



KING COUNTY POLICE-PROSECUTION PARTNERSHIP ACTION PLAN

MARCH 2017

Principal funding support provided by:
Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs,
U.S. Department of Justice

Table of Contents

I. Targeted Problem Analysis.....	3
II. Approach: Strategies, Tasks & Activities.....	4
III. Impact Evaluation.....	9
IV. Logic Model.....	11
V. Training and Technical Assistance.....	12
VI. Appendices.....	13
VII. Goals and Tasks Timeline.....	14

This project was supported in part through a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. Neither the U.S. Department of Justice nor any of its components operate, control, are responsible for, or necessarily endorse, this document

I. Targeted Problem Analysis

King County, located in Washington State, is the nation's 13th most populous county and home to over two million residents. Recently, the county began experiencing a sharp increase in firearm-related crime. In 2013, the County Executive adopted a public health approach to the problem, aimed at developing evidence-based strategies to limit preventable injuries and deaths.¹ Public Health-Seattle & King County, which serves both city and county residents, encountered a critical obstacle to the model's implementation: The county lacked essential data collection and sharing mechanisms.² Prosecutors and law enforcement, confronting a rising tide of firearm violence, encountered the same obstacle. Forty independent law enforcement agencies in King County investigate firearm crimes and refer them to the Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO) for charging, yet those agencies do not systematically collect or share standardized shooting data.

Reliable data that do exist, however, revealed an alarming increase since 2013 in violent crimes involving firearms. The rate of firearm-related homicides in King County during 2001-2012 was stable, and 94% of them occurred in just seven jurisdictions: Auburn, Federal Way, Kent, Renton, Seattle, Tukwila, and areas covered by the King County Sheriff's Office.³ Seattle Police Department (SPD) had collected substantial violent crime and firearm-related data. Reviewing the incidence of violent crimes for 2011-2015, SPD found that they had increased by only 11%; yet the proportion of violent crimes that involved firearms had grown by 29.4%.

That trend is accelerating. During 2014-2015, the number of violent crimes in Seattle remained stable, while the proportion involving firearms grew by 19.5%. By crime type, Seattle data showed that homicides had actually decreased by 11%, but those involving gunshots had increased by 28.6%; assaults decreased by 3.9%, while those involving firearms rose by 15.2%; robberies increased by only 3.1%, and robberies involving firearms increased by 31.5%.⁴

Although similar data for 2014-2015 were unavailable from high-crime jurisdictions other than Seattle, the PAO's internal homicide data indicated that firearm-related murders in King County increased during those years at a rate greater than the rate of murders in total. In 2013, prosecutors working in PAO's Most Dangerous Offender Project (MDOP) responded to 53 homicides, 45% resulting from firearms; in 2014, of 51 homicides they responded to, 61% involved firearms; in 2015, of the 57 homicides they responded to, 74% were firearm-involved.⁵ In 2016, MDOP prosecutors responded to 64 homicides, 49 (76%) of them (at least⁶) involving gunshot wounds.

Strategies for reducing gun-related homicides must first account for all illegal shootings ("shots fired"), including the majority that have no victims or identified suspects. SPD data show a 33.8% increase in

¹ King County Executive Order (February 14, 2013); accessed March 2017, available at: <http://www.kingcounty.gov/~media/operations/policies/documents/ph151aao.ashx?la=en>

² King County Public Health: The Impact of Firearms on King County's Children, 1999-2012.

³ King County Public Health: Firearm Violence in King County: A Look at the Data, January 6, 2015.

⁴ Seattle Police Department Violent Crime Trends (UCR data), 2011-2015.

⁵ KCPAO's Most Dangerous Offender Project (MDOP), a 20-year police-prosecution partnership, is an immediate-response team of prosecutors who join investigators, medical examiners, and crime lab personnel at the scene of homicides.

⁶ The partial remains of a dismembered murder victim were found in Seattle on April 10, 2016.

shots fired from 2013 through 2015.⁷ Shots-fired calls processed by the 911 communications center serving several of the jurisdictions increased by 33.4% from 2013 to 2015;^{8,9} as of March 2016, the center had processed 478 shots-fired calls, 16% more than in the first quarter of 2015 (and more than 71.3% in total than in the first quarter of 2014). Moreover, black residents of King County face firearm homicide rates seven times higher than whites.¹⁰

Increasing public attention on firearm-related violence and racial/ethnic and geographic disparities demands a coherent strategic response. PAO prosecutors propose to institutionalize data-driven responses to gun violence in King County in partnership with police, public health workers, and researchers in the field.

II. Approach: Strategies, Tasks, Actions, and Activities

Perpetrators of gun violence do not to operate within the confines of any single law enforcement jurisdiction. The PAO is in position to leverage its centralized role in King County's criminal justice system to facilitate collection and analysis of standardized violent crime data and to expand cooperation among law enforcement and other agencies using data-driven strategies and tactics to reduce gun violence.

The project's mission is to reduce firearm violence in King County. Three broad goals guide our work. These are:

- 1) Increase public safety by using proactive and preventative measures to reduce firearm violence across King County;
- 2) Use data and analytics to enhance and inform decision-making within the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office;
- 3) Work in collaboration with law enforcement agencies and other stakeholders in King County to use data-driven evidence-based approaches to reduce firearm violence.

Innovative Strategies: To address the increasing levels of gun violence within the targeted jurisdictions, the following evidence-based strategies will be implemented.

A. Data/Intelligence-Driven Prosecution: Crime Strategies Unit

The project proposes to adopt and implement a data-driven prosecution approach; specifically, we will establish a Crime Strategies Unit (CSU) within the PAO comprised of two prosecutors and an analyst based upon existing, innovative CSU models. The initial goal is to institutionalize standardized intelligence gathering and sharing to concentrate resources on reducing firearm violence and identifying those incidents involving chronic victims and offenders and "hot spot" locations.

Working with the Research Partner Dr. Andrew Fox, and partner law enforcement agency analysts, the CSU will provide technological and analytic support to prosecutors and investigators, facilitating their efforts and interagency communication. Both immediate and long-term beneficial outcomes will be derived from growth in the county agencies' competencies in the collection and use of reliable data to

⁷ Seattle Police Department internal review of RMS shots-fired data, 2013; 2014; 2015.

⁸ Shots-fired incidents included calls for shootings with medic and fire, shootings with medic and police, shots fired without injury, shots fired with minor injury (police and fire), and illegal discharges.

⁹ Data were unavailable for January 2013; therefore, January data are excluded each year for annual comparisons.

¹⁰ King County Public Health: Firearm Violence in King County: A Look at the Data, 1/6/15.

support evidence-based law enforcement, prosecution and violence-related public health policies, strategies and practices. This project will establish and direct the practice of these competencies on identifying systems and interventions (including policies) that will reduce firearm violence.

B. Social Network Analysis

Research shows that social networks are rich sources of data for the analysis and application of intelligence to violent crime reduction efforts. An individual's relative position within a social network can be related to victimization and offending. In Boston, for example, researchers have used social network analysis (SNA) to examine whether an individual's network could predict his or her risk of gunshot victimization. SNA showed that, on average, each member of a social network was about five connections away from a gunshot victim.¹¹ In Chicago and in Boston, SNA has revealed that within a social network, proximity to a gunshot victim is directly correlated to one's own risk of becoming a gunshot victim.¹² Understanding the social structure of those involved in violence is a major step in effective intervention. Gathering appropriate crime data from multiple police departments and the prosecutor's office will enable a more accurate social network construction and, thus, earlier and more precise identification of the most central and influential actors in violent crime.

To build internal capacity within the PAO and participating law enforcement agencies, the Research Partner will conduct a one-week Social Network Analysis (SNA) training for crime analysts, using current data to reveal central players related to shots-fired incidents. In accord with the action research framework, the Research Partner will coordinate with CSU and participating agencies to produce an annual regional social network of offenders associated with gun crimes. The network will include arrest and field interview data, along with shots-fired data and other relevant indicators of violence; this will be a significant tool for identifying key actors who cross jurisdictional lines for priority prosecution.

In accord with the data, the CSU and partner law enforcement agencies will concentrate attention on the most prolific locations (hot spots) and offenders, developing and implementing aggressive prosecution strategies, and assessing outcomes. The Research Partner will support the CSU's creation by compiling a user-friendly project implementation guide, documenting the Unit's purpose and developmental process, and delineating participant roles and responsibilities; also, by helping to develop policies, practices, and troubleshooting methods, and providing other information and support as needed, to help ensure a smooth transition post project completion.

In addition to the above, the Research Partner will work with the partnering agencies to conduct SNA on a minimum of 6 child/young adult firearm death review cases (see C below) to understand networks of victims and perpetrators and further inform evidence-based prosecution and earlier interventions to address risk of firearm violence and homicide.

C. Firearm Violence Review: Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission

The project proposes to implement the Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission (MHRC) model to better understand homicide and firearm related deaths across the seven targeted jurisdictions. MHRC is a multi-tiered intervention with four levels that combines the traditional criminal justice approach of

¹¹ Papachristos, A. V., A. A. Braga, & D. M. Hureau. 2012. "Social Networks and the Risk of Gunshot Injury." *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 89 (6): 992–1003.

¹² Papachristos, A. V., & C. Wildeman. 2014. "Network Exposure and Homicide Victimization in an African American Community." *American Journal of Public Health* (104): 143–50. Also, Papachristos, A. V., C. Wildeman, & E. Roberto. 2014. "Tragic, but not Random: The Social Contagion of Nonfatal Gunshot Injuries." *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), March. Elsevier Ltd, 1–12.

crime incident reviews with the public health approach of death reviews into a comprehensive and collaborative process. The goal of the MHRC is to foster and support innovative homicide prevention and intervention strategies using the emerging tools of strategic problem analysis. Drawing on public health and criminal justice approaches, the model was designed with the following goals in mind: 1) to gain a better understanding of homicide through strategic problem analysis; 2) to develop innovative and effective responses and prevention strategies; and, 3) to help focus available prevention and intervention resources.

This approach provides a forum for various stakeholders to work collaboratively to address violence in a comprehensive and sustainable way that balances short-term interventions with longer-term solutions. Members of the review committee include criminal justice professionals, community service providers, public officials, and residents that meet –through the homicide review process— to exchange information regarding homicides and near fatal shootings and to identify methods of prevention. Partners represent key stakeholders from multiple levels (city, regional, county, and state), disciplines, and agencies (governmental and private, including community service providers). At each review meeting, partners participate in an intensive discussion and examination of individual homicide and intentional crime incidents. Through this process, trends, gaps, and deficits within the already existing systems and programs designed to prevent and reduce violence are identified and recommendations are made to strengthen these systems and programs.

Actions, Tasks and Activities:

To address the problems outlined above, in partnership with stakeholders from the respective police departments of the cities of Auburn, Federal Way, Kent, Renton, Seattle, and Tukwila, and the King County Sheriff’s Office, and Public Health of Seattle & King County, and the Research Partners, the following guides our work.

Objective 1: Create the internal structures to support a data-driven prosecution (DDP) model within KCPAO.

Tasks/Activities:

- 1. a. Establish a functioning CSU within two years.
- 1. b. Hire an analyst within KCPAO (Rafael Serrano hired February 1, 2017).
- 1. c. Upgrade technology.
- 1. d. Instill leadership commitment to DDP as a prosecution philosophy.
- 1. e. Convene law enforcement (LE) partners and formalize partnership/get by in.
- 1. f. Formalize relationship with public health.

Objective 2: Develop standardized data collection methods and protocols for CSU and partners.

Tasks/Activities:

- 2.a. Identify specific team members within partner LE agencies.
- 2.b. Collectively define “shots fired” (SF).
- 2.c. Collaboratively create a SF template and database.
- 2.d. Develop protocols for SF data collection within template.
- 2.e. Train LE partners on SF template and protocols.
- 2.f. Facilitate timely collection of current/real-time SF data.

- 2.g. Facilitate collection of historical SF data from 2015 and 2016.
- 2.h. Consolidate SF data from all agencies into one common database.
- 2.i. Quarterly review of SF data and collection protocols.

Objective 3: Develop standardized data sharing methods and protocols for CSU and partners.

Tasks/Activities:

- 3.a. Develop and maintain a shared SF library and database.
- 3.b. Develop and maintain a secured file transfer application.
- 3.c. Develop protocols for two-way sharing of LE and PAO information and data.
- 3.d. Develop and maintain common real-time communication system between partner agencies.

Objective 4: Train crime analysts across partner agencies in social network analysis (SNA).

Tasks/Activities:

- 4.a. Train CSU and agency analysts in SNA.
- 4.b. Conduct SNA using LE and PAO violent crime data to create agency level and PAO social networks.
- 4.c. Combine agency/PAO networks to create a regional violent crime social network.
- 4.d. Use SNA to identify chronic firearm offenders.
- 4.e. Use SNA to identify chronic firearm victims.

Objective 5: Conduct SNA to identify hot-spots and key victims and offenders.

Tasks/Activities:

- 5.a. Conduct SNA on all LE incidents for 2015 and to date 2016 to produce annual regional social networks and provide those networks to KCPAO and Research Partners.
- 5.b. Combine annual regional social networks from each agency; add PAO data to create a comprehensive social network for region.
- 5.c. Clean and analyze 2015 and 2016 data on shots fired cases and corresponding PAO data.
- 5.d. Analyze all data to identify key actors responsible for violent crime.
- 5.e. Refine key prolific violent offender list with status updates.

Objective 6: Develop policies and procedures for aggressive prosecutorial, law enforcement, and/or community-based responses of prolific firearm offenders.

Tasks/Activities:

- 6.a. Analyze all data to identify key actors responsible for firearm violence.
- 6.b. Based upon data reviews, coordinate responses and develop plans for proactive prosecution.
- 6.c. Analyze key actors, set arrest alerts.
- 6.d. CSU will identify an area of high shots fired (Winter 2018). CSU and RP, in collaboration with LE partners, will identify a network of individuals involved (Winter 2018). Partners coordinate and will implement a proactive intervention strategy (place or person-based) (Spring 2018).
- 6.e. RP conduct per/post analysis of strategy to assess impact.

Objective 7: Assess the process and impact and adjust responses as needed.

Tasks/Activities:

- 7.a. Develop an Action Plan no later than March 2017.
- 7.b. Refine the key prolific offender list with status updates.
- 7.c. Conduct process evaluation to identify successes and problems in the process. Identify successful and unsuccessful strategies. Locate areas of potential improvement.
- 7.d. Review results of analysis, refine processes as necessary.
- 7.e. Review results of final analysis and evaluation of implementation.
- 7.f. Final Report.

Objective 8: In partnership with Public Health Seattle & King County, conduct firearm homicide reviews.

Tasks/Activities:

- 8.a. Public Health convenes committee to conduct two child firearm death panel reviews of children, ages 0-17 years old, in 2017 and 2018.
- 8.b. Public Health convenes committee to conduct one youth/young adult (18-29 years old) firearm violence review, based on Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission methodologies in 2018, with the intent to include two cases per targeted jurisdiction for a total of 14 cases (reviews).
- 8.c. Distribute report on modifiable risk factors and systems and policy recommendations within 120 days of review conclusion.
- 8.d. Conduct an SNA on a minimum of 6 selected cases to understand networks of victims and perpetrators.
- 8.d. Update Firearm Fact Sheet in 2017.

Collaborative Process and Communication Strategy:

Currently, outside of standard case investigations, there is no overall communication strategy between the KCPAO and its partner law enforcement agencies regarding countywide firearm violence. Each agency investigates its own cases and communicates with the individually assigned prosecutors about the cases. There is little interagency collaboration and no formalized communication or information sharing mechanism. To address these shortcomings, KCPAO and our law enforcement partners will work together to: (1) collect accurate historical and year-to-date data relating to firearms violence; and, (2) to develop the shots fired database.

To facilitate the collection and sharing of data, KCPAO hired its first ever crime analyst in February 2017. While the partner agencies already have their own analysts, KCPAO deputies have rarely had the opportunity to tap into the agency analysts' extensive knowledge regarding crime statistics and trends. To make better use of this resource and expand our own internal understanding of firearms violence, the KCPAO analyst will work closely with the agency analysts to document historical data and track trends across jurisdictional lines. In addition to attending monthly meetings with all the agency analysts, the KCPAO analyst will also regularly meet individually with each agency analyst to review data and coordinate appropriate enforcement and prosecution strategies.

The KCPAO analyst will also be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the shots fired database which will be developed collaboratively with law enforcement. The KCPAO will share the regional shots

fired data with all the partner agencies on a weekly basis using a new Secure File Transfer Site that will be developed by the KCPAO to allow for more efficient and secure electronic communication and sharing of information.

Partnerships and Outreach Strategies:

KCPAO will partner with King County Public Health to hold Firearm Violence Reviews, as documented above. The goal of bringing community, law enforcement, schools, DSHS/CPS and other informed stakeholders together in these Reviews is to identify earlier potential social, legal, and other systemic interventions that were missed in each case. These evidence-based findings, including systems and policy interventions, will inform the KCPAO approach to prosecution. Additionally, Public Health will update the gun violence population health data and analyze the data. This data will be used to update the publicly available Firearm Fact Sheet and Community Health Indicator dataset.

Expected Results:

The primary outcome will be establishing and institutionalizing the Crime Strategies Unit. The CSU will provide shared data infrastructure to promote police-prosecutor interventions focused on firearm violence. We anticipate changes in knowledge and awareness of data analytics among crime analysts in LE agencies, as well as improved practices related to data driven approaches. Moreover, we should see more collaboration between police and prosecutors, particularly among the crime analysts from participating agencies.

Because of the buy-in from the elected King County Prosecutor and the seven partner law enforcement jurisdictions, CSU and its mission will continue to move forward after the completion of the grant period. Through better collaboration, communication, and developed crime strategies as discussed above, this project aims to provide a valuable resource such that there is long-term sustainability.

III. Impact Evaluation Plan

Research Partner Role:

The Research Partner (RP) will follow the action research model. The research partners, under the direction of Dr. Andrew Fox, Assistant Professor, California State University-Fresno, Department of Criminology, will perform specific tasks, which will include, at a minimum (see attached Evaluation Logic Model for additional details):

- 1) Assisting with the establishment of the CSU;
- 2) Assisting 3PI partners with the development of the Strategic Action Plan including strategies to address identified problems;
- 3) Training local LE CA in Social Network Analysis and the use of this tool in data based decision making;
- 4) Assessing overall program implementation including plans for sustainability (process evaluation).
- 5) Conducting an assessment of overall program impacts of targeted objectives (outcome evaluation).

Dr. Fox will serve as the research partner and research liaison between research activities and the King County Prosecutor’s Office. Members of the research team will participate in weekly 3PI management team meetings (via teleconference and in person when required), and review best practices and evidence-based research to aid project outcomes, and to conduct the project evaluation

Efforts during Year 1 of the project are geared toward data management of the official police and prosecution data and maintenance of treatment integrity through on-the-ground observations of program implementation, and gathering of objective measures (i.e., comprehensive crime data, pre-implementation). Additionally, the research partner will be available to assist in the day-to-day management of the project, assisting with data collection, data entry (coding), and data storage, as well as the creation of reports and distribution of information.

Evaluation Plan:

Several strategies will be employed to evaluate the implementation of the Crime Strategies Unit to reduce firearm violence. First, a qualitative study on the diffusion of ideas, specifically the use of data driven decision making, will be conducted. The research design will be a semi-structured qualitative interview with 15-20 key stakeholders, at three time points over the study period. Questions will be asked about which other agencies they work with and the nature of the relationships. This will allow us to evaluate the change in collaboration network during project implementation. Second, a tracking form will be established. The tracking form will be a short online and paper form to allow partners to track activities related to implementation. CSU will use Outlook calendar scheduling to track activities for review by the research partner at a later date. They will be asked to document data sharing and law enforcement activities (offender targeting or enhanced prosecutions) related to the shots fired project. This tracking form will allow the researchers to understand the dosage of project implementation. Third, case processing data will be analyzed to examine the role CSU has played in increasing the focus and efficiency of shots fired related cases (key cases or key individuals). Data will be extracted from Karpel for this analysis. Finally, at the end of the SNA trainings, and 6-months post trainings, a brief survey will be distributed to CA to assess knowledge and awareness gains related to data driven approaches (specifically SNA).

Assessment of Impact:

The long-term impact of this project will be the reduction of firearm violence in King County. It is unlikely, however, that this can be accomplished on a large scale within two years. To assess the impact, first the qualitative survey of stakeholders will be used to determine whether the collaboration network between agencies has become denser during project implementation. We would expect that, if the CSU is having an effect, that analysts among participating agencies will be more closely connected to each other and the King County Prosecutor's Office by the end of the project. Finally, if the project progresses in a timely manner, the CSU will identify an area of high shots fired and further identify the network of individuals involved. During the last six months of implementation, the KCPAO will help coordinate an intervention on that location. A pre/post analysis of firearms violence will be conducted to determine if the intervention had an impact on firearms violence in the short term.

The researchers will track implementation and associated outcome measures (*e.g.*, for those identified for priority prosecution: convictions and sentence severity data); intelligence-led prosecution, using data to identify those most involved in violence, should result in stronger dispositions for those arrestees. Project data will be compared with that from similar cases in non-participating King County jurisdictions. Using time series analysis, researchers will examine trends in gun-related crime in the target jurisdictions. If the Police-Prosecutor Partnership is effective, we should see significant reductions in firearms violence. The research partner will also coordinate with the independent research conducted by Public Health to better understand the nature of gun violence in King County.

The research design integrates researcher and practitioner partnerships by bringing together research, action, and evaluation. The methodology combines both qualitative and quantitative methods to fully understand the complexities of gun violence.

The evaluation will address the following questions:

- 1) Does the implementation of a CSU enhance data driven decision-making within the KCPAO?
- 2) Is the CSU an effective strategy to increase collaborative processes across LE agencies within the targeted region?
- 3) Because of this project, did the use of data driven evidenced-based approaches by targeted law enforcement agencies to identify chronic firearm offenders, victims, and hot spots improve?
- 4) Is intelligence and crime data gathered through this process useful to effectively deploy resources?

Finally, the evaluation will seek to understand if this approach is effective in helping to reduce overall gun-related violent crime in target areas.

IV. Logic Model (see Appendix A)

V. Training and Technical Assistance

The KCPAO management team, stakeholders, and Research Partners will engage in training and technical assistance by tapping into the expertise of the APA and CNA TA teams. As areas of training and/or technical assistance are identified as we begin project implementation, these will be brought to the attention of the TA providers during the regularly scheduled TA call.

The following is a list of potential training and technical assistance needs, identified by KCPAO:

1. Homicide Death Reviews
2. Critical Incident Review (Non-Fatal Shooting Reviews). Peer-to-Peer with Indianapolis Non-Fatal Gun Review Board is scheduled for March 24th
3. Social Media data collection strategies
4. Crime Strategies Unit implementation
5. Law-enforcement based training
 - a. Records Management System (RMS) training to extract data from the system
 - b. Basic crime analysis training for regional law enforcement crime analysts in Seattle. Potential presenter: Julie Wartell. Potential training program: crime analysis presentation (similar to MSU Researcher Practitioner Academy Presentation) followed by Q & A. Julie Wartell and Dr. Fox to conduct potential joint presentation on place-based vs. people-based analysis. Dr. Fox to provide post SNA training. Length of training TBD. Dr. Fox will survey LE crime analysts the week of 3/14. Potential June-July training date. (CNA to be consulted)
 - c. Capabilities SKYPE session for LE analysts. To be scheduled for early fall following San Francisco site visit (early Fall)
6. Site Visit: San Francisco District Attorney's office, CSU. 2 ½ days (2 nights) to be scheduled in May. (Team members: Karissa Taylor, Dan Carew, Val Richey, and Rafael Serrano (analyst))
7. San Francisco District Attorney's CSU, Principal Analyst, Maria McKee travel to Seattle to observe the site's Initiative. To follow SF site visit.

8. Funding to bring Jeff Karpel on site to conduct technical assistance. (tabled at this time)
9. Intelligence-Driven Prosecution
10. Public Health
 - a. Determine factors for screening 14 cases (2 from each jurisdiction) for non-fatal gun crimes. Dr. Fox will assist. (Summer 2017)
 - b. Creating a data extraction form for Child Death Reviews. (Summer 2017)
 - i. Contact Mallory O'Brien Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission created database to capture data from different variables for homicide review /data dictionary (access database (APA to contact Milwaukee)
 - c. Creating Buy-in for child death review (0-17) and young adults
 - i. Site Champion Frank Carrubba suggested Youth Adult Court (deferred entry judgment/behavioral court model). SF District Attorney's website (FAQ sheet) reviewed. Potential peer-to-peer with Katy Miller (SFDA) and Brooklyn Smart Site (early fall)
 - ii. Brooklyn, Smart Prosecution Initiative, developed a Young Adult Court ages 16-24. Brooklyn Site provided training on adolescent and young adult brain development to stakeholders.
 - d. Getting Buy-in
 - i. Discuss early with police chiefs on the mission/goals of the entire project (public health) for violence review and school principals (child death review). APA can provide SME for guidance/planning. Site may gather chiefs all together and/or set up individual meetings to discuss the initiative. (May provide training-child/young adult brain development)
 - e. Victim Witness Assistance for gunshot victims (Currently no advocates for non-fatal shootings, but KCPAO has one advocate for homicides.) (Frank forwarded SFDA information to Karissa). Potential future TA for Victim Assistance/Engagement.
 - f. Training for patrol offices (post-initiative)
 - g. Potential Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) training and focus-deterrence training (2018)

VI. Goals and Tasks Timeline (See Appendix B)

APPENDIX A

KING COUNTY POLICE-PROSECUTION PARTNERSHIP LOGIC MODEL

INPUTS	OUTPUTS	OUTCOMES		
<i>Resources</i>	<i>Activities</i>	<i>Short-term</i>	<i>Intermediate</i>	<i>Long-Term</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KCPAO Staff: 2 Prosecutors, 1 Crime Analyst ▪ Public Health Seattle & King County ▪ Law Enforcement Partners: ▪ Auburn ▪ Federal Way ▪ Kent ▪ Renton ▪ Seattle ▪ Tukwila ▪ King County Sheriff’s Office ▪ Research Partner: CSU-Fresno ▪ Steering Committee Members ▪ APA ▪ CNA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish CSU ▪ Institute standardized data gathering protocols ▪ Implement standardized data sharing protocols ▪ Conduct SNA Training ▪ Conduct county-wide SNA ▪ Identify key actors, victims, and hot spots ▪ Develop focused intervention approach ▪ Conduct child/young adult firearm violence death reviews ▪ Assess overall impacts ▪ Training & technical assistance 	<p>Increase collaboration across targeted law enforcement and other stakeholder agencies.</p> <p>Improve knowledge and awareness of SNA and its application among regional crime analysts.</p> <p>Increase capacity of crime analysts to use data driven analytic approaches (e.g., SNA) to assess local trends and patterns in firearm violence.</p>	<p>Improve use of data driven evidenced-based approaches by targeted law enforcement agencies to identify chronic firearm offenders, victims, and hot spots</p> <p>Use data and analytics to enhance and guide decision-making within the King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office.</p>	<p>Increase public safety by using proactive and preventative measures to reduce firearm violence across King County.</p>

Assumptions: If the police-prosecutor partnership is effective, we should see significant reductions in firearms violence.

External factors: Level of readiness, “turf” issues, and political will are all external factors that have the potential to negatively affect project outcomes.

APPENDIX B

Goals and Tasks/Activities Timeline

Goal 1: Increase public safety by using proactive and preventative measures to reduce firearm violence across King County.

Task/Activities	Action Needed	Responsible Party	Expected Completion Date
Establish Crime Strategies Unit	Staff with attorneys, and begin search for analyst.	SC	January 2017
Hire analyst for CSU.	Develop job description; advertise position; interview/screen applicants. Start date of 1/2017.	SC	January-February 2017
Develop Strategic Action Plan.	In collaboration with RP, develop Action Plan to include Problem Statement, Approach/Strategies, Goals/Objectives, and Evaluation Plan.	SC, CSU, RP	February –March 2017
Collect historical data.	LE to provide 2015 case data and to date 2016 data on shots-fired cases to KCPAO.	LE, CSU	December 2017
Develop standardized data collection protocols and templates.	Develop and distribute tools/protocols.	CSU, RP, LE	January-February 2017
Monthly collection of data on shots-fired cases.	LE provides data on shots-fired cases to KCPAO using template.	LE	Ongoing beginning January 2017
SNA training for CSU.	Set training dates; conduct training.	CSU, RP	April 2017
Participate in quarterly meetings on progress.	Set meeting dates; conduct meetings.	SC, CSU, LE, RP, PH	Ongoing beginning January 2017
Monthly management team meeting.	Review and refine data collection protocols and prioritize locations and individuals of interest.	SC, CSU, LE, RP, PH	Ongoing beginning January 2017
Conduct targeted intervention (place or person-based)	Based upon data, CSU and LE partners identify and conduct intervention strategy 6 months prior to project end. RP collect pre/post SF data and conduct analysis of impact.	SC, CSU, LE, RP	May-December 2018

Goal 2: Use data and analytics to enhance and inform decision-making within the King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office.

Task/Activities	Action Needed	Responsible Party	Expected Completion Date
Conduct SNA on all LE incidents for 2015 and to date 2016.	Produce annual regional social networks and provide those networks to KCPAO and Research Partners.	LE	April-June 2017, repeated yearly
Communicate intelligence on crime drivers with assigned prosecutors and LE.	Develop intelligence briefings for routine distribution to project stakeholders.	CSU	Ongoing beginning June 2017
Conduct SNA analysis and create key actor list.	Analyze all data to identify key actors responsible for violent crime.	CSU, SC, LE, RP	Ongoing beginning April 2017
Create comprehensive social network for region.	Combine annual regional social networks from each agency, add PAO data.	CSU, SC, RP	April/May, repeated yearly
Conduct preliminary data analysis on shots-fired.	Clean and analyze 2015 and to date 2016 data on shots-fired cases and corresponding PAO data.	CSU, RP	April 2017
Provide monthly reports on shots fired.	Distribute data reports to each LE participant, coordinate responses and develop plans for proactive prosecution.	CSU, SC	Ongoing beginning February 2017
Implement refinement(s) of strategies/approaches.	Review data, assess progress, make course corrections as needed.	SC, CSU, LE, RP, PH	July 2017, and ongoing
Conduct Process Outcomes Review.	Identify successes and problems in the process, and successful and unsuccessful strategies. Locate areas of potential improvement.	CSU, RP, PH	June 2017, repeat every three months
Final Evaluation Report.	Analyze process and outcomes data, as applicable, write final evaluation report including recommendations.	RP	90 days post project end

Goal 3: Work in collaboration with law enforcement agencies and other stakeholders in King County to use data-driven evidence-based approaches to reduce firearm violence.

Task/Activities	Action Needed	Responsible Party	Expected Completion Date
Conduct quarterly partner meetings.	Set meeting date; send invites; conduct meeting.	CSU, SC, LE, RP, PH	Beginning January 2017
Develop method for secure information sharing with and between all LE participants.	Develop and distribute tools/protocols	SC	January-February 2017
Train LE stakeholders on data collection templates and protocols.	Set training date; conduct training.	CSU, LE, RP	February-March 2017
SNA Training for LE.	Set training dates; conduct training	RP, LE	April 2017
Analyze key actors.	Review/update SNA data; distribute prolific offender list; set arrest alerts.	CSU, SC, LE, RP, PH	Ongoing beginning April 2017, evaluate monthly
Conduct Youth/Young Adult Firearm Violence Reviews.	Identify appropriate cases for review (14 overall); convene review committee; conduct panel reviews; make recommendations as appropriate. Update Firearm Fact Sheet.	PH, RC	Fall 2017, Fall 2018
Youth/Young Adult Firearm Violence Review: Findings Report.	Distribute report on modifiable risk factors and systems and policy recommendations within 30 days of review conclusion.	CSU, RP, PH	TBD 2018
Conduct Child Death Reviews.	Attend panel reviews; make recommendations as appropriate.	PH, RC	TBD