

59.1

1971

C. 2

A  
N  
N  
U  
A  
L  
  
R  
E  
P  
O  
R  
T



1971

KING COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

Juvenile Court Board of Managers  
Seattle, Washington

In 1971 the Juvenile Court faced the continuing challenges of rebellious and delinquent youth and their distraught parents. There were successes and honest, if disappointing, failures. These are reflected in this summary report through discussions of department structure, operation, achievements and in revealing statistical tables.

A brief annual report can touch but momentarily on the many facets of the Youth Service Center and work of its people. Statistical data — for all their detail — usually present a broad, seldom dramatic picture; only the most discerning will detect in background figures where hard core problems lie.

We believe it will be obvious that in the past 12 months significant strides have been taken to intensify probation supervision and community liaison work. Some improvement has been made in facilitating crisis case work, detention screening and shortening the whole diagnostic process. But in seeking a deeper understanding of the family unit and better keys to redirecting family conflict, we confront increasing disorientation of youth and deprivation of useful relationships. The myriad problems will not be solved tomorrow; complexities of human behavior and the rapidly changing mores of our American culture require new zeal, new communion with adults and new relators. We have adjusted at considerable effort and cost to new requirements for legal rights but not without failing to steer those youth needing personal redirection to other places where it can be obtained — frequently such places do not exist.

The police, too, understand the cry of erring youth for supervision and training and are as frustrated as we in the face of public social revolt. Its resulting turmoil has demoralized the family's capacity to withstand the jolts of a violent century. Children still need family strength, durability, love and security.

CARL B. ERICKSON  
Director of Court Services



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Legal Rights	1
Management	1
The Court	2
Court Hearings	2
Juvenile Court Services	3
Investigation Divison	4
Probation Services Division	5
Child Care Division	9
Volunteer Program	10
Traffic Dispositions	12
Business and Operations	12
Finances	13
Youth Councils and Juvenile Court Conference Committees	14
Community Services	14
Youth Service Center Improvements	15
Statistical Tables	18

## LEGAL RIGHTS

The Juvenile Court in Washington State was established in 1905 in the belief that the adult criminal justice system was not an appropriate forum for the handling of law violations by juveniles. Accordingly, the juvenile court was structured to operate with a minimum of legal machinery and concentrated on finding social solutions to the problems brought before it. The probation officer (social worker) was given a major role to play in the juvenile court system and was authorized to determine whether the pattern of a child's life placed him and his family in need of the court's help. Probation officers recommended those children for probation whose habits seemed to be leading them deeper into trouble. A recommendation for commitment to a training school or other institution providing close supervision would be made for children who could no longer function in the community. Prior to 1967, most of the court's decisions respecting the children brought before it were made solely on the basis of the investigation and advice of the probation officer.

However, recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court have extended new safeguards for the protection of the legal rights of persons under 18. From the outset, a child must now be informed of his right to remain silent, his right to legal counsel, and his right to have court appointed counsel in the event he desires an attorney but is unable to afford one. An attorney may represent a child and/or his parents at any stage of a juvenile proceeding and the criminal rules of evidence must be observed.

Similarly, for the juvenile court to decline jurisdiction of a youth under 18 (who would subsequently be charged in adult criminal court), probable cause for making a criminal charge must be demonstrated, the exhaustion of juvenile court resources must be established, and parents of the youth must be furnished a copy of the petition and notice of the juvenile hearings.

The introduction of these criminal due process requirements into the juvenile court system has resulted in an expanded role for attorneys in juvenile proceedings. Thus, in King County, three full-time public defenders and four full-time deputy prosecutors are assigned to juvenile court cases. The court, consequently, now has the benefit of advice and counsel from probation officers, defense counsel and attorneys for the state in arriving at decisions affecting the lives of children.

## MANAGEMENT

The Juvenile Court Board of Managers has administrative responsibility for the Court's probation and detention services. Judge George H. Revell serves as its chairman; members are Francis Brownell, Jr.; John Schermer; Robert Weber and the Rev. Gil Lloyd. Mrs. Dale Mills succeeded Robert Weber at the end of the year. She is the first woman member appointed to the Board by the Superior Court. This operating Board directs operations and day to day staff services. It presides over a 240 man force that must deal on any day with approximately 417 active probation cases, 124 children in detention, 23 new investigations and 46 traffic appearances.

The Board of Managers is appointed by the Superior Court and it submits reports and the annual budget request to the Superior Court for approval. Major policy and management problems during 1971 have included new building additions, building contract obligations, union contract, probation subsidy plan, review of child care services, budget and budget revisions, and many others. Regular meetings are scheduled every three weeks, but special meetings are called when needed.



## THE COURT

Any formal action by the Juvenile Court on a case by case basis requires decision by one of its judges sitting as a judge. A Juvenile Court Committee of judges is responsible for the court and it assigns one or more judges to serve for a three-month period as the sitting judge. During 1971, Chairman Judge George H. Revelle and Judges Robert Elston, Frank Howard, Charles Z. Smith and David Soukup served as Juvenile Court Judges. Judge James H. Noe was appointed to succeed Robert Elston at the end of the year. Court Commissioner Robert Dixon also carried full-time judicial duties.

The Juvenile Court Judges Committee initiates policy and judicial procedure changes as evaluation and changing requirements necessitate. All of these men have chosen to work with youth and their many challenges to the Court.

## COURT HEARINGS

Actions by the Juvenile Court Judge are preceded by a hearing, where all possible solutions are debated and considered. Hearings are of various types, depending on the Court's intended action.

*Preliminary Detention Hearings* to determine whether a child should be detained or the conditions of his release are normally held within twenty-four hours of arrival at the Youth Service Center. At these hearings, the child, parents, his attorney when retained and the caseworker are present. The Judge may appoint counsel for the child if he believes it necessary. Possible temporary care in lieu of detention is appraised and most children released to the family. Neglected children are placed by the State Division of Public Assistance in parents homes or temporary foster care homes when needed. There were 2,795 such hearings in 1971.

A *Fact-finding Hearing* is scheduled if allegations or charges are denied or when the child exercises his right to remain silent and seek counsel. (see Legal Rights) A deputy prosecuting attorney prepares the petition and presents argument and evidence in such hearings. The Judge must apply rules of evidence; proof must be established beyond a reasonable doubt. There were 360 such hearings in the year.

A *Decline of Jurisdiction Hearing* becomes necessary when the charge is particularly serious, and the Juvenile Court considers transfer for trial in adult court. Sufficient facts must be established to constitute probable cause of the truth of the charge before the Judge can order such transfer. Among other guarantees, the Kent decision requires the Juvenile Court to try all available resources before transferring a youth to adult court. There were 26 such hearings during the year as compared to 54 in 1970.

A *Commitment Hearing* is held when the Court intends to send a child to the state correctional school. These hearings must provide the same guarantee of due process as fact-finding and decline hearings. We are guided in such hearings by the 1967 United States Supreme Court's decision *In Re Gault*. (1) There were 162 commitment hearings in 1971, and 240 in 1970.

*Disposition Hearings* are held when a judicial consent or decision is required for placement, probation or other corrective treatment. Prior to each, the probation officer

(1) The Gault decision of May 15, 1967, changed the entire procedure for Juvenile Courts. Francis Gault, a 15 year old boy, was sent to the Arizona State training school (for up to six years) for having made an obscene phone call. The facts of the delinquency were obscure; no record was made of the proceedings. The Judge's memory of the testimony conflicted with both that of the defendant and the arresting officer. The Supreme Court granted an appeal from the Arizona State Supreme Court that the original hearing didn't offer normal constitutional guarantees, nullifying in effect all juvenile hearings that do not meet adult rules.

evaluates social and family factors, submits a written report, alternative solutions and recommendation and effects agreement with child and parent wherever possible. There were 1,345 hearings conducted on disposition.

*Financial Hearings* to establish parent responsibility for care of children were held in 175 cases during 1971. These hearings involve parental support payments for institutional or foster care and the cost of detention care in the Youth Service Center. Many of these are show-cause matters.

*Traffic Hearings* may be held on contested traffic charges. Three traffic referees decide all other cases, including those involving negligent driving. In the past two years greater flexibility in dispositions and informal declines of jurisdiction for traffic cases have reduced full court hearings on traffic matters in Juvenile Court to 3 cases in 1971.

## JUVENILE COURT SERVICES

The Youth Service Center is like an emergency social hospital. It is the place where expert diagnosis, emergency physical care, family first aid and evaluations of future risk all take place. In addition, because this is also a court, those cases which require court determination and court authority for placement, correction or probation treatment can be determined. To some the Youth Service Center may be a jail but it is also the work place of the community's conscience toward its less tractable, less clever and least loved children. Every day for every child on these premises is a crisis of some sort. Our people seek daily to build another plan, a higher aspiration and a fuller self-realization for each youngster coming under our care and supervision.

Referrals to the Juvenile Court from law enforcement agencies constitute 66%, schools and social agencies 6%, parents or child 20%, and others 8%. Referrals are made by letter or bulletin requesting court intervention or determination, by bringing a child to the Youth Service Center for detention or shelter care and petitioning the Court, or by remand from an agency or department having care or custody of the child. More than one-half of all children referred were detained or sheltered, but not all of them require full court determination or wardship to meet the problem.

All kinds of offenses and conditions are included in these cases. During 1971, there were some increases in offenses against property but auto thefts declined by 170 to 400 cases, the lowest in ten years. Drinking offenses increased by 200 and drug use by 100 cases. There were also reductions in serious offenses including robbery, mail theft and various sex offenses. Neglect and shelter cases declined by 200, primarily as a result of protective services provided by the Department of Social & Health Services and their immediate shelter care program for younger non-delinquent children. There was no significant change in the number or kind of referrals for rebellious conduct or being out of parental control.

King County has 296,000 youngsters between ages five and eighteen. Only 8,297 of these, or 1 child in 35, was brought to the attention of Juvenile Court in 1971. Slightly over two-thirds were referred to us by police for alleged delinquent acts or breaking a law. The remainder were alleged to be dependent on the Court because they were beyond family control, unruly, runaway or were in need of protective custody from damaging adults.

All cases referred to the department in 1971 are classified as follows:

Alleged delinquent referrals . . .	5,338	Moving traffic citations . . .	11,626
Alleged rebellious conduct . . .	1,547	Pedestrian, motor boat,	
Alleged dependent & shelter . . .	1,412	hitchhiking citations . . .	4,349



## INVESTIGATION DIVISION

Law requires that a probation officer thoroughly investigate each case to ascertain that a petition needs to be filed and to recommend specific services required by the child.

In 1971 the Investigation Division, with an average of 36 probation officers in 5 units, performed its assigned tasks of detention screening, intake and investigative and diagnostic services in over 7,000 cases during the year. In addition, 7 other probation officers saw to specialized functions including information services, home-finding and volunteer services coordination.

Probation work requires intensive training, broad understanding of people problems, dedication to and skill with children. It requires professional competence to get a reliable assessment of the problem. Unemployment, divorce, personality conflicts, ill health, alcoholism and parental immaturity are frequently found in the family circle of today's delinquent or dependent child. Investigating probation officers must understand these events and their affect on people.

### *Service*

In 1971 probation officers and their supervisors performed at these levels:

Prepared 2,795 cases for preliminary detention hearings, interviewed children, parents, referring agents and then completed the services necessary after such hearings.

Completed 3,294 cases by adjustment with the family, counseling parents, effecting restitution or referring them to an appropriate private or public agency for care or service.

Dismissed 1,050 cases outright for lack of reasons for court intervention.

Performed 1,507 full investigations of allegedly delinquent or dependent children and presented the cases for fact-finding, decline of jurisdiction, commitment, or other dispositional hearings.

Processed 602 applications for adopting agencies for temporary custody of children pending placement.

Interviewed 2,515 children and their parents to work out alternatives to detention care while necessary court activity proceeded.

Supervised 85 cases for short term as determined by the court.

Represented the department through a variety of ways including community speaking assignments, juvenile court conference committee consulting and other kinds of community committee work.

Our intake services are a major part of the total probation work force effort. Over the past year we continued to seek better methods and to develop our skills in this area to make possible immediate and effective aid where other court disposition is not required. For example, in July 1971 detention screening services were expanded to provide *around the clock* coverage, Monday through Friday and *16-hour coverage* on weekends. This increased effort in providing crisis intervention for distraught families, arranging immediately for temporary care, referring families to other community agencies and protecting children from detention for unjustified reasons resulted in 2,515 children being screened out — not admitted to child care facilities. At the end of 1971 almost 50% of all children presented for admission into the Youth Service Center were provided alternative care. It is hoped that this trend will continue.

Medical examinations and around the clock nursing care is given here at the Youth Service Center. Not surprisingly, a youngster's mental health is a major concern of the Court. Where necessary special diagnostic and consulting services aid the probation officer

in making his assessment. Competent psychiatric consultants provide the diagnosis of seriously disturbed children and make a recommendation for treatment. Whenever parents can afford to pay for necessary psychological or psychiatric services, they are strongly encouraged to do so. There were 290 such diagnostic services paid for fully or in part by parents.

As must be evident, all work described above requires careful evaluation of each child's attitudes and behavior and of the parents' capacity and ability to manage. To assess people's difficulties so rapidly and effectively requires the highest professional competence to bring desired results.

In summary, highlights for 1971 are: (1) expanded detention screening services; (2) the employment of a volunteer coordinator who was responsible for the orientation, training, assessment and supervision of all volunteers in the division; (3) the planning and implementing in late December, 1971 of a judicial review for all children admitted into the Youth Service Center in the previous twenty-four hours. This is another effort to reduce unnecessary detention stays.

### *Goals of This Division For Next Year*

Full use of the new expanded admissions facility is the responsibility of the Investigation Division. The intent here is to establish and implement a mental health emergency service much like the medical emergency service within a hospital. This service would be operated daily on an around the clock basis, as family crisis help.

Better and more effective use of volunteers in all possible activities and services.

Greater reliance upon the Deputy Prosecuting Attorney in determining the legal appropriateness of cases.

Establishment of additional Juvenile Court conference committees to deal with minor offenders in the community, where local community development warrants.

Establishment of resource staff to develop family support, special education, jobs for youth, training placements, and social activities for deprived youth.

Upgrading of and maximum commitment to the development of needed orientation and training programs, both internal and external.

These activities are within our reach and every effort will be made toward their accomplishment.

## PROBATION SERVICES DIVISION

Administrative reorganization of the court at the beginning of 1971 placed the staff engaged in probation services in a separate division under the Assistant Administrator for Probation Services. This included the total Special Supervision Program (SSP) and units of General Probation organized along the same lines as the Special Supervision units except for a smaller clerical staff.

### *Youth On Probation*

Selected children are placed by the court under supervision of a probation caseworker. These children require follow-up direction, guidance or authority control but do not require removal from parents nor institutionalizing. The judge limits probation to those able to benefit and to the number the staff can effectively supervise.

The philosophy of this Court is to provide an opportunity for the child to improve and for his parents to rectify the conditions leading to delinquency through authority-based individual guidance and casework help. We believe the family unit should be maintained and strengthened in every case possible. We believe community services



should be used fully before court intervention is required or continued.

#### *Special Supervision Program*

The Special Supervision Program, or "Probation Subsidy," completed its second year of operation. It is subsidized by the State, which reimburses counties for expenditures on community based probationary treatment of selected seriously troubled juveniles who otherwise might be committed to state institutions. The objectives of the Special Supervision Program are: (1) increased protection to citizens; (2) more even administration of justice; (3) rehabilitation of juvenile offenders and (4) reduction of commitments to state correctional institutions.

The Department of Social and Health Services calculates for each county an average (or base) commitment rate per 100,000 population based upon pre-statute experience. This rate and current population determine the predicted commitments for each county during the budget year. The law provides for reimbursement to counties of a maximum of \$4,000 x the number of reductions a county achieves under the predicted figure for the year, or the actual expenditures of the county on an approved program, whichever is the lesser. In practice, program planning has been controlled by the amount of funds appropriated by the Legislature for program support and the pro-rata share allocated to each county. For King County this has amounted to about 1/3 the potential under the funding formula in terms of actual reductions achieved. Thus for 1971 the allocation to King County was \$386,502 whereas 299 reductions were achieved which would have permitted a program of \$1,196,000.

The support services staff developed in 1970 and 1971, in addition to probation workers, includes employment, education and research specialists; a foster home finder; support supervisor; business manager; assistant accountant and clerical assistance. The program establishes case loads of probation officers to a maximum of 20 (30 cases by state law), each unit with 5 probation officers under one supervisor. During 1971, the total case load of the SSP increased from 129 in January to 143 at year end. This represented a near maximum load for the kinds of cases involved. SSP workers have more difficult cases which call for comprehensive treatment plans including both the juvenile's family and school.

The major innovation tried during the year had a two-fold objective of increasing worker efficiency and better access to and use of the vast array of community resources in King County. The method was to assign cases to caseworkers on a geographical basis to cut down on travel requirements of workers and clients, facilitate involvement of families and peers in the treatment process, and establish worker identity with community leaders and organizations capable of contributing to the rehabilitative effort. The initial approach was to pair Special Supervision workers with General Probation workers to permit accommodation of clients in either program according to their needs.

Because individual probation officers are primarily case-oriented, we undertook to assign to their Supervisors the primary responsibility of intensifying community interest and coordinating community endeavors in the rehabilitative effort. This new effort is productive in several communities already and holds promise for better community impact on social services generally.

In addition to the individual and family treatment methods used by SSP effective group work has been carried out with parents and children by staff and other consultants. A Youth Service Center extension school was maintained for 7 months in temporary space for 20 youngsters per day, who were not acceptable in any other school program. In conjunction with this school other recreational and learning activities were scheduled including trips to Camp Orkila and the mountains, a car wash and baseball games.

The SSP rate of success has been high; only 14% of SSP clients were committed to the Department of Institutions during the year. When a commitment seems imminent, workers usually request a psychological or psychiatric evaluation of the child using either services of the new staff psychiatrist or consultant services from the University of Washington. Thus all possible alternatives for care are evaluated and tried.

SSP has served as a catalyst for regular court probation and other counseling services. SSP youngsters without this special attention would be committed to a state institution. Only with specialized services, fewer youth on probation to each SSP probation worker and greater attention to each child can these youngsters remain in the community.

Increased time for each case has permitted improved initial assessment of cases, more explicit supervision planning, and more intimate and subtle knowledge of individuals and their life situations with consequent increased ability to predict and evaluate progress or deterioration.

Staff training — which has included psychiatric consultation, general casework theory, and seminar courses in group and family treatment — has enhanced skills, added new techniques, and has provided greater depth of understanding of behavioral dynamics.

During the year staff under SSP supervised 245 youngsters, half of them newly assigned during the year, and 88 cases were successfully completed and closed after 9 to 12 months of intensive supervision. There were 23 youngsters committed as a result of new offenses or breakdown to the prescribed program, a few after 9 months. These "failures" were youngsters whose personal lives were grossly disorganized and where intervention was too little or too late. At the same time, commitments were dramatically reduced to 240 in 1970 and to 162 in 1971.

#### *General Probation Supervision*

General (county funded) Probation units, unlike units of the SSP, have no prescribed case load of supervisory limits, no specially designated support services staff to assist and only limited funds for purchasing social services. Under these circumstances the Probation Services Division must accommodate the remaining probation load with no control over the volume of that load.

During the year, services were performed by 10 probation officers, 2 supervisors, 4 clerks, 5 New Careers people and several volunteers. The direction and efforts of this staff are in community-based services stressing closer relationships between the caseworker, child, family and in creating or finding resources within the community to assist in building new modes of behavior.

The two staff units were charged during the year with providing supervision and direction for 641 youngsters ordered on probation by the court (an increase of 59 over 1970) exclusive of those whose special needs and legal status render them eligible for special supervision under the SSP. There were 31 youngsters, all county-residents, who were placed on supervision by other jurisdictions. Some children legally classified as dependent and appearing to need court intervention were also added to this probation group during the year. Parents, friends and relatives also constitute a portion of the workload of social workers in these units.

#### *Services and Achievements*

With the advent of assignment by geographic area the two staff units of General Probation developed new partnerships in their approach to service delivery. One unit had a probation officer diverted to supervision of the New Careers program (5 workers) plus 2 part-time community aides. The community aides utilized a drop-in center located in a high-delinquency area with the program geared at the grass-roots level.



The approach was to use the probation officer as case manager with the aids and volunteers providing group leaderships. Some aides and New Careerists were former court clients. The probation officer assigned also acted as indirect "change agent" in influencing public attitude and generating volunteer and resident assistance. Subsequently, this caseworker and one New Careerist resigned to take other employment.

Intensive community involvement has been made possible under geographical area assignments. Six workers are consultants to Juvenile Conference Committees, one group worker is involved in what he terms "Operational Community" together with his supervisor and a SSP worker assigned to the same area. Resource and supportive aid thus is provided to clients (and their families) on probation and reduced duplicative community services.

Other services performed by this dedicated staff are:

Conduct of group sessions by both SSP and regular probation staff.

Leading of group orientations of newly admitted youngsters in detention.

Assisting in extension schools for probationers not served in existing public school programs.

Greater participation in youth coordinating committees and planning groups around the county, i.e., Ballard, Queen Anne, Shoreline, Central Area, Bellevue, etc.

Conduct of special recreation programs, hiking, camping, etc.

Coordination of campership programs and Neighborhood Youth Corps jobs for any eligible child.

Use of former probationers as co-therapists.

Greater use of worker expertise in varying treatment modes, i.e., parent effectiveness training, transactional analysis, Heimler Scale of social functioning, etc.

The education specialist with qualified school personnel conducted special language disability tests for 92 children under supervised probation.

#### *Probation Goals*

In the immediate future these goals challenge our regular probation staff and the SSP:

Further refinement of our efforts in assignment by geographic area and involvement of the public sector in these areas.

Mobilization of more workers from the volunteer program and other para-professionals in direct service to both active and non-referred clients.

Involvement of other social service groups in assisting youth in more positive ways.

Development of a professional manual on the delivery of social services.

Securing of free or low cost housing in the community for use in probationary programs and cooperative services.

Expanded development and advanced training of staff, volunteers and New Careerists.

The 1968 Forward Thrust program offered Community Service Centers to the voters as a place where new social stability and family restoration could occur. The offer was turned down. But our staff in cooperation with some other people are pursuing those goals with troubled youth within the community through other means.

## **CHILD CARE DIVISION**

Three years careful screening of all admissions to detention has made a tremendous impact on the daily population of detention. Although the number of youth detained was higher by 578 in 1971 than in 1970, the average daily population dropped for the third year in a row and stood at 124. Individual length of stay has consequently dropped to 10.2 days, indicating that the decision-making process of "where to go from here" is more rapid than in previous years. Boys outnumbered girls 2,509 to 1,392 and half stayed four days or less. With most dependent children under 13 years of age going to receiving foster homes (2), the population for detention is now almost exclusively a teenage group (94% are 13 or over) of delinquent and rebellious youth. (See statistical tables.)

Although boys' sections of the detention home were still grossly over populated throughout most of the year, much of the building was capable of physically handling the youth detained.

#### *Nature of Child Care*

Children in detention are under the 24-hour supervision of a highly competent child care staff. These group supervisors are charged with the responsibility of offering good physical care and protection for each child. The goal is to provide a safe, clean, healthful, non-punitive and remedial kind of care. The work demands are great and require intelligence, flexibility with firmness and an ability to handle most varied problems. Many of the staff are college graduates; others are continuing their college work.

#### **Detention Admissions and Population**

<i>Five Year Comparison</i>	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
No. Children Presented for Detention:	5,561	5,765	5,420	5,430	6,791
No. Delinquent Admitted:	2,579	2,493	2,103	1,773	2,041
No. Rebellious Admitted:	2,534	1,910	1,752	1,705	1,957
No. Neglected Admitted:		762	364	423	481
No. Screened Out, Not Admitted:	e. 500 (e. - Estimated)	e. 600	1,769	1,985	2,515
Average Daily Population for Year:	162	160	148	136	124
Average Days Stay:		11.7	13.0	12.8	10.2

#### *Summary of Services*

Detention services include activities and programs to develop the physical and social potential in the individual youth. These services include school, craft, recreation, work, group discussions and experience in everyday group living. Nursing around the clock and medical care is available for all variety of illness — real and imagined.

(2) The Division of Public Assistance reached an important milestone in October, 1968. Receiving homes for neglected children were then made available around the clock, almost eliminating shelter care in the Youth Service Center. There were 3 children 7 years of age or less and 474 other children detained all year for shelter. The Division placed 400 others in receiving home care.



### *Living Groups or Child Care Units*

Assignment to living groups — 7 separate units available throughout 1971, with additional to be opened in 1972 — is made to fit the individual requirements of the youth being detained. The criteria for unit placement includes age, degree of physical, emotional and mental maturity, and reason for admission to detention.

The several units (primary, junior and senior) are geared with flexibility to reach the varying degrees of maturity found in youth in detention. Ping-Pong, pool, books, magazines, TV and radio fill free time. In addition, recreation in the gym or swimming pool, table games, sewing machines, various crafts and other pursuits also make the detention experience more stimulating and less boring. Interviews with caseworkers or public defenders or attorneys and visits with parents interrupt the activity programs. Court hearings are critical events which end their detention and order a new condition of freedom.

Changes have been made throughout detention in 1971. More positive and flexible programs have been entered into the daily routine. A youth-staffed council was formed late in the year. Increased communication between the youth and staff, and practical improvements in the child care program resulted.

The security unit has undergone the greatest change in focus, as selected activities and programs have evoked positive behavioral changes in many youth. Hostile or frightened youth are assigned to this unit because of their inability to get along with others without fighting.

### *School Services*

The Seattle School System provided 9 teachers for the Youth Service Center school program. In addition to remedial and academic instruction, one art teacher, one homemaking teacher and one physical education teacher help make this school a place where individual attention can help change an indifferent student into a teenager ready to make that new try at school work on the outside. During the year an average of 90 children attended classes each day in grades 3 through 12.

Success in the classroom is not necessarily related to a child's intelligence but it is, of course, a fair measure of his stability. It should be noted here that a third of the youngsters referred to us are either *not enrolled*, or are *not attending* or are truant. Many have been suspended or expelled. The youngster does reasonably well at our school if he accomplishes a significant amount of work and relates generally and favorably to his classmates. When he can not, he has trouble that may lead to rebellion or delinquency. Often, inability to succeed or get along at school may originally have started his fight against authority. His problem may disappear if we can help him to improve his performance through understanding and close supervision. Even when his adjustment has been fraught with numerous troubles, the first sign of a developing new outlook may be increased interest and ability in the classroom. In a sense, low grades are like high body temperature, useful to the specialist's diagnosis and dangerous in their own right.

## **VOLUNTEER PROGRAM**

Early in 1971 a study team of 4 citizens was appointed to examine in depth the Probation Volunteer Program and make recommendations to the Board of Managers pertinent to overall organization of the program. Some of those recommendations are reflected in the following paragraphs.

During the year two large and successful orientation programs were conducted to attract new volunteers, especially for probation services and family rebuilding. In all divisions of the department between 150 and 200 volunteers were active each

month and they devoted nearly 30,000 hours of service, supplies and financial support to youngsters with problems.

Their services include craft instruction, swim instruction, charm school, barbering, shopping trips, clinic visits, and school tutoring. Their aid to youth in probation includes direct supervision, job finding, vocational familiarity, school tutoring and providing a steady and sympathetic relationship.

Volunteer services are usually valued at \$3.00 per hour, largely for grant purposes. Combining the value of these hours with other contributions indicates a total community contribution of over \$100,000 for the year.

There were 4 full-time coordinators in the volunteer program, one for each division of the Juvenile Department. Requirements vary from division to division, thus the coordinator must tailor his efforts accordingly and in so doing, operate more or less independently from the remainder of the volunteer program in close coordination with special skills or interests to perform tasks ranging from clerical and transportation work to assisting caseworkers.

The Youth Service Guild, in which all volunteers have membership, was recently reorganized and is in a process of expanding its areas of interest to include recruitment, public relations and fund raising. Since its original formation in 1952 the Guild has maintained a group of 20 or more active volunteers in child care activities at the Youth Service Center.

The following organizations also were among those contributing significantly during the year.

American Federation of Musicians Local 776	Chochi Junior Women
American Women's Voluntary Services	Providence Hospital
Camp Fire Girls of America	Kiwanis International Industrial Club
Venture Club	1st Hill Kiwanis Club
Overlake Presbyterian Church	Mary Whitman Circle
Women's City Club	Pan American World Airways
Alpha Xi Chapter, Beta Sigma Phi	P.T.A. of Seattle
Quota Club	White SS Corporation
Pacific Northwest Bell	Shoreline School of Nursing
Sears Roebuck and Company	Shoreline School of Dental Hygiene
Carnation	Merriweds
Childrens Service Guild	Alpha Delta Kappa
Washington Jockey Club	Washington Mutual Savings
Womens Business Group	Pot and Kettle Club
Telephone Pioneers of America	Goodwill Industries
St. Stephens Episcopal Church Women	University Kiwanis
American Baptist Womens Group	East Shore Unitarian Women



## TRAFFIC DISPOSITIONS

All youth under the age of 18 years residing in King County who are issued traffic citations for moving violations are referred to the Juvenile Court for adjudication. Parking violations are paid in municipal court as are adult violations. Pedestrian violations such as jaywalking and hitchhiking, and boating violations are also referred to this department for disposition.

Traffic referrals for all moving violations for 1971 totaled 11,626 or 1,989 more than in 1970. The increases are in citations for speeding (900 more), for illegal turns and signals (782 more) and for defective equipment (400 more). The other astonishing increase (2,000 more) was for hitchhiking and pedestrian violations. Most hitchhiking citations are now written by Washington State Patrol on freeways and accesses, and therefore reflect dangerous conditions.

The system of adjudicating juvenile traffic offenses in King County is based on the concept of individual interview for each juvenile and his parents before a traffic referee. During the interview the youngster and his parents are apprised of and discuss the nature of the violation, why the citation was issued, corrective measures intended to prevent further violations and the penalty invoked if one is appropriate. No bails or fines are used in Juvenile Court as corrective measures. The penalty when applied is based on the driving privilege. Some violations may require license restriction or driving only under strict parental supervision. Suspension of driving privileges for 6 to 9 months in a given case may be deemed necessary. We believe young drivers benefit more from penalties against their driving privileges than from fines which can be paid by the parent. The traffic referee imposes a penalty only if it is deemed necessary to impress the youth as to the need for responsible driving.

In review, the 1971 traffic citations reflect the adult behavior extant for the most part and show the results of improved law enforcement efforts. Speeding offenses remained high at 33% of moving violations. All serious moving violations increased last year, including driving under the influence of alcohol. Speeding is considered a voluntary act of the driver and it is a prime cause of accidents.

The Juvenile Court needs to search for new and more effective means of educating the young traffic offender. In 1971 the number of youth receiving two or more citations doubled over the previous year. New methods for anticipating likely repeat violators should reduce recurring violations. This search continues with adult traffic offenders also.

It should be quite evident to the 16 to 18 year old what is required of him to be a legal and safe driver. The majority respond well to counseling; but repeaters apparently need more attention despite driver training programs, efforts of the Juvenile Court and the flood of other driver-oriented advice and statistical data appearing in the media.

The court will pursue an action-oriented approach to achieve such objectives as *universal* driver training and education and improvement of auto reliability. In doing so we must establish strong communications with citizen safety councils, high school safety councils (student courts), law enforcement agencies, legislative committees and others. A special project for 1972 will compare the effect of disposition by Selected District Courts on juveniles.

## BUSINESS AND OPERATIONS

Operations and maintenance reflected the increased costs and additional demands for services and supplies. Sixteen of thirty-four budget items exceeded the programmed amounts and required adjustments from other lines or fund transfers from surplus salaries and wages to meet end-of-year obligations. The most significant over expenditures were: Advisory and Consultation Services \$7,536; Attorney and Legal Services

\$11,427; Food \$5,345; and Office Supplies \$3,661. After adjustments it was necessary to transfer \$13,891 for accrued surplus salaries and wages to operations and maintenance accounts.

A total of \$142,858 of the gross budget allocation for 1971 was turned back unexpended. This amount was salaries and wages accrued throughout the year as a result of personnel turnover. From time to time positions went unfilled.

## FINANCES

### *Collections On Financial Orders*

The Court has the obligation and authority to assess parents who are able to pay for the cost of care of a child placed by court order in a private home or child care institution. The collection department maintained follow-up and collection procedures on 577 cases and assured the appropriate funds from other sources, such as Social Security or Veteran Benefits, are applied to the child's care. A total of \$246,542 was collected on such child care orders and the funds disbursed to the child caring agency.

In addition, when the Court finds that detention of a child is necessary, it may assess parents who are able to pay for the cost of detention care. Collections for detention totaled \$42,613 on 1,363 cases.

### *Juvenile Court Budget*

The Juvenile Court budget was appropriated by the King County Council. The budget is prepared by the administrative officers for the Board of Managers who submit it to the County Council. The funds appropriated for this Department, as for most County offices, come from the County general fund.

The budget allocation for 1971 was as follows:	Regular Budget Allocation	Special Supervision Program Allocated	Spent
<b>Salaries &amp; Wages</b>			
Administrative Division	\$ 98,040		
Probation-Investigation Division	788,110	\$262,740	\$249,618
Detention Division	582,540		
Operations Division	208,500		
Additional Positions	94,545		
Extra Help & Overtime	177,444	2,000	638
Employee Benefits	274,712	38,195	37,127
	<u>\$2,223,891</u>		
<b>Operations and Capital Outlay</b>			
Operations & Maintenance	236,180	81,800	61,375
Capital Outlay	0	1,767	1,491
	<u>\$2,460,071</u>	<u>\$386,502</u>	<u>\$350,249</u>

### *Cost of Detention Care*

The costs of operating the detention and shelter phases of the operation are used to determine the daily cost of physical care apart from probation services. The rate of \$15 per day was established in 1967 based on the actual costs divided by the number of child-care days during the year. The following figures are of interest in showing the cost of institutional care: (not including expenditures for probation, judicial and clerical services).



### *These Budget Expenditures Determine Detention Costs - 1971*

Salaries and Wages - Institutional Personnel . . . . .	\$1,016,976
Operation and Maintenance Costs . . . . .	105,081
Capital Outlay Chargeable to Detention . . . . .	0
	<hr/>
	\$1,122,057

This reflects a cost of \$24.85 per child day care for the year 1971. This is an increase of \$4.84 per child care day over 1970 costs.

The cost of food per meal showed a gain of \$0.036 this past year. Total cost of food for the year was \$54,346 and a total of 165,451 meals were served at an average cost of \$0.3284 per meal. Cost of food per meal for the two previous years were 1969 - \$0.2762 and 1970 - \$0.2923. The Department of Agriculture contributed 9,980 pounds of surplus food.

### **YOUTH COUNCILS AND JUVENILE COURT CONFERENCE COMMITTEES**

Several communities have developed youth councils organized by citizen leadership and made up of a broad representation of organizations, churches and dedicated citizens concerned with youth. There is a job and a challenge for such councils to inform the community of its own problems, to actually improve opportunities for youth, and to develop services and programs locally to assist those who need them. Such unified effort to reduce social disorganization and improve the social climate must surely prevent delinquency and reduce disorganization.

Several such community-wide youth councils have requested the appointment of a juvenile court conference committee serving to screen and recommend adjustment of minor cases of delinquency arising in the community. The conference committee is selected by the local council, appointed by the Juvenile Court and oriented to its task by the probation staff. The conference committee does not adjudicate but acts in helpful conferences with the child and parents to find and recommend solutions to the problem presented. Parents may be referred to an agency for help. Damage may be settled by an agreed restitution plan. When the case warrants, it may be referred to the Juvenile Court without waiting for more aggravated or serious behavior to occur.

This is a delinquency prevention measure geared to minor offenses, school adjustment and first-time drug use. A Court consultant aids in their decisions. Most problems are resolved in one evening, but many are referred out for other specialists and agencies.

Renton's Conference Committee was the first in King County and has done excellent work. There are committees now in Bellevue, Kent, Federal Way, Highline, West Seattle, Bothell and Shoreline.

### **COMMUNITY SERVICES**

The Juvenile Court does not operate in a vacuum. Every social agency and institution caring for children or for their parents, is a potential resource for care or treatment of children and families with severe social problems.

Much of the Court's work is pairing youngsters who need help with people who can give it. We first try to put a child in balance with his own family and often this cannot be done without close work with schools, community and church groups. Where the family cannot cope with their difficulty, more aid is needed and we depend heavily on others. This is a two-way street. We develop programs to strengthen the community; the community strengthens our work and sharpens our insight.

The Department of Social and Health Services aids families to stabilize difficult home situations and has come to play a mighty role with children under twelve years. Care of homeless preschoolers, formerly a difficult task of the Court, is now almost totally in their hands. An extensive program of foster and group homes for children who do not pose special problems has allowed these youngsters to live more normal lives.

A large number of public and private agencies specialize in caring full time for children whose problems are particularly difficult (3). They range from girls boarding schools to forest camps. Some take as few as 3 children, some as many as 20; but the present squeeze for funds, both in taxes and donations, has placed many in a difficult position endangering services that are already far short of demand.

For youngsters who stay with their parents or with foster parents, the community's help is often crucial. They need to work and achieve; they need interest, guidance, and respect from others and themselves, companionship, special help for family crises and problems with school work or even with drugs.

Religious agencies of many denominations help both family and child problems. Boys' clubs are primarily recreational but do some counseling. CAMP (the Central Area Motivation Program) handles many services. King County and Seattle parks support recreational programs and activities designed to build character and citizenship. Again, many of these agencies find themselves in a financial bind and will have to depend on more donated help to meet the youngsters' need.

In asking for help, the Court must know the child's interests and background. The more we learn, the more we feel the need for new and imaginative programs. Art, camping, music, reading, gymnastics, carpentry: each may fit some child's need. There is no practical limit to what can be done.

Some very good things are happening for troubled young people in King County through the efforts of concerned men and women who are willing to donate their time and expand their professional efforts. Our volunteer probation officer program is helping many. Council of Planning Affiliates (social agencies) is breaking down local problems in dealing with youth. Students are interesting themselves in the Court's activities. Committed professionals in enforcement agencies, schools and other services are at work on better methods to spot and treat social failure and delinquency.

### **YOUTH SERVICE CENTER IMPROVEMENTS**

The people of this County enthusiastically approved in 1968 a 6.1 million dollar bond issue for additions and improvements to the Youth Service Center. This was a vote of confidence but it was also the expression of great public interest and concern for their troubled children. The bonds were sold and money invested to accumulate interest until needed for each part of the project.

The architectural planning and work supervision is being done by Francis Huggard and Associates. The King County Design Commission approved the building

(3) Homes for children available in Washington State and used by the Court in 1971 include:

Good Shepherd Home	Seattle Children's Home
Ryther Child Center	Evergreen Heights Boys Home
Everett Deaconess Home	Evergreen Park Boys Home
Ruth School for Girls	Luther Child Center
Home on the Hill	Children's Home Society
Girls Club	Blue Mountain
Jessie Dyslin Ranch	Cobb Hall (no Girls)
Griffin Home	Flying "H" Youth Ranch
Boysville Ranch	Toutle River Boys Ranch
Galland Hall (Girls)	Firwood Boys Home
Stuart Hall	Lakeview Group Home for Girls



plan in December 1968 and the contract was let to Century Construction Company in March 1970. At the end of 1971 the general contract was 80% complete and the new additions will be complete in May 1972.

*The additions to the building and their uses are:*

- a) The new two-story residential building houses 64 in groups of 16. Each group has common living, game, reading and music rooms. Children may be assigned to sleep in single rooms or one dormitory for three. This means the end of overcrowding and more individual privacy.

The ground floor of this structure adds ten new classrooms thus doubling our potential for remedial classes, homemaking, art and regular high school work. The five new craft rooms are multi-purpose as is the central divisible dining room for 65 children. All children may attend school and other instruction as teachers are available.

For the first time in this building a children's library and learning center will supplement school work, crafts and volunteer activities for all age groups. We can respond to willing learners with new and interesting materials and methods.

- b) The new children's gym is a typical junior high play center which opens out to two playfields, one of them surfaced. It has a roll out stage, instructor's station and film projection capacity. It will more than double winter gym activities for children.
- c) The court and office building assures a new and enlarged space for detention receiving, admission of children and intake services. It is the hub of physical movement of children and of first contacts with parents. It provides reception, conference and interviewing space.

The main floor, or ground floor, accomodates three new court hearing rooms, chambers, public assembly, clerk's office and related service and file areas. It provides for future courtrooms on the same floor with only minor adaptations.

Two of the other three floors of office space will house probation staff now doubled up in temporary quarters along with clerical and support personnel. Two prosecuting attorney deputies, case aides and volunteers in probation and supervisory staff are also assigned here. The top floor (fifth) will be developed for interagency programs and cooperative training projects. All of these expanded areas will eliminate overcrowded and cramped office space existing for 15 years.

- d) The kitchen addition is two stories to provide a new walk-in cold storage, meat preparation space and enlarged food and dry storage. The lower floor provides bulk storage, repair shop and paint locker.
- e) The boys' dining and school addition is a two-story structure with a dining room and a multi-purpose school and activity room on each floor. The additions adjoin the detention units to be occupied by boys and supplement school and craft space on each floor. Boys will be served food in smaller groups with fewer escorting staff and less regimentation. It will also result in savings of staff time in escort and supervision of boys going to and from the dining room.

- f) The boys' security addition is a two-story building with 14 single rooms on the ground floor and a multi-purpose activity room and overflow sleeping on the upper floor.

The unit connects to the existing boys' building and gym for logistics and to form two outdoor play areas. The design provides flexibility in supervision and better activity space.

The entire building is reinforced concrete and is quakeproof and fireproof. Construction will be completed in May of 1972. Furnishings and equipment were acquired in the fall of 1971, and the exterior should be completed by June 1972.



## STATISTICAL TABLES

Page

Summary of Referrals and Court Processes	19
Summary of Court Hearings	19
Probation Department Services	19
Special Supervision Program — Intensive	20
Financial Section	20
Traffic Citations	20
Summary of Detention and Shelter Care	21
Summary of Detention and Shelter Care — 10 Years, 1962 to 1971	22
Table 1 — Number of Children Released and Length of Detention Stay by Age	23
Table 2 — Length of Detention Stay for Children Released	24
Comparison and Trends 10 Year Period — 1962 to 1971	24
10 Year Comparison of Total Alleged Delinquency Referrals	26
Table 3 — Delinquency Referrals	27
Statistics on Alleged Delinquency Referrals	28
Table 4 — Race of Delinquent Child Referred	28
Table 5 — Marital Status of Parents — Delinquent Referrals	28
Table 6 — Case Status of Delinquent referrals	28
Table 7 — Family Income of Child Referred for Delinquency	29
Table 8 — Source of Support for Family of Delinquent Child Referred	29
Table 9 — Age of Children Referred for Delinquency	30
Table 10 — School Status — Delinquent Child	30
Table 11 — Dispositions of Delinquent Referrals	31
Table 12 — Source of Referral to Juvenile Court	32
Ten Year Comparison of Total Alleged Dependency Referrals	33
Dependency Referrals Disposed of in 1971	34
Table 13 — Reason for Referral	34
Table 14 — Race of Dependent Child Referred	34
Table 15 — Marital Status of Parents — Dependent Referrals	35
Table 16 — Case Status of Dependent Referrals	35
Table 17 — Family Income of Child Referred for Dependency	35
Table 18 — Age of Children Referred for Dependency	36
Table 19 — Source of Support for Family of Dependent Child Referred	36
Table 20 — School Status — Dependent Status	37
Table 21 — Dispositions of Dependent Referrals	37
Traffic Violations	38
Table 22 — Reason for Citations	38
Table 23 — Disposition of Traffic Citations	40

## SUMMARY OF REFERRALS AND COURT PROCESSES

All referrals to the Court for reasons of delinquency (5,338) and for dependency (2,959) are reflected in one or more processes outlined below:

Summary of Court Hearings	1970	1971
Preliminary hearings on detention	3,303	2,795
Fact Finding and Decline of Jurisdiction hearings	607	376
Commitment to Dept. of Institutions hearings	205	
Dispositional hearings (formerly called "Regular" hearings)	987	1,507
Contested Traffic hearings	3	3
Financial hearings, support, etc.	195	175
Custody matters, hearings	810	838
Non-appearance matters, hearings	2,830	3,292

### Probation Department Services

#### Detention Screening

No. of children presented for admission to detention	4,904	6,791
Not admitted (screened out) by officer	1,320	2,515
Admitted by screening officer	2,268	4,276
All other admissions	1,633	203
No. of actual admissions	3,901	4,479

#### Intake & Crisis Casework

Cases received during year	3,528	3,208
Cases disposed of during year—intake completed	3,308	3,580
Cases active at end of year	758	386

#### Investigation Cases (Children)

Cases received during year	1,585	2,454
Cases disposed of during year—work completed	1,303	2,344
Cases active at end of year	712	1,084

No. referrals adjusted with parent, child, etc.	2,457	3,431
No. settled by referral to agencies, advising parents, etc.	1,265	1,328
No. dismissed in preliminary hearing	128	60

#### Probation Supervision (Regular Program)

Average no. children on active probation	242	282
No. children placed on probation in year	379	347
No. children on active probation during year	582	641
No. on probation at end of year	276	290
No. terminated Success	306	351
Average caseload per probation officer	31	23
Average No. new assignments per officer per month	6	3.3



## Special Supervision Program — Intensive

	1970	1971
No. cases carried in program during year	162	245
No. cases terminated success	28	88
No. cases closed as recurring or failing	20	12*
No. cases active end of year	117	145
No. of P. O. and Case load 10 P. O.	14	14.3

## Financial Section

No. of accounts receivable for support of child	602	577
No. of accounts receivable for detention costs	1,363	1,363
No. of court hearings on financial matters	195	175
Amount in arrears and collectible	\$ 32,859	\$ 36,594
Amount collected for support of children	273,193	246,543
Amount collected for detention care	<u>32,539</u>	<u>42,613</u>
Total collected during the year	\$305,732	\$289,156

\*D. I. Com.

## Traffic Citations Referred

### Five Year Comparison of Reason for Referrals

Citation or Referral	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Drunk Driving	51	92	52	35	111
Reckless Driving	205	193	162	168	214
Hit & Run	34	39	28	32	68
Speeding	3,410	3,233	2,748	2,946	3,876
Negligent Driving	1,087	1,109	905	795	882
Stop signs, signals	977	916	751	910	1,217
Right of way, illegal turn	1,090	961	985	857	1,306
Following too close	95	106	65	82	84
Aiding and abetting	29	25	50	20	41
Defective equipment	1,274	1,028	772	944	1,358
Vehicle license violations	298	276	305	255	320
No operator's license, license susp.	1,231	1,192	1,175	1,329	1,632
All other moving violations	<u>1,611</u>	<u>1,428</u>	<u>1,013</u>	<u>1,292</u>	<u>517*</u>
Total moving violations	11,392	10,598	9,012	9,665	11,626
Hitchhiking, Pedestrians & Motor Boat violations	<u>790</u>	<u>1,239</u>	<u>1,185</u>	<u>2,174</u>	<u>4,349</u>
Total Citations	12,182	11,837	10,197	11,839	15,975

\*Note—Includes motorcycle safety violations

## SUMMARY OF DETENTION AND SHELTER CARE

Detention and Shelter Care Services	1970	1971
Admissions to Youth Service Center for Delinquency Reasons	1,773	2,041
Admissions to Youth Service Center for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency	<u>2,128</u>	<u>2,438</u>
Total Admissions to Youth Service Center	3,901	4,479
No. Individual Children Detained for Delinquency Reasons	1,289	1,421
No. Individual children Detained for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency	<u>1,629</u>	<u>1,756</u>
Total No. Individual Children Detained	2,918	3,177
Child Care Days Provided for Delinquency Reasons	18,035	17,384
Child Care Days Provided for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency, Rebellious	<u>31,438</u>	<u>27,758</u>
Total Child Care Days Provided	49,473	45,142
Average Length of Stay of Delinquent Children released	10.2	8.6
Average Length of Stay of Dependent Children released, Nondelinquency, Rebellious	<u>14.5</u>	<u>11.6</u>
Total Average Length of Stay for all Children	13.0	10.2
Average Daily Population in Detention for Delinquency Reasons	49.4	47.6
Average Daily Population in Detention for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency, Rebellious	<u>86.1</u>	<u>76.1</u>
Total Average Daily Population in Detention	135.5	123.7



# NUMBER OF CHILDREN RELEASED AND LENGTH OF DETENTION STAY BY AGE

		1971		
Age	Number of Children	Total Days in Detention	Average Length of Stay	
1	1	2	2.0 days	
2	0	0	0.0 days	
3	0	0	0.0 days	
4	0	0	0.0 days	
5	0	0	0.0 days	
6	1	7	7.0 days	
7	2	75	37.5 days	
Subtotal	4	84	21.0 days	
8	3	29	9.7 days	
9	16	417	26.1 days	
10	22	269	12.2 days	
11	59	1,179	20.0 days	
12	143	2,145	15.0 days	
Subtotal	243	4,039	16.6 days	
13	376	4,189	11.1 days	
14	765	9,004	11.8 days	
15	1,054	11,646	11.0 days	
16	1,120	10,240	9.1 days	
17	904	6,478	7.2 days	
18	13	38	3.0 days	
Subtotal	4,232	41,595	9.8 days	
Total	4,479	45,718	10.2 days	

NOTE:  
4 children age 7 or younger sheltered. The one child age 1 was in the infirmary overnight at the request of the mother who was also detained in the Youth Center.

94½% are age 13 and over

## SUMMARY OF DETENTION AND SHELTER CARE 10 Years, 1962 to 1971

Year	Referrals Delinquent & Dependent	All Detention Admits	% Det.	Del. Ref.	% Det.	Dep. Ref.	% Det.
1962	7,147	3,524	49%	3,681	56%	3,466	42%
1963	7,480	3,687	49%	3,824	54%	3,656	44%
1964	8,299	4,040	48%	4,697	52%	3,602	44%
1965	8,527	4,260	49%	4,624	46%	3,903	54%
1966	8,717	4,447	51%	4,718	48%	3,999	54%
1967	8,792	5,061	57%	4,760	50%	4,032	63%
1968	8,101	5,165	64%	4,171	60%	3,930	68%
1969	8,252	4,219	51%	4,658	45%	3,594	59%
1970	7,911	3,901	49%	4,659	38%	3,252	65%
1971	8,297	4,479	54%	5,338	38%	2,959	82% (c) (d)

(a)

(b)

(a) Total referrals corrected to exclude miscellaneous services, military clearances, remands from agencies.

(b) Includes preschool children, rebellious, ungovernable and other non-delinquency reasons for detention.

(c) These figures are inflated by runaways needing emergency shelter. There were 712 out-of-county runaways detained but not counted as referrals. The detention rate without them included would be 58%.

(d) These are rough rates only. Dependency referrals, for instance, include adoption custody matters which do not include detention.



# **LENGTH OF DETENTION STAY FOR CHILDREN RELEASED - 1971**

**Table 2**

<i>Length of Stay</i>	<i>All Children</i>	<i>Delinquent Children</i>	<i>Neglected Children</i>	<i>Rebellious Children</i>
1-4 days	2,389-53.3%	1,223-59.4%	286-58.9%	880-45.5%
5-10 days	931-20.8%	397-19.3%	109-22.5%	425-21.9%
11-15 days	315- 7.0%	127- 6.2%	28- 5.8%	160- 8.3%
16-20 days	186- 4.2%	72- 3.5%	14- 2.9%	100- 5.2%
21-30 days	266- 5.9%	95- 4.6%	14- 2.9%	157- 8.1%
31-60 days	304- 6.8%	126- 6.1%	21- 4.3%	157- 8.1%
61 and over	88- 2.0%	19- .9%	13- 2.7%	56- 2.9%
	4,479-100%	2,059-100%	485-100%	1,935-100%
Average Stay	10.2 days	8.6 days	7.6 days	12.2 days
Child Care Days	45,718	17,695	4,364	23,659
Number of Boys	2,789	1,716	226	847
Number of Girls	1,690	343	259	1,088

## **COMPARISON AND TRENDS 10 YEAR PERIOD 1962-1971**

*Trend in Total Court Referrals Alleging Delinquency and Dependency with % Annual Change*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Del. &amp; Dep. Referrals</i>	<i>&amp; Annual Change</i>	<i>Alleged Del. Referrals</i>	<i>&amp; Annual Change</i>	<i>Alleged Dep. Referrals</i>	<i>&amp; Annual Change</i>
1962	7,147	+ 29%	3,681	+ 42%	3,466	+ 19%
1963	7,480	+ 5%	3,824	+ 4%	3,656	+ 5%
1964	8,299	+ 11%	4,699	+ 23%	3,602	- 2%
1965	8,527	+ 3%	4,624	- 2%	3,903	+ 8%
1966	8,716	+ 2%	4,717	+ 2%	3,999	+ 3%
1967	8,792	+ 1%	4,760	+ 1%	4,032	+ 1%
1968	8,101	- 8%	4,171	- 12%	3,930	- 3%
1969	8,252	+ 2%	4,658	+ 12%	3,594	- 9%
1970	7,911	- 4%	4,659	0%	3,252	- 10%
1971	8,297	+ 5%	5,338	+ 15%	2,959	- 9%
1962-1971 Average Change per Year		+ 4.6%		+ 8.5%		+ .3%

## *Delinquent Referrals and Rates*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Delinquent Referrals</i>	<i>10-17 Year Population</i>	<i>Percent Population Referred</i>	<i>Rate of Delinquent Referrals per 10,000 Children, 10-17 Years</i>
1962	3,681	138,242	2.7%	266.3
1963	3,824	144,477	2.6%	264.7
1964	4,697	150,712	3.1%	311.6
1965	4,624	158,210	2.9%	291.1
1966	4,717	162,470	2.8%	284.2
1967	4,760	166,730	2.9%	285.5
1968	4,171	170,986	2.4%	243.9
1969	4,658	172,000 (est.)	2.7%	270.8
1970	4,659	177,960 (a)	2.6%	261.8
1971	5,338	191,640	2.8%	280.0

## *Dependent Referrals and Rates*

<i>Year</i>	<i>Dependent Referrals</i>	<i>10-17 Year Population *</i>	<i>Percent Population Referred</i>	<i>Rate of Dependent Referrals per 10,000 Children, 10-17 Years</i>
1962	3,466	344,400	1.0%	99.2
1963	3,656	354,400	1.0%	103.1
1964	3,602	364,400	1.0%	98.8
1965	3,903	374,460	1.0%	104.2
1966	3,999	385,840	1.0%	103.6
1967	4,032	397,205	1.0%	101.5
1968	3,930	408,577	1.0%	96.2
1969	3,594	378,000 (est.)	1.0%	95.1
1970	3,252	381,914 (a)	0.9%	85.2
1971	2,959	398,900	0.7%	74.5

\* Office of Population Research Figures for King County  
(a) 1970 Census



# DELINQUENCY REFERRALS

Disposed of in 1971

Table 3

Reason for Referral	Boys	Girls	Total
Murder/Manslaughter	2	-	2
Rape	13	-	13
Prostitution	-	13	13
Indecent Exposure	9	-	9
Indecent Liberties	15	3	18
Other Sex Offenses	4	3	7
Assault - Threatened	51	7	58
Assault - Fighting	89	26	115
Assault - Unprovoked	52	8	60
Robbery - Armed	27	4	31
Robbery - Unarmed	49	5	54
Purse Snatching	21	6	7
Auto Theft	386	14	400
Motor Bike Theft	27	-	27
Riding in Stolen Car - Knowing	57	7	64
Car Prowl	44	1	45
Bicycle Theft	48	-	48
Burglary/Unlawful Entry	747	17	764
Forgery	17	18	35
Shoplifting	217	158	375
Theft of Mail	19	5	24
Attempted/Other Theft	134	9	143
Arson	26	-	26
Vandalism	45	3	48
Property Damage	73	4	77
Trespassing/Prowling	51	2	53
Curfew	169	43	212
Glue Sniffing	13	1	14
Marijuana	259	64	323
L.S.D.	44	15	59
Other Narcotics & Dangerous Drugs	54	26	80
Attempted Suicide	5	9	14
Liquor - Use/Possession	390	45	435
Runaway from Correctional Institution	5	7	12
Other Delinquency	356	60	416
Courtesy Supervision	2	8	10
Total Delinquency Referrals (with full social data)	3,520	591	4,111

Actual Delinquency Referrals were ---

5,338

## 10 YEAR COMPARISON OF TOTAL ALLEGED DELINQUENCY REFERRALS King County Juvenile Court

Reason for Referral	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Murder/Manslaughter	1	0	1	1	2	1	5	6	6	2
Auto Theft	553	677	795	562	565	682	684	661	572	400
Riding in Stolen Car, Knowing	-	-	-	102	97	141	129	60	61	64
Motor Bike Theft	-	-	-	37	25	29	22	23	20	27
Burglary, Unlawful Entry	376	463	635	642	563	459	585	672	672	764
Robbery, Armed	62	47	75	52	23	23	57	63	48	31
Unarmed, Purse Snatch	-	-	-	-	20	46	95	75	99	81
Forgery	-	-	-	-	31	35	41	52	29	35
Mail Theft	-	-	-	-	23	30	32	39	36	24
Shoplifting	-	-	-	396	332	237	200	278	307	375
Other Theft, Attempts, Bikes	714	695	979	585	392	277	214	179	244	191
Rape	-	-	-	-	8	7	7	7	9	13
Indecent Exposure, Liberties	-	-	-	-	45	33	53	27	22	27
Sex Offense - Other	285	233	276	283	161	121	70	35	29	20
Injury to Person - Assault	139	175	167	166	82	60	47	67	77	60
Fighting - Threatened Assault	-	-	-	81	117	165	144	122	157	173
Vandalism, Property Damage	100	99	170	285	189	111	91	89	121	125
Arson, Firesetting	-	-	35	79	68	60	44	31	45	26
Car Prowl, Trespass	-	-	-	-	64	81	58	85	103	98
Boat Violation, Trespass	-	-	-	11	58	81	nc	nc	nc	nc
Carelessness, Mischief	4	5	1	11	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc
Curfew	80	49	74	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc
Use of Liquor, Possession	172	180	194	278	291	216	152	198	138	212
Runaway, Correctional Inst.	760	751	820	646	852	865	467	519	225	435
Attempted Suicide	141	107	91	56	49	84	46	80	76	12
Glue Sniffing	-	-	16	18	76	148	130	18	15	14
Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs	-	-	5	5	32	324	386	356	363	462
Supervision for Other Court	-	-	-	-	22	20	22	16	23	10
Other Reasons	295	343	346	291	488	285	291	279	295	416
Minor Infractions Adjusted or Pending Dispositions	-	-	-	-	-	181	71	577	860	1,227
TOTALS	3,681	3,824	4,697	4,624	4,717	4,760	4,171	4,658	4,659	5,338

Note: Where multiple offenses are committed, the most serious one is tabulated as "Reason for Referral."



# STATISTICS ON ALLEGED DELINQUENCY REFERRALS

1971 — continued

**Table 4** *Race of Delinquent Child Referred:*

<i>Race</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
White	2,887	422	3,309
Negro	492	137	629
Indian	44	17	61
Filipino	25	3	28
Chinese/Japanese	21	3	24
Other	51	9	60
Total	3,520	591	4,111

**Table 5** *Marital Status of Parents — Delinquent Referrals:*

	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Married and together	1,711	240	1,951
Divorced	569	100	669
Divorced — Mother remarried	337	65	402
Divorced — Father remarried	137	26	163
Both Remarried	154	18	172
Separated	150	38	188
Married and Apart	10	4	14
Father Dead	134	18	152
Mother Dead	31	14	45
Both Dead	11	2	13
Father dead — Mother remarried	41	2	43
Mother dead — Father remarried	23	1	24
One Parent Deserted	7	2	9
Unmarried	47	8	55
Unknown or not reported	158	53	211
Total	3,520	591	4,111

**Table 6** *Case Status of Delinquent Referrals:*

	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
New	1,776	354	2,130
Old Dep.	101	45	146
Reappear — Dependent	70	30	100
Recidivist — Dependent	14	7	21
Old Delinquent	613	52	665
Reappear — Delinquent	629	57	686
Recidivist — Delinquent	220	20	240
Old Delinquent & Dependent	85	25	110
Recidivist — Delinquent & Dependent	12	1	13
Total	3,520	591	4,111

**Table 7** *Family Income of Child Referred for Delinquency:*

<i>Amount of Income</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Under \$200 per month	26	6	32
200 — 299	71	17	88
300 — 399	133	22	155
400 — 499	173	23	196
500 — 599	210	32	242
600 — 699	227	27	254
700 — 799	170	25	195
800 — 899	187	22	209
Over 900	744	101	845
Unemployed	100	19	119
Unknown or not reported	1,479	297	1,776
Total	3,520	591	4,111

**Table 8** *Source of Support for Family of Delinquent Child Referred:*

<i>Source of Support</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Father	1,903	263	2,166
Step-Father	280	42	322
Mother	474	78	552
Step-Mother	4	-	4
Relatives	31	1	32
Public Assistance — SDPA	294	82	376
Social Security	47	5	52
Self	22	4	26
Other	40	9	49
Unknown or not reported	425	107	532
Total	3,520	591	4,111



Table 9

## Age of Children Referred for Delinquency:

Years	Boys	Girls	Total
6	1	1	2
7	4	-	4
8	9	-	9
9	10	1	11
10	36	3	39
11	59	8	67
12	96	22	118
13	227	41	268
14	465	114	579
15	677	119	796
16	826	141	967
17	1,110	141	1,251
Total	3,520	591	4,111

Table 10

## School Status - Delinquent Child:

Grade in School	Boys	Girls	Total
Grade 1	1	-	1
Grade 2	-	-	-
Grade 3	12	-	12
Grade 4	24	2	26
Grade 5	40	3	43
Grade 6	54	7	61
Grade 7	152	34	186
Grade 8	312	51	363
Grade 9	506	80	586
Grade 10	593	118	711
Grade 11	565	74	639
Grade 12	378	48	426
Pre-School	-	-	-
Kindergarten	12	4	16
Withdrew	207	31	238
Dropped Out	73	6	79
Suspended	12	-	12
Expelled	32	6	38
College, University, Other	13	3	16
Less than full time	6	4	10
Adjustment Classes	35	4	39
Graduated	493	116	609
Unknown or not reported	3,520	591	4,111
Total	3,520	591	4,111

## DISPOSITIONS OF DELINQUENT REFERRALS

Table 11

	Boys	Girls	Total
Matter adjusted with parent and child	2,444	452	2,896
Petition dismissed	376	57	433
Probation and/or wardship dismissed	9	1	10
Placed on probation - own home	229	13	242
Placed on probation - in foster home	8	7	15
Supervision for other courts	5	2	7
Technical probation and reports	31	2	33
Technical probation - no reports	6	1	7
Continued for later review	29	2	31
Transferred to other juvenile courts	10	-	10
Declined jurisdiction - adult court	20	2	22
Declined jurisdiction - suspended	7	1	8
Committed to the Department of Institutions	64	17	81
Commitment suspended	6	-	6
Re-committed to the Dept. of Institutions	1	-	1
Runaway, parole failure, shelter for parolee of Dept. of Institutions	5	-	5
Referred to juvenile parole counselor	-	-	-
Committed or placed in custody of:			
Catholic Children's Service	1	-	1
Children's Home Society of Washington	1	-	1
Evergreen Heights Boys' Home	3	-	3
Griffin Home	4	-	4
Good Shepherd Home	-	2	2
Family Counseling Service	-	1	1
Public Assistance - Foster homes	7	2	9
Public Assistance - Family care	7	2	9
Ruth School	-	2	2
Seattle Children's Home	1	-	1
Vancouver Boys' Academy	1	-	1
Other private agency or institution	30	2	32
Placed with relatives	2	-	2
All other dispositions	213	23	236
Total	3,520	591	4,111

Note: These dispositions are for full data cases.  
Total delinquency referrals were 5,338.



Table 12

Source of Referral to Juvenile Court:

Agency of Individual	Delinquency	Dependency	Total
Seattle Police Department	2,204	263	2,467
King County Sheriff	504	53	557
Washington State Patrol	76	9	85
Bellevue	192	26	218
Clyde Hill	10	1	11
Medina	10	1	11
Bothell	26	2	28
Kirkland	95	8	103
Carnation	1	-	1
Redmond	62	5	67
Enumclaw	29	-	29
Issaquah	27	2	29
North Bend	7	-	7
Pacific	6	-	6
Des Moines	17	1	18
Auburn	102	10	112
Kent	61	3	64
Tukwila	52	1	53
Renton	162	17	179
Mercer Island	61	3	64
Lake Forest Park	3	-	3
Snoqualmie	7	-	7
Normandy Park	3	-	3
Algona	4	-	4
Black Diamond	1	-	1
Other Police Departments	67	47	114
Other Law Enforcement	40	20	60
Post Office Department	32	-	32
Probation Officer - K.C.J.C.	6	26	32
Juvenile Conferency Committee	24	9	33
Other Juvenile Courts	148	147	295
Administrative and Agency Petitions	-	3	3
School Department	4	135	139
Social Agencies	7	208	215
Parent(s)	33	655	688
Relatives	2	140	142
Self	5	267	272
Other Source	21	59	80
Total	4,111	2,121	6,232

Note: These are sources of referral for full data cases. The combined referrals for delinquent and dependent reasons in 1971 were 8,297.

## TEN YEAR COMPARISON OF TOTAL ALLEGED DEPENDENCY REFERRALS

## King County Juvenile Court

Reason for Referral	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Abuse or Cruel Treatment	59	63	72	33	20	39	48	38	30	33
Injurious Living, Neglect	622	678	700	768	555	425	290	114	96	73
Abandonment	135	148	119	126	87	93	44	52	17	32
Shelter	280	302	192	139	177	269	133	65	61	58
Protective Custody	-	nc	nc	180	301	208	309	247	193	167
Incest	-	nc	6	10	9	24	10	15	9	20
Sub Total				1,256	1,149	1,058	834	531	406	383
Rebellious, Ungovernable	258	284	314	271	360	499	717	771	728	565
Unable to Adjust	199	228	290	237	161	166	142	173	219	282
Runaway from Home	622	567	584	673	690	800	674	579	521	570
Truancy, Unable to Adjust in School	151	164	156	110	136	180	156	152	151	130
				1,291	1,347	1,645	1,689	1,675	1,619	1,547
Custody, Investigations	330	388	345	449	422	305	453	523	467	553
Custody for Adoption	615	637	674	663	721	788	733	716	633	324
Mentally Handicapped	11	12	15	2	5	3	3	6	2	6
Other Reasons & Pending	184	185	135	242	355	233	218	143	125	146
				1,356	1,503	1,329	1,407	1,388	1,227	1,029
Total for Year	3,466	3,656	3,602	3,903	3,999	4,032	3,930	3,594	3,252	2,959



**Table 13** **DEPENDENCY REFERRALS**

<i>Reason for Referral</i>	<i>Disposed of in 1971</i>		
	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Neglect</i>			
Abandonment	15	17	32
Injurious Living Conditions, Neglect	33	40	73
Shelter	21	37	58
Cruel/Abusive Treatment	12	15	27
Child Beating	1	5	6
Incest	5	15	20
Protective Custody	65	102	167
	152	231	383
<i>Dependency – Rebellious</i>			
Unable to adjust – Home or Foster Home	96	186	282
Incorrigible/Ungovernable	282	283	565
Runaway	266	304	570
Truancy	50	27	77
Refusal to Attend School	14	7	21
Unable to Adjust in School	21	11	32
	729	818	1,547
<i>Dependency – Custody</i>			
Custody Establishment	14	16	30
Deprivation – Custody for Adoption	6	3	9
Other Dependency	81	71	152
	101	90	191
Subtotal Dependency Referrals with Full Social Data	982	1,139	2,121
<i>Other Dependency Matters Referred but Not Fully Reported</i>			
Adoption – Relinquishments			315
Adoption Investigations and Publications			67
Custody Changed or Established			456
Total Dependency Matters			2,959
Out-of-Town Runaways and Courtesy Shelter (Incl. P.V.D.I. & A.W.O.L.)			712

**Table 14** *Race of Dependent Child Referred:*

<i>Race</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
White	827	981	1,808
Negro	99	119	218
Indian	23	24	47
Filipino	5	6	11
Chinese/Japanese	5	2	7
Other	23	7	30
Total	982	1,139	2,121

**Table 15** *Marital Status of Parents – Dependent Referrals*

	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Married and Together	320	354	674
Divorced	170	197	367
Divorced – Mother Remarried	116	160	276
Divorced – Father Remarried	75	62	137
Both Remarried	58	96	154
Married and Apart	5	6	11
Separated	61	62	123
Father Dead	28	45	73
Mother Dead	10	21	31
Both Dead	9	5	14
Father Dead – Mother Remarried	21	14	35
Mother Dead – Father Remarried	7	15	22
One Parent Deserted	2	1	3
Unmarried	30	32	62
Unknown or Not Reported	70	69	139
Total	982	1,139	2,121

**Table 16** *Case Status of Dependent Referrals*

	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
New	504	643	1,147
Old Dependent	182	214	396
Reappear – Dependent	145	197	342
Recidivist – Dependent	30	33	63
Old Delinquent	35	13	48
Reappear – Delinquent	46	14	60
Recidivist – Delinquent	10	-	10
Old Delinquent and Dependent	22	22	44
Recidivist – Delinquent & Dependent	8	3	11
Total	982	1,139	2,121

**Table 17** *Family Income of Child Referred for Dependency*

<i>Amount of Income</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Under \$200 per month	13	7	20
200–299	13	33	46
300–399	36	45	81
400–499	63	39	102
500–599	48	42	90
600–699	42	41	83
700–799	35	29	64
800–899	46	38	84
Over 900 per month	105	127	232
Unemployed	37	35	72
Unknown or Not Reported	544	703	1,247
Total	982	1,139	2,121



**Table 18** *Age of Children Referred for Dependency*

<i>Years</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
-1	10	12	22
1	6	12	18
2	13	11	24
3	7	12	19
4	8	8	16
5	11	12	23
6	12	5	17
7	9	19	28
8	11	9	20
9	15	7	22
10	18	8	26
11	28	19	47
12	39	42	81
13	109	103	212
14	167	196	363
15	202	274	476
16	192	238	430
17	125	152	277
Total	982	1,139	2,121

**Table 19** *Source of Support for Family of Dependent Child Referred*

<i>Source of Support</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Father	407	402	809
Step-Father	92	121	213
Mother	107	120	227
Step-Mother	2	3	5
Relatives	15	32	47
Public Assistance — SDPA	145	171	316
Social Security	9	17	26
Self	5	2	7
Other	9	14	23
Unknown	191	257	448
Total	982	1,139	2,121

**Table 20** *School Status — Dependent Child*

<i>Grade in School</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Grade 1	7	4	11
Grade 2	4	5	9
Grade 3	7	5	12
Grade 4	12	6	18
Grade 5	15	10	25
Grade 6	29	21	50
Grade 7	60	39	99
Grade 8	120	127	247
Grade 9	153	167	320
Grade 10	120	200	320
Grade 11	77	102	179
Grade 12	28	54	82
Preschool	54	56	110
Kindergarten	1	3	4
Withdrew	7	7	14
Dropped Out	31	25	56
Suspended	15	13	28
Expelled	7	-	7
College, University, Other	3	7	10
Less than full time	2	9	11
Adjustment classes	2	1	3
Graduated	9	7	16
Unknown or not reported	219	271	490
Total	982	1,139	2,121

Table 21

*Dispositions of Dependent Referrals*  
(Includes Neglect, Truant, Rebellious, Custody)

<i>Disposition or Action Completed</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Adjust with parent, child, relative, etc.	331	305	636
Petition dismissed, service completed	264	358	622 + 2 (b)
Probation and wardship dismissed	25	28	53 + 173 (b)
Placed on probation — own home	41	40	81
Placed on probation in foster home	8	17	25
Supervision for other court	1	1	2
Continued for later review	5	7	12
Referred to juvenile parole counselor	1	-	1
Committed to Dept. of Institutions	42	38	80
Committed to state mental hospital	4	1	5
Transferred to other juvenile court	5	2	7
Committed to Dept. of Inst. & Suspended	2	1	3
Committed or placed in care of:			
Casey Family Program	-	-	- + 9 (b)
Catholic Children's Service	4	7	11 + 93 (a)
Children's Home Society of Washington	4	2	6 + 82 (a)
Deaconess Home	3	1	4
Evergreen Heights Boys' Home	8	-	8
Family Counseling Service	-	2	2
Florence Crittenden Home	-	2	2
Griffin Home	9	-	9 + 1 (b)
Good Shepherd Home	-	19	19 + 1 (b)
Luther Child Center	-	-	- + 2 (b)
Lutheran Family & Children's Service	-	-	- + 71 (a)
Medina Children's Service	-	1	1 + 46 (a)
Ruth School for Girls	-	8	8 + 11 (b)
Ryther Child Center	3	7	10 + 1 (b)
Seattle Children's Home	6	2	8
Public Assistance Foster Homes	59	108	167 + 208 (b)
Public Assistance — family, receiving care	19	20	39 + 94 (b)
Stuart Hall — Halfway House	-	7	7
Vancouver Boys' Academy	4	-	4
Other voluntary agencies & treatment	24	12	36 + 4 (b)
Placed with relatives	34	49	83 + 9 (b)
Parents deprived of custody	-	1	1
All other dispositions	76	93	169 + 31 (b)
Total	982	1,139	2,121 838

*Note:* These dispositions are for full data cases. Total dependency referrals received during the year were 2,959.

Number of cases in the fourth column are additional dispositions without full social data. Those denoted by (a) are routine agency adoptions; those denoted by (b) are summary dispositions of custody matters.

## TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS

Table 22

## Reason for Citations — 1971

	<i>No. of Citations 1971</i>	<i>% of Total</i>
Influence — Alcohol (a)	111	1.0%
Reckless Driving (a)	214	1.8%
Hit and Run (a)	68	.6%
Licnese Falsification	70	.6%
Speeding 0-10 mph	1,378	11.9%
Speeding 11-15 mph	1,456	12.5%
Speeding 16-20 mph (b) 3,876	570	4.9%
Speeding 21 + mph	297	2.6%
Speeding Too Fast for Conditions	175	1.5%
Negligent Driving	882	7.6%
Through Stop Sign	1,217	10.5%
Failure to Yield	538	4.6%
Defective Equipment (d)	1,358	11.7%
No Opr. License on Person	1,422	12.2%
No Opr. License — License Susp.	5	
No Opr. License — Other License	5	.1%
No Opr. License — No License Issued	180	1.5%
Violating Learner's Permit	20	.2%
Aiding and Abetting	41	.4%
No Vehicle License	188	1.6%
Improper Vehicle Registration	132	1.1%
Improper Turn	768	6.6%
No Signal	60	.5%
Following Too Closely	84	.7%
Other Violations	387	3.3%
Total Moving Violations	11,626	100.0%

Pedestrian, Hitchhiking Violations (c) 4,271

Motor Boat Citations (c) 78

All Violations — Citations 15,975

(a) Automatic suspension of license by Director of Licenses in these violations.

(b) Speeding offenses 3,876 represent 33% of all moving violations. 3,876 speeding violations was an increase of 930 violations or 32%.

(c) 4,349 citations were nondriving violations or 27% of total.

(d) Defective Equipment Citations were for following equipment:

Defective Brakes	115	Stoplight	83	Windshield Wipers	17
Headlight Defective	125	Direct Signals	49	Glass Absent — Broken	49
Headlight Focus	16	Exhaust — Muffler	249	Other Equipment	466
Taillight Defective	187	Tires	2	Total	1,358

*Note:* Liquor consumption and possession are referred and handled as delinquent referrals, not as traffic violations.



Table 23

## Dispositions of Traffic Citations

1971

License Issuance Deferred	(a)	589
License Held (30 days to 18 mos.)	(a)	526
Driving Restricted (School/Work/With Parent)	(a)	1,263
Reprimand and Closed	(b)	8,846
Dismissed		470
Declined Jurisdiction		2,690
Referred to other Juvenile Court		1,198
Accident Prevention School		254
Referred to Student Court		8
Other Dispositions		<u>131</u>
Total		15,975

Note: (a) 15% of dispositions resulted in license suspension, licensing deferred or driving restricted  
 (b) Includes Pedestrian violation dispositions and 2,100 warnings on first time speeding offenses.

Recurrence of Traffic Referrals	1971	% of Total
1st Referral	8,770	54.9%
2nd Referral	4,170	26.1%
3rd Referral	1,645	10.3%
4th Referral	1,390	8.7%

## No. Referrals Involving Accidents and Insurance

No. Referrals for	Boys Referred	13,380	83.7%
Moving Violations 11,626	Girls Referred	2,595	16.3%