

KING COUNTY
DOCUMENT

J9.1

copy 2

[3289]

MUNICIPAL REFERENCE LIBRARY
307 MUNICIPAL BUILDING
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104
SEP 13 1971



ANNUAL REPORT

KING COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

Seattle, Washington

1970

Juvenile Court Board of Managers
Seattle, Washington

This report summarizes the work and case counts for this department in the year 1970. It reflects the frustration and uncertainty of parents and the efforts of law enforcement agencies to deal with rebellious and disoriented youth.

We report improved court procedures resulting from several efforts. A second deputy, assigned by the Prosecuting Attorney, assures the filing of proper petitions and more deliberate actions on contested cases. A public defender represents youth without funds. Time saving multicopy forms for orders have reduced delay in processing cases. The Judge and Court Commissioner have carried a full calendar all year.

For the sixth consecutive year, Public Assistance Administrators have increased protective services for neglected children so that 125 fewer neglect cases came to the Court, and there were 59 fewer children given shelter in our facility.

We reduced our average daily detention population from 148 last year to 136 by careful intake selection. We admitted 318 fewer children than in 1969, but those admitted stayed an average of 13 days as they did last year. Rebellious children outnumbered delinquent children admitted.

The new state support for local probation services was a welcome stimulus for more inventive and persistent supervision of youth under probation. Reduced case loads, job finders, school helpers and emergency aid added up to better probation work for 160 more risky but manageable youth.

Volunteer help was extended to include probation work. At year's end 43 volunteer men and women were supervising children under direction of the Probation Officer. Some 100 people continue volunteer services in detention, crafts, charm school, transportation, outings and other recreation activities.

Rebellious youth and distraught parents have required extensive counseling in 1700 cases again this year; and, in spite of extended hours of detention screening, 43 percent of admissions were for unruly conduct.

The staff deserve high commendation for inventiveness and perseverance. They have tried to work for the children's best interests and to assure the community's protection. They have coped with construction noise, dirt and inconvenience with stoicism. They have helped to create new neighborhood interest and willingness to nurture and teach diffident youth.

We are again grateful to those perceptive and responsive people who made cooperation possible with law enforcement agencies, schools, social agencies, local government and community services.

CARL B. ERICKSON
Director

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES

The Juvenile Court aids youngsters and parents when the usual methods of training and care seem to have broken down. Something like it is necessary wherever people live together. In principle, it is a very ancient thing although its modern form and methods are still developing.

Each generation looks out for the next until it can fend for itself, and a child's parents can seldom do the whole job. Grandparents, doctors, ministers, craftsmen and councils always shoulder part of the burden. Just as the teacher has largely replaced village blacksmiths in teaching special skills, the Juvenile Court has taken the place of tribal and village councils in handling special problems.

When family and school are unable to deal with a child, he is brought to us, and we try to discover what went wrong. Where possible, we help the family aid itself. Where necessary we call on individuals or agencies who help families and young people. If the situation is very serious, we supervise and counsel the child ourselves. If either the child's care or the community's protection demand his detention, we furnish such in our Youth Service Center. In certain cases we may send him to one of the State's correctional schools.

King County has 287,071 youngsters between ages five and eighteen. Only 7,911 of these, or 1 child in 36, was brought to the attention of Juvenile Court in 1970. Slightly over two-thirds were referred to us by police for alleged delinquent acts or breaking a law. The remainder were alleged to be dependent on the Court because they were neglected or mistreated by their parents or beyond family control. (1)

Our first task is sorting out the problems. One boy threw rocks at a bus; another stole an automobile; one girl won't mind her stepmother; another tries to be a prostitute. We try to discover what the child has done or hasn't done, where and how he lives and what his difficulties are. Probation workers available from 7 a.m. to 12 p.m. carefully screen out as many of the mild problems as possible before admission to the Youth Service Center. In 1970 for the first time we were able to screen out one-half of the children presented for detention admission and another 8% before a preliminary detention hearing was held. The remaining problems were felt to be particularly serious or couldn't be quickly investigated. In either case a preliminary detention hearing was scheduled for each youth detained.

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

THE COURT

Any formal action by the Juvenile Court requires decision by one of its judges. A Juvenile Court Committee of judges is responsible for the Court and its chairman assigns one or more judges to serve for a six-month period. During 1970, Chairman Judge George H. Revelle and Judges Robert Elston, Frank Howard and David Soukup served as Juvenile

(1) Of the 7,911 referrals to King County Juvenile Court in 1970, 4,659 were for alleged delinquency, 3,252 for alleged dependency or non-delinquency reasons. There were 3,901 admissions to the Youth Service Center. In addition there were 9,665 traffic violations and 2,174 motor boat, pedestrian and other violations.

Court Judges. Court Commissioner Robert Dixon also carried full-time judicial duties. These men, all Judges of the Superior Court, have chosen to work with youth, accepting the rapid pace and complex problems.

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

Preliminary Detention Hearings to determine whether a child should be detained or the conditions of his release are normally held within twenty-four hours of arrival at the Youth Service Center. At these hearings the child, parents, his attorney when retained and the caseworker are present. The Judge may appoint counsel for the child if he believes it necessary. Possible temporary care in lieu of detention is appraised and many cases are released to the family. Neglected children may be placed by the State Division of Public Assistance in parents homes or temporary foster care when needed. There were 3,303 such hearings in 1970.

A Fact-finding Hearing is scheduled if allegations or charges are denied or when the child exercises his right to remain silent and seek counsel. (See Legal Rights) A deputy prosecuting attorney prepares the petition and presents argument and evidence in such hearings. The Judge must apply rules of evidence; proof must be established beyond a reasonable doubt. There were 581 such hearings in the year.

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

A Commitment Hearing is held when the Court intends to send a child to the state correctional school. These hearings must provide the same guarantee of due process as fact-finding and decline hearings. For example, a boy who failed on probation who commits burglaries and requires institutional control can be committed to a correctional school. We are guided in such hearings by the 1967 United States Supreme Court's decision *In Re Gault*. (2) There were 347 commitment hearings held resulting in 240 actual commitments.

Disposition Hearings are held when a judicial consent or decision is required for placement, probation or other corrective treatment. Prior to each, the probation officer evaluates social and family factors, submits a written report and recommendation and effects agreement with child and parent wherever possible. There were 987 hearings conducted on disposition.

Financial Hearings to establish parent responsibility for care of children were held in 195 cases during 1970. These hearings involve parental support payments for institutional or foster care and the cost of detention care in the Youth Service Center. Many of these are show-cause matters.

Traffic Hearings may be held on contested traffic charges. Three traffic referees decide all other cases, including negligent driving. In the past two years greater flexibility in dispositions and informal declines of jurisdiction for traffic cases have reduced traffic court hearings in Juvenile Court from 152 in 1968 to a total of 3 cases in 1970.

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

MANAGEMENT

The Juvenile Court Board of Managers has administrative responsibility for the Court's probation and detention services. Judge George H. Revelle serves as its chairman; members are Francis Brownell, Jr.; John Schermer; Robert Weber and the Rev. Gil Lloyd, who replaced George Fahey at mid-year. They are the operating Board who direct operations and day to day staff services. They preside over a 200-man force that must deal on any day with approximately 230 active probation cases and 135 children in detention, 19 new investigations and handle 46 traffic appearances.

The department's work calls for alert clerical and reception people who must handle everything from court transcripts to angry parents and deal with a formidable complex of orders, petitions, referrals, statistics, analyses, bills, reports, etc. Much of this work is done under sudden pressure. In large part our success in developing better methods and handling difficult problems depends on the skill, flexibility and tact of these people.

INVESTIGATION AND GUIDANCE

Law requires that a probation officer investigate each case to be certain a petition needs to be filed, and recommend what should be done for each child's care or correction. In effect, our intake services are a major part of the probation department work force. Ten officers, backed by a specially trained clerical staff, are at work daily from 7 a.m. to 12 p.m. receiving youngsters, interviewing them and their parents, providing crisis intervention for distraught families, arranging for temporary care, referring families to other agencies and protecting children from detention for unjustified reasons. Over the last few years better methods and developing skills in this area have allowed us to give immediate and effective aid where other court disposition is not required.

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

SUPERVISION OF YOUTH ON PROBATION

A probation officer's day-by-day task is the counseling of those children whom the Court has decided to put on probation. These are cases where the child has a serious behavior problem that can be best resolved at home. The Court determines its authority is necessary to modify the child's attitude and redirect his behavior, and that a delinquent pattern hasn't already solidified. There must be sufficient strengths in child and family to allow for positive change, the caseworker must believe he can work with them. A school plan or work opportunity must normally be available, and there must be latent capacity to take advantage of it. There must be no need to control the child through confinement.

The probation staff supervised 582 children on probation during 1970, an increase of 101 over 1969. We propose to increase this vital service when funds for additional probation officers can be secured.

Where Court action seems indicated, the staff makes a factual investigation of alleged delinquencies and a social evaluation, including a study of the child's personality, attitudes toward him, school history, recreation and companions.

OTHER PROBATION SERVICES

Since the probation staff must both prepare cases and supervise children under court care, the majority of probation officers do their work in staff units combining both

investigative and supervision tasks. In 1970, 45 probation officers in four units did investigative and supervision work, 8 others were assigned to information services, home finding and coaching volunteers. Probation work requires special training, broad understanding, dedication and skill with children. Unemployment, divorce, 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 these problems and their effect on people.

In 1970 these probation officers and their six supervisors:

Prepared 3,901 cases for preliminary detention hearings, interviewing children, parents and referring agent, and then completed the services necessary after such hearings;

Did 1,303 full investigations of allegedly delinquent or dependent children and presented these cases for fact-finding hearing or for decline of jurisdiction, commitment hearing or other dispositional hearings;

Completed 2,457 cases by adjustment with the family, counseling parents, effecting restitution or referring them to an appropriate private or public agency for care or service;

Processed 621 applications for adoptive agencies for temporary custody of children pending placement;

Dismissed 128 cases outright for lack of reason for court intervention. Referred to other agencies 1,265 for care or service;

Interviewed child and parent and worked out alternatives to detention on an average of 110 cases per month;

Supervised 505 cases which were heard and continued for later review or held on technical probation without supervision. There were 347 cases held on such review status without probationary supervision on January 1, and 178 were added during the year. At the end of the year there were 20 cases under surveillance or continued for reports to the Court. (3)

A written probation plan is confirmed in the hearing, so that conditions of probation and the worker's expectations are known to the youth and others as sanctioned by the Judge. We try to limit probation to the number of children our staff can effectively supervise, since each child will require six hours a month of care. In this time the worker must counsel child and family, keep track of schoolwork and acquaintances, and try in as far as possible to change the outlook and habits of his charge.

Each youngster, each family and each situation is different from any other. A boy going through a stormy adolescence has pushed everyone around him to exasperation. He provokes his parents into treating him as incorrigible. He frustrates school personnel until they suspend him. He insults the neighbors, or breaks things, steals, and is confronted by police or Court action. For each boy or girl there are reasons for such anger and frustration. Feeling unloved, unwanted, unfairly treated by those around him, he is hostile, resistive and suspicious of outside help.

The boy needs constructive outlets for his energies. He needs to be responsible for his choices. He must accept reasonable controls. He needs to understand his parents better. Maybe he can bypass the learning block which reduced his motivation in school. If he learns to achieve small success, he can build up personal security. One good grade on a

(3) This is a planned reduction compatible with due process and strengthened intake services.

school paper, a part-time job, a new friend and an improved sense of well-being are all part of probation.

Always the parents are close to the problem — sometimes they're too close. Our mistakes are seldom evident to ourselves. The caseworker helps parents to deal with the youngster's temporary rebellion and to be more consistent and judicious in their use of parental authority. Most parents need encouragement to give credit for achievement and to recognize healthy change in their own youngster. All families need help to learn to talk with each other and use the strengths they have. This requires hard work on everyone's part. The caseworker must keep all lines open to achieve the continuing sense of purpose and step-by-step progress that gives substance to personal growth.

NEW SUPERVISION PROGRAM

Two years ago the Legislature authorized a "Subsidy" program for intensive supervision of seriously delinquent children who would otherwise go to state correctional schools. Such a program got underway in King County at the beginning of this year with a staff of six probation workers and other specialists and its own clerical support staff. The original unit has handled over a hundred youngsters in its first full year of operation. A second unit, in operation since July, has taken in additional children for a total of 162 children who otherwise would have been confined. Of these, 45 were released during 1970 and another 117 cases were active at the end of the year. (4)

The objectives of the program as stated in the statute are fourfold:

To increase the protection afforded the citizens of this State;

To permit a more even administration of justice in juvenile courts;

To rehabilitate juvenile offenders;

To reduce the necessity for commitment of juveniles to state juvenile correctional institutions.

The objectives are to be achieved "by strengthening and improving the supervision of juveniles placed on probation by the Juvenile Court."

The size of program which can be supported under existing funding regulations is limited by two factors — the earnings which the County can achieve through the reduced commitment formula, and the County's allocated share of the total funding provided by the Legislature for the statewide program. The reduced commitments in the first year were 240 below the expected number based on our rate. We requested \$282,000 for the first year but were allocated \$229,000. The legislature got a fantastic bargain inasmuch as state institutions have 490 fewer commitments from all counties to deal with and at less than half the per capita cost of care.

These youngsters are all difficult and troublesome, so the average caseload is held to 20 per probation officer. They and their families need various community services, school readjustment, job training, welfare assistance and daily reinforcement. Most of them have failed in school many times, have lived up to a bad reputation, have very low self-image and poor expectations for their futures.

This is a bold program. We have entered into it with hope and confidence, and our

(4) The 1969 statute allows us a dollar for the program for each dollar we save on confinement costs. In 1970 a total 240 fewer commitments were made by King County. This compares with the rest of the State and represents a \$960,000 reduction of expenses by the Department of Institutions. Theoretically, this sum would be allotted to the program; but the funds are actually limited by the legislature.

experience in this first year spells success; but final evaluation will have to wait until we see how many of these youngsters stay out of trouble. (5)

There has been a general marshaling of forces to keep youth in the community where several forces may help to strengthen the family, youth and the community; and we are becoming stronger ourselves as we tackle each difficult case. The first year has seen progress in organization, development of methods, creation of helping resources and liaison with public and private agencies, much of which may aid the effectiveness of their programs as well as our own. Future development will depend on budget allocations.

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.

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:

detention care:

The child who 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 who 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 offer no alternative and the child is certain to run away or be in dangerous circumstances. There were 1,705 unruly and runaway children detained last year.

numbers detained and days of stay:

The detention loads decreased by 9% last year. On January 1, 1970, there were 119 children under care, and during the year 2,918 individual children were detained. The average daily population was 136 children and the average length of stay was 13 days, as compared to 148 and 13 last year. Many children were detained on more than one occa-

(5) An ideal caseload for the program hasn't been fixed. The preliminary figure is 20 cases per worker. For now, evaluation of success must depend on individual cases. Later, when a flow rate through the program can be ascertained, optimum caseloads can be set.

sion during the year so there were actually 3,901 admissions to detention during 1970. The total child care days spent by all children under care at the Youth Service Center was 50,124, a decrease of 3,335 days from 1969. Admission of boys outnumbered those of girls 2,509 to 1,392. Admission of delinquents exceeded those of nondelinquents, so there were 1,773 delinquents, 1,705 rebellious and 423 shelter and dependent admissions.

The longest detention was 196 days. Half of all children were released in 4 days or less and used 9% of all child care days. One-sixth of all children stayed over 30 days and used 53% of child care days. Those remaining longest were the most difficult to place or had no home or family able to care for them.

Five-Year Comparison

Detention Admissions and Populations (including 1960)

	1960	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
No. Children Presented for Detention:	2,986	4,747	5,561	5,765	5,420	5,430
No. Delinquent Admitted:	1,852	2,269	2,579	2,493	2,103	1,773
No. Rebellious Admitted:	834	2,178	2,534	1,910	1,752	1,705
No. Neglected Admitted:	834	2,178	2,534	762	364	423
No. Screened Out not Admitted:	e.*300 (* estimated)	e.*300	e.*500	e.*600	1,769	1,985
Average Daily Population for Year	113	135	162	160	148	136

Changes in Detention Care

For two years careful screening of all admissions has helped to reduce admissions and make detention successful for those who need it. Most children under the age of 13 are placed in receiving homes (6) rather than detention, resulting in a marked decrease in shelter care. 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 nondelinquent 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.

Nature of Detention Care

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

(6) The Division of Public Assistance reached an important milestone in October, 1968. Receiving homes for neglected children were then made available around the clock, almost eliminating shelter care in the Youth Service Center. There were 5 children 7 years of age or less and 480 other children detained all year for shelter. The Division placed 312 others in receiving home care.

Staff Work with Children

Children in detention are under the control of supervisors who are usually young and always talkative. To survive, they must like children, hold no grudge, have a strong character and a reserve of self-composure. The work demands intelligence, flexibility and a sense of humor. They must be solidly built. Many are college graduates; others are beginning a career in child welfare.

Detention services include activities and programs 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 record accountability to the community. Staff undergo training and observation to improve their capacity to help children. Detention is a crisis for all children; for those who spend weeks with us, it becomes a deeply-felt experience. This places a heavy responsibility on both Court and community to make it work for the child.

Volunteers and staff teach leather crafts, sewing and knitting. A volunteer teaches the girls about hair, skin care and charm. Others take youngsters on outings, and many — we need more — take groups to gym and swimming.

Children's Living Groups

Our present overworked facility has nine separate living units. It has dormitories, single rooms, dayrooms, a cafeteria, gym, swimming pool and class and craft rooms. Most units have game rooms for ping-pong; some have pool tables. All have books and magazines, some T.V., radios, record players, sewing equipment, table games, one piano and one guitar.

Assignment is by level of maturity rather than by age, but the middle or junior units are usually 13 to 15 years old.

Our primary units for younger children shrink year by year as other agencies assume part of the burden. They house children with a wide range of problems — everything from mental retardation to child delinquency. They require patient, firm supervision to handle their impulses and hysteria. They require security and affection. Their teachers pin point their remedial need. Volunteers contribute time and imagination to make their lives pleasant and meaningful. Spare hours go to television and reading, model making and artwork. Some coed activities are scheduled between boys' and girls' units.

The Defiant Age

The junior units built for 20, house up to 30 girls and 50 boys. At this age, any group of 50 children is difficult to control. Growing intelligence combines with lack of experience and a confused metabolism to produce an awesomely stubborn and excitable creature. Here are the County's most disruptive children, and their simple physical control becomes a full-time job for the two or three supervisors in charge.

Defiant or not, a child's first right is to protection, care, love and supervision by his parents. Parents are assured visiting hours here, and a minister may give religious counsel. Competent caseworkers will arrange special medical, psychiatric or other diagnostic services when needed. The child's adjustment in detention is considered in planning subsequent treatment.

Nearly Adults

The senior units are smaller, quieter and generally more responsive than juniors. More help can be given and it is better accepted. Many of these are near-adults, and their relations with their supervisors can be cordial and productive. When control problems arise, they can be far more serious; but these are the exception. Since the supervisor can

work with the youngsters, he becomes elated by their successes and depressed by their failures.

The security unit is set aside for those who must be separated from the others. It is seldom crowded. Youngsters who break the rules are placed there usually for 24 hours. Others request to be isolated from the rest simply because the others are getting on their nerves. The few who can't seem to get along at all in a larger group sleep in this unit but join the rest for activities. The rooms are secure, have a screened front, and they are kept locked. There are ping-pong, music, reading and gym activities as in other units.

School Services

The Seattle Schools provide seven especially chosen teachers for the Youth Service Center School Program. Five teachers provide remedial and academic programs for up to 75 children daily in grades one through twelve; one teacher instructs arts and crafts; and another teaches homemaking. The classrooms are scheduled for 5 periods each day with most classes limited to 8 to 12 students. The teachers are specially selected and the program adapted to the capacities of children under care.

As the length of attendance in the Youth Center school program is about 17 days, its major function is to create interest. Improvement in one subject and remedial help in general will help these youngsters and their teachers try to see that they get it.

Success in school is not necessarily related to a child's intelligence but is a fair measure of his stability. (7) The youngster does reasonably well at school if he accomplishes a certain amount of work and relates generally to the doings of others. Where he can't, he has trouble that may lead to rebellion or delinquency. Often, too, inability to succeed or get along at school may have started his fight with authority and his problem may disappear if he can improve his performance. Even where school adjustment is one of many troubles, the first sign of a new outlook may be increased ability in the classroom. In a sense, low grades are like high body temperature, useful to the specialist's diagnosis and dangerous in their own right.

Probation staff strive to maintain a close relationship to school people. One of the first things we have to know about a child is how he is doing in the classroom, and improving his performance there becomes a major task of our caseworkers. Lines are kept open to the schools to insure close cooperation and effective help for the youngster in trouble. (8)

CLINICAL SERVICES

Medical examinations and consultation are given by the part-time physician, and around the clock nursing care is given here at the Youth Service Center. More extensive services are available at King County Hospital or at Orthopedic Hospital for youngsters who need medical help. Not surprisingly, a youngster's mental health is a major concern of the Court. Where necessary special diagnostic and consulting services aid the probation officer in making his assessment. Competent psychiatric consultants provide diagnosis of seriously disturbed children and make a recommendation for treatment. Whenever parents can afford to pay for necessary psychological or psychiatric services, they are strongly encouraged to do so. There were 282 such diagnostic services paid for fully or in part by parents.

(7) A third of the youngsters referred to us are either not enrolled, or not attending or truant. Many have been suspended or expelled.

(8) The Seattle Public Schools now maintain a remedial education center for older youths who cannot be returned to their regular schools. The Center, at the Aetna Building on 12th Avenue, is especially fitted to the needs of these youngsters to restore them to regular school attendance.

VOLUNTEERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

The Youth Service Guild volunteers have provided emergency transportation, craft activities, financial resources, a Camp Fire Girl program and assisted with special work in probation. The St. Stephen's Episcopal Church Women have expanded our arts and recreation program. Other organizations gave constant assistance and personal involvement through the year: The American Federation of Musicians—Local 76, American Women's Voluntary Services, Camp Fire Girls of America, Overlake Presbyterian Church, Venture Club, Women's City Club, Alpha Xi Chapter, Beta Sigma Phi, numerous PTA's, Alpha Delta Kappa, Quota Club, Pacific Northwest Bell, Sears Roebuck and Co., Children's Social Service Guild, Washington Jockey Club, Mt. Zion Baptist Church, Telephone Pioneers of America, Charles B. Hopkins Chapter No. 30 and numerous Girl Scout Troops.

More than 400 individuals, including many high school students who are not associated with any organization, have provided materials, needs, helping services and money.

The swimming pool, dedicated in April of 1969, was contributed by Dan McEachern. It cost more than a hundred thousand dollars, but the spirit of such a gift can't be measured in money. Nor can the spirit of its acceptance. Swimming is not a forced activity for our youngsters and for over 150 students from Pacific Prevocational School. We have left it free and spontaneous, and we dare anyone to come in with a slide rule to measure their laughter.

THE PEOPLE WHO HELP

In a way, our detention is only a gloss coat on something that has happened inside the children. A family is the strong house from which each youngster enters the world and for some reason it has collapsed for these. They are trapped — perhaps for life — in a tangle of clashing wills and rejection.

There are men and women in King County who are trying to pry these youngsters out. In 1970 they gave thousands of hours — thought, money, skill, and work — to reach them. Volunteers have thrown themselves into every part of our program; working with the youngsters in the gym and pool, providing outings and music, teaching arts or crafts, cooking, baking, sewing, grooming and games. Others work in the community to bring in clothing, craft material, money for tuition and medical needs. One volunteer has served as guardian ad litem for many children. Another supervises a campfire girls unit for our girls.

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. Pedestrian violations such as jaywalking and hitchhiking are referred to the Court for disposition. Referrals increased from the 1969 total by 1,642 totaling 11,839 including nonmoving violations.

These are beginning drivers, most of whom are under parental control and their treatment is radically different than that given to adults. A "bail" payment cannot be made. In all cases the youth appears with his parents; our traffic referee settles the matter in accord with the seriousness of the offense, the youngster's attitude and maturity and the capacity of the parents to supervise him. Where the youth is sufficiently mature or living independently, his case may be declined to a justice court for adult disposition.

Fines have proven a poor remedy for juvenile offenders and few are given. Instead, a program is worked out with the family including closer supervision, restricted driving

and driver training where it seems necessary. Driver training is necessary for all youngsters since 37% of moving violations are made by youths with no such training. Where the youngster is plainly out of hand, his license may be suspended.

Most offenses of beginners result from poor judgement and inattention; about 30% are speeding citations; girls got 15% of the total, up from 12% last year. The number of youngsters cited twice or more times rose from 24% to 29%. This last is a disturbing figure. It means that a rising number of our young drivers are more careless or aggressive on the road. (9)

The Court tries to make each youth and his family realize their responsibility for the lives of others. Auto worship is now a fact of our lives, and youth patterns risk and danger after adults. The public must defend itself with universal driver training, improve auto reliability and educate youths and adults more effectively. Safety councils, high school student councils, law enforcement agencies, citizens, and young people themselves must strengthen their efforts to reach these people before they reach the rest of us.

BUSINESS AND OPERATIONS

The physical existence of the Juvenile Court depends on the Business and Operations Department, that converts our support money into lodging, meals, pay checks and repairs. In 1970 it continued to battle everything from rodent control to the price of wieners.

The drop in numbers of children detained took some of the repair load from our maintenance staff, but new building construction and remodeling has kept them more than busy.

The kitchen operation reflects inflation in food prices although the number of meals dropped. They served 170,314 meals this year, down from 181,800 for 1969. Total food cost for 1970 was \$49,880 against \$50,220 for 1969. The Department of Agriculture contributed 18,200 pounds of surplus food. (10)

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 602 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 \$273,193 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 \$32,538 on 1,363 cases.

Juvenile Court Budget

This Juvenile Court budget was appropriated by the King County Council. The budget is prepared by the administrative officers for the Board of Managers who submit it

(9) Normally referrals are high in summer and fall due to the increased number of miles driven during vacation and the Traffic Department has been able to catch up with its relatively small backlog by the end of the year. 1970 was an exception. Despite 815½ hours of volunteer help and 328 hours of paid part-time help, the year closed with a backlog of approximately 1300 unprocessed tickets.

(10) Fire and sanitation inspections, boiler inspection and rodent control are regularly maintained. Food menus are reviewed by the University Home Economics staff.

to the County Council. The funds appropriated for this Department, as for most County offices, came from the County general fund.

The budget allocation for 1970 was as follows:

	Regular Budget Allocation	Special Supervision Program Allocated	Spent
Salaries & Wages			
Administrative Division	\$ 106,903		
Traffic Division	40,064		
Detention Division	624,473		
Probation Division	719,053	\$198,982	\$170,606.37
Operations Division	283,872	7,044	7,177.08
Extra Help & Overtime	163,542		
	<u>\$1,937,907</u>	<u>\$206,026</u>	<u>\$177,783.45</u>
Operations and Capital Outlay			
Operations & Maintenance	226,025	52,487	37,244.18
Capital Outlay	<u>4,020</u>	<u>23,313</u>	<u>7,834.05</u>
	<u>\$2,167,952</u>	<u>\$281,826</u>	<u>\$222,861.68</u>

Cost of Detention Care

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

These Budget Expenditures determine Detention Costs — 1970

Salaries and Wages — Institutional Personnel	\$807,429
Operation and Maintenance Costs	180,945
Capital Outlay Chargeable to Detention	<u>1,404</u>
	\$989,778

LEGAL RIGHTS

In recent years the Kent and Gault decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court have caused the Juvenile Court to extend new safeguards for the legal rights of youngsters. (11) From the outset a child and his parents are now informed of the right to remain silent and to seek legal counsel. In some cases an attorney is provided by the Court if the child is found indigent but in need of such aid. If the Juvenile Court wishes to decline jurisdiction so that the youth may be tried as an adult, he must have a full chance to defend himself. An attorney may represent child and parents at any sort of hearing and legal rules of testimony and evidence must be observed.

(11) The Supreme Court decision in the Kent Case requires that a youth under 18, to be charged in adult criminal court, must have constitutional rights and safeguards assured. He is entitled to counsel, a record must be made and reasonable grounds for making a criminal charge must be alleged. His parents are entitled to a copy of the petition and notice of the hearing, and the Juvenile Court must have exhausted its resources before it declines jurisdiction to an adult court.

The Juvenile Court process is based on the assumption that the Court assumes parental responsibility for a child. The intention in 1900 was to make law less severe for youth and a juvenile court's decisions were presumed not to constitute a criminal conviction. Accordingly, such courts tended to operate with a minimum of legal machinery and concentrate on finding solutions to the problems brought before them. We could not foresee that unprecedented social change would put such enormous demands on the juvenile court.

The seriousness of a delinquent act is only one of many aspects considered in recommending action. Studies have found that many youngsters are guilty of one or another of vandalisms and petty thefts for which juveniles are usually brought to court. The probation staff must consider whether the pattern of a child's life puts him and his family in need of the Court's help. Those whose habits seem to be leading them deeper into trouble are recommended for probation. Where the situation has gotten beyond family control, he may be sent to a training school.

Beyond the extra weeks of court and probation officer's time our outlays for court-appointed legal counsel in 1970 amounted to \$56,000. The prosecutor now has two full time deputies working with us. Not all the costs are public. Parents who feel their child must have legal protection yet are unable to judge either its effectiveness or its possible cost are liable to be in serious difficulties.

When, in his dissenting opinion to the *Gault* decision, Mr. Justice Stewart stated that "the mission and purpose of Juvenile proceedings are the very opposite of the mission and purpose of a prosecution in a criminal court...the object of one is correction of a condition. The object of the other is conviction and punishment of a criminal act." He put his finger on a very real problem that has caused us increasing headaches.

NEED FOR NEW SERVICES

There are only a few more beds for badly troubled youngsters in our community than there were ten years ago, and the number of children in King County increases. Time and again our caseworkers search for resources and in frustration choose the second best.

The need for group homes is second to our need for child and family counseling services. During 1970 a total of 1,675 children were referred to the Department for troubles at home or in school. Most of these problems shouldn't require Court intervention — truancy and school adjustment difficulties point up the need for special education programs and family counseling, not juvenile courts — but if left to fester, a certain number of these problems will result in delinquency or mental disorder.

The Probation Subsidy Program and our Volunteer Probation Officer Program are significant steps by the Court toward providing meaningful services for our youth but they are only a beginning, and they must treat problems that should have been resolved before they reach crisis proportions.

LIST OF SERVICES NEEDED IN 1970

	Boys	Girls	Total
Out-patient treatment and counseling	69	23	92
Group Homes	40	35	75
Small Residential Treatment Center	69	30	99
Large Residential Treatment Center	5	3	8
Foster Homes	19	14	33
Boarding House	9	5	14
Forestry or Vocational Camp	57	6	63
Trade Training — pre-apprentice	62	3	65
Other care needed by child	12	5	17
Other care needed by family	2	-	2
Total	344	124	468

The principal expansion of institutional care for children in the past decade has been in State institutions of the Division of Juvenile Rehabilitation. It is both inhumane and impractical to wait until a child is seriously delinquent before we help him. We are dealing more effectively and imaginatively with adult insanity than with youngsters whose problems are far less acute.

With proper resources, time and competent staff, this State's juvenile courts can close the State Reformatory in 1981 as surely as the medical profession makes Northern State Hospital useless in the last decade.

YOUTH COUNCILS AND JUVENILE COURT CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

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

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

Renton's Conference Committee was the first in King County and has done excellent work. There are committees now in Bellevue, Kent, Federal Way, Highline and West Seattle. A Northshore Committee in Bothell is getting underway, and Shoreline is forming a committee at year's end.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

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

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

A large number of public and private agencies specialize in caring full time for children whose problems are particularly difficult. (12) They range from girls boarding schools to forest camps. Some take as few as 3 children, some as many as 20; but the present squeeze for funds, both in taxes and donations, has placed many in a difficult position endangering services that are already far short of demand.

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

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

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

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

(12) Homes for children available in Washington State and used by the Court in 1970 include:

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

YOUTH SERVICE CENTER IMPROVEMENTS

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

The planning and work supervision is being done by Francis Huggard and Associates. The King County Design Commission approved the building plan in December 1968 and the contract was let to Century Construction Company in March 1970. At the end of 1970 the general contract was 50% complete and the new additions will be complete in October 1971.

The additions to the building and their uses are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

- d) The kitchen addition is two stories to provide a new walk-in cold storage, meat preparation space and enlarged food and dry storage. The lower floor provides bulk storage, repair shop and paint locker.

- e) The boys' dining and school addition is a two-story structure with a dining room and a multi-purpose school and activity room on each floor. The additions adjoin the detention units to be occupied by boys and supplements school and craft space on each floor. Boys will be served food in smaller groups with fewer escorting staff and less regimentation. It will also result in savings of staff time in escort and supervision of boys going to and from dining room.
- f) The boys' security addition is a two-story building with 14 single rooms on the ground floor and a multi-purpose activity room and overflow sleeping on the upper floor. The unit connects to the existing boys' building and gym for logistics and to form two outdoor play areas. The design provides flexibility in supervision and better activity space.

The entire building is reinforced concrete and is quakeproof and fireproof. Construction should be completed in Fall of 1971. Furnishings and equipment will be acquired in October, 1971, and we plan the facility to be in use in November, 1971.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of Referrals and Court Processes	19
Summary of Court Hearings	19
Probation Department Services	19
Special Supervision Program – Intensive	20
Financial Section	20
Traffic Citations Referred	20
Summary of Detention and Shelter Care	21
Summary of Detention and Shelter Care – 10 Years, 1961 to 1970	22
Table 1 – Number of Children Released and Length of Detention Stay by Age	23
Table 2 – Length of Detention Stay for Lengths of Children Released	24
Comparison and Trends 10 Year Period – 1961 to 1970	24
10 Year Comparison of Total Alleged Delinquency Referrals	26
Table 3 – Delinquency Referrals	28
Statistics on Alleged Delinquency Referrals	
Table 4 – Race of Delinquent Child Referred	29
Table 5 – Marital Status of Parents – Delinquent Referrals	29
Table 6 – Case Status of Delinquent Referrals	29
Table 7 – Family Income of Child Referred for Delinquency	30
Table 8 – Source of Support for Family of Delinquent Child Referred	30
Table 9 – School Status - Delinquent Child	31
Table 10 – Dispositions of Delinquent Referrals	32
Table 11 – Source of Referral to Juvenile Court	33
Ten Year Comparison of Total Alleged Dependency Referrals	34
Dependency Referrals Disposed of in 1970	
Table 12 – Reason for Referral	35
Table 13 – Race of Dependent Child Referred	35
Table 14 – Marital Status of Parents - Dependent Referrals	36
Table 17 – Source of Support for Family of Dependent Child Referred	37
Table 18 – School Status - Dependent Child	37
Table 19 – Dispositions of Dependent Referrals	37
Table 20 – Traffic Violations	39
Table 21 – Dispositions of Traffic Citations	40

SUMMARY OF REFERRALS AND COURT PROCESSES

All referrals to the Court for reasons of delinquency (4,659) and for dependency (3,252) are reflected in one or more processes outlined below:

Summary of Court Hearings	1969	1970
Preliminary hearings on detention	3,693	3,303
Fact Finding and Decline of Jurisdiction hearings	673	607
Commitment to Dept. of Institutions hearings	347	205
Dispositional hearings (formerly called "Regular" hearings)	887	987
Contested Traffic hearings	49	3
Financial hearings, support, etc.	263	195
Custody matters, hearings	911	810
Non-appearance matters, hearings	3,100	2,830

Probation Department Services

Detention Screening

No. of children presented for admission to detention	5,470	4,904
Not admitted (screened out) by officer	1,769	1,320
Admitted by screening officer	3,701	2,268
All other admissions	518	1,633
No. of actual admissions	4,219	3,901

Intake & Crisis Casework

Cases received during year	4,075	3,528
Cases disposed of during year – intake completed	3,537	3,308
Cases active at end of year	538	758

Investigation Division

Cases received during year	1,266	1,585
Cases disposed of during year – work completed	1,263	1,303
Cases active at end of year	614	712

Probation Supervision

Average no. children on active probation	204	242
No. children placed on probation in year	230	379
No. children on active probation during year	481	582
No. on probation at end of year	203	276
No. terminated Success	260	306
No. referrals adjusted with parent, child, etc.	2,462	2,457
No. settled by referral to agencies, advising parents, etc.	219	1,265
No. dismissed in preliminary hearing	145	128
No. cases presented by all staff units for full court hearing	1,907	2,139
Average caseload per probation officer	35	31
Average no. new assignments per officer per month	7	6

Review Load – Cases Continued Without Probation Supervision

No. cases placed on review status during year	917	178
No. cases dismissed, completed, terminated	1,021	505
No. cases in review load end of year	347	20

Special Supervision Program — Intensive

No. cases carried in program during year	162
No. cases terminated success	28
No. cases closed as recurring or failing	20
No. cases active end of year	117
No. of P. O. and Case load	10 P. O. = Average 14 cases

Financial Section

	1969	1970
No. of accounts receivable for support of child	660	602
No. of accounts receivable for detention costs	1,177	1,363
No. of court hearings on financial matters	263	195
Amount in arrears and collectible	39,559	32,859
Amount collected for support of children	263,599	273,193
Amount collected for detention care	45,709	32,539
Total collected during the year	\$309,308	\$305,732

Traffic Citations Referred

Five Year Comparison of Reasons for Referrals

Citation or Referral	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Drunk Driving	92	51	92	52	35
Reckless Driving	142	205	193	162	168
Hit & Run	52	34	39	28	32
Speeding	3,488	3,410	3,233	2,748	2,946
Negligent Driving	1,031	1,087	1,109	905	795
Stop signs, signals	936	977	916	751	910
Right of way, illegal turn	722	1,090	961	985	857
Following too close	637	95	106	65	82
Aiding and abetting	27	29	25	50	20
Defective equipment	1,273	1,274	1,028	772	944
Vehicle license violations	247	298	276	305	255
No operator's license, license susp.	1,273	1,231	1,192	1,175	1,329
All other moving violations	1,374	1,611	1,428	1,013	1,292 *
Total moving violations	11,294	11,392	10,598	9,012	9,665
Hitchhiking, Pedestrians & Motor Boat violations	1,064	790	1,239	1,185	2,174
Total Citations	12,358	12,182	11,837	10,197	11,839

*Note — Includes motorcycle safety violations

SUMMARY OF DETENTION AND SHELTER CARE

Detention and Shelter Care Services	1969	1970
Admissions to Youth Service Center for Delinquency Reasons	2,103	1,773
Admissions to Youth Service Center for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency	2,116	2,128
Total Admissions to Youth Service Center	4,219	3,901
No. Individual Children Detained for Delinquency Reasons	1,543	1,289
No. Individual Children Detained for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency, Rebellious	1,677	1,629
Total No. Individual Children Detained	3,220	2,918
Child Care Days Provided for Delinquency Reasons	23,077	18,035
Child Care Days Provided for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency, Rebellious	31,026	31,438
Total Child Care Days Provided	54,103	49,473
Average Length of Stay of Children for Delinquency Reasons	10.9	10.2
Average Length of Stay of Children for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency, Rebellious	114.7	14.5
Total Average Length of Stay for all Children	13.0	13.0
Average Daily Population in Detention for Delinquency Reasons	63.2	49.4
Average Daily Population in Detention for Dependency Reasons, Nondelinquency, Rebellious	85.0	86.1
Total Average Daily Population In Detention	148.2	135.5

NUMBER OF CHILDREN RELEASED AND LENGTH OF DETENTION STAY BY AGE

Table 1

1970			
Age	Number of Children	Total Days in Detention	Average Length of Stay
1	0	0	0.0 days
2	0	0	0.0 days
3	0	0	0.0 days
4	0	0	0.0 days
5	1	57	57.0 days
6	0	0	0.0 days
7	4	7	1.8 days
Subtotal	5	64	12.8 days
8	6	95	15.8 days
9	9	365	40.6 days
10	23	518	22.5 days
11	60	1,137	19.0 days
12	135	3,251	24.1 days
Subtotal	233	5,366	23.0 days
13	324	6,613	20.4 days
14	630	9,144	14.5 days
15	928	11,711	12.6 days
16	979	10,751	11.0 days
17	815	6,445	7.9 days
18	7	30	4.3 days
Subtotal	3,683	44,694	12.1 days
Total	3,921	50,124	12.8 days

NOTE:
5 children age 7 or younger sheltered

94% are age 13 and over

SUMMARY OF DETENTION AND SHELTER CARE

10 Years, 1961 to 1970

Year	Referrals Delinquent & Dependent (a)	All Det. Adm.	% Det.	Dep. Ref.	% Det. (b)
1961	5,825	2,760	47%	2,901	38%
1962	7,147	3,524	49%	3,466	42%
1963	7,480	3,687	49%	3,656	44%
1964	8,299	4,040	48%	3,602	44%
1965	8,527	4,260	49%	3,903	54%
1966	8,717	4,447	51%	3,999	54%
1967	8,792	5,061	57%	4,032	63%
1968	8,101	5,165	64%	3,930	68%
1969	8,252	4,219	51%	3,594	59% (c)
1970	7,911	3,901	49%	3,252	65% (d)

- (a) Total referrals corrected to exclude miscellaneous services, military clearances, remnants 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 680 out-of-county runaways detained but not counted as referrals. The detention rate without them included would be 44%.
- (d) These are rough rates only. Dependency referrals, for instance, include adoption custody matters which do not include detention.

**LENGTH OF DETENTION STAY
FOR LENGTHS OF CHILDREN RELEASED — 1970**

Table 2

<i>Length of Stay</i>	<i>All Children</i>	<i>Delinquent Children</i>	<i>Neglected Children</i>	<i>Rebellious Children</i>
1 - 4 days	1,935 - 49.3%	985 - 55.0%	217 - 50.9%	733 - 43.0%
5 - 10 days	726 - 18.5%	321 - 17.8%	97 - 22.8%	308 - 18.1%
11 - 15 days	341 - 8.7%	148 - 8.3%	28 - 6.6%	165 - 9.7%
16 - 20 days	166 - 4.3%	92 - 5.1%	19 - 4.5%	55 - 3.2%
21 - 30 days	265 - 6.8%	92 - 5.1%	29 - 6.8%	144 - 8.5%
31 - 60 days	353 - 9.0%	121 - 6.8%	22 - 5.1%	210 - 12.3%
61 and over	135 - 3.4%	33 - 1.8%	14 - 3.3%	88 - 5.2%
	3,921-100%	1,792-100.0%	426-100.0%	1,703-100.0%
Average Stay	12.8 days	10.2 days	11.1 days	15.9 days
Child Care Days	50,124	18,259	4,741	27,124
Number of Boys	2,516	1,547	203	766
Number of Girls	1,405	245	223	937

COMPARISON AND TRENDS 10 YEAR PERIOD

1961 — 1970

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

<i>Year</i>	<i>Del. & Dep. Referrals</i>	<i>& Annual Change</i>	<i>Alleged Del. Referrals</i>	<i>& Annual Change</i>	<i>Alleged Dep. Referrals</i>	<i>& Annual Change</i>
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%
1970	7,911	- 4%	4,659	+ 0%	3,252	-10%
1961-1970 Average						
Change per Year		+ 5%		+ 6%		+ 1%

Delinquent Referrals and Rates

<i>Year</i>	<i>Delinquent Referrals</i>	<i>10-17 Year Population</i>	<i>Percent Population Referred</i>	<i>Rate of Delinquent Referrals per 10,000 Children, 10-17 Years</i>
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

Comparison and Trends Over 10 Year Period — continued

1964	4,697	150,712	3.1%	311.6
1965	4,624	158,210	2.9%	291.1
1966	4,717	162,470	2.8%	284.2
1967	4,760	166,730	2.9%	285.5
1968	4,171	170,986	2.4%	243.9
1969	4,658	172,000 (est.)	2.7%	270.8
1970	4,659	177,960 (a)	2.6%	261.8

Dependent Referrals and Rates

<i>Year</i>	<i>Dependent Referrals</i>	<i>0-17 Year Population*</i>	<i>Percent Population Referred</i>	<i>Rate of Dependent Referrals per 10,000 Children, 0-17 Years</i>
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	378,000 (est.)	1.0%	95.1
1970	3,252	381,914 (a)	0.9%	85.2

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

DELINQUENCY REFERRALS

Disposed of in 1970

Table 3

Reason for Referral:	Boys	Girls	Total
Murder/Manslaughter	6	-	6
Rape	9	-	9
Prostitution	-	-	17
Fornication	-	1	1
Indecent Exposure	6	3	9
Indecent Liberties	12	1	13
Window Peeping	-	-	-
Other Sex Offenses	9	2	11
Assault - Threatened	57	10	67
Assault - Fighting	78	12	90
Assault - Unprovoked	64	13	77
Robbery - Armed	46	2	48
Robbery - Unarmed	75	3	78
Purse Snatching	21	-	21
Auto Theft	545	27	572
Motor Bike Theft	19	1	20
Riding in Stolen Car - Knowing	51	10	61
Car Prowl	50	1	51
Bicycle Theft	9	1	10
Burglary/Unlawful Entry	633	39	672
Forgery	23	6	29
Shoplifting	161	146	307
Theft of Mail	33	3	36
Attempted/Other Theft	210	24	234
Arson	39	6	45
Vandalism	33	3	36
Property Damage	81	4	85
Trespassing/Prowling	42	10	52
Curfew	107	31	138
Glue Sniffing	12	3	15
Marijuana	225	49	274
L.S.D.	28	7	35
Other Narcotics & Dangerous Drugs	36	18	54
Attempted Suicide	1	6	7
Liquor - Use/Possession	197	28	225
Runaway from Correctional Institution	49	27	76
Other Delinquency	263	32	295
Courtesy Supervision	18	5	23
Total Delinquency Referrals (with full social data)	3,248	551	3,799
Actual Total Delinquency Referrals were - - -			4,659

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

Reason for Referral

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Murder/Manslaughter	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	5	6	6
Auto Theft	510	553	677	795	562	565	682	684	661	572
Riding in Stolen Car, knowing	-	-	-	-	102	97	141	129	60	61
Motor Bike Theft	-	-	-	-	37	25	29	22	23	20
Burglary, Unlawful Entry	416	376	463	635	642	563	459	585	672	672
Robbery, Unlawful Entry	41	62	47	75	52	23	23	57	63	48
Unarmed, Purse Snatch	-	-	-	-	-	20	46	95	75	99
Forgery	-	-	-	-	-	31	35	41	52	29
Mail Theft	-	-	-	-	-	23	30	32	39	36
Shoplifting	-	-	-	-	396	332	237	200	278	307
Other Theft, Attempts, Bikes	543	714	695	979	585	392	277	214	179	244
Rape	-	-	-	-	-	8	7	7	7	9
Indecent Exposure, Liberties	-	-	-	-	-	45	33	53	27	22
Sex Offense - Other	180	285	233	276	283	161	121	70	35	29
Injury to Person - Assault	91	139	175	167	166	82	60	47	67	77
Fighting, Threatened Assault	-	-	-	-	81	117	165	144	122	157
Vandalism, Property Damage	-	-	99	170	285	189	111	91	89	121
Arson, Firesetting	-	100	-	35	79	68	60	44	31	45
Car Prowl, Trespass	-	-	-	-	-	64	81	58	85	103
Boat Violation, Trespass	-	-	-	-	-	58	81	58	85	103
Carelessness, Mischief	156	4	5	1	11	58	nc	nc	nc	nc
Curfew	-	80	49	74	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc
Use of Liquor, Possession	-	172	180	194	278	291	216	152	198	138
Runaway, Correctional Inst.	535	760	751	820	646	852	865	467	519	225
Attempted Suicide	-	141	107	91	56	49	84	46	80	76
Glue Sniffing	-	-	-	18	48	42	39	28	18	7
Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs	-	-	-	16	18	76	148	130	44	15
Supervision for Other Court	-	-	-	5	5	32	324	386	356	363
Other Reasons	429	295	343	346	291	488	285	291	279	295
Minor Infractions Adjusted or Pending	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dispositions	-	-	-	-	-	-	181	71	577	860
TOTALS	2,901	3,681	3,824	4,697	4,624	4,717	4,760	4,171	4,658	4,659

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

STATISTICS ON ALLEGED DELINQUENCY REFERRALS

1970 — continued

Table 4 *Race of Delinquent Child Referred:*

<i>Race</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
White	2,522	378	2,900
Negro	575	149	724
Indian	74	15	89
Filipino	23	2	25
Chinese/Japanese	13	3	16
Other	41	4	45
Total	3,248	551	3,799

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

	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Married and together	1,446	210	1,657
Divorced	470	90	560
Divorced — Mother remarried	308	65	373
Divorced — Father remarried	127	19	146
Both Remarried	132	17	149
Separated	155	18	173
Married and Apart	13	5	18
Father Dead	98	18	116
Mother Dead	43	5	48
Both Dead	9	4	13
Father dead — Mother remarried	33	4	37
Mother dead — Father remarried	25	2	27
One Parent Deserted	11	-	11
Unmarried	57	12	69
Unknown or not reported	321	81	402
Total	3,248	551	3,799

Table 6 *Case Status of Delinquent Referrals:*

	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
New	1,339	255	1,594
Old Dep.	112	57	169
Reappear — Dependent	81	26	107
Recidivist — Dependent	8	-	8
Old Delinquent	680	87	767
Reappear — Delinquent	798	85	883
Recidivist — Delinquent	149	11	160
Old Delinquent & Dependent	69	27	96
Recidivist — Delinquent & Dependent	12	3	15
Total	3,248	551	3,799

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

<i>Amount of Income</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Under \$200 per month	21	1	22
200 - 299	77	13	90
300 - 399	143	26	169
400 - 499	218	36	254
500 - 599	219	34	253
600 - 699	197	22	219
700 - 799	120	30	150
800 - 899	184	17	201
Over 900	498	61	559
Unemployed	52	9	61
Unknown or not reported	1,519	302	1,821
Total	3,248	551	3,799

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

<i>Source of Support</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Father	1,514	233	1,747
Step-Father	294	44	338
Mother	458	63	521
Step-Mother	4	-	4
Relatives	39	6	45
Public Assistance —SDPA	296	64	360
Social Security	31	10	41
Self	27	4	31
Other	34	7	41
Unknown or not reported	551	120	671
Total	3,248	551	3,799

Table 9

School Status — Delinquent Child:

<i>Grade in School</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Grade 1	6	-	6
Grade 2	2	-	2
Grade 3	7	-	7
Grade 4	28	6	34
Grade 5	33	5	38
Grade 6	63	8	71
Grade 7	153	36	189
Grade 8	248	43	291
Grade 9	429	68	497
Grade 10	480	74	554
Grade 11	369	61	430
Grade 12	268	40	308
Pre-School	-	-	-
Kindergarten	-	-	-
Withdrew	17	5	22
Dropped Out	267	42	309
Suspended	90	20	110
Expelled	28	4	32
College, University, Other	15	1	16
Less than full time	25	1	26
Adjustment Classes	13	3	16
Graduated	42	2	44
Unknown or not reported	<u>665</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>797</u>
Total	3,248	551	3,799

DISPOSITIONS OF DELINQUENT REFERRALS

Table 10

	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Matter adjusted with parent and child	1,596	302	1,898
Petition dismissed	361	55	416
Probation and wardship dismissed	11	1	12
Placed on probation — own home	193	22	215
Placed on probation — in foster home	18	6	24
Supervision for other courts	4	-	4
Technical probation and reports	148	20	168
Technical probation — no reports	9	-	9
Continued for later review	58	7	65
Transferred to other juvenile courts	14	-	14
Declined jurisdiction — adult court	42	6	48
Declined jurisdiction — suspended	17	3	20
Committed to the Department of Institutions	95	12	107
Commitment suspended	11	1	12
Re-committed to the Dept. of Institutions	17	1	18
Runaway, parole failure, shelter for parolee of Dept. of Institutions	55	21	76
Referred to juvenile parole counselor	72	13	85
Committed or placed in custody of:			
Casey Family Program	1	-	1
Catholic Childrens Service	1	1	2
Children's Home Society of Washington	2	-	2
Eastside Psychiatric Clinic	1	-	1
Evergreen Heights Boys' Home	3	-	3
Griffin Home	3	-	3
Good Shepherd Home	-	5	5
Family Counseling Service	1	1	2
Public Assistance — foster home	7	1	8
Public Assistance — family care	3	1	4
Ruth School	-	3	3
Ryther Child Center	2	-	2
Seattle Children's Home	1	-	1
Vancouver Boys' Academy	1	-	1
Other private agency or institution	18	2	20
Placed with relatives	1	2	3
Driver's license suspended or restricted	1	-	1
All other dispositions	<u>481</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>546</u>
Total	3,248	551	3,799

*Note: These dispositions are for full data cases.
Total delinquency referrals were - 4,659.*

Table 11

Source of Referral to Juvenile Court:

<i>Agency or Individual</i>	<i>Delinquency</i>	<i>Dependency</i>	<i>Total</i>
Seattle Police Department	2,161	365	2,526
King County Sheriff	508	88	596
Washington State Patrol	77	2	79
Bellevue	130	10	140
Clyde Hill	3	-	3
Medina	1	-	1
Bothell	27	5	32
Kirkland	29	-	29
Carnation	2	-	2
Redmond	64	4	68
East Redmond	2	-	2
Enumclaw	22	3	25
Issaquah	20	1	21
North Bend	10	-	10
Pacific	2	-	2
Des Moines	4	-	4
Auburn	53	18	71
Kent	73	4	77
Tukwila	20	-	20
Renton	140	3	143
Mercer Island	42	4	46
Lake Forest Park	2	-	2
Other Police Departments	54	17	71
Other Law Enforcement	36	13	49
Post Office Department	43	-	43
Game Department	2	-	2
Probation Officer — K.C.J.C.	18	30	48
Juvenile Conference Committee	14	7	21
Other Juvenile Courts	125	81	206
Administrative and Agency Petitions	1	4	5
School Department	15	144	159
Social Agencies	15	184	199
Parent(s)	46	747	793
Relatives	1	128	129
Self	6	250	256
Other Source	31	106	137
Total	3,799	2,218	6,017

NOTE: These are sources of referral for full data cases. The combined referrals for delinquent and dependent reasons in 1970 were 7,911.

TEN YEAR COMPARISON OF TOTAL ALLEGED DEPENDENCY REFERRALS
King County Juvenile Court

<i>Reason for Referral</i>	<i>1961</i>	<i>1962</i>	<i>1963</i>	<i>1964</i>	<i>1965</i>	<i>1966</i>	<i>1967</i>	<i>1968</i>	<i>1969</i>	<i>1970</i>
Abuse or Cruel Treatment	40	59	63	72	33	20	39	48	38	30
Injurious living, Neglect	519	622	678	700	768	555	425	290	114	96
Abandonment	96	135	148	119	126	87	93	44	52	17
Shelter	191	280	302	192	139	177	269	133	65	61
Protective Custody			nc	nc	180	301	208	309	247	193
Incest				6	10	9	24	10	15	9
		Sub Total			1,256	1,149	1,058	834	531	406
Rebellious, Ungovernable	163	258	284	314	271	360	499	717	771	728
Unable to Adjust	210	199	228	290	237	161	166	142	173	219
Runaway from Home	647	622	567	584	673	690	800	674	579	521
Truancy, Unable to Adjust in school	131	151	164	156	110	136	180	156	152	151
		Sub Total			1,291	1,347	1,645	1,689	1,675	1,619
Custody, Investigations	323	330	388	345	449	422	305	453	523	467
Custody for Adoption	501	615	637	674	663	721	788	733	716	633
Mentally Handicapped	5	11	12	15	2	5	3	3	6	2
Other Reasons & Pending	98	184	185	135	242	355	233	218	143	125
		Sub Total			1,356	1,503	1,329	1,407	1,388	1,227
Total for Year	2,924	3,466	3,656	3,602	3,903	3,999	4,032	3,930	3,594	3,252

DEPENDENCY REFERRALS

Disposed of in 1970

Table 12 Reason for Referral

	Boys	Girls	Total
<i>Neglect</i>			
Abandonment	5	12	17
Injurious Living Conditions, Neglect	40	56	96
Shelter	21	40	61
Cruel/Abusive Treatment	10	15	25
Child Beating	4	1	5
Incest	-	9	9
Protective Custody	86	107	193
<i>Dependency -- Rebellious</i>			
Unable to adjust -- Home or Foster Home	88	131	219
Incorrigible/Ungovernable	367	361	728
Runaway	198	323	521
Truancy	72	47	119
Refusal to Attend School	6	7	13
Unable to Adjust in School	14	5	19
<i>Dependency -- Custody</i>			
Custody Establishment	33	21	54
Deprivation -- Custody for Adoption	4	8	12
Other Dependency	64	56	120
Courtesy Investigation	4	3	7
Subtotal Dependency Referrals with Full Social Data	1,016	1,202	2,218
<i>Other Dependency Matters Referred but Not Fully Reported</i>			
Adoption -- Relinquishments			621
Adoption Investigations and Publications			49
Custody Changed or Established			364
Total Dependency Matters			3,252
Out-of-Town Runaways -- Shelter Only			680

Table 13

Race of Dependent Child Referred:

	DEPENDENT		
Race	Boys	Girls	Total
White	841	996	1,837
Negro	138	157	295
Indian	20	19	39
Filipino	5	4	9
Chinese/Japanese	5	9	14
Other	7	17	24
Total	1,016	1,202	2,218

Table 14

Marital Status of Parents -- Dependent Referrals

	DEPENDENT		
	Boys	Girls	Total
Married and together	299	361	660
Divorced	180	193	373
Divorced -- Mother Remarried	117	152	269
Divorced -- Father Remarried	62	54	116
Both Remarried	57	78	135
Separated	50	79	129
Married and Apart	9	11	20
Father Dead	41	48	89
Mother Dead	18	18	36
Both Dead	12	14	26
Father Dead -- Mother Remarried	19	19	38
Mother Dead -- Father Remarried	9	16	25
One Parent Deserted	5	2	7
Unmarried	39	45	84
Unknown or not reported	99	112	211
Total	1,016	1,202	2,218

Table 15

Case Status of Dependent Referrals

	DEPENDENT		
	Boys	Girls	Total
New	443	594	1,037
Old Dependent	158	232	390
Reappear -- Dependent	165	238	403
Recidivist -- Dependent	27	21	48
Old Delinquent	93	51	144
Reappear -- Delinquent	90	32	122
Recidivist -- Delinquent	8	3	11
Old Delinquent and Dependent	27	24	51
Recidivist -- Delinquent & Dependent	5	7	12
Total	1,016	1,202	2,218

Table 16

Family Income of Child Referred for Dependency

	Boys	Girls	Total
Amount of Income			
Under \$200 per month	9	18	27
200 - 299	33	31	64
300 - 399	45	52	97
400 - 499	70	61	131
500 - 599	60	68	128
600 - 699	71	49	120
700 - 799	25	43	68
800 - 899	42	48	90
Over 900 per month	96	115	211
Unemployed	28	31	59
Unknown or not reported	537	686	1,223
Total	1,016	1,202	2,218

Table 17 *Source of Support for Family of Dependent Child Referred*

<i>Source of Support</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Father	374	483	857
Stepfather	100	116	216
Mother	143	159	302
Stepmother	2	-	2
Relatives	23	19	42
Public Assistance — SDPA	151	177	328
Social Security	23	24	47
Self	3	-	3
Other	15	14	29
Unknown	182	210	392
Total	1,016	1,202	2,218

Table 18 *School Status — Dependent Child*

<i>Grade in School</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Grade 1	5	2	7
Grade 2	6	6	12
Grade 3	15	10	25
Grade 4	26	6	32
Grade 5	20	12	32
Grade 6	30	23	53
Grade 7	79	55	134
Grade 8	91	128	219
Grade 9	111	185	296
Grade 10	112	193	305
Grade 11	48	112	160
Grade 12	22	47	69
Preschool	56	67	123
Kindergarten	3	4	7
Withdrew	4	11	15
Dropped Out	54	52	106
Suspended	54	31	85
Expelled	15	6	21
College, University, Other	2	2	4
Less than full time	-	2	2
Adjustment classes	7	4	11
Graduated	26	7	33
Unknown or not reported	230	237	467
Total	1,016	1,202	2,218

DISPOSITIONS OF DEPENDENT REFERRALS

(Includes Neglect, Truant, Rebellious, Custody)

Table 19

<i>Disposition or Action Completed</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Adjust with parent, child, relative, etc.	257	302	559
Petition dismissed, service completed	227	322	549 + b
			3

Probation and wardship dismissed	12	14	26 + b	142
Placed on probation — own home	52	47	99	
Placed on probation in foster home	10	22	32	
Supervision for other court	1	1	2	
Technical probation with reports	31	24	55	
Technical probation and review	2	4	6	
Continued for later review	17	22	39	
Referred to juvenile parole counselor	25	24	49	
Committed to Dept. of Institutions	54	44	98	
Committed to state mental hospital	2	-	2	
Committed to School for mentally retarded	1	-	1	
Runaway or parole failure, returned to				
Dept. of Institutions	4	4	8	
Transferred to other juvenile court	4	10	14	
Committed to Dept. of Inst. and suspended	2	1	3	
Committed or placed in care of:				
Casey Family Program	2	1	3 + b	7
Catholic Children's Service	4	14	18 + a	140
Children's Home Society of Washington	1	3	4 + a	185
Deaconess Home	1	-	1	
Evergreen Heights Boys' Home	8	-	8 + b	2
Family Counseling Service	-	1	1	
Florence Crittenden Home	-	2	2	
Griffin Home	8	-	8	
Good Shepherd Home	-	12	12	
Luther Child Center	1	-	1	
Lutheran Family & Children's Service	1	-	1 + a	131
Medina Children's Service	-	2	2 + a	115
Ruth School for Girls	-	10	10 + b	20
Ryther Child Center	8	7	15 + b	2
Seattle Children's Home	5	1	6	
Public Assistance Foster Homes	49	71	120 + b	144
Public Assistance Family, receiving				
care	39	41	80 + b	113
Stuart Hall —Halfway House	-	6	6 + b	1
Other voluntary agencies & treatment	23	7	30 + b	4
Placed with relatives	33	38	71 + b	10
Parents deprived of custody	3	4	7	
All other dispositions	129	141	270 + b	15
Total	1,016	1,202	2,218	1,034

NOTE: These dispositions are for full data cases. Total dependency referrals received during the year were 3,252.

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

Reasons for Citations — 1970

Table 20

	No. of Citations 1970	% of Total
Influence — Alcohol (a)	35	.4%
Reckless Driving (a)	168	1.7%
Hit and Run (a)	32	.3%
License Falsification	35	.4%
Speeding 0-10 mph	1,009	10.4%
Speeding 11-15 mph	1,169	12.1%
Speeding 16-20 mph (b) 2,946	529	5.5%
Speeding 21 + mph	191	2.0%
Speed Too Fast for Conditions	48	.5%
Negligent Driving	795	8.2%
Through Stop Sign	910	9.4%
Failure to Yield	390	4.0%
Defective Equipment (d)	944	9.8%
No Opr. License on Person	982	10.2%
No Opr. License — License Susp.	11	.1%
No Opr. License — Other License	9	.1%
No Opr. License — No License Issued	311	3.2%
Violating Learner's Permit	16	.2%
Aiding and Abetting	20	.2%
No Vehicle License	155	1.6%
Improper Vehicle Registration	100	1.0%
Improper Turn	467	4.9%
No Signal	26	.3%
Following Too Closely	82	.8%
Other Violations	<u>1,231</u>	<u>12.7%</u>
Total Moving Violations	9,665	100.0%
Pedestrian Violations (c) (incl. Hitchhiking)	2,083	
Motor Boat Citations (c)	<u>91</u>	
All Violations — Citations	11,839	

Table 20 — continued

(d) Defective Equipment Citations were for following equipment:

Defective Brakes	87	Stoplight	69	Windshield Wipers	7
Headlight Defective	82	Direct Signals	16	Glass Absent-Broken	11
Headlight Focus	11	Exhaust-Muffler	216	Other Equipment	<u>297</u>
Taillight Defective	147	Tires	1	Total	944

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

DISPOSITIONS OF TRAFFIC CITATIONS

Table 21

	1970
License Issuance Deferred (a)	476
License Held (30 days to 18 mos.) (a)	389
Driving Restricted (School/Work/With Parent) (a)	996
Car to be Sold	3
Reprimand and Closed (b)	7,123 (c)
Dismissed	59
Declined Jurisdiction	1,775
Referred to other Juvenile Court	359
Accident Prevention School	173
Referred to Student Court	16
Other Dispositions	<u>470</u>
Total	11,839

NOTE: (a) 16% of dispositions resulted in license suspension, licensing deferred or driving restricted.

(b) Includes Pedestrian violation dispositions.

(c) Includes 1,852 warnings on 1st time speeding offenses.

Recurrence of Traffic Referrals	1970	% of Total
1st Referral	8,351	70.5%
2nd Referral	1,909	16.1%
3rd Referral	858	7.3%
4th Referral	721	6.1%

No. Referrals Involving Accidents and Insurance

No. Referrals for Moving Violations	9,665	No. Accidents Injury Fatality	765 210 0	Total Insured	5,293
No. Driver Trained In Driver Training	6,119 4	Boys Referred Girls Referred	10,070 1,769	= =	85.1% 14.9%

- (a) Automatic suspension of license by Director of Licenses in these violations.
- (b) Speeding offenses 2,946 represent 30% of all moving violations. 2,946 speeding violations was an increase of 193 violations or 7%. There was a reduction of 133 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) 2,174 citations were nondriving violations or 18% of total.