

**Bellingham-Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence**



**STRATEGIC PLAN**

**2008-2010**



Domestic violence is a serious problem in Whatcom County and it affects all social, economic and ethnic groups. Its roots are based on beliefs and attitudes that exist in our society and have their foundation in the abuse of power and control. Abuse is a choice and it is always the responsibility of the perpetrator.

The Bellingham-Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence (BWCCADV) is a broad-based body appointed by the lead elected officials of the governments that chartered the Commission's existence. The Commission is expressly charged with carrying out the purposes outlined in its mission statement in order to combat the serious impacts domestic violence (DV) has on Whatcom County: A list of the members of the Commission can be found in Appendix A of this document.

To maintain focus on the community it hopes to build, the Commission's vision statement is:

***“We envision a safe and non-violent community in which all people are free from physical, emotional and sexual abuse. Until that vision becomes a reality, we will assure the community makes the safety of domestic violence victims and their children a priority, while holding perpetrators of violence accountable and providing them with options and long-term support for change. We will promote understanding, sensitivity and respect within our diverse community to create non-violence through holistic, community-based solutions that empower the community to help and care for itself.”***

To achieve its vision and comply with the expectations of its charter, the Commission's mission statement is:

***“The Bellingham-Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence provides leadership in the community's effort to reduce and prevent domestic violence. To fulfill this vital mission, we:***

- ***Develop, implement and monitor a comprehensive domestic violence plan***
- ***Increase community awareness and understanding of domestic violence***
- ***Serve as an advisory body regarding domestic violence issues to local governments, service agencies and the community as a whole***
- ***Develop community benchmarks to monitor change***
- ***Promote collaboration and coordination among all institutions, systems and services that respond to victims, children, offenders and others who are impacted by domestic violence, and***

- *Serve as a community forum on domestic violence and create a mechanism for identifying issues, concerns, needs and resources.”*

### **Processes Used to Produce the Plan**

Nearing conclusion of the major components of its previous charter-required plan, the Commission launched a new strategic planning process in early 2007 to craft the plan contained in this document that will guide operations in the years 2008 through 2010. A Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) was appointed and the formal planning process was launched at a retreat of the Commissioners. (see Appendix A) The Committee retained the firm of Webster, Caballero & Associate to guide its work, inclusive of research and community input support, and to author the plan.

Both internal and external environmental scans were conducted in preparation for writing the plan. At its inaugural retreat, the Commission reviewed elements of the prior plan and identified momentum and unfinished business it wanted to see continued into the new plan. It also provided guidance on criteria by which the SPSC could assess the volume of ideas generated in the planning process for ultimate inclusion or exclusion. The Commission’s own structure and membership were examined to assess how it could best position itself to execute the final plan’s contents. Commissioners were also heavily involved in prioritizing the goal statements that emerged from the SPSC’s work and the input of stakeholders. Finally, the Commission fulfilled its responsibility of reviewing plan drafts and ultimately approving the final plan presented here.

The external scan included review of relevant studies and reports by other bodies, demonstrated best practices from other communities and the completion of a series of focus groups facilitated by Commission staff. Among the external studies, reports and best practices reviewed were:

- a. Washington State Domestic Violence Fatalities Review Report, 2006
- b. “A Closer Look...”, Women’s Funding Alliance study of women and girls in four WA counties, including Whatcom, 2007
- c. WA State Coalition Against Domestic Violence web site and resources
- d. National Coalition Against Domestic Violence website and resources
- e. Whatcom County Prosperity Project data sub-report on households reporting high importance of DV services (Cornerstone Strategies, Inc., 2007) (Appendix D)

- f. Whatcom County 2007 “Point-in-Time Count of the Homeless” Report
- g. Tacoma-Pierce County Coalition Against Domestic Violence website and resources
- h. Family Justice Center of Northwest Ohio Strategic Plan, 2005
- i. Family Justice Center Network website
- j. “Welfare on WorkFirst: Serving Domestic Violence Victims on Public Assistance in Washington State,” WA DV Coalition, 2001
- k. San Diego Coalition Against Domestic Violence website and resources

In that the Commission instructed the SPSC to put heavy emphasis on gaining diverse stakeholder input, including perspective from victims/survivors of domestic violence, DV service providers, law enforcement, elected officials and other community service professionals, the conducted focus groups were a key element of the learning upon which the new plan is based. Five (5) focus groups facilitated during July and August 2007 collected the experiences, perspectives and wisdom of DV Advocates, DV Commission members, CPS staff, and a mix of community professionals who work with victims, abusers, and their children. A total of seventy-two professionals participated in these five groups.

Four (4) focus groups were facilitated with DV victims during July and August 2007 at several local domestic violence agencies and a residential facility for youth. A total of thirty-five victims participated. A summary of the influential responses and common themes documented from both the community stakeholders and DV victims/survivors can be found in Appendix B of this document.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** From the internal scan and the external scan’s research and focus group learnings, the SPSC developed a list of problem statements that were eventually crafted into goal statements for the ‘08-10 plan (see Appendix C). While these elements shaped the Commission’s plan, they also highlighted other needs and suggestions that exceed the Commission’s scope and/or resources. The reader and other community entities are, therefore, encouraged to review both the focus group summaries and the goal statements for ways to collaboratively accomplish that which fell outside the domain of the Commission’s plan.

## **About the Plan's Format**

Much of the format containing the '08-10 plan specifics will be familiar to the reader; it simply cites the strategy or step to be executed, to whom the work is delegated, proposed activities and the timeline by which it targeted for completion. The fourth column in the plan's matrix, however, warrants explanation.

In synthesizing the scans' information, the SPSC became aware that expectations of the Commission's work fell predominantly into four clusters of impact. Some were focused on enhanced physical access to DV services, others on enhanced collaboration and/or on cross-education of providers of existing services, some on the transformation of approach in one or more mode of DV service provision, and then those that simply identified local gaps in need of closure. To assist the Commission in tracking how well it balanced these four categories of expectation, the fourth column was added to the plan's matrix. The legend for that column is, therefore:

- ◆ Enhanced Physical Access to DV Services (PA)
- ◆ Enhanced collaboration/cross-education of providers (CE)
- ◆ Transformation of an approach to direct service (TA); and
- ◆ Identified gap closure (i.e. new service) (GC)

**Bellingham-Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence  
STRATEGIC PLAN  
2008-2010**

\*Strategy Clusters Key: Enhanced Physical Access to Services (PA), Enhanced Collaboration among Providers/Education on Existing Services (CE), Transformation of Approach on Service Provision (TA), Identified Gap Closure (GC)

**I. Increase the centralization, integration and coordination of quality services to victims of domestic violence.**

Commission Strategy:	Assigned to:	Proposed Activities	Strategy Cluster*	Proposed Timeline:
(A) Conduct a feasibility study of the Family Justice Center model for our community		Workgroup established to develop a process for feasibility study. Funding identified and secured if needed. Identify stakeholders to engage in process. Conduct the feasibility study through a series of meetings. End product...determine whether or not Whatcom County wants to move forward on planning for/implementing a Family Justice Center. 6-9 months	PA	
(B) Convene a summit of (or series of events with) service providers (mental health, drug & alcohol, CPS, domestic violence and housing) to discuss coordination and integration of services across all disciplines and to set the foundation for a more coordinated and integrated service delivery model.		Talk with DV Service Providers for "buy-in"/collaboration. Identify key players. Convene community work group to identify next steps. Support implementation of next steps	CE	

integrated service delivery model.		as defined by work group.		
(C) Review Commission composition to bring appropriate representation that reflects the new coordinated and integrated service delivery model.	Executive Committee		CE	2008 and Annual

**II. Identify systemic issues that impact a community response to Domestic Violence and identify methods that have positive impacts on a community response to Domestic Violence.**

Commission Strategy:	Assigned to:	Proposed Activities	Strategy Cluster*	Proposed Timeline:
(A) Explore with the Whatcom County Coordinated Response Leadership Team any additional role for the Commission in overseeing the implementation of the “Whatcom County Coordinated Response Protocol: Domestic Violence, Children & Child Maltreatment”	Commission-decision  Staff activity	If Commission supports this role for DV Commission, discuss with Leadership Team to agree on scope of this responsibility.	CE/TA	Early 2008
(B) Develop an ongoing mechanism to ensure there is regular identification and resolution of gaps in the coordinated response to domestic violence.		Work group to assess what is in place and how to improve process of problem/gap identification. Design and implement a mechanism to address strategy. Ensure that CCR philosophy is integrated into mechanism. See III B. and C. – how do we ensure “maintenance” of best practices?	GC	
(C) Complete at least one additional Safety Audit in an area of need indicated by the community-wide approach.		Identify focus of next Audit. Secure funding for Audit. Identify scope of Audit and secure buy-in. Conduct Audit and support implementation of recommendations.	TA	
(D) Publish an annual benchmark report		Work group to provide assistance with defining scope of report, data collection and analysis.	CE/TA	Annual

(E) Conduct annual focus groups of victims/survivors to remain in touch with current issues.	Staff to ensure focus groups are conducted as part of some Commission activity.		CE/TA	Annual
(F) Assess the Commission's role in DV Awareness Month in order to balance plan-identified initiatives within available staff and volunteer hours. Whatever role the DV Commission assumes in DV Month, as much as possible, parallel DV Month activities with strategic plan initiatives.	Ed/Outreach to provide overall direction.  DV Month committee to implement with staff.		CE/TA	Annual
(G) Implement Grants to Encourage Arrest Award (July 2007 – June 2009) and enhance the domestic violence response of the criminal justice system in the five small cities of Whatcom County by hiring and overseeing a system-based advocate, and by increasing linkages with community-based domestic violence services	Staff  Some issues may need Commission input.		GC/TA/ PA/CE	2008 - 2009

**III. Increase consistent and appropriate responses to domestic violence victims/survivors from the broad array of community and institutional service providers.**

Commission Strategy:	Assigned to:	Proposed Activities:	Strategy Cluster*	Proposed Timelines
(A) Provide training and technical assistance to mental/behavioral health, drug & alcohol services providers and CPS to align their approaches with demonstrated best practices for working with DV victims/survivors.		See I. B.	TA	
(B) Identify a lead entity for maintenance of the Commission's achievements in increasing DV awareness and improved practice among medical providers		Work group to assess dv screening practices in place among health care providers. Determine process/lead entity to ensure	TA	

		efforts are sustained.		
(C) Identify a way to maintain the Commission's achievements in increasing DV awareness and improved practices among the criminal/civil legal system.		Work group to discuss need and/or methods to monitor implementation of previous audit recommendations. Work with City of Blaine to support implementation of most recent Audit. Identify other areas where maintenance of improved practices (not a result of Audit) may be needed.	TA	

**IV. Increase children and youth access to DV services and educational opportunities related to domestic violence and its prevention.**

Commission Strategy:	Assigned to:	Proposed Activities	Strategy Cluster*	Proposed Timelines
(A) Complete the initiative on school DV policies and procedures model		Work group to develop draft best practices procedures to accompany the policy in place by Meridian SD. Take model policy and procedures to Whatcom County Superintendents. Work with schools, as requested, to implement. Assist with any training efforts.	TA	Complete procedures and presentation to School Superintendents in 2008
(B) Convene local children's and youth service providers to assess needs and existing service strategies around issues of DV		Collaborate and build on any work of STAR/Whatcom County Family & Community Network. Identify key players. Convene community work group to identify gaps and areas of focus. Follow up role determined based on work group.	CE	
(C) Work with dv service providers to support and/or develop strategies to overcome barriers to increasing DV prevention education in all county school districts.		Part of IV B.?	TA/GC	

**V. Increase consistent and appropriate responses by employers to domestic violence issues in the workplace.**

Commission Strategy:	Assigned to:	Proposed Activities	Strategy Cluster*	Proposed Timelines
(A) Increase awareness and improve the skills of employers to offer consistent, appropriate responses to employees who are at-risk and/or victimized by DV.		Work group. Research model policies. Identify major employers to approach with model policies. Present model policies to SHRM. Assist with adoption of dv policies by employers identified above.	TA/GC	
(B) Increase awareness and improve the skills of area employers to offer consistent and appropriate responses to identified perpetrators of domestic violence within their employee base.		Same as above.	TA/GC	

**VI. Provide increased opportunities for the CPS professional's perspective and input to inform community DV strategy and policy formation.**

Commission Strategy:	Assigned to:	Proposed Activities	Strategy Cluster*	Proposed Timelines
(A) In conjunction with the Mayor and County Executive, appoint a representative from DSHS Child Protective Services to the Commission	Executive		GC	2008
(B) Populate Commission committees or task groups with CPS professionals, as appropriate, to insure linkages and shared perspectives related to dually served children and families.	Executive/Staff		TA/CE	Annual

**VII. Strengthen the Commission’s internal organizational development.**

Commission Strategy:	Assigned to:	Proposed Activities	Strategy Cluster*	Proposed Timelines
(A) Conduct periodic stakeholder informational presentations on trends and local progress to maintain financial support for Commission operations.	Ed/Outreach		EC	Annual
(B) Develop strategy for expanding Commission funding base to ensure sustainability	Executive		EC	2008
(C) In light of documented trends and best practices, review annually the composition of the Commission, and utilizing existing vacancies or ordinance amendments, seek appointment of individuals and institutional representatives that can provide needed perspective relevant to the trends.	Executive		GC	Annual

*The Commission should ensure that all strategies take into account populations that have either been underserved or might benefit from tailored strategies, such as those who are not proficient in English, persons with disabilities, teens, gays and lesbians, and the elderly. (This is not meant as an exclusive list.)*

**Appendix A:**  
**Bellingham-Whatcom Commission Against Domestic Violence**  
**Membership Roster**



## **Bellingham-Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence**



**January 2008**

*The Commission consists of 13 government and 14 community members. Government officials are designated by government position. Community members are selected by the Mayor and the County Executive from among members of the community who have an interest in, or are impacted by, domestic violence.*

### **(13) Designated Government Representatives**

Term Exp.	Name	Community Position
December 2011	Dennis Carlson	Selected Superintendent-Whatcom Co. School Districts
December 2011	Vacant	Designated Representative-Whatcom County Cities
December 2011	Candy Petersen	Designated Representative of DSHS/DCFS
December 2011	Michael Knapp	Selected Police Chief-Whatcom County Cities
N/A	Bruce Van Glubt	Whatcom County District Court & Probation Administrator
N/A	Regina Delahunt	Whatcom County Health Department Director
N/A	William Elfo	Whatcom County Sheriff
N/A	Randall Carroll	Bellingham Police Chief
N/A	Dave McEachran	Whatcom County Prosecutor
N/A	Jon Komorowski	Whatcom County Public Defender
N/A	Linda Storck	Bellingham Municipal Court Administrator
N/A	Joan Hoisington	Bellingham City Attorney

### **(7) County Community Appointments**

Term Exp.	Name	Community Position
December 2011	Vacant	Major Employer
December 2011	Karen Burke	Domestic Violence Victim Service Provider

December 2010	Joy Monjure	Community at Large
December 2010	Nikki Finkbonner	Human Service Provider
December 2009	Dr. Chi-Na Kim	Health Care Provider
December 2009	Sheri Emerson	Human Service Provider
December 2008	Cynthia Bauleke	Community at Large

**(7) City Community Appointments**

Term Exp.	Name	Community Position
December 2011	Cindy Enger	Community at Large
December 2011	Kirsten Hammer	Domestic Violence Victim Service Provider
December 2010	Rebecca Johnson	Health Care Provider
December 2010	Anna Carey	Major Employer
December 2009	Byron Manering	Human Service Provider
December 2009	Karen Summers	Community at Large
December 2008	Shannon Meyer	Human Service Provider

**Strategic Plan Steering Committee:**

Rebecca Johnson, Chair  
 Cynthia Bauleke  
 Regina Delahunt  
 Sheri Emerson  
 Kathy Washatka (former-Commission member)

**Appendix B:**  
**Focus Groups' Responses and Common Themes**

[Note: What follows is a compilation of responses obtained from four focus groups facilitated with victims during July and August 2007 at several local domestic violence agencies and a residential facility for youths. A total of thirty-five victims participated.]

### **MAIN THEMES - Victim Responses**

1. We want to learn more about what victims of domestic violence need in order to deal with the violence in their lives.
  - Where did you go/to whom did you turn, to get help?
    - Typical responses here were the DV agencies, law enforcement, family and friends, other non-profits in the community
  - What happened that was helpful?
    - Typical responses were the supportive, non-judgmental attitudes and the array of DV Advocacy services. Also mentioned were basic services - food, shelter.
  - What happened that was NOT helpful?
    - “Bad attitudes” – judgmental, blaming, hostile, non-responsive professionals and/or agencies. CPS was mentioned in all groups as being difficult to maintain a connection with.
    - Difficulty navigating the array of service providers – having to go to a different place for each different need.
    - Insufficient understanding of the dynamics of DV on the part of some professionals, causing victims to be put at risk or re-abused in some way by their abuser
2. Were there people in your everyday life you turned to for information /support/advice that you haven't already mentioned? If so, what/who were they and what happened?
  - AA/NA meetings/sponsor, a fellow DV victim, mental health counselor
3. If you have children, what services did they receive?
  - Big Brothers/Big Sisters
  - Counseling
  - Basic services such as Food Bank, free clothing, free breakfasts
  - Day care

How well did these services work for them and for you?

- ❑ Generally, victims gave favorable reviews of the DV agencies and other social service agencies that provided services for them and their children. One social service agency's staff member, however, did advise a victim whose child was having difficulties that she should return to her abuser. These agencies helped by helping their kids to heal and providing childcare.

Did they need any services they did NOT get? If not, why not?

- ❑ Schools were mentioned more than once as being difficult to work with – labeling children as “bad seed”, not responding to parent requests for assistance/services such as tutoring
- ❑ Emergency day care (It is not uncommon for a victim to have to respond to an immediate request for her time, such as attend a job interview, etc.)
- ❑ Counseling for the parent to assist the child with PTSD symptoms

4. Is there anything else you would like us to understand about what is most helpful for victims of domestic violence and their children?

- ❑ Having someone who will listen, believe them, and treat them respectfully. DV Advocates are seen as lifelines.
- ❑ Understanding the primacy of the need for victim/child safety
- ❑ The responses depended on the victims' current situation. Those victims still in transitional living longed for stable housing. Those victims currently dealing with CPS longed for a connection with this agency that they could trust.

5. What are your thoughts about what keeps others like yourself from getting what they need, to deal with the violence?

- ❑ FEAR – of a multitude of realistic contingencies (violence, rejection, being alone, etc.)
- ❑ Lack of knowledge about DV – what it is, what resources are out there
- ❑ Insufficient housing resources
- ❑ Perception the community safety net is insufficient and will not keep them safe
- ❑ All the defenses common for victims: denial, shame, minimization, rationalization, accommodation
- ❑ Stay for the children's sake

6. What is your advice to others like yourself? What would you want them to know that would help them?

- ❑ Lots of enthusiasm for this question – basically, a variety of responses encouraging others to gather up their courage and leave, it will get better, do it for their kids if not themselves, etc.

7. Is there anything else we haven't thought to ask you that you think we should know?

- Mostly a re-iteration of concerns/recommendations mentioned earlier: more emergency shelter beds, problems communicating with CPS, agencies should coordinate services in a more integrated fashion; educate the public and our children on DV

### **Summary of Themes – Victim Responses**

1. DV-related services are under-marketed. Victims reported they didn't really know much about them until they needed to use them. The problem is worse for the Teens who were interviewed, who didn't get help until they were in really deep trouble and their behavior got the community involved.
2. There is an overarching perception on the part of these victims that the rest of the world does not see them as equals. Instead they expect to be shamed, judged, and blamed, not be listened to/believed, and to have everything be hard and complicated. When a professional does NOT treat them in this way, they never forget it. It makes a huge impression.
3. Most of these women have multiple problems – typically substance abuse, mental health, and domestic violence. There is a perception the services are not coordinated among these three professions.
4. DV Advocates are perceived as a godsend – a highly respected and valued resource.
5. There are still (and always?) those professionals who are not trained on DV dynamics and not sensitized to victim safety issues.
6. Housing resources are seemingly insufficient. Waiting lists exist for the transitional housing facilities, causing a back up at the emergency shelter, which then allows women to stay longer than the stated 30 days, etc. One victim stated this shortage causes some women to not leave their abusers, as there is nowhere for them to go.
7. Working with one person who could help coordinate multiple needs was considered ideal but not typical.
8. Both victims and DV Advocates viewed ongoing training for all stakeholders - especially the courts - as very important.
9. There were many who reported having problems working with CPS in particular. The main themes were lack of social worker follow through, difficulties making and maintaining a connection with the worker, and frequent changes in workers.

[Note: What follows is a compilation of responses obtained from five focus groups facilitated during July and August 2007 with DV Advocates, DV Commission members, CPS staff, and a mix of community professionals who work with victims, abusers, and their children. A total of seventy-two professionals participated.]

### Themes – Stakeholder Responses

8. Imagine the “ideal world” scenario in which Whatcom County is providing the most effective coordinated community response system possible to domestic violence: i.e. victims achieve maximum safety, their children are effectively protected, and abusers are always held accountable. What, specifically, would this look like?
  - Uniform standards/consistency in response: law enforcement, courts
  - Family Justice Center or integrated service delivery model of some sort
  - An enlightened citizenry through education: Primary Prevention efforts to socialize our children towards non-violence; DV curriculum offered in the schools; community media campaigns; a no-tolerance attitude
  - Enlightened Institutions: well trained professionals that coordinate services. The agencies mentioned were Probation, LE, Courts, CPS, schools, non-profits
  - Safe, adequate, affordable housing
  - Abuser accountability – no plea bargaining; new jail; good communication between BIPs and other stakeholders
  - Sufficient amounts of \$\$ to provide adequate housing, mental health services
  
9. What do we already do well now; what’s already in place and working effectively?
  - The array of DV services was mentioned here: Advocates, shelters, etc.
  - LE received kudos
  - DV Commission is highly regarded
  - Prosecutors meetings are a good place to share information and coordinate cases
  - Some collaborative relationships that work well were mentioned: DV Advocacy agencies and BHA, CPS and LE, WWU and DVSAS
  - DV Court
  
10. Why does what we already do well, work? What are our strengths?
  - “We talk to each other;” “We value and practice collaboration” was the overriding theme of these responses
  - Fine leadership provided by the DV Commission coupled with responsive institutions committed to doing better
  - Community commitment from top leaders on down; rich history of activism

- ❑ Respect for the work being done by DV Advocates

## 11. Look at what we want and what we have. What is missing?

Immediate fix: what could we strengthen now or in the near term?

- ❑ Training/education was mentioned a lot – in the schools, for stakeholders, etc.
- ❑ Expand collaborative relationships; enhance our capacity for coordinated response
- ❑ Work on the housing issue
- ❑ Expand DV Advocates programs: more are needed in courts, at the small cities, at the hospital ER, with Law Enforcement agencies/Prosecutors' offices, etc.

Long term: what could we strive for as a long-term objective?

- ❑ Family Justice Center or some variation on that theme: e.g. a multidisciplinary team of specialists of some sort. This concept was far and away the most popular idea
- ❑ Integrated services for multiple problem victims/abusers
- ❑ Community-wide education
- ❑ Highly trained professionals
- ❑ Evidenced-based practices and quality assurance function in place
- ❑ Expand the work done by DV and Law Enforcement to other stakeholders in some way. Ideas included to expand doing audits beyond criminal justice agencies; focus with equal intensity on health care providers, etc.
- ❑ \$\$ to implement all these ideas

### Summary of Stakeholder Themes

1. There is great confidence this community can accomplish what it sets out to do.
2. The DV Commission and the DV Advocacy agencies are highly regarded, and the collaborative relationships that exist are seen as productive and working well.
3. A family justice center (FJC) was recommended in every meeting and received lots of priority votes. Those participants who hadn't heard of a FJC described it in some other way.

4. There is a desire to have greater consistency in how this community intervenes with these families. One person said there need to be uniform standards in how we respond; another said there should be better collaboration among agencies to ensure victims experience consistent responses, to enable them to trust the community will respond in a predictable fashion; someone recommended compliance monitoring; another complained about how different courts provide really different outcomes.
5. Education is highly touted as a form of primary prevention as well as the mechanism for ensuring our community has knowledgeable, skilled professionals. The goal is to create an enlightened citizenry and institutions.
6. Adequate and affordable housing is a concern. [Note: This concern was mentioned in almost every focus group, for both victims and professionals.]
7. I was impressed by the great ideas our stakeholders have for improving the way we work with this population. Several of the recommendations are very do-able.
8. Some stakeholders are not up to date on what others are doing and/or have misconceptions about what others are doing. Examples include:
  - ✓ A few mental health providers expressed concern that the treatment being provided to batterers is only "anger management."
  - ✓ Someone stated (erroneously) that a support group being provided by one of the DV agencies includes only victims who have chosen to stay with their abusers.

In fact after the DV Advocates' focus group, the attendees decided to hold a resource fair in the fall so everyone could learn more about one another's services. Is there some built-in way for stakeholders to stay better informed about one another?

**Appendix C:  
Community Goal Statements Derived from 2007 Internal &  
External Scans**

**BWCCADV  
Strategic Planning  
Goal Statements**

Based on the community assessment information, the following goal statements were created by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. Taking into account prioritization by Commission members and appropriate fit with the Commission mission, only a portion of the listed goals was included as elements of the strategic plan. Note: the goal statements are not listed in any rank order.

1. Increase DV prevention education in K-12 settings.
2. Increase services for children of DV victims in the schools and elsewhere in the community.
3. Increase awareness about DV resources among Whatcom County teens.
4. Reduce DV and other human service providers' lack information about what each other offers in terms of programming and services.
5. Increase the presence of the CPS professionals' perspective and input in community DV strategy and policy groups, including the Commission.
6. Reduce inconsistent, inappropriate responses from community and institutional service providers received by DV victims, which often leaves them with feelings/perceptions of being "less than" others.
7. Increase the availability of immediate and affordable housing for survivors of DV.
8. Reduce barriers to economic security, such as victims' skill mismatch with local markets, lack of livable wage jobs and costs of child care, to increase the wherewithal for victims to leave their abusers.
9. Improve the ways mental health and substance abuse services are tailored for DV victims and increase the access to such services.
10. Increase the number of DV advocates for victims in need of services.
11. Increase the Commission's longitudinal data about the impact of its past initiatives to enable closing of the "loop" of continuous quality improvement.
12. Develop a community clearinghouse for capturing raised systemic or direct service issues pertaining to DV so cumulative needs or developing trends that can be the catalysts for change are not lost.
13. Centralize a broad range of services needed by individuals or families affected by DV and integrate/better coordinate those services.
14. Increase safety awareness and consistent, appropriate responses by employers to DV victimization.

15. Increase the understanding that mental health clinicians and DV advocates have about the other's roles and services.
16. The population affected by DV is not monolithic; increase tailored strategies for persons with disabilities, teens, limited-English speaking families and other sub-populations that are not always available in our communities.

**Appendix D:**  
**Whatcom County Prosperity Project data sub-report on**  
**households reporting high importance of DV services**  
**(Cornerstone Strategies, Inc., 2007)**

# Whatcom Prosperity Project

## Experiences of Poverty in Whatcom County

September 13, 2007      SUB-SAMPLE REPORT:

### Domestic Violence

Sponsored by:

**Bellingham-Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence**

**And**

**Whatcom Coalition for Healthy Communities**

Research and reporting by:

**Cornerstone Strategies, Inc.**



## Table of Contents

<b>Survey Respondents: Who Are They? .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Domestic Violence Sub-sample Report .....	3
Geographic Distribution.....	4
Gender and Age.....	4
Household Composition .....	4
Race, Ethnicity, and Language .....	5
Disability Status.....	6
Duration of Residence in Whatcom County .....	7
<b>Employment, Education and Income .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Income.....	8
Poverty Status .....	10
Job Skills Training and Living Wage Jobs .....	12
Financial Situation .....	13
Educational Attainment .....	16
<b>Housing.....</b>	<b>17</b>
Housing Type .....	17
Housing Cost Burden and Assistance .....	18
Housing Condition .....	21
Housing Situations .....	21
<b>Health and Healthcare.....</b>	<b>23</b>
Overall Health Status .....	23
Health Insurance .....	24
Primary Care .....	25
Health Information .....	27

<b>Parenting and Childcare .....</b>	<b>32</b>
Child Health Insurance .....	32
Child Characteristics .....	32
Childcare .....	33
<b>Food and Nutrition .....</b>	<b>36</b>
Food Security and Assistance.....	36
Accessing Community Resources .....	37
<b>Transportation .....</b>	<b>38</b>
Transportation Challenges .....	38
Public Transit Use .....	40
Barriers to Public Transit Use .....	40
<b>Community Services Assessment .....</b>	<b>41</b>
Service gaps analysis .....	41
<b>Other Respondent Comments .....</b>	<b>48</b>

### Survey Respondents: Who Are They?

The Whatcom Prosperity Project (WPP) was convened initially in summer 2006 by the Whatcom Coalition for Healthy Communities. The goal of this effort has been to bring people together across the different “silos” of service provision to address issues of poverty in Whatcom County and to make action recommendations around policies, resources, service coordination, and community engagement and awareness. The process of talking to people about their experiences and needs became a critical first step to making effective recommendations. In response, the group launched a needs assessment project to provide both quantitative type data as well as more in-depth qualitative data. The intent of the study is to provide results of this needs assessment process with low-income families that involved a client intercept paper survey of 610 households (countywide), focus groups and face-to-face interviews with 105 key informants, and an online survey of service providers.

### **Domestic Violence Sub-sample Report**

An indirect indicator for households affected by domestic violence (DV) is used to select the sub-sample for this report using only the quantitative survey data. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of “domestic violence shelter and/or counseling services” to “your household now,” from 1 (not important) to 5 (extremely important). The subject of this report is the sub-sample consisting of the 89 respondents who reported that domestic violence services are extremely important to their household at the time of the survey. By singling out this extreme group, we are more likely to target the sub-sample that is most directly suffering from domestic violence and its adverse affects.


These particular respondents were recruited to participate in the survey through various service access points throughout Whatcom County in early 2007, including nine food banks, two transitional housing providers, DSHS Community Service Office, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Services, Opportunity Council, and five other specialty social service providers.

What follows is a focused examination of this particular population, from now on referred to as either households with extreme DV needs, DV cases, DV respondents, or the sub-population. To put these findings in context, we also make comparisons to the whole sample of 610 WPP respondents to increase our understanding of the concerns and needs of the low-income domestic violence population in Whatcom County.

This sub-sample report was requested by The Bellingham-Whatcom County Commission Against Domestic Violence to inform its strategic planning process. For information about WPP project methodology, goals, and objectives, please refer to the project’s main report, which can be found at: <http://www.whatcomcoalition.org/pdf/wpprpt.presumitdraft.pdf>

**Geographic Distribution**

Almost two thirds (64%) of our sub-sample live in Bellingham (Figure 1). At first, it may seem that Bellingham low-income households are overrepresented in this sample because Bellingham has only 39% of Whatcom County’s population (based on 2005 Census Bureau data). However, in 2005, nearly two-thirds (64%) of all persons living at the poverty level in Whatcom County resided in Bellingham city limits.



**Figure 1: Geographic distribution of survey respondents**

**Gender and Age**

Survey respondents in general were far more likely to be female (65%) than male, and respondents with extreme DV needs were even more likely to be female (78%). Our sub-sample ranged in age from 21 to 68 years old, with a mean age of 40.8 and a median of 40.5 years, only slightly younger than all respondents with a mean age of 42.4 and a median of 42.00 years.


**Household Composition**

Household size ranged from 1 (36%) to 9 (1%) with a mean household size of 2.7 and a median household size of 2 for respondents with extreme DV needs. Our full sample had a very similar HH size averages and distribution.

Of the sub-sample households, 51% had one or more children under the age of 18 living at home, and out of these parenting households, 49% (N=20) were single parent households. Out of these single parent households with extreme DV needs, 50% had two or more children, and 25% had three or more. The general low-income population is less likely to be parenting (43%), and these parents are less likely to be single (36%).

**Race, Ethnicity, and Language**


About three out of four respondents from households with extreme DV needs are white (74%), 15% are Native Americans, 3% African American, 3% Asian and 1% are Hawaiian or Pacific Islanders. 13% of DV cases identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino (Figure 2). These proportions of race and ethnic groups are not significantly different for the full WPP sample.



**Figure 2: Respondent race and ethnicity**

While the vast majority speak English (87.1%), in many households with extreme DV needs a language other than English is spoken (Figure 3). Other languages include Spanish (9.4%), Russian or Ukrainian (1.2%), and 1% or fewer spoke Punjabi, German, Arabic,


Farsi, Filipino, Swedish, or American Sign Language (ASL). These results are very similar for both the DV population and the general low-income population.



**Figure 3: Respondent language usually spoken at home**

**Disability Status**

Survey respondents were asked if anyone in their household has difficulty with certain activities due to physical, mental or emotional conditions lasting six months or more (Figure 4). The difference between the self-reported disability status of the two samples is stark. The sub-sample is more likely to have someone in the household with difficulties learning, remembering, and concentrating (45% compared to 33%), working at a job or business (38% compared to 35%), going outside the home (24% compared to 16%), dressing, bathing, and getting around (10% compared to 8%), and other disability (19% compared to 16%). This may indicate that households with disabled persons are more vulnerable to domestic violence, or that domestic violence fosters disability. Either way, the intercept between disability and violence within the home needs further attention.



**Figure 4: Percent households with a person whose disability limits one or more activities**

**Duration of Residence in Whatcom County**

Respondents with extreme DV needs have on average lived in Whatcom County for a shorter time than the full WPP sample. The mean and median number of years lived here are 16 and 8 years respectively, (compared to 18 and 13 years for all cases). However, nearly two thirds (65%) of the sub-sample have lived in Whatcom County for four years or longer.

Employment, Education and Income


**Income**

The mean monthly income from all sources for households with extreme DV needs is \$803 and the median monthly income is \$623. Monthly household incomes ranged from \$0 to \$3,800 per month. This income range was significantly lower than for the general low-income population which had a mean income of \$990, a median of \$800 and a maximum of \$5,000 per month. Income also varies by household size, ranging from a median income of \$620 for single-person households to \$2,250 for an eight-person household (Table 1).

**Table 1: Respondent household income by household size**

Household Size	Number of households	Mean monthly income	Median monthly income	Minimum	Maximum
<b>1</b>	27	\$ 571	\$ 620	\$ -	\$ 1,500
<b>2</b>	15	\$ 638	\$ 450	\$ -	\$ 1,500
<b>3</b>	11	\$ 883	\$ 900	\$ 320	\$ 1,500
<b>4</b>	10	\$ 1,113	\$ 900	\$ 583	\$ 3,000
<b>5</b>	6	\$ 933	\$ 780	\$ 200	\$ 2,000
<b>6</b>	2	\$ 2,175	\$ 2,175	\$ 1,350	\$ 3,000
<b>8</b>	2	\$ 2,250	\$ 2,250	\$ 700	\$ 3,800
<b>9</b>	1	\$ 399	\$ 399	\$ 399	\$ 399
<b>Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>\$ 820</b>	<b>\$ 627</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 3,800</b>

Only 43% of households with extreme DV needs identify wages as a source of household income, much less than the 53% of all respondents who did so (Figure 5). The sub-population is more likely to receive SSI (26%), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, referred to as TANF (25%), and child support (10%), than the general low-income population, and about the same for Social Security (18%) and General Assistance, referred to as GAU or GAX (11%).



**Figure 5: Household income sources**

Having established that DV respondents have a significantly lower household income than the full WPP sample (mean of \$803/month compared to \$990), we wanted to know how much this income difference was an effect of education attainment, and how much could be accounted for by DV status alone. We began by condensing the educational attainment variable from eight categories to three categories: (1) high school or less; (2) vocational school, some college, or two-year degree; and (3) four-year degree or higher. A linear regression analysis allowed us to examine the effect of DV status on income (hypothesized to be negative) while controlling for the effect of education on income (hypothesized to be positive).

Both of our hypotheses were supported by the analysis. First, as is commonly found, the more education one has, the higher one's income. The difference in average monthly income between each of these three education levels was about \$126 per month, significant at the .05 level ( $p=.018$ ). Our second hypothesis, that households with extreme DV needs will have a lower average monthly income is also supported at the .05 significance level ( $p=.017$ ). Even when controlling for educational level of the respondent, these households still earn about \$229 less per month. One thing to remember about these findings is that the reported annual income and DV status are household measures, while the educational attainment is an individual respondent measure. As with all correlations, without longitudinal data it is difficult to determine causality. We do not know if poverty causes domestic violence or domestic violence causes poverty, just that they are associated.

### **Poverty Status**


Adjusting for family size, the proportion of DV respondents who report household income at or below the federal poverty level (FPL) is 85% (Table 2); those households at or below 125% of FPL account for 92% of respondent households. DV households are more likely to fall into both these categories than the full WPP sample, 74% of which are at or below the FPL and 86% of which are at or below 125% of FPL.

**Table 2: Low-income respondent households by poverty status and household size**

Household size	Number of respondent households	Federal Poverty Level (FPL) threshold Income per month (\$)	% of DV importance low-income households at or below FPL threshold	Monthly income eligibility limits at 125% of FPL (\$)	% of DV importance low-income households at or below 125% FPL
1	27	\$ 851	85%	1,064	89%
2	15	\$ 1,141	80%	1,426	93%
3	11	\$ 1,431	91%	1,789	100%
4	10	\$ 1,721	90%	2,151	90%
5	6	\$ 2,011	100%	2,514	100%
>5	5	\$ 2,301	60%	2,876	80%
<b>All households</b>	<b>74</b>		<b>85%</b>		<b>92%</b>


### **Job Skills Training and Living Wage Jobs**

Almost three-quarters of households with extreme DV needs (74%) reported that there are one or more working adults in their household; only 8% include workers under age 16 (Figure 6). This finding is confusing because it is inconsistent with income source reporting above. Only 43% of households reported having household income from wages or a job. One possible explanation for the discrepancy is that individual survey respondents reported wage income only if they themselves had received wage income in the previous 12 months (rather than think about others in their household who may have also had wage income).



**Figure 6: Number of persons per household with extreme DV needs who worked for pay in the previous 12 months by age group (N=70)**


More than two-thirds of survey respondents for both groups (71% DV cases, 70% all cases) said that getting or keeping a good job had been a problem for someone in their household. Top reasons for difficulty getting or keeping a good job for respondents with extreme DV needs include: physical or mental disability (40%), too few jobs (38%), lacking the right kinds of skills (32%), and lack of transportation (32%). The same barriers held true for the general low-income population, with an even greater emphasis on the scarcity of jobs and inadequate job skills (Figure 7).



**Figure 7: Barriers to getting or keeping a good job**


**Financial Situation**

Among a list of seven household financial situations, respondents from households with extreme DV needs most frequently reported not being able to save for unexpected expenses (63%), having debt from medical or dental care (53%), and having fines or legal fees that are hard to pay off (32%). The general low-income sample had the same top three situations, in slightly lesser proportions (Figure 8). The only situation that the sub-population was less likely to experience is having built up too much credit card debt (15% compared to 22% of all cases).



**Figure 8: Respondent financial situations**


Survey respondents with extreme household DV needs commonly said that they have recently had to borrow money from family or friends (73%) and that they had been pressured to pay bills by stores, creditors or bill collectors (68%). More than half said that they fell behind in paying their rent or mortgage payment (53%) and they had to pawn or sell off valuables to make ends meet (53%). This sub-population was more likely to experience all of the negative financial situations reported in this survey than the general low-income population (Figure 9).



**Figure 9: Respondent financial experiences in the last year**

**Educational Attainment**

Nearly half respondents from households with extreme DV needs have some form of post-secondary education (Figure 10). They have attained vocation or trade school education (6%), some college education (28%), a two-year (1%) or four-year degree (9%) degree, or a graduate degree (4%). One third of our sub-sample has a high school education: 19% have a GED or high school equivalency and 14% have a high school diploma. There is no consistent pattern to the differences between this population and the general low-income population. On the one had, they are more likely to have less than a high school education (20% compared to 15%), but on the other hand, they are more likely to have some college (28% compared to 24%) and just as likely to have a four-year degree or a graduate degree (9% and 4% respectively). They are more likely to have a GED than a HS diploma, and less likely to have a vocational or two-year degree.




**Figure 10: Educational attainment of respondents 25 years and older**

Housing


**Housing Type**

Households with extreme DV needs are less likely to rent or own their own homes (50% and 13% respectively) than the full WPP sample, and more likely to reside in shared housing (12%), transitional or emergency shelter (12%) and to be homeless (12%). Though the differences in each category are small, they represent a consistent pattern for this sub-population to be in less stable housing situations (Figure 11).



**Figure 11: Respondent housing type**

One way to further understand these differences in housing status is to examine barriers to homeownership (Figure 12). Households with extreme DV needs are more likely to find monthly mortgage payments unaffordable (74%), to have insufficient income in general (8%), and to find the process of purchasing a home too complicated (25%).



**Figure 12: Barriers to homeownership**

**Housing Cost Burden and Assistance**


On average, low-income renter households with extreme DV needs pay \$401 per month for rent, slightly lower than the average for all low-income households at \$424 (Table 3). Monthly mortgage payments on the other hand, are higher for households with extreme DV needs at \$653 versus \$558. Housing is considered to be affordable when households spend no more than a third of their pretax income on housing costs. By comparing household income to reported rent or mortgage payment, a conservative estimate of the housing affordability rate can be determined for this sub-sample. 67% of homeowners with extreme DV needs and 59% of renters are

spending more than a third of their household income on mortgage and rent payments. The proportion of low-income clients paying more than a third of income for total housing costs is certainly higher than what could be estimated with this survey data because the questionnaire did not measure other housing costs such as insurance, property taxes and maintenance. Our sample of homeowners with extreme needs for domestic violence services was so small (N=9), that we focused on the renters (N=49), which have cost burdens comparable to the general low-income renters in our sample.

**Table 3: Renter cost and cost burden**

	All Renters (N=398)	DV Renters (N=49)
Mean monthly cost (rent or mort. pmt.)	\$ 424	\$ 401
Median monthly cost (rent or mort. pmt.)	\$ 400	\$ 350
Mean cost burden (% of income spent on rent)	56%	56%
Median cost burden	41%	50%
Cost burden >30% of income	59%	59%


Housing assistance in the forms of various subsidies for low-income renters (e.g. Section 8 voucher) and homeowners (e.g. down payment assistance) are meant to reduce the household’s housing cost burden. Figure 13 demonstrates this by comparing the average rent payments with and without some form of housing assistance. The effect of housing assistance on households with extreme DV needs compared to other households is similar, though the gap between assisted and non-assisted rents is slightly smaller for our sub-population.



**Figure 13: Mean rent costs for survey respondents with and without housing assistance**

**Housing Condition**

Most households with extreme DV needs reported their housing to be in good shape (49%) or needing only minor repairs (31%). Just 1%, even less than in the general low-income population, say that their home is in such bad shape that it is unsafe (Figure 14).




**Figure 14: Housing condition**

**Housing Situations**

A comparison of housing situations experienced by the sub-population and the general low-income population leads to a deeper understanding of the housing challenges associated with domestic violence (Figure 15). The sub-population is much more likely to experience having to share housing (44%), having to move multiple times (44%), staying in emergency or transitional shelter (29%), and being homeless (43%).

Housing




**Figure 15: Housing situation**

## Health and Healthcare

### **Overall Health Status**


Our findings about the relationship between health status and need for DV services are ambiguous (Figure 16). Respondents from households with extreme DV need are more likely to rate their health as excellent (10% compared to 6% all cases), but also more likely to rate their health as fair (40% compared to 35% all cases), and poor (15% compared to 13% all cases). They are less likely to rate their health good or very good. Most of these differences are very small, however, ranging from a 2-5% gap except for the “very good,” category, with 8% for households with extreme DV need and 15% for other households.



**Figure 16: Respondent general health status**

**Health Insurance**


While nearly half of all survey respondents (46%) rely on DSHS coupons for medical coverage, an even greater percent (59%) of households with extreme DV need rely on DSHS (Figure 17). Households with extreme DV need were less likely to use Medicare (11% compared to 16% for all cases), but this might be explained by the higher percent of these households to have no residents 60 or more years old (93% compared to 85% of all households). About one in three survey respondents have no medical coverage, at 27% for DV cases and 32% for all cases.



**Figure 17: Respondent's type of health insurance**

**Primary Care**


The full WPP sample is more likely to seek medical care at a private doctor’s office (40% compared to DV cases 37%) and at a walk-in clinic (24% compared to DV cases 20%). The target population of households with extreme DV needs is more likely than the general population to seek medical care at a community health center (43% compared to 39%) or the emergency department (38% compared to 32%). (Figure 18)



**Figure 18: Where survey respondents usually go for medical care**

**Health Information**


While insurance policies often restrict where an individual may seek medical care, where they seek medical information may reveal more about social supports and constraints. When asked where they usually seek out advice or information about their health, the results between the sub-sample and the full WPP sample reveal a few striking statistics (Figure 19). Though both groups were most likely to go to a doctor or other health professional (68 and 69%), the general low-income population were more likely than households with an extreme DV need to seek this information from family (28% compared to 20%), friends (26% compared to 19%), the internet (21% compared to 15%), church (4% compared to 1%), and the library (3% compared to 1%). All of these sources of information represent access to a social network and social support. Households with extreme DV needs are more likely than the general group to seek medical advice and information from the hospital (24% compared to 18%) and from social service organizations (11% compared to 5%). Domestic violence often isolates victims from social support, leaving them with no other option but to turn to large institutions for help.



**Figure 19: Where survey respondents usually go for advice or information about health**

**Access and Barriers**

Nearly two-thirds of survey respondents (65% all cases, 61% DV cases) said that in the last 12 months, they needed medical, dental, mental health care or medication, but didn't receive it. By far, the most common reasons for not receiving any of four types of health care (medical, dental, mental health, or medications) are the high cost and not having insurance (Figure 20). For medical care, time conflicts, having to wait too long for an appointment, not being able to get an appointment, and having other things that need to be done are also major barriers. For both mental health care and dental care, almost one in three respondents does not know where to go to get the care they need. Even with a relatively small sample size, these findings point to serious issues of access to care.



**Figure 20: Main reasons for not getting each type of health care for households with extreme DV need**

For medical care, long waits for appointments disproportionately affect households with extreme DV need, affecting one in three respondents (33% as compared to 19% for all cases). Having no way to get to the appointment is also more frequently cited as a barrier to medical, dental, and mental health appointments by the sub-population (Table 4). These findings are another indicator of the isolation of DV victims and their particular challenges to getting the services they need.

**Table 4: Health care barriers for households with extreme DV needs**

	All cases	DV cases	Difference
<b>Too long to get an appointment</b>			
Medical	19%	33%	14%
Dental	14%	21%	7%
Mental	10%	13%	2%
<b>No way to get to appointment</b>			
Medical	16%	28%	12%
Dental	10%	21%	11%
Mental	7%	17%	10%
<b>Didn't know where to go</b>			
Medical	15%	19%	3%
Dental	20%	30%	11%
Mental	25%	33%	9%

## Parenting and Childcare


There is arguably nothing more important to parents than the care and support their children receive, leading to significant concern and the responsibility to find quality, affordable childcare. Low-income households with extreme DV needs face even greater challenges than the overall low-income population; 54% of childcare users with DV needs find it difficult to keep adequate childcare services, compared to 37% of all childcare users.

### **Child Health Insurance**

Of the 42 households with extreme DV needs who have children living at home, 88% say their children are covered by health insurance, compared to 81% of all parenting households.

### **Child Characteristics**


Respondents with children under 18 years old living at home were asked to describe their children in terms of hopes, concerns, and child disabilities (Figure 21). The encouraging finding that 68% of children in households with extreme DV needs are doing well in school (compared to 64% of all cases) is quickly overshadowed by the fact that 27% of sub-population respondents report that their children are having trouble in school (compared to 21% of all cases). About half of both the general and sub-population report that their children receive adequate medical care (47% all cases, 46% DV cases). Households with extreme DV needs, however, are more likely to report learning and physical disabilities (24% and 27% respectively); as well as worries about child's weight (eating habits 24%, overweight 22%, and underweight 27%).



**Figure 21: Characteristics of survey respondents' children**

**Childcare**


More than a third of both groups (36% all cases, 35% DV cases) of survey respondents with children at home less than 13 years old said they do not use any form of childcare service (Figure 22). Just under a third rely on relatives, friends, or neighbors (30% all cases, 25% DV cases) for childcare. About one in four (23% all cases, 24% DV cases) said that a grandparent sometimes takes care of the children. Households with extreme DV needs are much more likely to use licensed childcare services (27% as compared to 20% for all cases). The sub-population is slightly less likely to use Head Start programs (6% as compared to 10% for all cases) and unlicensed childcare (6% as compared to 8% for all cases).



**Figure 22: Type of childcare services used**

As mentioned above, 54% of childcare users from households with extreme DV needs find it hard to get and keep adequate services. More than half (53%) of this group attributed this difficulty in part to the affordability of services (Figure 23). Some also find it difficult to find childcare services that fit their needs, such as evening (33%), weekend (33%), and infant care (27%). Interestingly, in spite of high percentages of disability in households with extreme DV as cited earlier, none of these households reported this as a major barrier to childcare. This could be explained by the small sample size (N=15) of sub-sample households who reported specific childcare barriers.

Strikingly, about two out of three (67%) households who had both childcare needs and extreme DV needs reported that their child has been expelled from childcare due to behavior (Figure 23). This is more than ten times the proportion of all low-income childcare consumers surveyed (6%) to report a child being expelled from childcare. Despite the small sample size, this finding deserves attention, especially since being expelled is a more objective measure of behavior problems than the less specific “having trouble in school” discussed above.




**Figure 23: Barriers to keeping adequate childcare services**

Food and Nutrition

**Food Security and Assistance**


Programs that supplement a household’s food supply help 87% of the sub-sample (Figure 24). Even so, two out of three households with extreme DV needs (67%) said that someone in their household had skipped meals in the past 12 months because there was not enough money for food. Nearly half (48%) said that someone at home had gone hungry because they could not get enough food. Though households with extreme DV needs are slightly more likely to use food assistance, they are much more likely to skip meals and go hungry.



**Figure 24: Household food security and assistance indicators**

**Accessing Community Resources**

Survey respondents rely on a wide variety of supplemental sources of food (Figure 25). Two stand out for the degree of participation by respondent households. Food banks in Whatcom County supply food to 90% of households with extreme DV needs, and 79% of this sub-sample uses Food Stamps. Though Figure 24 revealed that these households are more likely to skip meals and go hungry, Figure 25 reveals that they are generally accessing more types of food assistance than the general low-income sample. In particular, 31% of DV cases report using churches (compared to 23% of all cases), and 26% report using soup kitchens (compared to only 19% of all cases).




**Figure 25: Food assistance programs used by survey respondents**

## Transportation

### **Transportation Challenges**

Half of survey respondents with extreme DV needs (50%) said they are unable to afford gas for their cars (Figure 26). Many have additional car problems, including inability to afford needed car repairs (44%), not having car insurance (43%), and not having access to a car (37%). A third of respondents with extreme DV needs (33%) said they either don't have a driver's license or it is suspended. Only 7% said they do not have any transportation problems. There are many similarities between the transportation issues of this sub-population and the general low-income population, and a few key differences. Respondents with extreme DV needs are more likely to report having no car insurance, and having no license or a suspended license, and they are less likely to report having no transportation challenges.




**Figure 26: Household transportation problems**

**Public Transit Use**

Nearly half of respondents with extreme DV needs (49%) reported that someone in their household regularly uses the bus, only slightly higher than the general low-income population (47%).

**Barriers to Public Transit Use**

When asked why people in their households don't regularly use the bus, 41% of respondents with extreme DV needs said they prefer to use their cars, while a mere 2% prefer walk or bike (Figure 27). The next most common reasons for this sub-population are related to bus schedules and routes: times/days don't work for them (35%), no service where they are going (19%), and no bus stop close to home (14%). Some reported a disability (16%) or the cost of bus fare (12%) as a barrier. DV cases are more likely to report that bus times don't work than the general low-income sample, and less likely to cite preference for cars or no bus stop near their home as barriers to bus use.



**Figure 27: Barriers to bus use by non-regular bus users**


## Community Services Assessment

### **Service gaps analysis**

Survey respondents rated both the *importance* and the *availability* of 14 categories of services in Whatcom County to their own household currently. Below, we examine DV respondent perspectives on community services as a way to gauge local service gaps to this sub-population.


**Importance of services.** At first glance, it is apparent that households with extreme DV needs are more likely to rate each of the service categories extremely important than is the general low-income population (Figure 28). The importance of domestic violence services was used as a selector variable to target the sub-population, which is why it is rated extremely important by 100% of these respondents. The next most common services to be rated extremely important are housing help (89%), affordable dental and medical care (87% and 83% respectively).

DV respondents were more than twice as likely to rate mental health/counseling services as extremely important (82% compared to 35%) drawing our attention to the mental health needs of this population. Households with extreme DV needs are also twice as likely as our full sample to rate legal help (62%), affordable childcare (49%), and help with life skills (47%) as extremely important. One thing these numbers do not tell us is which household member is in need of which services. For example, are victims, abusers, or both in need of the substance abuse treatment that so many of these households (64% compared to 16%) find extremely important?



**Figure 28: Proportion of DV respondents and all respondents who rate services extremely important to their households**


**Availability of services.** Significant proportions of survey respondents who had an opinion about service availability agree that some services are “very hard to get” in Whatcom County, with some variation between our two sample groups (Figure 29). Two thirds of households with extreme DV needs (68%) reported that affordable dental care is very hard to get. DV respondents are also much more likely than the full sample to rate living wage jobs (53%), housing help (52%), affordable medical care (49%), and legal help (37%) as very hard to get. Interestingly, a few services that DV respondents were much more likely to find important (DV services, life skills, and substance abuse treatment) they were less likely to find hard to get. This could be because they have sought out these services more fervently than the full WPP sample.



**Figure 29: Proportion of DV respondents and all respondents who rate services “very hard to get”**

**Services gap analysis using importance-availability index.** From an individual household’s perspective, if a social or health service is both “extremely important” to their household and “very hard to get”, there is a perceived extreme service gap for that particular service. Figure 30 presents the proportion of DV respondents compared to the proportion of all respondents who perceive an extreme service gap for each of the 14 services.

The extreme service gap analysis draws our attention to the prevalence and diversity of unmet, high priority needs experienced by domestic violence survivor households. The lessons to be drawn from these findings are as complex as they are deep. The effect of domestic violence on individuals and families goes far beyond the immediate physical symptoms, crossing over into all spheres of social and economic life. Overall, the community service needs of this population are similar in type to the general low-income population, yet DV survivors are far more likely to have trouble accessing these essential services. Furthermore, there is a prominent suite of services for which DV survivors are two to four times more likely to express an extreme gap: domestic violence, substance abuse, mental health, life skills, child care, legal, and basic education services.



**Figure 30: Percent of DV respondents and all respondents who perceive an extreme gap in their community for the listed service (extreme service gap is defined here as “extremely important” to their household and “very hard to get”)**

**Services gap analysis using importance-availability coordinate system.** Because DV respondents rated these services on five-point scales,<sup>1</sup> another way to analyze these data is to calculate the average importance and availability scores for each service. These data form the basis of an “importance-availability” coordinate rating system (Figure 31). The average importance and availability ratings were calculated and plotted on a two-dimensional chart. The lines making up the “crosshairs” of each graph represent the average importance score and the average availability score of all services combined for this sub-population.

The importance-availability charts are divided into quadrants that rate the services as follows:

*Quadrant I Services that rank above average in importance, and below average in availability*

*Quadrant II Above average in importance and availability*

*Quadrant III Below average in importance and availability*


*Quadrant IV Below average in importance, and above average in availability*

Individuals and organizations planning for future services may want to pay particular attention to the services that appear in the first quadrant (I). These highlighted services are those that, on average, are extremely important to low-income households affected by DV and very hard for them to access.

For this list of services, *housing help, dental and medical care, living wage jobs and help with heating/electric* appear to be high priority services needing attention for both DV households and all households in this sample. These finding should not diminish the importance of other services that are needed by a smaller percentage of the population such as childcare, legal help, and substance abuse treatment. Though many of the other service needs could be alleviated by an increase in the availability of living wage jobs, this is one of the most challenging services to provide, requiring community-wide transformation of a labor market. Temporary assistance with medical or material needs is a more conceivable immediate solution.

---

<sup>1</sup> Importance scale ranged from 1, for “not important” to 5, for “extremely important”; Availability scale ranged from 1, for “very hard to get” to 5, for “very easy to get”



**Figure 31: Low-income DV respondents' perspectives on services' importance and availability**

### Other Respondent Comments

At the end of the paper survey, respondents were invited to comment and give recommendations to service providers with the following open-ended question:

*The Whatcom Prosperity Project wants to find ways to help everyone in our community be successful in their lives. Based on your own situation, would you like to suggest ways that people or organizations in Whatcom County can support you in your success?*

Following are the open-ended responses from the sample of 89 households with extreme DV needs. Some of them fall into survey categories such as employment, health care, and housing, while others push the envelope of what is commonly considered a low-income service need, demanding fairness and acceptance as well as food stamps and rental assistance.

### **Employment, Education, and Income**

Living wage jobs.

More jobs.

If DSHS offered work study/ experience on weekends - help those who don't have time during the week to get the skills they need.

Jobs: they need people, but the process is still too slow. WorkSource is overwhelmed.

### **Financial**

Help pay some bills owed.

Need legal and financial help.

Help with bad credit.

Financial help.

### **Housing / Energy**

Help those people without kids to pay rent or buy basic needs or power bills.

Also help with loans to pay for a house.

Keep housing and shelters open to save lives.

Low-income housing for people with disabilities without such a long wait.

More affordable housing; people w/ bad credit, or criminal record have trouble renting from anyone.

More assistance with deposits, application fees, etc.

Please consider low-cost housing; people can't afford \$700-800 a month and raise kids.

Provide more low-income houses within the city limits (not condos/complexes or duplexes).

Provide a weekend help center that will have repair/gas vouchers on hand.

Provide more programs to assist people into getting affordable housing.

Money for credit/background checks, deposit, first and last months rent payment make it impossible.

**Health and Healthcare**

Better dental care.

Help with medical care costs, including mental health and medications.

Dental help would be wonderful. I have not received dental care in years.

Also need medical help.

Reduce dental costs.

**Mental Health/ Counseling / Substance Abuse**

DSHS - GAU doesn't cover counseling; Victims need that to help recover from post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and function in society.

Free counseling, free fellowship.

There is a serious drug & alcohol problem and the people who need the help don't get the support that they deserve.

**Food and Nutrition**

TANF clients: helpful to get food voucher.

More fresh fruit, veggies – often get free donuts and sweet stuff that fill me up but make me feel sick.

**Transportation**

Sometimes we just need a little help to get a car fixed so we can get back on our feet.

Funding for good car/scooter.

Cart to carry food home from store.

Bike lights.

**Respect / Humanity**

Fairness and validation of human beings; acceptance and providing opportunities for all kinds of people.

Promote honesty, integrity and fairness to the financially under-privileged.

Keep reaching out and helping people.

**Other**

Keep domestic violence and sexual support services.

Help hotline for questions.

Stop bureaucracy and political corruption.