • Physical Health services (forensic and other) • Financial empowerment services

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Scenarios**

Seattle FJC Scenario Planning: Annual Operating and One-Time Capital Investments

For the purpose of high-level feasibility analysis, the potential expenses for the launch of the Seattle Family Justice Center are detailed below in the form of both: 1) Operating; and 2) One-time Capital Investments. The "operating" expenses are those costs which would be net new expenses for the partners and would require new funding on an ongoing basis. The one-time capital investments represent infrastructural costs that would, in most cases, need to be made once only. Both of these types of costs are viewed in three potential scenarios: 1) Initial Co-location; 2) Core Operations; and 3) Comprehensive Services.

Scenario		Scenario 1 - Initial Co-location	Scenario 2 - Core Operations	Scenario 3 - Comprehensive Services
Shared Space		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared counseling space • Shared space for other services • Small conference space 	All in Scenario 1, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional conference space 	All in Scenario 2, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training room
Space Needs (sqft estimates)		17,390	20,100	22,675
# of Co-located Partner Staff Members		86	96	105
Annual Operating Costs	Staffing	\$ 112,251	\$ 242,588	\$ 438,621
	Facility Rental	\$ 521,700	\$ 603,000	\$ 680,250
	Communications and IT	\$ 56,700	\$ 56,700	\$ 56,700
	Consultants and Contractors	\$ 50,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 90,000
Annual Operating Costs Subtotal		\$ 740,651	\$ 972,288	\$ 1,265,571
Current Annual Operating Costs		\$ 394,958	\$ 394,958	\$ 394,958
Net New Annual Operating Costs		\$ 345,693	\$ 577,330	\$ 870,613

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Scenarios**

Seattle FJC Scenario Planning: Annual Operating and One-Time Capital Investments

For the purpose of high-level feasibility analysis, the potential expenses for the launch of the Seattle Family Justice Center are detailed below in the form of both: 1) Operating; and 2) One-time Capital Investments. The "operating" expenses are those costs which would be net new expenses for the partners and would require new funding on an ongoing basis. The one-time capital investments represent infrastructural costs that would, in most cases, need to be made once only. Both of these types of costs are viewed in three potential scenarios: 1) Initial Co-location; 2) Core Operations; and 3) Comprehensive Services.

Scenario		Scenario 1 - Initial Co-location	Scenario 2 - Core Operations	Scenario 3 - Comprehensive Services
Capital and Infrastructure Development Costs	Security Systems	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
	Workstation Costs	\$ 430,000.00	\$ 480,000.00	\$ 525,000.00
	Facility Development	\$ 251,025.00	\$ 291,250.00	\$ 339,500.00
	IT Infrastructure	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
Capital and Infrastructure Development Costs Subtotal		\$ 716,025.00	\$ 806,250.00	\$ 899,500.00

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Budget Details**

Facility Space Calculator				
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Notes
Total Square Feet	17,390	20,100	22,675	Total square feet
Main Waiting Room / Entrance	500	500	500	
Additional Waiting Room Areas	-	500	500	
Other (hallways, etc.)	750	1,000	1,250	
Restrooms	1,100	1,100	1,100	
Childcare Space	300	300	300	
Family Kitchen	320	320	320	For clients
Break Room / Kitchen	500	500	500	For staff
Storage Space	625	1,000	1,250	
Shared Counseling Space	625	625	625	
Shared Space for Other Services	625	1,000	1,250	
Shared Conference Room	1,000	1,250	1,875	Scenario 3 includes training room
Agency-Specific Space & Workstations	11,045	12,005	13,205	From square footage calculator
\$/sqft/month (low)	\$ 1.67	\$ 1.67	\$ 1.67	Same \$/sqft/month for all scenarios. Based on estimates of \$20-\$40/sqft/year (does not include operating costs)
\$/sqft/month (high)	\$ 3.33	\$ 3.33	\$ 3.33	
\$/sqft/month (average)	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.50	
Monthly Lease	\$ 43,475	\$ 50,250	\$ 56,688	Total sqft * average \$/sqft/month

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Budget Details

Capital and Infrastructure Development Costs				
Item	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Notes
1. Security Systems	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	GPG Estimate
1.1 Security Cameras	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	
1.2 Bullet-proof Glass	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	
1.3 Other - Card pass, locking doors and file cabinets	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	
2. Workstation Costs (200sqft per workstation)	\$430,000	\$480,000	\$525,000	\$5,000 per office/workstation
Number of FTE	86	96	105	From Square Footage Calculator
2.1 Phone System				GPG Estimate
2.2 Network Wiring				GPG Estimate
2.3 Office Furnishings				GPG Estimate
2.4 Copiers and Fax Machines				GPG Estimate
2.5 Computer Systems				GPG Estimate
3. Facility Development and Furnishings	\$251,025	\$291,250	\$339,500	GPG Estimate
3.1 Facility renovation	\$173,900	\$201,000	\$226,750	\$10 psf
3.2 Child care area	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$30 psf
3.3 Waiting Room / Entrance Area	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$20 psf
3.4 Other Areas (restrooms, etc.)	\$0	\$0	\$0	Existing
3.5 Shared Counseling Space	\$18,750	\$18,750	\$18,750	\$30 psf
3.6 Shared Space for Other Services	\$9,375	\$15,000	\$18,750	\$15 psf
3.7 Shared Meeting and Training Room	\$30,000	\$37,500	\$56,250	\$30 psf
4. IT Infrastructure	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	
4.1 Server and router	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	GPG Estimate
4.2 Outcomes Monitoring Software Setup and Training	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	Estimate from Social Solutions for Efforts to Outcomes software
4.3 Other IT costs	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000	GPG Estimate
Subtotal:	\$716,025	\$806,250	\$899,500	

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Budget Details**

Annual Operating Costs				
Item	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Notes
1. Staffing	\$112,251	\$242,588	\$438,621	
1.1 Center Coordinator	\$112,251	\$112,251	\$112,251	From personnel document
1.2 Front Desk / Reception	\$0	\$50,337	\$50,337	From personnel document
1.3 Lead Navigator	\$0	\$80,000	\$80,000	GPG estimate
1.4 Additional Navigator	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	GPG estimate
1.5 Additional Navigator	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	GPG estimate
1.6 Office / Data Manager	\$0	\$0	\$76,032	From personnel document
1.7 Contract Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	From personnel document
2. Communications and IT	\$56,700	\$56,700	\$56,700	
2.1 Telecommunications	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$200 per month
2.2 Internet Service	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$150 per month
2.3 Outcome Monitoring Systems	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500	Estimate from Social Solutions (Annual License Fees for software)
2.4 Communications	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	GPG estimate. Includes marketing and outreach
2.5 Translation/Interpretation Services	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	GPG Estimate
3. Consultants and Contractors	\$50,000	\$70,000	\$90,000	
3.1 Program and Financial Development and Support	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	Could potentially include strategic planning, grant writing, program development, and space planning services.
3.2. Monitoring and Evaluation	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$40,000	Outside monitoring and evaluation of FJC program outcomes.
4. Facility Rental Cost	\$521,700	\$603,000	\$680,250	
4.1 Facility Rental	\$521,700	\$603,000	\$680,250	Based on square footage
Subtotal:	\$740,651	\$972,288	\$1,265,571	
Total Year 1 Costs	\$1,456,676	\$1,778,538	\$2,165,071	Includes a full year of operations.
Annual Costs (Rent + Operating Costs)	\$740,651	\$972,288	\$1,265,571	

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Square Footage Calculator**

Summary	SqFt	FTE
Scenario 1	11,045	86
Scenario 2	12,005	96
Scenario 3	13,205	105

	SqFt	FTE	SqFt/FTE	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Source
City of Seattle Police Department							
Domestic Violence and Elder Abuse Unit, Victim Support Team							
Detectives Cubes	1360	17	80	X	X	X	Provided by SPD 08/01/13
Sergeants Office	240	2	120	X	X	X	
Victim Services Team Manager	120	1	120	X	X	X	
Victim Services Team Supervisor	120	1	120	X	X	X	
Lieutenant Office	180	1	180	X	X	X	
Administrative Specialist Cubes	160	2	80	X	X	X	
Advocate Cubes	320	4	80	X	X	X	
VST Volunteer	240	3	80	x	x	x	
Evidence Room	160			X	X	X	
Locker Rooms/Shower/Toilets (Men)	400			X	X	X	
Locker Rooms/Shower/Toilets (Women)	400			X	X	X	
Computer Room	100			X	X	X	
VST File Storage	180			X	X	X	
DV File Storage	180			X	X	X	
Patrol Officer Work Stations	160	2	80	X	X	X	
Prosecutors/Law Department							
King County Prosecuting Attorney's Offices							
Domestic Violence Unit							
Manager	240	2	120	X	X	X	

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Square Footage Calculator**

	SqFt	FTE	SqFt/FTE	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Source
Trial DPA	600	5	120	X	X	X	FTE Provided by King County Prosecutor's Office, square footage estimated based on City Attorney's needs
PAO-City Attorney DV Liaison	120	1	120	X	X	X	
Filing DPA	120	1	120	X	X	X	
Negotiating DPA	120	1	120	X	X	X	
Paralegals	160	2	80	X	X	X	
County Advocate	120	1	120	X	X	X	
VAWA STOP Grant Coordinator	120	1	120	X	X	X	
Protection Order Advocacy Program							
Manager	120	1	120	X	X	X	FTE Provided by King County Prosecutor's Office, square
Advocate	480	4	120	X	X	X	
Elder Crimes Unit							
Elder Crimes Prosecutor	240	2	120	X	X	X	Provided by SPD 08/12/13
Elder Crimes Administrative	80	1	80	X	X	X	
Seattle City Attorney's Offices							
Assistant City Attorney's Offices	840	7	120	X	X	X	
Paralegal/Investigator Cubes	80	1	80	X	X	X	

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Square Footage Calculator**

	SqFt	FTE	SqFt/FTE	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Source
Interns Cubes	128	2	64	X	X	X	Provided by SPD 08/01/13
Victim Advocate's Offices	960	8	120	X	X	X	
Case Preparation Admin Specialists Cubes	192	3	64	X	X	X	
Other							
Hoteling Office	120			X	X	X	Provided by SPD 08/01/13
File Room	400			X	X	X	
Filing Desk	225			X	X	X	
Additional FJC and Community Staff							
Center Coordinator	180	1	180	X	X	X	Provided by SPD 08/01/13
Lead Navigator	120	1	120		X	X	GPG Estimate
Additional Navigators	200	1	200			X	
Office/Data Manager	120	1	120			X	
Child Care Providers Office	120	2	60	X	X	X	
Community Advocate Cubes	560	7	80	X	X	X	
Community Advocate Cubes	400	5	80		X	X	
Community Advocate Cubes	400	5	80			X	Provided by SPD 08/01/13
Mental Health Provider Office	240	2	120			X	
Civil Legal Services Attorney Offices	360	3	120		X	X	
Civil Legal Services Paralegal Cube	80	1	80		X	X	
Client Computer Room	200			X	X	X	
Client Protection Order Kiosk	80			X	X	X	
Medical Assessment Room	120					X	
Medical Assistant Staff Office	120					X	
Grant Writer	120			X	X	X	

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Current Costs**

Agency	Current Space (square feet)	Cost per square foot/year	Total Cost
City Attorney's Office	4,971	\$30	\$149,130
SPD	4,138	\$29	\$121,988
King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office	4,128	\$30	\$123,840
		Total:	\$394,958

Note: The cost per square foot/year figure is approximate for the City Attorney's Office and the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office

Note: The Current Space occupied by the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office is approximate

**Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis
Cost Projections - Year One Expense Phases**

Seattle FJC Scenario Planning: Projected Annual Operating and One-Time Capital Investments by Year One Quarter

This represents one model for phasing in the operating and capital expenses for a FJC over the first year of center operations.

Scenario	Scenario 1 - Initial Co-location	Scenario 2 - Core Operations	Scenario 3 - Comprehensive Services
Quarter 1			
Operating Expenses	\$11,087	\$17,214	\$25,593
Capital Expenses	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$15,000
Quarter 2			
Operating Expenses	\$29,890	\$66,348	\$121,469
Capital Expenses	\$66,603	\$70,625	\$74,950
Quarter 3			
Operating Expenses	\$29,890	\$66,348	\$121,469
Capital Expenses	\$501,218	\$564,375	\$629,650
Quarter 4			
Operating Expenses	\$29,890	\$66,348	\$121,469
Capital Expenses	\$143,205	\$161,250	\$179,900
Total:	\$816,781	\$1,022,508	\$1,289,499
Total Operating:	\$100,756	\$216,258	\$389,999
Total Capital:	\$716,025	\$806,250	\$899,500

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

Attachment 5: Family Justice Center Promising Practices

ATTACHMENT 5: FAMILY JUSTICE CENTER PROMISING PRACTICES

During the President's Family Justice Center Initiative, and in subsequent evaluations, focus groups, client feedback surveys, and national Promising Practices Conferences, the following ten FJC promising practices were identified.¹

1. **Co-located, Multi-disciplinary Services for Victims of Family Violence and Their Children Increase Safety and Support.** In the Family Justice Center model, partners to be co-located often include: law enforcement officers; prosecutors; probation officers; military advocates (if applicable); community-based victim advocates; civil attorneys; medical professionals; and staff members from diverse community-based organizations. Including other partners, such as a Chaplain's Program, is strongly encouraged in order to meet the expressed needs of clients experiencing trauma from family violence.
2. **Proactive Policing and Prosecution Policies in Family Justice Center Communities Increase Accountability for Offenders.** Each Family Justice Center community has law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies that emphasize the importance of arrest, prosecution, and long-term accountability for family violence offenders.
3. **Policies Incidental to Arrest/Enforcement Reduce Re-victimization of Victims.** Each Family Justice Center community should have a demonstrated history of addressing common problems in communities, such as dual and mutual arrest. No jurisdiction has policies that require a victim to pay costs for obtaining a restraining order if the victim is financially unable to afford such costs.
4. **Victim Safety/Advocacy Must Be the Highest Priority in the Family Justice Center Service Delivery Model.** Each Family Justice Center site has readily identifiable processes as well as the staff needed to assess and provide for victim safety during the intervention process. All Family Justice Center sites have policies in place to ensure, to every possible extent, security for staff and clients at the Family Justice Center. Site security and victim safety policies and procedures must be considered during FJC design.
5. **Victim Confidentiality Must Be a Priority.** All Family Justice Center sites have policies and procedures that provide for victim confidentiality to the extent required by law. No private, non-profit victim advocacy or shelter organization should be required to compromise their own victim safety and confidentiality procedures in order to collaborate with a Family Justice Center. Relevant victim information should be shared among agencies working in partnership to protect the client, but only after informed consent procedures are implemented.
6. **Offenders Must Be Prohibited From Accessing On-site Services at Centers.** No criminal defendants should be provided services at a Family Justice Center. Family Justice Center sites are oriented towards victims and their children. Off-site services for offenders should be central to any community's response to domestic violence; but they should not be available on-site at a Family Justice Center. Domestic violence victims with a previous history of violence or with a current incident in which the victim is the alleged perpetrator are assessed on a case-by-case basis for eligibility for services at a Family Justice Center site. Procedures also must be created to ensure availability of off-site services for victims in the event that a current or prior criminal conviction prevents them from receiving services at a Family Justice Center site.

¹ The President's Family Justice Center Initiative Best Practices, Office on Violence Against Women, United States Department of Justice, 2007.

7. **Community History of Domestic Violence Specialization Increases the Success of Collaboration in the Family Justice Center Model.** Every Family Justice Center community should have a history of specialization of services in their community. Specialization generally refers to specially trained advocates, police officers, prosecutors, judges, court support personnel, medical professionals, and other professionals with similar domestic violence expertise. In the absence of such a history, Family Justice Center planning should include provision of intensive training for all proposed partners and staff, with an emphasis on victim safety, victim advocacy, and partner collaboration in the co-located services model.
8. **Strong Support from Local Elected Officials and Other Local and State Government Policymakers Increases the Effectiveness and Sustainability of Family Justice Centers.** All new FJC communities should demonstrate strong local support from those in positions of authority within the community in order to enhance their capacity to build strong, sustainable financial bases.
9. **Strategic Planning Is Critical to Short-term and Long-term Success in the Family Justice Center Service Delivery Model.** Each Family Justice Center site should implement a strategic planning process to ensure the development of the program, the sustainability of the program, and to identify local funding options for future operations. A history of local funding is strong evidence of possible future support. Local revenues used to fund specialized intervention professionals demonstrate the commitment of local elected officials and policymakers to support domestic violence intervention and prevention work.
10. **Strong/Diverse Community Support Increases Resources for Victims and Their Children.** All Family Justice Center sites need strong, diverse community support. Strategic planning efforts that include developing and maintaining support from local and state government, business, labor, diverse community-based social service organizations, and faith-based organizations increase the resources available to victims and their children at a Family Justice Center and thereby increase safety and support.

The California FJC statewide evaluation has identified several additional promising practices that contribute to the successful operation of Family Justice Centers.² These include:

1. **Strong Leadership and Collaboration Skills on the Part of FJC Directors.** Working effectively together with partners is what creates the benefits of co-location for FJC clients. Because many partner agencies and staff have not worked collaboratively together in the past, or have a history of negative interactions, it is particularly important that the leadership of the FJC possess the skills to foster collaboration.
2. **Partner Agencies Work in the Same Direction, Emphasize Relationship Building, and Acknowledge Different Professional Cultures.** Again, the benefits that accrue from co-location are a direct result of the strength and quality of the relationships between the partners. The extent to which partner agencies pursue common goals and invest in strengthening their connections with one another is closely tied to the success of their work together. Recognizing the differences in professional culture that result from substantially different missions and goals can help to facilitate the process of relationship building.

² “Final Evaluation Results-Phase II California Family Justice Initiative-Statewide Evaluation,” EMT Associates, April 2013, p. 62.

Seattle Family Justice Center Feasibility Analysis

Attachment 6: Summary of Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement Benefits

Attachment 6: FJC Feasibility Analysis: Summary of Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement Outcomes

Family Justice Centers (FJCs) seek to reduce incidents of domestic violence and improve services to victims through a coordinated approach to service delivery. The primary services provided are physically located together in one building, with ancillary services being easily accessible. The services are diverse and comprehensive and designed to support victim safety and offender accountability. The entire process of reporting a domestic violence incident becomes much less overwhelming for the victims and children involved (although not mandatory). This collaboration seeks to improve the quality of police investigations and ultimately to increase convictions of domestic violence perpetrators.

A Family Justice Center in Seattle would build on the existing strengths of the law enforcement and criminal justice system in Seattle including the Co-location Project, Victim Support Team, and Protection Order Advocacy Program.¹ It would encourage greater collaboration and communication between law enforcement, prosecution, community-based agencies, and other service providers in one victim-friendly location, creating a more user-friendly, efficient, and comprehensive service-delivery system for victims.

Data from existing FJCs suggest that a Family Justice Center in Seattle has the potential to yield significant criminal justice outcomes (in addition to increased safety for victims).² These include:

- Increased numbers of successful prosecutions;
- Reduced domestic violence aggravated assault and homicide;
- Reduced case dismissals; and
- Reduced recidivism.³

FJCs can increase offender accountability in several ways. The co-location of police and prosecutors provides an ability to exchange information and increase collaboration on filed cases. Providing coordinated services that reduce the victim's dependence on the offender increases the victim's independence from the offender and, potentially, the victim's willingness to assist in holding the offender accountable. The net result will be the ability to realize a significant return on investment (ROI) through increased prosecution success, reduced numbers of case dismissals, and reduced recidivism.

In the area of case dismissals alone, the potential for ROI in Seattle is significant. Currently, 34.55% of Seattle misdemeanor cases are dismissed, a level consistent with dismissal rates in other jurisdictions that lack family justice centers.⁴ Conservative projections suggest that the impact of an FJC in reducing case dismissals would significantly enhance the investment currently being made in arrest and prosecution of perpetrators of domestic violence. High dismissal rates not only undermine victim confidence in the system, but case dismissals also significantly impact the morale of criminal justice personnel as well as survivors. The lower the level of confidence victims have in the system, the less likely they will cooperate fully in prosecution, thereby further increasing the possibility of dismissals. In addition, the research base also indicates that convictions reduce the likelihood of domestic violence recidivism.⁵

¹ See Section B.2 of Feasibility Analysis for more information on these programs

² See Section C.2.a of Feasibility Analysis for Family Justice Center Outcomes

³ While Seattle had the good fortune to not have any DV homicide in 2012 (a fact which some stakeholders attribute to the availability of excellent trauma care) there were 734 DV-related aggravated assault cases in Seattle in 2012 and 12 DV homicides in greater King County in the same year.

⁴ City of Seattle Human Services Department, Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Prevention, May 28th, 2013.

⁵ Lois A. Ventura and Gabrielle Davis, "Court Case Conviction and Recidivism," Violence Against Women, Vol. 11, No. 2, 255-277 (2005).