

KING COUNTY
DOCUMENT
J. 9.1
1969

copy 2

MUNICIPAL REFERENCE LIBRARY
307 MUNICIPAL BUILDING
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104
JUN 16 1970

[3290]

ANNUAL REPORT KING COUNTY JUVENILE COURT 1969



Superior Court of King County
Board of Managers - Juvenile Court
Seattle, Washington

Gentlemen:

This report will summarize the activities and the caseload of this Department for 1969. The nature of children's offenses and behavior is a direct reflection of the turmoil and violence around them. Parents in increasing numbers have serious problems with their children and gross rebellion often incurs authority intervention.

There are a few positive reports. Our implementation of the Supreme Court decisions requiring due process is creditable. A full time deputy prosecutor has reduced delays in fact-finding and commitment hearings. Court reporters are now available as needed so that a proper record of hearings is made. The staff have facilitated the conduct of hearings, reduced paper work and helped to make the court hearing meaningful to the child and his parents. The Judge and Court Commissioner have carried out a difficult work calendar all year.

For the fifth consecutive year referrals of neglect cases have declined. Credit goes to the Department of Public Assistance administrators who have moved ahead with protective services and receiving home care for such children. There were thus 336 fewer referrals for neglect than in 1968 and 398 fewer detentions for shelter reasons.

There was improvement again in youth traffic violations. There were 1,640 fewer traffic citations and most of the reductions occurred in serious moving violations including negligence and speeding.

Admissions of children to the Youth Service Center were 946 less than last year and the average population of 148 children per day was 12 fewer than the all time high of 160 for 1968. Fewer neglected children, fewer shelter cases of all ages and fewer rebellious admissions account for the reduction.

The report of delinquent referrals is mostly negative. Delinquency (alleged) cases increased by 487 or 9% over last year. We expected law enforcement agencies to continue selective enforcement of more serious offenses; however, minor offenses increased while auto theft, drug use and sex offenses declined. The delinquency rate of 2.7 referrals per 1,000 of 10 to 17 year olds in the County is higher than last year but better than the 3.0 rate of 5 years ago.

Unruly and rebellious children and frantic parents from all parts of the County hard press our intake staff. More than 1,800 children and their parents or guardians were counseled and their conflict relieved or referred to other more appropriate community helping services. In spite of strengthened staff work and extended hours 30% of admissions to detention were for rebellious, nondelinquent behavior.

All of this staff deserve commendation for creativity and perseverance with a demanding work expectation. Probation staff invented and maintained crisis intervention and detention evaluation services. Detention personnel improved their child care skills in spite of high populations of unruly and confused children. Clerical staff have carried out time-saving procedures. Maintenance and kitchen staff, nurses and volunteers have performed with zeal and dedication.

We are grateful for the cooperation and assistance of community services, law enforcement agencies, schools and individuals.

The cover shows work in progress as seen by a fifth grade sidewalk superintendent.

CARL B. ERICKSON
Director

ASSIGNMENT OF PRESIDING JUVENILE COURT JUDGE

The Superior Court created a Juvenile Court Judges Committee in 1964 to assure continuity in judicial functions of the Juvenile Court. One member is elected to serve as chairman of the Committee, and assigns one or more judges from this five Judge Committee to serve as Juvenile Court Judge for a six month period. During 1969 in addition to Judge Lloyd Shorett, Judges Stanley Soderland, Robert Utter, Charles Z. Smith and Morell Sharp served as Juvenile Court Judges. The Court Commissioner, Robert Elston, appointed by the Superior Court in 1969 also carried full time judicial duties in the Juvenile Court and was later appointed a Superior Court Judge and served in this capacity from August to December. Judge Lloyd Shorett is also chairman of the Juvenile Court Board of Managers which has the overall administrative responsibility for detention and probation services. The members of the Board of Managers are Frank Brownell, George Fahey, John Schermer and Robert Weber.

FUNCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

The Juvenile Court's primary functions under the law are:

To investigate and adjudicate cases of delinquency and dependency referred to it;

To determine the kind of care or treatment best for the welfare of the child and the protection of the community;

To detain those children needing temporary care pending investigation and court hearing;

To provide probation services and place or commit children into such appropriate family care, agency service or institutional treatment as is available.

Individualized justice is the basic principle of the Juvenile Court operation. The law requires liberal application so that the children under its jurisdiction may have that care which should have been given them by their own parents. Recent court decisions require guarantees of constitutional rights to children.

A delinquent child is one who is found to have broken any local, state or federal law. A dependent child is one whose parents are not providing adequate care, or who is without parents or guardian, or is beyond his parents' control and is therefore dependent upon the state for protection, proper care or placement. Traffic offenders are referred for the same moving violations for which adults are cited into traffic court. The Court must always be concerned with correction and treatment of the child's problem or condition as well as adjudication of the facts. All available resources which can be provided by individuals, agencies or institutions are pressed into use to provide the kind of service or care the child and his family require. Our constant concern is that the resources necessary to treat and rehabilitate these children do not meet the growing need.

COURT HEARINGS

A court hearing is a legal process of adjudication and disposition of all matters of dependency and delinquency. There are several types of court hearings, each having a function or a purpose as provided in the statutes. Each type of hearing is described in the paragraphs below.

Preliminary Hearing

A preliminary hearing is normally held within twenty-four hours of admission for each child detained in the Youth Service Center. The Juvenile Court Code (1961), supplemented by the Juvenile Court Rules (1969), requires, for each child detained, a petition setting forth the charges of dependency and/or delinquency. The purpose of this hearing is to determine (1) whether or not the child requires detention pending court investigation or placement, and (2) whether or not the facts alleged in the delinquency or dependency petition warrant court intervention or dismissal.

The Judge or Court Commissioner hears each case on petition with the child's parents, child's attorney when retained and the caseworker all present. Police officers are not required to be present at such preliminary hearings unless their direct testimony is vital to the case. In each case possible alternative sources of care in lieu of detention are appraised. Many minor cases are adjusted with judicial approval following preliminary hearing and the child's release to his family. Neglected children who can be cared for in temporary foster care in lieu of detention are placed by the State Department of Public Assistance.

A total of 3,693 preliminary hearings were held in 1969, a decrease of 15 percent from 1968. Improved procedures for assessment of problem before detention resulted in this reduction.

Fact-finding and Decline of Jurisdiction Hearings

A fact-finding hearing is scheduled for all children where there is a denial of the allegations or charges and where the child exercises his constitutional right to remain silent and to seek legal counsel.

A decline of jurisdiction hearing includes (1) the fact-finding process to determine innocence or guilt, and (2) the disposition process to determine whether or not the court will establish jurisdiction or transfer jurisdiction to the adult authorities. Decline hearings demand special procedures as required by In Re Gault and In Re Kent, two U.S. Supreme Court decisions involving juveniles, and strict adherence to all legal requirements. The criminal rules of evidence are operative and proof must be established beyond a reasonable doubt. Hearings are before the Judge, or before the Court Commissioner if he is appointed a Superior Court Judge Pro Tempore. There were 673 such hearings in 1969, some of them appearing with counsel of the parents' choice. The Court appointed attorneys in 743 cases and the County paid \$39,144 in youth's cases where found indigent but in need of counsel.

A commitment hearing is actually a disposition hearing, but because of the gravity of the court's intended action, i.e. commitment to the state correctional school, such a hearing must provide the same guarantee of due process as in the fact-finding and decline hearings. We are guided in their hearings by the 1967 U.S. Supreme Court's In Re Gault.

A total of 347 commitment hearings were held in 1969, but a total of 379 children were actually committed in all hearings conducted.

Disposition Hearings

Any case requiring judicial consent or decision about placement, probation or other corrective or treatment program for a child is heard in a disposition hearing. Prior to such hearing the probation officer evaluates all social and family factors, submits a written report and recommendation and effects agreement with child and parent whenever possible. There were 887 disposition hearings in 1969, an increase of 138 cases.

Financial Hearings

In addition to the court hearings described above, the Juvenile Court held 263 hearings on financial matters to establish parent responsibility for care of children. These hearings involve parental support payments for institutional or foster care of children and/or the costs of detention care in the Youth Service Center. Many of these are show-cause matters.

Traffic Hearings

There were 49 full court hearings on contested traffic matters requiring adjudication. These hearings provide full legal determination in disputed matters and those involving negligent homicide, reckless driving, permanent personal injury or property damage in excess of \$1,000. This reduction of 152 hearings from last year is a result of more discretionary authority delegated to the traffic referees in (1) reducing charges, and (2) effecting a decline of jurisdiction without a court hearing. Three traffic referees carry out dispositions of all other cases including negligent driving.

PROBATION SERVICE

The probation department serves as the investigating and screening arm of the Juvenile Court. It provides intake and investigation services, probation supervision, detention and shelter care. The workload for the department for 1969 was 8,252 referrals of which 4,658 were referrals for alleged delinquency and 3,594 were for reasons of alleged dependency or neglect. Out of 8,252 referrals, 4,219 children were admitted to the Youth Service Center for detention or shelter. The department also disposed of 9,012 traffic referrals of youth cited for moving violations.

Referrals to the Juvenile Court come from law enforcement agencies 75%, schools and social agencies 8%, parents or child 15% and others 2%. 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.

INTAKE AND INVESTIGATION SERVICES

The several functions of the probation staff were modified to provide better precourt investigation or disposition, and postcourt supervision. Our statute provides that a probation officer will assess the need for court intervention, conduct an investigation and recommend a disposition providing for the child's care and correction.

The probation staff is responsible for making a factual and social investigation of each case so that the Judge or Court Commissioner can make a decision based on all the pertinent information available about the child and family. This social assessment includes a study of the child's personality, attitudes toward him, school history, recreation and companions. Probation work requires special training in social work, high personal qualities, aptitude and skill to work with children. Problems such as unemployment, divorce or separation, family conflict, ill health, alcoholism and parental immaturity are often present in the family of a delinquent or dependent child. The probation officers must understand conduct and behavior patterns and the nature of causative factors before they can help the child and parents understand their problem and its possible solution.

The increase in numbers of rebellious children, parent demands for probation help and requests for admission of children for unjustified reasons, compelled us to improve our intake and screening services. We therefore assigned additional experienced probation officers and special clerical support to do crisis intervention, to interview and plan alternative care or service for the child and to give immediate help to distraught families. These 10 officers were also scheduled over longer hours of the day, 7 a.m. to 11 p.m., in order to make screening prior to detention more effective. The result of strengthened intake work has also eliminated delays in first handling of non-detention cases, reduced admissions to detention and settled out cases not requiring further court intervention.

The majority of probation officers do their work in staff units combining both investigative and probation supervision tasks. In 1969, 32 probation officers in 4 staff units carried out investigative and supervision work while 8 were assigned to review load, information services, resource finding and volunteer organizing.

The probation officers and their 6 supervisors carried out the following job assignments during 1969.

Prepared 3,693 cases for preliminary hearings and interviewed children, parents and referring agent before the hearing on the question of detention or release of the child and completed the services necessary after the hearing;

Completed 1,907 cases of full investigation of either allegedly delinquent or dependent children and presented the cases for fact finding, decline of jurisdiction, commitment and dispositional court hearings;

Disposed of 2,462 cases by adjustment with the family, counseling parents, effecting restitution or referring the family to an appropriate private or public agency for continued care or service;

Processed 704 applications from adoptive agencies for temporary custody pending adoption;

Supervised 1,021 cases which were heard and continued for later review or on technical probation without supervision. There were 451 cases held on review status without probationary supervision on January 1 and 917 were added during the year. At the end of the year there were 347 such cases under surveillance or continued for reports to the Court.

Interviewed child and parent and worked out alternatives to detention on an average of 145 cases per month.

These work details are not perfunctory but require careful case by case evaluation of the seriousness of the behavior and of the parents' capacity and ability to manage the problem. We strive for professional competence so that these services provide a prompt and reliable assessment of each case referred and to initiate an appropriate action by the Court.

CHILDREN UNDER SUPERVISION

Selected children are placed on regular probation with weekly counseling by a caseworker. These children require follow-up direction, guidance or authority control but do not require removal from parents nor institutionalization. The Judge limits probation to those able to benefit and to the number the staff can effectively supervise. Each child's case will require a minimum of 6 hours per month of direct service by a probation officer. There were 251 children on probation January 1, 1969 and 230 were placed on probation by court order during the year. The average term of supervision was 8 1/2 months. The casework staff provided supervision for 481 children last year.

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.

The criteria used by the Judge, the Court Commissioner and the staff for determining probation are as follows: the authority of the Court is necessary to assure change in attitude and behavior; a delinquent pattern has not been firmly established and the child has potential for improved behavior; there are sufficient social strengths in the child and family to expect positive change in behavior; the caseworker believes he can work effectively and constructively with the child and those around him; there is a possible school plan or work opportunity for him; there is latent motivation to encourage; and there is no compelling need to control the child's behavior by institutional treatment or confinement. In all cases, a written probation plan is worked out prior to the hearing so that conditions of probation and expectations are known and sanctioned by the Judge.

Each youngster on probation is an individual and his behavior problem and adjustment is different from another child's. A typical boy or girl going through a stormy adolescence may have reasonable motivation to achieve maturity but he has provoked everyone around him to exasperation. He provokes his parents to the point of treatment as an incorrigible. He frustrates school personnel until they suspend him. He provokes the neighbors or commits a delinquent act and is confronted by police or court action.

The first factor in probation success with such a youngster is the caseworker's skill and perseverance in helping the youngster to understand himself and his feelings. He needs constructive outlets for his energies while he learns to grow up with less distress. He needs to be responsible for his choices and actions. He must accept society's controls. He needs to understand his parents better. He may need help in overcoming the psychological or learning block which reduced his motivation in school. In this helping process he learns ways of achieving small success at first on which to build a greater sense of personal security. One good grade on a school paper, a part-time job, a new friend and an improved sense of well-being are all part of the probation experience.

The caseworker helps the parents to cope with the youngster's temporary rebellion and to be more consistent and judicious in their use of parental authority. Most parents need encouragement so that they can recognize and give credit for achievement and healthy change in the youngster. All families need help to learn to communicate with each other and use the strengths they have. This requires hard work on everyone's part. It is essential that the caseworker maintain frequent and regular contact to assure purpose and ongoing understanding of the youngster's adjustment and to give substance to the probation process.

NEW SERVICES

Probation Subsidy Program

The Legislature in 1969 authorized a subsidy program for the State of Washington through the Department of Institutions to share in the cost of supervising probationers who could otherwise be committed by the juvenile courts to the Department of Institutions and who are granted probation and placed in special supervision programs.

King County approved our plan in 1969 and we predict excellent results in upgrading and strengthening our overall probation services and adding new and innovative techniques and methods. This new service began operations on January 1, 1970, with a staff of 6 probation officers and other specialists, clerical and stenographic staff.

Volunteer Probation Officer

A new way of using volunteers began in November, 1969, with 40 men and women volunteer probation officers. Each volunteer provides individual guidance, support supervision and personal relationships to the child or youth assigned to him. At the end of December, 1969, these 40 volunteers contributed 523 hours of service to a total of 49 children. We firmly believe that these citizen volunteers can and will provide a very special service to the child and be a service to the community. The key to the volunteer program is the ability and capacity of the volunteer to develop a meaningful and solid relationship with the individual youth assigned him. Our casework staff is gratified that the volunteers' contributions have been unique, socially useful and individually beneficial.

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.

The cooperation of all of these is essential for proper disposition of children's cases. We use the help of all the youth agencies, private practitioners, ministers, recreation leaders, relatives and interested individuals who can take part in a child's development or help the family to do a more effective job with their children.

Liaison with Schools

The Court makes full use of school reports and guidance information. The school appraisal of a child's adjustment is important in each case, as is continued liaison with school personnel about children on probation. One-third of all referrals for delinquency are school attendance problems or children not enrolled. It is crucial for both school and court personnel to work together for the best attainable school and social adjustment of the child. Working procedures are maintained with all public schools to effect good liaison, reduce delay and assure accountability.

Role of Attorneys

Any parent has a right to employ legal counsel when his child is referred to the Court. The assistance and cooperation of the attorney is sought in order to develop and carry out a plan of action. It is important that the attorney be involved in the matter as soon as possible so that he may be of maximum service to the family. Each child and his parents are advised of this in their first contact with the Department. A child of fourteen is considered capable of waiving his right to an attorney with the consent of his parent. A guardian ad litem is appointed to act for a parent believed incompetent or for a child without parents.

An increased number of attorneys are involved in commitment and fact-finding hearings resulting from the Gault decision. The recent Washington State Supreme Court case In Re Lesperance, rights to counsel are extended to all delinquent cases including traffic offenses. Counsel are retained or appointed by the Court whenever the facts in a serious delinquency are denied or where the child may be subject to commitment to a correctional school or his parents deprived of permanent custody. The prosecuting attorney has assigned a full-time deputy to the Juvenile Court to represent the department in the fact-finding hearings before the Judge. Public funds will be necessary to retain appointed counsel in a larger number of cases where parents are indigent in order to comply with the Supreme Court mandate.

A new court procedure arising out of the Kent decision of the Supreme Court provides special procedures in decline of jurisdiction. In all cases where the Judge is advised that the facts of the case or the youth's experience and maturity may warrant waiver for trial in adult court, the Judge will appoint counsel if parents have not retained one and set a special hearing to consider all factors. Parents and youth are entitled to adequate notice and the Judge must consider the youth's welfare along with society's right to protection. There were 60 such waivers for trial in adult court during 1969.

CLINICAL SERVICES

Special diagnostic and consulting services are secured in any case needed to supplement the probation officer's assessment. Whenever parents can afford to pay for necessary psychological or psychiatric services, they are strongly encouraged to do so. A competent psychiatric consultant provides diagnoses of seriously disturbed children and makes a recommendation for treatment. Medical examinations are provided by the part-time physician at the Youth Service Center, and special medical services are available at King County Hospital or at Orthopedic Hospital. A number of clinical psychologists provided clinical services. Fees for diagnostic services

are paid from court funds when parents are unable to pay for them. There were 72 psychiatric diagnoses and consultations and 317 psychological services provided during the year and paid from court funds. A larger number (324) of both services were paid for fully or in part by parents. Consultants were also employed in staff training, probation and child care staff.

DETENTION AND SHELTER CARE

Purpose of Detention

The detention of children for the Juvenile Court is the temporary care of children under eighteen in a physically restricted facility pending court disposition or transfer to another agency or jurisdiction. It is primarily for children who have committed delinquent acts and for whom secure custody is required to protect the community. It should also be a constructive experience for those detained. Detention care is short term and nonpunitive. Each child should know the reality of the crisis he is in but at the same time find his sense of worth and individual human dignity enhanced. The child's detention adjustment is correlated with casework planning and court adjudication. All staff are thus vitally important in providing those experiences which have a constructive impact on him during a critical time of his life. Without these goals detention care becomes cold storage. Shelter care is now provided for most children in receiving homes under the administration of the Department of Public Assistance.

Detention and Shelter Care

The detention loads decreased by 18% last year. On January 1, 1969, there were 109 children under care and in the year 3,220 individual children were detained. The average daily population was 148 children and the average length of stay was 13 days, as compared to 160 and 12 last year. Many children were detained on more than one occasion during the year so there were actually 4,219 admissions to detention during 1969. The total child care days spent by all children under care at the Youth Service Center was 54,103, a decrease of 4,273 days from 1968. Admission of boys outnumbered those of girls 2,824 to 1,395. Admission of delinquents equalled those of non-delinquents. Actually there were 2,103 delinquents, 1,752 rebellious and 364 shelter and dependent admissions.

The average length of stay was 13 days, one day longer than last year; the longest detention was 295 days. 49% of all children were released in 4 days or less and used 9% of all child care days. 13% of all children stayed over 30 days and used 52% of child care days. Those remaining longest were the most difficult to place or had no home or family able to care for them.

Detention Workload

A full year's experience at extensive casework screening of all admissions prior to detention, and the placement of neglected children under the age of 13 in receiving homes rather than detention has resulted in a marked decrease in the number of children detained. As a result of these two processes, the population has narrowed to almost exclusively a teen-age and preteen-age group of delinquent and rebellious youth. Beds formerly occupied by younger non-delinquent children are now used for rebellious youngsters detained. The junior boys unit was 100% over capacity again for the entire year, primarily because more younger teen-age boys were admitted for delinquent and rebellious behavior.

The law provides that a child may be released to his parents or others in lieu of detention upon a statement of the parents that they will bring the child to the Court when necessary, thus eliminating unnecessary detention care. In addition, each child brought to the Youth Service Center is interviewed, as are his parents, to determine whether detention is necessary. A petition is signed by the arresting officer or referring agent on each child admitted alleging the reasons for the delinquency or dependency and the reasons for his detention. The petition is heard the following morning in preliminary hearing.

Detention population is under constant case review by probation staff and by the Judge and Court Commissioner. In summary, we are continuing with a higher population in this facility than it was designed to accommodate and it is increasingly more difficult to make detention experience constructive for the child.

Detention Admissions and Control

Any child under eighteen years who requires detention in this County is cared for in the Youth Service Center. Youth over sixteen may be detained in jail when the Juvenile Court has waived jurisdiction or the Judge has specifically ordered jail care for him. The criteria for admission to detention at the Youth Service Center are:

The child must be detained to be available for court investigation and hearing, or requires detention pending placement in an institution and who is certain to run away if not detained.

The child is unsafe to be at large because he has performed serious delinquent acts and is almost certain to commit an offense dangerous to himself or to the community before court disposition can be made.

The child who must be held for another jurisdiction including runaways from institutions to which they were committed, certain material witnesses and those held as a courtesy in transit.

shelter care:

Some children require protection and shelter care not otherwise available to them and resulting from neglect, abuse, abandonment or violent treatment by parents, guardians or others.

Runaways from home and rebellious children may be detained as a last resort when the family crisis or the child's rebellion offers no alternative and the child is certain to run away or be in dangerous circumstances. 1,752 unruly children were detained last year.

The Department of Public Assistance reached an important milestone in October, 1968. Receiving homes for neglected children were made available around the clock, almost eliminating shelter care in the Youth Service Center. There were 7 children under 7 years and 4,207 other children detained all year for shelter.

Over 678 out-of-county children were detained and returned home.

Nature of Services Provided

Detention should be a constructive experience for those detained. Youth in conflict need protection and require direction and supervision from competent, understanding personnel. The law provides for prompt judicial determination of the need for detention (in 72 hours) and subsequent review when detention exceeds 30 days. Detention security must protect the community from violence and protect the child from himself. For all children detention is a crisis.

Detention services include activities and program to develop the individual child such as remedial school, physical exercise, work, crafts and experiences in everyday living. We must guarantee good physical care, nutritious meals and clean, comfortable beds. We assure that nursing and medical care are available. Proper detention records are kept to report accountably to the community. Staff undergo training and observation to improve their capacity to help children.

The caseworker and detention supervisor correlate observations of each child so they may better understand his behavior and the reasons for his antisocial acts. Each child should face the need for change in his attitude and behavior. Each child must be stimulated and helped to mobilize his abilities and strengths. Although the child is a member of a group in detention, the staff is always concerned with his individual rights and well-being.

Rights of Children and Parents

Every child, whether alleged to be delinquent or dependent, has a right to see his probation officer and to judicial review by the Judge. Parents have the right to visit their children and to seek legal counsel. A minister may give religious guidance. Competent caseworkers will determine when special medical, diagnostic, psychiatric or psychological services are needed. A child's first right is to care, love and supervision by his parents. Constitutional rights of children are described in the section on intake services.

School Services

The Seattle Schools provide seven teachers for the Youth Service Center School program. Five teachers provide remedial and academic programs for up to 75 children daily in grades one (1) through 12; one teacher instructs in arts and crafts and one teacher instructs in homemaking. The classrooms are scheduled for 5 periods each day with most classes limited to 8 to 12 students. The teachers are especially selected and the program is adapted to the capacities of the children under care. Most class work is remedial with individual instruction given by the teacher. Reports on school performance of each child are received from the previous school, and performance at the Youth Service Center is always reported to the probation officer and forwarded to the school or institution which the child will attend upon release.

Volunteered Services

Volunteered services are used in regularly planned activity programs in detention. Volunteers provide the necessary instruction and supervision for hand crafts, hobbies, cooking and baking, grooming and organized games. Some assist in the admission area and in the infirmary. Many help by filing, typing, handling telephone calls and working on research projects. The volunteers plan and supervise an extensive outing program and transportation for individual youngsters. They secure clothing, materials for hobbies and craft classes and money for tuition and medical needs for the children. Their outstanding contribution is their demonstrated concern and care for the children as individuals.

The Youth Service Guild, organized in 1952, assisted with the detention program, sponsored and supervised an outing program, provided emergency transportation and assisted with special assignments in probation. They have sponsored and led a very successful Camp Fire Unit in cooperation with the Camp Fire Council. They have continued to provide financial assistance.

A new Guild unit, the Kinderguild, was organized late in 1969 and has already provided personal and financial assistance in a variety of ways. We have also been assisted very generously in our recreation program by the St. Stephen's Episcopal Church Women. The Fairway Fund was created by Mr. and Mrs. Marshall Doty to assist children on probation with material needs and special medical or other treatment.

Numerous other organizations have aided the Youth Service Center in financial assistance and/or personal involvement throughout the year. Included in this group are:

American Federation of Musicians - Local 76	Pot and Kettle
American Women's Voluntary Services	Plymouth Church
Camp Fire Girls of America	Venture Club
East Shore Unitarian Church	Women's City Club
Kiwanis Industrial	Youth Service Guild
Overlake Presbyterian Church	Beta Sigma Phi
St. Catherine's Guild of St. Dunstan's Church	Kinderguild
St. Stephen's Church Women	Numerous PTA's
United Commercial Travelers Auxiliary	

Over 300 individuals, not associated with any organization, provided volunteer services to the Youth Service Center, have donated material needs, helping services and money to meet individual children's needs. We have received free professional services from several medical doctors, ophthalmologists and optometrists for needy children.

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS

Any youth under eighteen receiving a traffic citation for a moving violation is referred to the Juvenile Court under the general statute. The Court is the central adjudicating agency for all such juvenile traffic offenders in this County. Youth receiving parking tickets are not referred but are processed the same as are adults. Since 1964 pedestrian violations such as jaywalking and hitchhiking were referred to the Court for disposition. Referrals decreased from the 1968 total by 1,640 totaling 10,197 including nonmoving violations. 76% were single referrals, 14% were referred twice and 10% had three or more citations.

In the past year 1,640 fewer youthful traffic violators were referred to the Juvenile Court and their violations were less serious than in 1968.

Procedures

Each youngster referred by law enforcement agencies for a traffic offense is interviewed along with his parent or parents, and with their counsel if retained. Three traffic referees have discretionary authority to make an equitable disposition of the offense based on the seriousness of the violation, the youngster's attitude, the capacity of the parents to provide supervision and guidance and the degree of maturity of the youngster. Our goal is individualized justice with dispositions suiting the individual case. Jurisdiction may be declined to a justice court based on the youth's age, maturity, emancipation and upon the referee's recommendation and an order of the Judge. Three clerks assist the traffic referees by setting appointments, tabulating statistics and reporting dispositions to the appropriate referring agencies and in all cases to the Department of Licenses.

Principal Offenses and Dispositions

Many youth, like adults, drive irresponsibly. Most offenses are the result of poor judgment, inexperience and inattention. Of all moving violations 30% were for speeding; 12% of all violations were by girls. Other principal violations are for negligence, no license, wrong way on a street, defective lights and defective equipment. A license deprivation schedule, in effect since 1958, is applied to speeding offenses. 18% of dispositions were effected to control the youth's license or his car. The Juvenile Court has the authority to suspend licenses or set any special condition. Fines are rarely levied. A regular court hearing before the Judge or Court Commissioner was provided in 49 cases where the citation was contested, where no disposition agreement could be reached with the parents or where the nature of the offense or degree of injury or damage warranted.

Need for Education and Training

Every effort is made in the traffic conference to induce the youth and his parents to realize the responsibility for his own safety and for the lives of others. We stress the need for constant attention and good judgment and we encourage driver training to help reinforce safety responsibility. 37% of the youngsters referred for moving violations had no driver training. Individualized attention to each case provides understanding of the youth's motivation and permits for realistic dispositions. Since 76% of the traffic referrals are first offenders, it is urgent that universal driver training be assured and that additional techniques in education and preparation for responsible driving be adopted. Safety councils, high school student councils, law enforcement agencies, citizens and youth themselves must continue to cooperate to educate both youth and adults in responsible driving.

CLERICAL SERVICES

The clerical department performs all of the typical office functions, including stenographic, clerical, secretarial, switchboard, filing and record keeping. A clerk prepares the preliminary hearing schedules and distributes court orders and disposition reports to appropriate personnel and agencies.

The transportation office served or processed a total of 3,287 legal court notices. They also transported 621 children to clinics, hospitals and bus and air terminals as needed, and performed 1,394 other messenger services.

Tabulations of statistical data are made monthly and reports are made to the state-wide reporting center on juvenile court referrals. Statistical data was maintained on 10,197 traffic referrals and dispositions sent to the law enforcement agencies referring the cases.

BUSINESS AND OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT

The business functions of purchasing, accounting and payroll are supervised by the office-business manager. In addition, all plant, maintenance grounds upkeep, heating plant and refrigeration equipment are maintained by personnel in this department. Furnishings and equipment in the detention facilities undergo severe usage particularly in periods of excessive population. The maintenance staff have maintained a high level of proficiency in keeping the building and equipment in good repair and proper working order. Regular fire inspection, health and sanitation inspection, boiler inspection and rodent control are maintained regularly. Improvements have been made during the year on fire extinguisher equipment, kitchen equipment, office furnishings and laundry equipment.

The kitchen staff served a total of 181,800 meals during the year to an average of 148 children per day. The total food cost for 1969 was \$50,220, up 6.7%, and the average food cost per meal was 27.6 cents. The Department of Agriculture furnished surplus items totaling approximately 14,929 pounds, including flour, powdered milk, corn meal, rice, frozen orange juice, butter and lard. Food menus are reviewed periodically by the University Home Economics staff to assure that adequate, nutritious and well-balanced meals are served.

DEPENDENT REFERRALS

The reasons for which dependent children are referred to the Court are no longer simple neglect matters. The criteria for legal dependency in the 1913 Juvenile Court Law were basically neglect, injurious living or mistreatment and harmful social condition. That Law also included a definition making "incorrigible" children dependent but it was infrequently applied until the last few years.

In 1959, 1961 and 1967 the Legislature overhauled the Juvenile Court Law and made more specific the conditions under which the Court could find a child dependent. The law now embraces those who are incorrigible or beyond the control and power of parents by reason of the conduct and nature of the child; the child who is an habitual truant as defined by the school laws; the child who uses intoxicants, opium, cocaine, morphine, heroin, marijuana or other similar drug without prescription; the child who loiters at night or violates curfew ordinances; or the child who is grossly and willfully neglected as to medical care for his well-being.

The children's cases then coming to the Court's attention for dependency reasons fall into three categories (neglect, legal custody, rebellious/incorrigible) all of them based on the child's right to care and supervision, protection from harmful conditions and protection against self-destruction.

Neglect

Fewer cases (300) of child abuse, injurious living, abandonment, temporary shelter and incest were referred to the Juvenile Court in 1969. The development of the Protective Service's unit in the Department of Public Assistance has reduced the number of detentions by 360. Since 1959 the Department of Public Assistance has provided receiving home care and assumed social planning responsibility for an increasing number of neglected children. Additional personnel will permit more placements and social planning for neglected children over twelve. Catholic Children's Services has similarly provided receiving home care and child welfare services for Catholic children under six.

The probation staff makes a preliminary determination on those neglect cases not assumed by the State Department of Public Assistance in order to refer the parents for help in the community where court intervention is not necessary nor desirable. The Judge in preliminary hearing authorizes release for immediate receiving home care in lieu of detention and transfers temporary custody and social planning responsibility to a competent agency whenever possible. The probation staff carry responsibility for investigating fully in gross neglect where continued court supervision is necessary or where a deprivation action is taken. The probation officer also consults with the social agency caseworker on the need for interim care or the necessity for full court hearing when there is a dispute over the custody rights of parents.

Legal Custody

There are a number of child-parent conditions in which the legal custody of the child requires the State to act for the parents or to act in their absence. Children relinquished by mothers to social agencies for adoption need interim protection under the law as wards of the court until the adoption is completed. Children placed with relatives or those already in the custody of private institutions for foster care or residential treatment need their future care assured by wardship authorizing the custody and child welfare arrangements. Some mentally retarded children without parents are dependent on court wardship for long term institutional or foster care. Grandparents and relatives concerned with the care of children of absent, institutionalized, mentally ill and temporarily incapacitated parents secure temporary custody through court wardship. The Court provided this kind of legal protection and individual rights protection for some 1,171 children during the year.

Rebellious or Incorrigible

There was a slight increase and a continued upward trend in the number of children referred to the Court because they were believed to be out-of-control, rebellious and incorrigible. There were 1,675 referrals for reasons of runaway, out-of-control, truancy and other non-delinquent conduct. Some of these children are indeed out-of-control of parents or guardians but many are in temporary rebellion to the particular conditions under which they live. Some are genuinely unable to adjust to the irrational, destructive or violent behavior of others around them. Some of them reflect the general social rebellion and adult response to rapid social change. Many are confused and looking for identity and healthy supporting relationships. Many are involved in self-destructive, debasing experiences. Very few are found to be truly incorrigible.

The probation staff is obliged to counsel with the child and parent (only half of this group live with both natural parents) in cases of runaway-from-home or other rebellion whether detained or not. It is necessary to assess carefully the conditions in which a child finds himself or herself unable to adjust in his own home or elsewhere. Police generally return and adjust many runaway cases directly with the parents. Many are counseled at the court intake desk through crisis intervention or at the admissions desk by probation staff and detention screening to avoid detention and official court intervention. Too many children in this runaway and rebellious group are detained; 1,752 of them in 1969 including 678 out-of-county runaways. For some the crisis or conflict can be alleviated before preliminary hearing the following day or in subsequent counseling efforts. Some children require full case investment, court adjudication, placement in foster care or treatment facilities and a few in correctional facilities.

In cases of repeated truancy and serious school adjustment problems the limited availability of special school services makes investigation and planning in these cases difficult. There is no doubt that the lack of community resources for child-parent counseling and other remedial services has resulted in an increased number of children subject to court involvement. The recent concern for legal rights of children in conflict with the law or with their parents does not attack the roots nor alleviate conditions of rebellion or delinquency.

PROBLEMS AFFECTING GOOD COURT SERVICES

Lack of Community Services

Greater community resources are needed to help children and their parents before they require the Court's attention. These services are too few in number and their development has not kept pace with population growth. There are fewer beds in community child care facilities than there were ten years ago, although the child population has increased by 100,000! Our caseworkers search for resources and in frustration choose second-best plans. The Judge has an equally frustrating responsibility in making sound and wise decisions--and providing for the child's best welfare and for the welfare of the community. The principal expansion in institutional care for problem children has been in state institutions of the division of Juvenile Rehabilitation. But it is grossly unfair to wait until a child is seriously delinquent before remedial help can be given. We believe the State Probation Subsidy Program (becoming operational January 1, 1970) and the Volunteer Probation Officer Program (operational November, 1969) are two significant programs which will provide an initial thrust in the development of meaningful and specialized services for our youth.

The most critical need is child and family counseling services. Last year 1,675 children were referred to the Department whose problem or "offense" was being rebellious, ungovernable, unable to adjust in the home, a runaway from home or truant. These are problems of child and family conflict rarely requiring detention or court intervention. If unresolved, these problems may result in overt delinquent behavior or serious personality malformation. Our next most critical need is for group homes.

Actual Case Record of New Services Needed for Children

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Out-patient treatment and counseling	115	57	172
Group Homes	64	41	105
Small Residential Treatment Center	84	40	124
Foster Homes	27	26	53
Forestry or Vocational Camp	56	0	56
Trade Training - pre-apprentice	34	10	44
Other care needed by child	10	4	14
Other care needed by family	4	1	5
	394	179	573

Heavy Intake and Caseloads

The probation department cannot control its intake as other public and private agencies can. The continued increase in referrals results in a heavier investigation

workload. The workload per probation officer is excessive; caseworkers supervising probationers have averaged 35 cases. This workload has forced emergency adjustment or summary dispositions in many cases needing better service. While the average caseload is about one-half to what it was ten years ago, our youth today present more serious problems. Proportionately more time, better skills, and more community resources are needed to meet the challenge. The basic ingredients of effective probation services are skill and time. We are constantly attempting to conserve time so that it can be spent productively with children and their families.

Staff Shortage and Recruitment

We have a critical problem in recruiting and retaining qualified probation officers. There is a shortage nationwide of trained people for social work and probation. Trained and experienced staff are attracted to other employment with higher salaries and new frontiers of professional work. Our recruiting efforts, here and nationally, have chronically failed due to inadequate and noncompetitive salaries. In spite of strong support of our Board of Managers for a continual upgrading of salaries for trained and experienced people, we are unable to compete with the higher salaries paid experienced probation officers. We know it is good business to maintain a staff of experienced and gratified personnel who can perform their demanding job intelligently and efficiently.

Citizen Interest in Youth Necessary

The President's Commission on Crime outlines the challenge that delinquency and crime presents to all of us. One strong recommendation is involvement of citizens and youth in the solution of our severe social problems. There is a heartening increase in the concern with preventing and correcting delinquency, school failure and family disorganization. Our newly developed Volunteer Probation Officer Program is an example of increased citizen concern.

The Council of Planning Affiliates has attacked the local problems in providing services for children. Graduate and undergraduate students in law, social work, sociology, education, medicine and nursing have participated in workshops, institution tours and case discussions in the Court and other child care facilities. Personnel in social agencies, enforcement agencies, schools, institutions and the helping professions are participating in a variety of ways to effect better methods of identification and treatment of the social failures and delinquents.

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 to 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 will 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.

The Renton Mayor's Advisory Committee on Youth has served as an effective coordinating body for several years. The development of a branch office of Family Counseling Service and an extension of Big Brother Service to Renton (now discontinued) are among the developments emanating from this citizen activity. The Renton Juvenile Court Conference Committee has been in operation more than ten years and has screened and consulted on over 1,200 cases.

The Highline Youth Council has been in operation for eight years and has concerned itself with family counseling, youth employment, school guidance services, recreation and others. The Juvenile Court Conference Committee has been in operation six years and has consulted in over 500 cases. All leaders in the Council and members of the Conference Committee are enthusiastic about this form of self-help and facilitation of needed reforms in their own community.

The Federal Way Juvenile Court Conference Committee is in operation although the Federal Way Coordinating Committee has dissolved. The West Seattle Council on Youth Affairs has established itself firmly and is embarking on a program of better opportunities for youth. It also sponsors a juvenile court conference committee. The Kent Health and Welfare Council along with other programs is sponsoring a juvenile court conference committee. Bellevue and Shoreline have developed strong community action councils. These communities and their leadership realize local action and planning is vital in order to improve the social climate for youth. These are healthy social activities coming out of grass roots citizen interest.

1969 IN RETROSPECT

The reasons for delinquent behavior or for defiance and rebellion are extremely varied and in a given case may be simple or complex. Our 1968 report showed a decrease in delinquent referrals and an increase in rebellious behavior. This year referrals for delinquent reasons number about the same as in 1966 and 1967.

Police patrol and priorities no doubt affect the referral rate although serious offenses always get attention. Glue sniffing and drug use have declined slightly, along with sex offenses and auto theft.

The reduction in neglect referrals is a gratifying result of the Department of Public Assistance providing shelter care in receiving homes and developing protective services to help abused children and defaulting parents. These new services have in five years reduced neglect referrals by 1,020 per year and reduced detention of neglected children by 450.

Several community counselling services have undertaken treatment for more rebellious youth in conflict to restore family unity and control. Our staff efforts in referring cases out have therefore been more effective through our crisis intervention service even though the number of referrals have increased. Additionally, some of our staff have served as volunteers in these innovative programs in very meaningful capacities.

Management of detention overload has required strong admission control to find alternatives to detention. Staff assigned to crisis intervention found ways to alleviate the crisis in cases of boys and girls rebelling from parents and reducing the need for detention. Detention of older sophisticated unmanageable delinquent children has been and will continue to be a difficult and unrewarding service in any facility.

As we look back on 1969, then we discover that several meaningful achievements are readily identifiable. First, the implementation of the Gault decision of 1967 again caused massive changes and further refinement of procedures to insure that the full intent of the U. S. Supreme Court would be effectively carried out. Obviously without the individual staff's endless patience, hard work and dedication, any degree of success would have been impossible. Second, staff's direct participation in the planning, development and implementation of the volunteer probation officer program was a major highlight of 1969. Third, the expansion of the crisis intervention service, including detention screening, again involved the determination of the staff to make it work. Fourth, the concept of the probation subsidy program was amplified by the staff with ideas and suggestions for developing a workable program. Supplementing the program in 1970 will certainly require the same determination and dedication typical of our staff. Fifth, our work/study program produced 4 graduate-trained (MSW degree) social workers who joined the staff in June, 1969. The training program also supports 7 first year graduate students and 7 in the second year. These people provided valuable service to the department while in school in detention screening (nights and weekends) and in other duties permitting probation officers more time for full investigative and supervision functions.

Finally, all aspects of planning for the addition and alterations to the Youth Service Center were completed by the end of 1969. The contract will be signed soon and by March 1970 actual construction would begin.

In retrospect, then, 1969 was a very challenging and sometimes frustrating year. A hard working, competent and dedicated staff met this challenge, and with this same spirit and challenge look forward to 1970.

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 712 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 \$263,599.46 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 \$45,708.60 on 1,578 cases.

Juvenile Court Budget

This Juvenile Court budget was appropriated by the Board of County Commissioners. Future budgets will be appropriated by the County Council. The budget is prepared by the administrative officers for the Board of Managers and submitted to the Board of County Commissioners. The funds appropriated for this Department, as for most County offices, came from the County general fund.

The budget allocation for 1969 was as follows:

Salaries and Wages

Probation and Clerical Departments	\$ 819,750.00
Youth Service Center - Detention	486,270.00
Business and Operation Department	152,860.00

Operations and Capital Outlay

Operation and Maintenance	418,256.00
Capital Outlay Expenditures	0

\$1,877,136.00

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:

Budget Expenditures Affecting Detention Care - 1969

Salaries and Wages	\$ 644,486.00
Operation and Maintenance Costs	165,749.00
Capital Outlay Chargeable to Detention	0

\$ 810,235.00

ADDITIONS AND REMODELING ON YOUTH SERVICE CENTER

The plans for our building additions were completed in 1969. The Forward Thrust Bond Issue for 6.1 million dollars for this project was approved in 1968 with confidence by the public. The bonds were subsequently sold and funds invested pending property purchase and contractual payments.

The architectural firm Huggard and Associates prepared preliminary plans and sketches for the Juvenile Court Board of Managers beginning in September, 1967. When the King County Design Commission was finally appointed in mid-year 1968, they reviewed a series of alternative design plans and approved a building design plan at the end of the year. Detail plans and specifications for bidding and construction were completed in November, 1969, and the contract was let to Century Construction Company February, 1970.

The King County Property Department staff completed acquisition of the property in the 64 lots for \$730,000. Charles O. Carroll, prosecuting attorney, assigned a deputy prosecutor to assist in the acquisition of property and preparation of condemnation proceedings which were not needed. Street and alley vacations, removal of water mains, gas pipes, telephone lines and power poles and lines were completed in October.

We completed the relocation of 65 families or individuals who were renters or handicapped owners requiring assistance. Inasmuch as King County had no urban renewal, staff undertook the relocation in 1968. A canvass of the occupants in the area in July was repeated in October as owners began receiving payments and were found to need information and assistance. Through the Seattle office of Federal Housing Administration it was possible to qualify several families for purchase of homes under the displaced persons priority and low down pay procedures. Two of these families had never owned a home before. The Seattle Housing Authority made special provisions for several families with children for immediate occupancy. Several of the families bought or rented near friends or in new neighborhoods including Ellensburg, Ravenna Park, South Beacon, White Center and Ballard. Several realtors found homes for displaced families.

Several families entrapped by poverty, victims of slum landlords, overcharged for rent and services of all kinds, often needed rescue as well as relocation. A single man got himself to Harborview Hospital with pneumonia; another across the street from our building, near death, needed emergency help. A 74 year old widow confined to a wheelchair by an old injury defied us, then accepted our relocation help. A retired roofer under treatment for cancer was emotionally unable for months to face removal from his comfortable home of 25 years. A young mother with four girls needed and received in addition to relocation in a housing unit with a play yard the following special services: extensive medical care for the whole family, including birth defect repair surgery for one; assistance in securing a training program through Concentrated Employment Program; Seattle Schools' Special Education Division worked out transportation to maintain a remedial program for one of the girls; and the Salvation Army Welfare office furnished beds, mattresses and kitchen furniture with the balance of the furnishings donated by Central Area Beautification Program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Summary of Referrals and Court Process	
Court Hearings	1
Probation Department Services	1
Collection Division	2
Traffic	2
Detention and Shelter Care	
Summary of Detention and Shelter Care 1969	3
Comparison Over 10 Year Period	4
Table 1 - Number Detained and Length of Stay by Age	5
Table 2 - Length of Stay Alleged Delinquent and Dependent Children	5
Total Referrals to Juvenile Court	
Comparison and Trends over 10 Year Period	6
Alleged Delinquency Referrals 1969	
10 Year Comparison of Alleged Delinquency Referrals	7
Table 3 - Reasons for Referral	8
Table 4 - Race of Child	9
Table 5 - Marital Status of Parents	9
Table 6 - Status of Referrals	9
Table 7 - Income of Family	10
Table 8 - Source of Support	10
Table 9 - School Status of Child	10
Table 10- Dispositions of Alleged Delinquency Referrals	11
Table 11- Source of Referrals for Alleged Delinquency & Dependency Referrals	12
Alleged Dependency Referrals 1969	
10 Year Comparison of Alleged Dependency Referrals	13
Table 12 - Reasons for Referral	14
Table 13 - Race of Child	15
Table 14 - Marital Status of Parents	15
Table 15 - Status of Referrals	15
Table 16 - Income of Family	16
Table 17 - Source of Support	16
Table 18 - School Status of Child	16
Table 19 - Dispositions of Alleged Dependency Referrals	17
Traffic 1969	
Table 20 - Reasons for Citations	18
Table 21 - Dispositions of Citations	19
Recurrence of Traffic Referrals	19
Number of Traffic Referrals Involving Accidents and Insurance	19

SUMMARY OF REFERRALS AND COURT PROCESSES

All referrals to the Court for reasons of delinquency (4,658) and for dependency (3,594) are reflected in one or more processes outlined below:

SUMMARY OF COURT HEARINGS

Preliminary hearings on detention	3,693
Fact Finding and Decline of Jurisdiction hearings	673
Commitment to Dept. of Institutions hearings	347
Dispositional hearings (formerly called "Regular" hearings)	887
Contested Traffic hearings	49
Financial hearings, support, etc.	263
Custody matters, hearings	911
Non-appearance matters, hearings	3,100

PROBATION DEPARTMENT SERVICES

Detention Screening

No. of children presented for admission to detention	5,470
Not admitted (screened out) by officer	1,769
Admitted by screening officer	3,701
All other admissions	518

Intake Screening

Cases received during year	4,075
Cases disposed of during year	3,537
Cases active at end of year	538

Investigation Division

Cases received during year	1,266
Cases disposed of during year	1,263
Cases active at end of year	614

Probation Supervision

Average no. children on active probation	204
No. children placed on probation in year	230
No. children on active probation during year	481
No. on probation at end of year	203
No. referrals adjusted with parent, child, etc.	2,462
No. settled out by letter to parents or agency	219
No. dismissed in preliminary hearing	145
No. cases presented by all staff units for full court hearing	1,907
Average caseload per probation officer	35
Average no. new assignments per officer per month	7

Review Load - Cases Continued Without Probation Supervision

No. cases placed on review status during year	917
No. cases dismissed, completed, terminated	1,021
No. cases in review load end of year	347

COLLECTION DIVISION1969

No. of accounts receivable for support of child	660
No. of accounts receivable for detention costs	1,177
No. of court hearings on financial matters	263
Amount in arrears and collectible	39,559
Amount collected for support of children	263,599
Amount collected for detention care	45,709
Total collected during the year	\$309,308

TRAFFIC CITATIONS REFERREDFive Year Comparison of Reasons for Referrals

<u>Citation or Referral</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Drunk Driving	58	92	51	92	52
Reckless driving	157	142	205	193	162
Hit & Run	46	52	34	39	28
Speeding	2,614	3,488	3,410	3,233	2,748
Negligent driving	922	1,031	1,087	1,109	905
Stop signs, signals	862	936	977	916	751
Right of way, illegal turn	489	722	1,090	961	985
Following too close	103	637	95	106	65
Aiding and abetting	27	27	29	25	50
Defective equipment	943	1,273	1,274	1,028	772
Vehicle license violations	194	247	298	276	306
No operator's license, license susp.	863	1,273	1,231	1,192	1,175
All other moving violations	<u>1,380</u>	<u>1,374</u>	<u>1,611</u>	<u>1,428</u>	<u>1,013</u> *
Total moving violations	8,658	11,294	11,392	10,598	9,012
Hitchhiking, Pedestrian & Motor Boat violations	<u>919</u>	<u>1,064</u>	<u>790</u>	<u>1,239</u>	<u>1,185</u>
Total Citations	9,577	12,358	12,182	11,837	10,197

* Note - Includes motorcycle safety violations

SUMMARY OF DETENTION AND SHELTER CARE

Detention and Shelter Care Services	<u>1969</u>
Admissions to Youth Service Center for Delinquency Reasons	2,103
Admissions to Youth Service Center for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency	<u>2,116</u>
Total Admissions to Youth Service Center	4,219
No. Individual Children Detained for Delinquency Reasons	1,543
No. Individual Children Detained for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency	<u>1,677</u>
Total No. Individual Children Detained	3,220
Child Care Days Provided for Delinquency Reasons	23,077
Child Care Days Provided for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency	<u>31,026</u>
Total Child Care Days Provided	54,103
Average Length of Stay of Children for Delinquency Reasons	10.9
Average Length of Stay of Children for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency	<u>14.7</u>
Total Average Length of Stay for all Children	13.0
Average Daily Population in Detention for Delinquency Reasons	63.2
Average Daily Population in Detention for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency	<u>85.0</u>
Total Average Daily Population in Detention	148.2

SUMMARY OF DETENTION AND SHELTER CARE

10 YEARS, 1960 to 1969

<u>Year</u>	<u>Referrals Delinquent & Dependent (a)</u>	<u>All Det. Adm.</u>	<u>% Det.</u>	<u>Del. Ref.</u>	<u>% Det.</u>	<u>Dep. Ref.</u>	<u>% Det. (b)</u>
1960	5,545	2,686	48%	2,615	45%	2,930	30%
1961	5,825	2,760	47%	2,901	48%	2,924	38%
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	5,106	64%	4,171	60%	3,930	68% (c)
1969	8,252	4,219	51%	4,658	45%	3,594	59%

- (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 678 out-of-county runaways detained but not counted as referrals. The detention rate without them included would be 40%.

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

NUMBER OF CHILDREN RELEASED
AND LENGTH OF DETENTION STAY BY AGE

Table 1

1969

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number of Children</u>	<u>Total Days in Detention</u>	<u>Average Length of Stay</u>
1	0	0	0.0 days
2	1	4	4.0
3	0	0	0.0
4	0	0	0.0
5	2	4	2.0
6	1	5	5.0
7	<u>2</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>57.5</u>
Subtotal	6	128	21.3 days
8	9	173	19.2 days
9	19	531	27.9
10	32	687	21.5
11	52	1,492	28.7
12	<u>110</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>23.6</u>
Subtotal	222	5,483	24.7 days
13	387	5,647	14.6 days
14	643	9,312	14.5
15	953	12,647	13.3
16	1,077	12,794	11.9
17	923	7,442	8.1
18	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2.0</u>
Subtotal	3,986	47,848	12.0 days
Total	4,214	53,459	12.7 days

LENGTH OF DETENTION STAY
FOR GROUPS OF CHILDREN RELEASED
1969

Table 2

<u>Length of Stay</u>	<u>All Children</u>	<u>Delinquent Children</u>	<u>Neglected Children</u>	<u>Rebellious Children</u>
1 - 4 days	2,057 - 48.8%	1,107 - 52.2%	207 - 56.9%	743 - 43.0%
5 - 10 days	758 - 18.0%	390 - 18.4%	60 - 16.5%	308 - 17.8%
11 - 15 days	356 - 8.5%	160 - 7.5%	22 - 6.0%	174 - 10.1%
16 - 20 days	203 - 4.8%	99 - 4.7%	10 - 2.7%	94 - 5.4%
21 - 30 days	301 - 7.1%	144 - 6.8%	17 - 4.7%	140 - 8.1%
31 - 60 days	415 - 9.9%	182 - 8.6%	31 - 8.5%	202 - 11.7%
61 and over	<u>124 - 2.9%</u>	<u>39 - 1.8%</u>	<u>17 - 4.7%</u>	<u>68 - 3.9%</u>
	4,214 -100.0%	2,121 -100.0%	364 -100.0%	1,729 -100.0%
Average Stay	12.7 days	11 days	13.1 days	14.7 days
Child Care Days	53,459	23,254	4,772	25,433
Number of Boys	2,822	1,811	181	830
Number of Girls	1,392	310	183	899

COMPARISON AND TRENDS 10 YEAR PERIOD
1960 - 1969

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

<u>Year</u>	<u>Del. & Dep. Referrals</u>	<u>& Annual Change</u>	<u>Alleged Del. Referrals</u>	<u>& Annual Change</u>	<u>Alleged Dep. Referrals</u>	<u>& Annual Change</u>
1960	5,545	+ 14%	2,615	+ 11%	2,930	+ 17%
1961	5,825	+ 5%	2,901	+ 11%	2,924	+ 0%
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%
1960-1969 Average						
Change per Year		+ 6%		+ 9%		+ 4%

Delinquent Referrals and Rates

<u>Year</u>	<u>Delinquent Referrals</u>	<u>10-17 Year Population*</u>	<u>Percent Population Referred</u>	<u>Rate of Delinquent Referrals per 10,000 Children, 10-17 Years</u>
1960	2,615	125,772	2.1%	207.9
1961	2,901	132,007	2.2%	219.8
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	175,245	2.7%	265.2

Dependent Referrals and Rates

<u>Year</u>	<u>Dependent Referrals</u>	<u>0 - 17 Year Population*</u>	<u>Percent Population Referred</u>	<u>Rate of Dependent Referrals per 10,000 Children, 0-17 Years</u>
1960	2,930	324,337	0.9%	90.3
1961	2,942	336,822	0.9%	87.3
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	419,949	1.0%	85.6

* Office of Population Research Figures for King County

KING COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

10 YEAR COMPARISON OF TOTAL ALLEGED DELINQUENCY REFERRALS

Reason for Referral	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Murder/Manslaughter	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	5	6
Auto Theft	470	510	553	677	795	562	565	682	684	661
Riding in Stolen Car, knowing	-	-	-	-	-	102	97	141	129	60
Motor Bike Theft	-	-	-	-	-	37	25	29	22	23
Burglary, Unlawful Entry	383	416	376	463	635	642	563	459	585	672
Robbery, Holdup	19	41	62	47	75	52	23	23	57	63
Unarmed, Purse Snatch	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	46	95	75
Forgery	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	35	41	52
Mail Theft	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	30	32	39
Shoplifting	-	-	-	-	-	396	332	237	200	278
Other Theft, Attempts, Bikes	527	543	714	695	979	585	392	277	214	179
Rape	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	7	7	7
Indecent Exposure, Liberties	-	-	-	-	-	-	45	33	53	27
Sex Offense - Other	186	180	285	233	276	283	161	121	70	35
Injury to Person-Assault	94	91	139	175	167	166	82	60	47	67
Fighting, Threatened Assault	-	-	-	-	-	81	117	165	144	122
Vandalism, Property Damage	-	-	100	99	170	285	189	111	91	89
Arson, Firesetting	-	-	-	-	35	79	68	60	44	31
Car Prowl, Trespass	-	-	-	-	-	-	64	81	58	85
Boat Violation, Trespass	-	-	4	5	1	11	58	nc	nc	nc
Carelessness, Mischief	184	156	80	49	74	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc
Curfew	-	-	172	180	194	278	291	216	152	198
Use of Liquor, Possession	426	535	760	751	820	646	852	865	467	519
Runaway, Correctional Inst.	-	-	141	107	91	56	49	84	46	80
Attempted Suicide	-	-	-	-	18	48	42	39	28	18
Glue Sniffing	-	-	-	-	16	18	76	148	130	44
Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs	-	-	-	-	5	5	32	324	386	356
Supervision for Other Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	20	22	16
Other Reasons	326	429	295	343	346	291	488	285	291	279
Minor Infractions Adjusted or Pending Dispositions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	181	71	577
TOTALS	2,615	2,901	3,681	3,824	4,697	4,624	4,717	4,760	4,171	4,658

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

DELINQUENCY REFERRALS
Disposed of in 1969

Table 3

<u>Reason for Referral:</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Murder/Manslaughter	5	1	6
Rape	7	-	7
Prostitution	-	19	19
Fornication	2	1	3
Indecent Exposure	11	-	11
Indecent Liberties	15	1	16
Window Peeping	1	-	1
Other Sex Offenses	11	1	12
Assault - Threatened	46	8	54
Assault - Fighting	57	11	68
Assault - Unprovoked	55	12	67
Robbery - Armed	58	5	63
Robbery - Unarmed	52	11	63
Purse Snatching	9	3	12
Auto Theft	623	38	661
Motor Bike Theft	23	-	23
Riding in Stolen Car - Knowing	52	8	60
Car Prowl	46	3	49
Bicycle Theft	8	-	8
Burglary/Unlawful Entry	638	34	672
Forgery	33	19	52
Shoplifting	152	126	278
Theft of Mail	39	-	39
Attempted/Other Theft	158	13	171
Arson	31	-	31
Vandalism	34	1	35
Property Damage	53	1	54
Trespassing/Prowling	33	3	36
Curfew	138	60	198
Glue Sniffing	40	4	44
Marijuana	229	43	272
L.S.D.	19	9	28
Other Narcotics & Dangerous Drugs	46	10	56
Attempted Suicide	4	14	18
Liquor - Use/Possession	449	70	519
Runaway from Correctional Institution	53	27	80
Other Delinquency	242	37	279
Courtesy Supervision	10	6	16
Total Delinquency Referrals (with full social data)	3,482	599	4,081

Actual Total Delinquency Referrals were ---

4,658

STATISTICS ON ALLEGED DELINQUENCY REFERRALS - 1969 - continued

Table 4 Race of Delinquent Child Referred:

<u>Race</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
White	2,787	435	3,222
Negro	551	135	686
Indian	84	20	104
Filipino	26	-	26
Chinese/Japanese	18	6	24
Other	16	3	19
Total	3,482	599	4,081

Table 5 Marital Status of Parents - Delinquent Referrals:

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Married and together	1,581	229	1,810
Divorced	378	66	444
Divorced - Mother remarried	350	72	422
Divorced - Father remarried	93	14	107
Both Remarried	98	23	121
Separated	150	47	197
Married and Apart	17	3	20
Father Dead	89	14	103
Mother Dead	46	6	52
Both Dead	12	-	12
Father dead - Mother remarried	28	10	38
Mother dead - Father remarried	10	3	13
One Parent Deserted	16	1	17
Unmarried	25	4	29
Unknown or not reported	589	107	696
Total	3,482	599	4,081

Table 6 Case Status of Delinquent Referrals:

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
New	1,702	312	2,014
Old Dep.	128	62	190
Reappear - Dependent	106	47	153
Recidivist - Dependent	17	9	26
Old Delinquent	639	56	695
Reappear - Delinquent	641	63	704
Recidivist - Delinquent	139	10	149
Old Delinquent & Dependent	85	31	116
Recidivist - Delinquent & Dependent	25	9	34
Total	3,482	599	4,081

STATISTICS ON ALLEGED DELINQUENCY REFERRALS - 1969 - continued

Table 7

Family Income of Child Referred for Delinquency:

<u>Amount of Income</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Under \$200 per month	26	6	32
200-299	61	15	76
300-399	106	34	140
400-499	203	26	229
500-599	169	19	188
600-699	168	17	185
700-799	119	19	138
800-899	139	21	160
Over 900	267	48	315
Unemployed	23	7	30
Unknown or not reported	<u>2,201</u>	<u>387</u>	<u>2,588</u>
Total	3,482	599	4,081

Table 8

Source of Support for Family of Delinquent Child Referred.

<u>Source of Support</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Father	1,560	220	1,780
Step-Father	223	45	268
Mother	362	63	425
Step-Mother	3	-	3
Relatives	40	12	52
Public Assistance - SDPA	178	61	239
Social Security	21	5	26
Self	27	2	29
Other	20	9	29
Unknown or not reported	<u>1,048</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>1,230</u>
Total	3,482	599	4,081

Table 9

School Status - Delinquent Child:

<u>Grade in School</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Grade 1	2	2	4
2	1	-	1
3	11	1	12
4	8	4	12
5	44	-	44
6	55	6	61
7	147	22	169
8	270	66	336
9	414	74	488
10	462	76	538
11	362	61	423
12	257	45	302
Pre-School	-	-	-
Kindergarten	-	-	-
Withdrew	33	4	37
Dropped Out	229	51	280
Suspended	112	12	124
Expelled	29	9	38
College, University, Other	17	3	20
Less than full time	4	1	5
Adjustment Classes	28	4	32
Graduated	37	2	39
Unknown or not reported	<u>960</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>1,116</u>
Total	3,482	599	4,081

DISPOSITIONS OF DELINQUENT REFERRALS

Table 10

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Matter adjusted with parent and child	1,617	295	1,912
Petition dismissed	354	61	415
Probation and wardship dismissed	6	5	11
Placed on probation - own home	119	14	133
Placed on probation - in foster home	7	5	12
Supervision for other courts	5	2	7
Technical probation and reports	334	40	374
Technical probation - no reports	38	4	42
Continued for later review	87	8	95
Transferred to other juvenile courts	16	3	19
Declined jurisdiction - adult court	44	4	48
Declined jurisdiction - suspended	13	1	14
Committed to the Department of Institutions	178	28	206
Commitment rescinded; suspended	13	1	14
Re-committed to the Dept. of Institutions	16	1	17
Runaway, parole failure, shelter for parolee of Dept. of Institutions	83	20	103
Committed to school for mentally retarded	-	-	-
Committed to state mental hospital	2	-	2
Referred to juvenile parole counselor	45	12	57
Committed or placed in custody of:			
Briscoe School	1	-	1
Eastside Psychiatric Clinic	1	-	1
Evergreen Heights Boys' Home	2	-	2
Griffin Home	3	-	3
Home of the Good Shepherd	-	4	4
Family Counseling Service	1	-	1
Jeff's Home	1	-	1
Jewish Family & Child Service	1	1	2
Kings' Boyville	1	-	1
Lutheran Family and Child Service	-	1	1
Public Assistance - foster home	6	3	9
Public Assistance - family care	12	-	12
Seattle Children's Home	2	-	2
Other private agency or institution	16	4	20
Placed with relatives	8	3	11
Driver's license suspended or restricted	2	-	2
All other dispositions	<u>448</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>527</u>
Total	3,482	599	4,081

Note: These dispositions are for full data cases.
Total delinquency referrals were - 4,658.

Table 11 Source of Referral to Juvenile Court:

<u>Agency or Individual</u>	<u>Delinquency</u>	<u>Dependency</u>	<u>Total</u>
Seattle Police Department	1,961	433	2,394
King County Sheriff	548	156	704
Washington State Patrol	240	15	255
Bellevue	118	12	130
Clyde Hill	3	--	3
Medina	--	1	1
Bothell	20	1	21
Kirkland	58	14	72
Carnation	10	--	10
Redmond	44	4	48
Enumclaw	30	3	33
Issaquah	18	1	19
North Bend	1	1	2
Snoqualmie	1	--	1
Pacific	3	3	6
Normandy Park	3	2	5
Des Moines	11	--	11
Algona	2	5	7
Auburn	66	21	87
Kent	44	4	48
Tukwila	34	2	36
Black Diamond	1	--	1
Renton	181	18	199
Mercer Island	56	5	61
Lake Forest Park	9	3	12
Other Police Departments	86	43	129
Other Law Enforcement	46	10	56
Post Office Department	37	1	38
Game Department	1	--	1
Probation Officer - K.C.J.C.	34	75	109
Juvenile Conference Committee	9	13	22
Other Juvenile Courts	207	105	312
Administrative and Agency Petitions	17	24	41
School Department	4	140	144
Social Agencies	15	161	176
Parent(s)	70	667	737
Relatives	5	144	149
Self	6	203	209
Other Source	82	133	215
Total	4,081	2,423	6,504

NOTE: These are sources of referral for full data cases. The combined referrals for delinquent and dependent reasons in 1969 were 8,252.

TEN YEAR COMPARISON OF TOTAL ALLEGED DEPENDENCY REFERRALS

KING COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

<u>REASON FOR REFERRAL</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Abuse or Cruel Treatment		40	59	63	72	33	20	39	48	38
Injurious living, Neglect	445	519	622	678	700	768	555	425	290	114
Abandonment	76	96	135	148	119	126	87	93	44	52
Shelter	248	191	280	302	192	139	177	269	133	65
Protective Custody				nc	nc	180	301	208	309	247
Incest					6	10	9	24	10	15
				Sub Total		1256(ST)	1149	1058	834	531
Rebellious, Ungovernable	226	163	258	284	314	271	360	499	717	771
Unable to Adjust	164	210	199	228	290	237	161	166	142	173
Runaway from Home	656	647	622	567	584	673	690	800	674	579
Truancy, Unable to Adjust in school	89	131	151	164	156	110	136	180	156	152
				Sub Total		1291(ST)	1347	1645	1689	1675
Custody, Investigations	475	323	330	388	345	449	422	305	453	523
Custody for Adoption	477	501	615	637	674	663	721	788	733	716
Mentally Handicapped	6	5	11	12	15	2	5	3	3	6
Other Reasons & Pending	68	98	184	185	135	242	355	233	218	143
				Sub Total		1356(ST)	1503	1329	1407	1388
Total for Year	2930	2924	3466	3656	3602	3903	3999	4032	3930	3594

DEPENDENCY REFERRALSDisposed of in 1969Table 12 Reason for Referral

<u>Neglect</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Abandonment	28	24	52
Injurious Living Conditions, Neglect	52	62	114
Shelter	35	30	65
Cruel/Abusive Treatment	8	26	34
Child Beating	4	-	4
Incest	-	15	15
Protective Custody	105	142	247
<u>Dependency - Rebellious</u>			
Unable to adjust - Home or Foster Home	72	101	173
Incorrigible/Ungovernable	367	404	771
Runaway	236	343	579
Truancy	48	26	74
Refusal to Attend School	29	20	49
Unable to Adjust in School	21	8	29
<u>Dependency - Custody</u>			
Custody Establishment	28	28	56
Deprivation - Custody for Adoption	6	6	12
Other Dependency	67	72	139
Courtesy Investigation	8	2	10
Subtotal Dependency Referrals with Full Social Data	1,114	1,309	2,423
<u>Other Dependency Matters Referred but Not Fully Reported</u>			
Adoption - Relinquishments			704
Adoption Investigations and Publications			138
Custody Changed or Established.			329
Total Dependency Matters			3,594
Out-of-Town Runaways - Housing Only			678

STATISTICS ON ALLEGED DEPENDENCY REFERRALS - 1969 - Continued

Table 13

Race of Dependent Child Referred		<u>Dependent</u>		
<u>Race</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>	
White	925	1,051	1,976	
Negro	122	177	299	
Indian	38	54	92	
Filipino	10	10	20	
Chinese/Japanese	11	8	19	
Other	8	9	17	
Total	1,114	1,309	2,423	

Table 14 Marital Status of Parents - Dependent Referrals

	<u>Dependent</u>		
	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Married and together	310	417	727
Divorced	164	170	334
Divorced - Mother Remarried	140	184	324
Divorced - Father Remarried	61	82	143
Both Remarried	71	77	148
Separated	74	91	165
Married and Apart	13	5	18
Father Dead	35	39	74
Mother Dead	27	13	40
Both Dead	11	12	23
Father Dead - Mother Remarried	16	18	34
Mother Dead - Father Remarried	7	8	15
One Parent Deserted	6	17	23
Unmarried	44	52	96
Unknown or not reported	135	124	259
Total	1,114	1,309	2,423

Table 15 Case Status of Dependent Referrals

	<u>Dependent</u>		
	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
New	543	702	1,245
Old Dependent	177	224	401
Reappear - Dependent	140	241	381
Recidivist - Dependent	38	50	88
Old Delinquent	69	26	95
Reappear - Delinquent	92	23	115
Recidivist - Delinquent	10	7	17
Old Delinquent and Dependent	39	28	67
Recidivist - Delinquent & Dependent	6	8	14
Total	1,114	1,309	2,423

Table 16 Family Income of Child Referred for Dependency

<u>Amount of Income</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Under \$200 per month	18	13	31
200-299	24	33	57
300-399	48	49	97
400-499	62	76	138
500-599	50	77	127
600-699	42	69	111
700-799	34	57	91
800-899	47	40	87
Over 900 per month	93	106	199
Unemployed	24	18	42
Unknown or not reported	672	771	1,443
Total	1,114	1,309	2,423

Table 17 Source of Support for Family of Dependent Child Referred

<u>Source of Support</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Father	377	477	854
Stepfather	118	120	238
Mother	131	159	290
Stepmother	1	1	2
Relatives	18	23	41
Public Assistance - SDPA	144	181	325
Social Security	24	27	51
Self	10	6	16
Other	17	13	30
Unknown	274	302	576
Total	1,114	1,309	2,423

Table 18 School Status - Dependent Child

<u>Grade in School</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Grade 1	12	9	21
2	9	10	19
3	20	9	29
4	15	10	25
5	25	10	35
6	29	23	52
7	80	60	140
8	101	149	250
9	151	201	352
10	106	182	288
11	65	122	187
12	31	44	75
Preschool	97	94	191
Kindergarten	6	7	13
Withdrew	8	12	20
Dropped Out	35	56	91
Suspended	34	30	64
Expelled	7	9	16
College, University, Other	3	2	5
Less than full time	4	4	8
Adjustment classes	23	12	35
Graduated	1	4	5
Unknown or not reported	252	250	502
Total	1,114	1,309	2,423

DISPOSITIONS OF DEPENDENT REFERRALS
(Includes Neglect, Truant, Rebellious, Custody)

Table 19

<u>Disposition or Action Completed</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>		
Adjust with parent, child, relative, etc.	276	274	550		
Petition dismissed, service completed	190	272	462	+	2b
Probation and wardship dismissed	11	15	26	+	113b
Placed on probation - own home	41	40	81		
Placed on probation in foster home	10	13	23		
Supervision for other court	2	3	5		
Technical probation with reports	82	129	211		
Technical probation and review	9	16	25		
Continued for later review	29	34	63		
Referred to juvenile parole counselor	22	16	38		
Committed to Dept. of Institutions	69	85	154		
Committed to state mental hospital	2	1	3		
Runaway, parole failure, shelter for parolee, Dept. of Institutions	7	3	10		
Transferred to other juvenile court	6	5	11		
Committed to Dept. of Inst. and suspended	1	2	3		
Committed or placed in care of:					
Big Brothers	1	-	1		
Casey Family Program	1	-	1	+	5b
Catholic Children's Service	5	12	17	+	177a
Children's Home Society of Washington	6	2	8	+	260a
Deaconess Home	-	1	1		
Evergreen Heights Boys' Home	3	-	3		
Family Counseling Service	2	7	9		
Florence Crittenden Home	-	2	2		
Griffin Home	9	-	9	+	1b
Home of the Good Shepherd	-	24	24	+	3b
King's Boyville	2	-	2		
Luther Child Center	3	-	3		
Lutheran Family & Children's Service	-	-	-	+	159a
Medina Children's Service	-	-	-	+	137a
Ruth School for Girls	-	12	12	+	22b
Ryther Child Center	5	7	12	+	4b
Seattle Children's Home	-	2	2		
Public Assistance Foster Homes	68	82	150	+	102b
Public Assistance Family, receiving care	25	30	55	+	145b
Stuart Hall - Halfway House	-	7	7	+	2b
Vancouver Boys' Academy	1	-	1		
Other voluntary agencies & treatment	19	5	24	+	9b
Placed with relatives	36	46	82	+	2b
Parents deprived of custody	1	-	1		
All other dispositions	170	162	332	+	28b
 Total	 1,114	 1,309	 2,423	 1,171	

Note: These dispositions are for full data cases. Total dependency referrals received during the year were 3,594.

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 20 Reasons for Citations - 1969

	No. of Citations 1969	% of Total
Influence - Alcohol (a)	52	.6%
Reckless Driving (a)	162	1.8%
Hit and Run (a)	28	.3%
License Falsification	2	-
Speeding 0-10 mph	1,012	11.2%
Speeding 11-15 mph	935	10.4%
Speeding 16-20 mph (b) 2,748	348	3.9%
Speeding 21 + mph	175	1.9%
Speed Too Fast for Conditions	278	3.1%
Negligent Driving	905	10.0%
Through Stop Sign	751	8.3%
Failure to Yield	549	6.1%
Defective Equipment (d)	772	8.6%
No Opr. License on Person	703	7.8%
No Opr. Lic. - License Susp.	5	-
No Opr. Lic. - Other License	9	.1%
No Opr. Lic. - No. License Issued	441	4.9%
Violating Learner's Permit	17	.2%
Aiding and Abetting	50	.6%
No Vehicle License	206	2.3%
Improper Vehicle Registration	100	1.1%
Improper Turn	436	4.8%
No Signal	50	.6%
Following Too Closely	65	.7%
Other Violations	961	10.7%
Total Moving Violations	9,012	100.0%
Pedestrian Violations (c) (incl. Hitchhiking)	1,112	
Motor Boat Citations (c)	73	
All Violations - Citations	10,197	

- (a) Automatic suspension of license by Director of Licenses in these violations.
 (b) Speeding offenses 2,748 represent 30% of all moving violations. 2,748 speeding violations was a decrease of 485 violations or 15% reduction. There was also a reduction of 882 in total referrals implying negligence (reckless, hit & run, speeding 15 m.p.h. and over, speed too fast for conditions, negligent driving, through stop sign and failure to yield right of way).
 (c) 1,185 citations were nondriving violations or 12% of total.
 (d) Defective Equipment Citations were for following equipment:

Defective Brakes	89	Stoplight	56	Steering Alignment	1
Headlight Defective	73	Direct Signals	9	Windshield Wipers	6
Headlight Focus	12	Exhaust-Muffler	193	Glass Absent-Broken	2
Taillight Defective	138	Tires	2	Other Equipment	191
					Total
					772

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

DISPOSITIONS OF TRAFFIC CITATIONS

Table 21

		1969
License Issuance Deferred	(a)	385
License Held (30 days to 18 mos.)	(a)	522
Driving Restricted (School/Work/With Parent)	(a)	960
Car to be Sold		12
Reprimand and Closed	(b)	6,216
Dismissed		10
Declined Jurisdiction		1,382
Referred to other Juvenile Court		352
Accident Prevention School		96
Referred to Student Court		7
Other Dispositions		<u>255</u>
Total		10,197

Note: (a) 18% of dispositions resulted in license suspension, licensing deferred or driving restricted.
 (b) Includes Pedestrian violation dispositions.

<u>Recurrence of Traffic Referrals</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
1st Referral	7,698	75.5%
2nd Referral	1,465	14.4%
3rd Referral	582	5.7%
4th Referral	452	4.4%

No. Referrals Involving Accidents and Insurance

No. Referrals for		No. Accidents	858	Total Insured	5,213
Moving Violations	9,012	Injury	252	No. Accidents	597
		Fatality	0		

No. Driver Trained	5,659	Boys Referred	8,935	=	87.6%
In Driver Training	10	Girls Referred	1,262	=	12.4%