

10689

68901

INFORMATION FILE

VOLUME 3  
NUMBER 14  
MARCH 1971

Library  
National Council on Crime & Delinquency  
Continental Plaza  
411 Hackensack Avenue  
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

PROBATION SUBSIDY  
" "  
IN WASHINGTON STATE  
CALENDAR YEAR 1970

R  
E  
S  
E  
A  
R  
C  
H  
R  
E  
P  
O  
R  
T

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES  
DIVISION OF INSTITUTIONS  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH  
P. O. BOX 768  
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98501

BULK RATE  
U. S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
OLYMPIA, WASH.  
PERMIT NO. 259

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

E1971b

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES  
DIVISION OF INSTITUTIONS - OFFICE OF RESEARCH



Agency  
National Council on Crime & Delinquency  
Cottman Avenue  
411 Hackensack Avenue  
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

✓  
Wash. (St.)  
DIVISION OF INSTITUTIONS  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH

PROBATION SUBSIDY IN WASHINGTON STATE  
CALENDAR YEAR 1970

Acknowledgements

The data in this report were obtained through visits to counties participating in the Probation Subsidy Program. The assistance of the Chief Probation Officers and others involved in Probation Subsidy who provided the information is gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks are due to Walter L. Corwin, Probation Subsidy Coordinator. Secretarial services were provided by Miss Faye Nieves.

68901 6JJP

Table of Contents

	Page
A Summary of Probation Subsidy in 1970.....	1
Probation Subsidy in Washington State Calendar Year 1970.....	3
Table 1 - Juvenile Commitments and Commitment Rates by County and Type of Probation Subsidy Program For Calendar Year 1970.....	21
Table 2 - Admissions to Cascadia JR-DC During 1969 by Counties Grouped by Type of Participation in Probation Subsidy Programs.....	22
Table 3 - 1970 Admissions Chargeable to Probation Subsidy.....	24

A SUMMARY OF PROBATION SUBSIDY IN 1970

Probation Subsidy has been operative in the State of Washington since January 1, 1970. While one year is not a sufficient period of operation to make conclusive judgments, general trends can be observed.

The following observations can be made:

1. In 1970, total commitments to state juvenile rehabilitation facilities by counties participating in Probation Subsidy decreased 42.8% over the figure for 1969. In counties not participating in the program, there was a 15.4% increase in commitments. (Statewide, there was a 37.6% decrease.)
2. In 1970, first commitments to state juvenile rehabilitation facilities by counties participating in Probation Subsidy decreased 41.6% over the 1969 figure. In counties not participating in the program, there was a 15.7% increase in first commitments. (Statewide, there was a 36.3% decrease.)
3. Before Probation Subsidy, large caseloads represented one of the major problems facing probation officers. The average caseload was 65, and caseload size sometimes exceeded 100. In counties participating in Probation Subsidy, those probation officers involved in the program carried an average caseload of less than 20, with 30 being maximum.
4. The state commitment rate to juvenile rehabilitation facilities was 37.58 per 100,000 population for the period 1964-1969. For 1970, it was 24.56, a 34.6% decrease. Counties in

Probation Subsidy have a commitment rate of 23.33; those not in Probation Subsidy, of 33.00.

5. Counties participating in Probation Subsidy represents 87.6% of the state population. In 1969, these counties accounted for 91.2% of all commitments to state juvenile rehabilitation facilities; in 1970, they accounted for 83.3% of all commitments.
6. Through the middle of November, approximately 1100 juveniles had participated in or were still participating in special probation programs through Probation Subsidy. Of these 1100, about 90 were later committed to a state juvenile rehabilitation facility. This represents about 8% of those who were in the program.
7. With more time and money available, the counties in Probation Subsidy have implemented new programs and have made better use of existing resources. Perhaps most important, probation officers are now able to individualize probation programs to an extent not possible in the past.

PROBATION SUBSIDY IN WASHINGTON STATE  
CALENDAR YEAR 1970

In its 1969 special session, the Washington State Legislature passed the Probation Subsidy Act. This act authorized the Washington State Division of Institutions to subsidize the costs of special county probation supervision to juveniles who could be committed to state juvenile rehabilitation facilities.

There are two funding methods available to counties electing to participate in the program. The first is designated the "special" program. Reimbursement in this program is on the basis of reduction in the rate of commitment. The following steps are involved in calculating the reduction:

1. Commitments per 100,000 population are established for each county for either the period 1964-1968 or the period 1967-1968, whichever is higher. The resultant figure is called the "base commitment rate."
2. Each year, the base commitment rate is multiplied by the county population (certified as of April 1), giving an "expected commitment rate" for the year.
3. At the end of each year of operation, the actual number of commitments for each county is subtracted from its expected commitment rate. This gives the "commitment reduction number" for each county.

The maximum amount of reimbursement for which a county may establish eligibility is arrived at by multiplying the "commitment reduction number"

by \$4,000. Reimbursement is by actual program cost or by the maximum figure mentioned above, whichever is smaller.

If a county has an average base commitment rate of less than thirty, it may either choose the special program, or elect the "alternate" program. In the alternate program, the state pays the salary of one full-time probation officer who is assigned to the Probation Subsidy unit only. In 1970, there were ten judicial districts representing eleven counties in the special program, and eight judicial districts representing nine counties in the alternate program.

The objective of the Probation Subsidy program is to reduce the necessity for commitment of juveniles to state rehabilitation facilities by strengthening and improving the supervision of juveniles placed on probation by the juvenile courts of the state. It is the intent of this program to create a variety of special new techniques for treating juvenile offenders. It encourages the use of innovation and creativity in developing new ways of doing a better rehabilitation job in the community. Specifically, the goals of Probation Subsidy are these:

1. To reduce commitment rates to state juvenile rehabilitation institutions by 25% or more in participating counties.
2. To reduce overall costs to the state for rehabilitating selected delinquent youths.
3. To provide higher quality probation services to selected youthful offenders through (a) reducing probation officer caseloads, and (b) making funds available for purchasing additional services as needed.
4. To provide increased protection to the community through more consistent, uniform supervision of probationers.

5. To reduce the extent to which youths become involved in repeated offenses.

Probation Subsidy became operative in Washington State on January 1, 1970, with twenty counties participating in the program. This report presents a picture of what is happening in the program in these counties.

At the present time there is no reporting system which gathers information concerning Probation Subsidy. Since each county keeps its own records, and not all counties do so in the same manner or even keep the same information, there is a limit on the type of data which can be presented. However, it is felt that there is adequate information available to present a meaningful report. In general, this report will illustrate what the counties are doing to meet the goals of Probation Subsidy.

The first goal of Probation Subsidy--reduction in commitment rate--is a reality. Statewide, the commitment rate has decreased from 38.76 commitments per 100,000 population in 1969, and 37.58 for the period from 1964 to 1969, to a figure of 24.56 for 1970. This represents a 36.6% decrease from the 1969 figure, and a 34.6% decrease from the average for the last six years. For counties in the Probation Subsidy program, the commitment rate is down 34.5% from the six-year average, and 41.5% from the 1969 figure. The goal for these counties was a 25% reduction.

Not only is commitment rate down, but also the number of commitments. From 1969 to 1970 for the state as a whole, total commitments are down 37.6% and first commitments are down 36.3%. For counties in Probation Subsidy, total commitments are down 42.8% and first commitments are down 41.6%. For counties not in Probation Subsidy, total

commitments are up 15.4% and first commitments are up 15.7% from the 1969 figure.

Table 1 contains a list of all the counties in Probation Subsidy, grouped according to type of participation in the program. It shows the expected commitment figure for each county and the actual commitment figure for 1970. The table also gives each county's base commitment rate, and its commitment rate for 1970. Table 2 shows commitments for 1969 and 1970 for all counties in the state, grouped by type of Probation Subsidy program. Table 3 lists 1970 admissions chargeable to Probation Subsidy by county and by type of admission.

There are indications that the second goal of Probation Subsidy--to reduce the overall cost of juvenile rehabilitation--will be met by the program. The lower populations in the juvenile rehabilitation facilities (a result of lower admissions largely attributable to Probation Subsidy) have already yielded some cost savings. Eight cottages within juvenile rehabilitation residential treatment facilities have been closed. (Most of the facilities have several "cottages", which are self-contained living units.) Fifty-five staff vacancies in juvenile rehabilitation residential treatment facilities have not been filled. These unfilled vacancies are over and above those required to meet the savings goals set by the Governor.

Lower populations have also eliminated the need at this time for a planned 160 bed intensive treatment facility. This facility would have cost approximately \$5 million to build, with operating costs of about \$3.5 million per biennium.

The third goal of Probation Subsidy--to increase the quantity and quality of probation services--can be measured in several ways. One of these is caseload size, since the number of juveniles a probation officer has determines to a large extent how much time he can spend on each one.

Before Probation Subsidy, caseload size averaged 65, and in some cases exceeded 100. In the Probation Subsidy units, the maximum allowable caseload is 30; the average caseload in these units was between 18 and 19. Some counties were fairly close to the maximum figure; others were substantially below it. The majority of the counties considered 20 a more realistic maximum than 30.

Another measure of improvement in probation supervision is the amount of advanced training given to probation officers. Most of the counties have had some kind of special training for their probation officers involved in Probation Subsidy. Generally, the training involved family counselling, individual counselling or group therapy techniques. Those who have received this training considered it very beneficial in carrying out their probation functions. Many counties plan to increase such training in the future.

A third measure of improvement in probation services involves the implementation of new programs and techniques, or the improvement of existing ones. In Probation Subsidy units, the area of greatest concentration thus far has been individual and family counselling. With smaller caseloads, the probation officers are able to spend more time with their probationers than was possible in the past. In most counties, the probation officers in Probation Subsidy units spent a large part of their

time out of the office, working in schools and homes. Often the work in the homes was done in the evening so that working parents could be contacted.

In the area of family counselling, one county implemented a Parent Effectiveness Training program in cooperation with a nearby college. This program involved 17 parents and their children, plus members of the college staff and the Probation Subsidy unit staff. Sessions were held three hours a week for eight weeks. The goal of the program was to get parents to listen and to communicate with their children. Several techniques were used, with the playacting portion considered especially beneficial. The program was considered very effective, and the county plans to repeat it. Other counties have used techniques similar to those employed in the Parent Effectiveness Training program, but on a less formalized basis.

In another county, the main emphasis was on concentrated therapy programs for child and family. This included family group therapy (parents, child, and other family members, if appropriate); team group therapy (those in the family group therapy program plus "significant" others: relatives, employers, doctors, lawyers, etc.); and total agency therapy, in which the family and all agencies associated with it were included (schools, social agencies, employment office, Public Assistance, and Child Guidance, for example). Through these sessions, an individual plan was developed for each family. In developing the plan, the goals and desires of the probation staff, the parents, and the child were all taken into consideration.

Another area of concentration was the school. Since most of the juveniles in the program were in some school program, it was helpful for the probation officers to work closely with the schools. In many cases, special educational programs were worked out for individual probationers, with the teachers, other school staff, and the probation officer working together. In a few cases, arrangements were made for a juvenile to finish his high school education at a local community college because of an inability to adjust to a regular high school environment.

Work-study programs and special programs for school drop-outs were operated in some counties. Several counties plan to implement such programs in the future.

Tutoring, often on a limited basis, was available in a few counties, and several of the counties have plans to expand in this area. One county plans to expand their present volunteer program to include tutoring functions, with an emphasis on improving attitudes towards school; another county plans to start using volunteers as tutors as soon as they complete their new probation facilities.

Besides the tutor-volunteer programs mentioned above, several counties had other volunteer programs. Most programs emphasized the companionship aspect of the relationship, with volunteers meeting with probationers on a one-to-one basis. Some meetings took place in the home of the juvenile; others involved activities such as movies, cultural events, swimming, hobbies, coke breaks, and so on. In one county, occupational volunteers were used. The program involved a local businessman working with a probationer in a field in which the probationer had

expressed an interest. The businessman served as a teacher, and the probationer used what he learned in carrying out tasks assigned by the businessman.

In an effort to put something positive in a juvenile's probation rules, one county plans to implement a noncompensatory work program in which the probationers will act as companions to persons in nursing homes, or as playground supervisors.

One county employed ex-probationers and ex-parolees as treatment agents. In another county, before certain probationers were released from formal probation, they spent six sessions with adult convicts: four sessions with individual convicts, and two group therapy sessions with convicts. Only the older, more mature probationers were selected for this program.

Most counties try to individualize their programs as much as possible to fit the needs of the probationers. As an example, in one county, arrangements were made for a girl in the Probation Subsidy program to take a class in behavior modification at a mental health center. She received credit for the class; the class was particularly relevant to her situation, since she had a retarded sister. Another county arranged for guitar lessons for one girl in the program. Some counties selectively paid for memberships in the YMCA, or for fees to send certain probationers to summer camps. One county had a program to "socialize" probationers before they went into foster homes. Some probationers were not aware of common grooming practices or techniques; in some cases, they did not know how to eat using the implements and the manners to

which most members of foster homes are accustomed. This program taught some of these basics.

Recreational activities were used to some extent in most counties. While some activities took place all year long, the largest portion were in the summer, when most of the probationers were out of school. Lacking the structured environment of the school situation, most of the probationers needed something to take its place. In the area of recreational activities, camping and fishing trips were the most popular. Other activities mentioned included trips to county fairs, attendance at cultural or sports events, and bowling, basketball, and other athletic activities.

During the summer, jobs become an important factor in creating a structured living situation. Some counties had excellent success in finding summer work for their probationers, but most experienced difficulties because of depressed job markets. One county implemented a project in which twenty probationers worked in the county parks, doing building and repair work. They worked eight hours a day, five days a week, for eight weeks, and were paid for the work. During this period, none of those involved in the project got into trouble.

The fourth goal of Probation Subsidy--to provide increased protection to citizens--is fairly difficult to measure. The goal, however, specifies that this protection will come through closer supervision of probationers. By the very nature of the program, probationers in Probation Subsidy received more attention and more supervision than probationers in regular programs; given these premises, we may infer that

there has been an increase in the protection to the community. If a juvenile was judged a danger to himself or to the community while he was in the program, he was committed to a state juvenile rehabilitation institution.

The fifth goal of Probation Subsidy--to reduce recidivism--is really impossible to measure at the present time. There is no information collected on a statewide basis, and not all counties keep the information in the same manner. With the implementation of the Juvenile Court reporting system in 1971, information on recidivism among juveniles in Probation Subsidy programs and among juveniles in regular probation programs will begin to be available. A few counties have kept records, and these records indicate a lower rate of recidivism among probationers in the Probation Subsidy program.

Evidence currently available indicates that the goals of Probation Subsidy are being met. Commitments are down; caseloads are smaller; and innovation has been used in developing new or improved services in the counties participating in Probation Subsidy. The counties as a group are very enthusiastic about the program and its results. Several of the counties in the alternate program plan to adopt the special program July 1, 1971; and several of those in the special program plan to expand their Probation Subsidy units beginning July 1.

Having examined the ways in which the goals of the Probation Subsidy are being met, certain other areas will be examined to give a more complete picture of Probation Subsidy in Washington State.

The first of these areas concerns the probationers involved in the program. Through the middle of November, over 1100 juveniles in

Washington State had been served or were being served by a special probation program as a result of Probation Subsidy. In general, these 1100 represented the more "difficult" probationers in the counties involved in the Probation Subsidy program. The criterion most frequently mentioned by the counties in selecting juveniles for the program was the likelihood that the juvenile in question would be committed in the near future. The majority of the juveniles selected for the program had a record of past offense; many were in regular probation caseloads and were transferred to the Probation Subsidy unit because all of the resources available in the regular unit had been exhausted.

Other criteria used by the counties in selecting juveniles for the program included the ability of the juvenile to benefit from an intensive program; the juvenile not being a danger to himself or to the community; how placing the juvenile in the program would affect the others in the caseload; and having a suitable living arrangement available for the juvenile.

Most of those selected for the Probation Subsidy unit were between the ages of 14 and 17, with a few younger children involved. Most (about 80%) were males.

Of the 1100 probationers involved in the program, about 90 (8%) were later committed to a state juvenile rehabilitation institution. Of those who were committed, several were from old caseloads and had a long history of offenses, and a large number were committed within a short period of time after being assigned to the Probation Subsidy unit (sometimes before any work had been done with them in the special unit).

Of the juveniles in the program who were not committed, some showed dramatic changes in attitude or behavior. Changes in the area of attitude are fairly difficult to measure; but several counties commented that once a juvenile developed a trust in the probation officer and began to relate to him, attitude changes were evident, and in some cases, very significant. Some counties pointed to the decrease in recidivism among their probationers as evidence of behavioral change. In some cases, a juvenile with a long history of offenses would commit no new ones, either during his period in Probation Subsidy or after being released from probation after having successfully completed the program.

In most counties, there were probationers staying in school who would normally have become drop-outs (or who would have been dismissed from school). In some cases a probationer stayed in school simply because it was a condition of his probation; but for others, it could be attributed to an increase in motivation. In one county, 17 of the probationers placed in Probation Subsidy units were out of school at the time they were assigned to the unit; 15 of them are now in school.

Some of the probationers showed improvements in grades and behavior. In one county, a juvenile in the program went from a grade point average of 1.5 to one of 2.6; in another county, a boy who had never shown an interest in high school athletics before turned out for the cross-country team. One of the more dramatic cases involved a girl who had refused to attend school. After being placed in the Probation Subsidy unit, she finished the ninth grade and entered high school with average to better than average grades. She also took a part-time job--a real accomplishment

for a third generation welfare case. She entered a YWCA Slim and Trim class to improve her appearance, and now desires to finish her high school program and become employable.

Another area of importance is community acceptance of the Probation Subsidy program. Overall, this acceptance has been very good.

In the area of local law enforcement, there were some counties in which law enforcement was not completely behind the program and there were sometimes problems with individual police officers, but generally cooperation was good. In many counties, the police called the probation officer before any action was taken when a juvenile in the program was involved in some sort of trouble.

Cooperation with the schools has been very good. While some school districts refused to cooperate and some individual schools were uncooperative, these were the exception rather than the rule. There were many schools which helped set up special programs or make special concessions for juveniles involved in Probation Subsidy. In one county, a boy was bussed several miles each day because the program in his own school district was not suitable to his situation. In some schools, if a probationer in the special program acted up, the probation officer was called, rather than the school taking unilateral disciplinary steps.

Most county Probation Subsidy units had a good working relationship with supportive agencies in the communities. Child Guidance was one of the agencies with which most counties worked closely, and cooperation with them seemed to be uniformly good. Some counties mentioned problems in working with Public Assistance, with most of the problems related to the area of foster home care.

Service organizations have been active supporters of Probation Subsidy in several counties. Some counties had supplies for their summer recreation programs donated by local service agencies; in one county, a ladies' service organization obtained corrective lenses for one probationer and arranged for physical examinations for others. Most of the counties made presentations to local service organizations, explaining the Probation Subsidy program, and were very well received.

In general, newspaper coverage of Probation Subsidy has been good. A few counties did not have any newspaper coverage; most had some, and it was favorable. One county in which the probation office generally had a poor relationship with the local paper received favorable coverage on Probation Subsidy.

In response to questions about services not available in the community, most counties mentioned the area of homes. There was a lack of appropriate foster homes and group homes almost everywhere. Many counties mentioned the need for an interim home--a place where juveniles could go on a short-term, drop-in basis. Interim homes could be used as a place to go when a crisis situation developed at home, or as a temporary home while a juvenile was awaiting transfer to a foster home.

A frequently mentioned unmet need was in the area of testing and diagnosis. Psychological evaluations were not always available when they are needed. Most areas did not have a psychiatrist readily available. In some cases, medical and dental problems were not diagnosed, or were not treated.

About half of the counties participating in Probation Subsidy programs felt that the present funding method was adequate to cover their

current operating expenses in the special unit. Of those who did not find it adequate, half were in the special program and half in the alternate program. Complaints about the funding method were in two areas: restrictions on how the money could be spent, and the method used to arrive at the reimbursement figure.

In the area of program restrictions, the most common complaint was not being allowed to include dependent children in the program. Some counties felt that by getting certain of these juveniles early, before they became delinquent, further problems could often be avoided.

The counties which had complaints about the method used to calculate the reimbursement were basically those with low base commitment rates, and some of the smaller counties. Some of those with low base commitment rates felt they were being penalized for having kept more of their juveniles in the community in the past, since they had to work harder to reduce commitment rates than did those counties with historically high commitment rates. In the smaller counties choosing the alternate plan, only the salary of an additional probation officer was paid, so no extra funds were available for implementing new programs.

Despite the problems encountered, almost all of the counties felt that the benefits of the program outweighed the problems. Almost without exception, they mentioned having more time to spend with the individual probationers as the major benefit of Probation Subsidy. With this increase in time the probation officers were more available to their probationers; several mentioned that for the first time in their

careers, they were able to provide the services which a probation officer is supposed to provide.

Another frequently mentioned benefit of Probation Subsidy was that community resources were being developed to a greater extent. With more time available the probation officers were able to see what is available in the community and to evaluate the different resources. In one county a probation officer in the Probation Subsidy program visited several group homes in the state. In this way, she was aware of what was available, and of what type of juvenile would fit in best in each of the group homes. Then, if one of her probationers was in need of a group home, she was better prepared to determine where he would best fit in.

Along the line of developing resources, one county mentioned that the probation people were finally working together as a team, with each other and with the resource people. Because of this, the probationers were receiving a more unified type of treatment program than before.

Another comment was that the Division of Institutions is now being used as a referral service, rather than as a "dumping ground." It is a resource, just as Child Guidance is a resource and there are times when it is the proper resource for the situation.

In addition to the benefits accruing to the Probation Subsidy units, several counties mentioned that their regular probation units were also aided by the Probation Subsidy program. In some cases, the regular units have smaller caseloads because of the addition of probation officers to the Probation Subsidy unit. In others, regular caseloads are

now easier because the Probation Subsidy units take the more difficult juveniles. Training given to those in the Probation Subsidy unit is often passed on to those in the regular units.

Some limitations on the data available for evaluating Probation Subsidy will be eliminated with the introduction of the Juvenile Court reporting system. This system will collect data on every juvenile with whom the juvenile courts of the state have any contact. For every referral in a county, a document will be prepared for submission to the system. Through the system, information will be available on every juvenile who passed through the juvenile courts, and on every action that was taken in regard to a particular juvenile.

It will be possible to determine such things as type of probation program, sex, age, race, education, present school attendance, type of living arrangement, recidivism, reason released from the program, and length of stay in the program. Comparisons of juveniles in Probation Subsidy and those in regular probation units will be made.

A limitation of this data system is that it is voluntary--counties do not have to participate. It is hoped that counties which do not participate the first year will decide to after seeing the type of data which is available from the system.

Unfortunately, the system will not be fully operational for all of 1971; however, it should be in operation long enough and in enough counties to give a better picture of Probation Subsidy--and the entire county juvenile court system--than is available at the present time.

In addition to the data available through the Juvenile Court reporting system, there will be more detailed data available through a system

designed specifically for the Probation Subsidy program. This system will report in greater depth what is being done with the juveniles involved in the program. Such things as amount and types of counselling, response to the program, adjustment of the juvenile, violations of probation rules, and any special services will be reported for each juvenile in the program. It is hoped that this system will be implemented in 1971.

From the data obtained through these two reporting systems, a much clearer picture of what is happening in Probation Subsidy, and how it compares with regular probation programs, should be available in the future.

TABLE 1

JUVENILE COMMITMENTS AND COMMITMENT RATES BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF PROBATION SUBSIDY PROGRAM FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1970

COUNTY AND TYPE OF PROGRAM	EST 1970 (PRELIM) POPULATION	BASE RATE (COMMITMENTS PER 100,000 POPULATION)	EXPECTED 1970 COMMIT.	ACTUAL* 1970 COMMIT.	COMMITMENT REDUCTIONS	1970 RATE (COMMITMENTS PER 100,000 POPULATION)
<b>SPECIAL</b>						
BENTON-FRANKLIN	91,850	46.58	42	32	10	34.84
CHELAN	39,222	66.69	26	8	18	20.40
CLARK	126,446	40.88	52	26	26	20.56
COWLITZ	68,450	47.72	33	21	12	30.68
KING	1,139,730	39.66	454	216	238	18.95
PIERCE	405,238	43.76	178	170	8	41.95
SKAGIT	51,146	43.03	22	11	11	21.51
SNOHOMISH	262,150	27.25	71	32	39	12.21
SPOKANE	283,077	39.41	110	52	58	18.37
YAKIMA	142,235	29.64	43	43	0	30.23
<b>ALTERNATE</b>						
CLALLAM-JEFFERSON	44,742	45.72	20	9	11	20.12
GRANT	40,504	34.80	14	11	3	27.16
ISLAND	25,900	18.30	5	1	4	3.86
KITSAP	101,646	28.76	28	21	7	20.66
Klickitat	11,959	25.18	3	3	0	25.09
LEWIS	44,485	24.74	11	13	-2	29.22
MASON	19,975	43.94	9	6	3	30.04
WALLA WALLA	40,722	46.66	19	11	8	27.01
	2,939,477		1,140	686	454	23.33

\*INCLUDES FIRST COMMITMENTS TO ADULT CORRECTIONS FACILITIES OF PERSONS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.

TABLE 2

ADMISSIONS TO CASCADIA JR-DC DURING 1969 AND 1970 BY COUNTIES GROUPED BY  
TYPE OF PARTICIPATION IN PROBATION SUBSIDY PROGRAMS

COUNTY	TYPE OF ADMISSION BY YEAR								TOTAL:		%: 1970
	FIRST COMMITMENT		RE-COMMITMENT		RET'N FROM PAROLE		OTHER		ALL ADMISSIONS		FIRST & RE-COMMITMENTS OF 1969
	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	FIRST & RE-COMMITMENTS
BENTON	31	26	3		1	2	1	1	36	29	76
CHELAN	26	7			1			1	27	8	26
CLARK	57	25	2		4	14	1	1	64	40	42
COWLITZ	27	21	2		5	8		1	34	30	72
FRANKLIN	12	6	2		2		1		17	6	42
KING	362	207	18	3	77	65	27	31	484	306	55
PIERCE	296	166	12	4	45	58	12	11	365	239	55
SKAGIT	24	11			6	4	2	1	32	16	45
SNOHOMISH	82	32	1		22	21	2	7	107	60	38
SPOKANE	94	47	3	2	17	8	7	4	121	61	50
YAKIMA	41	43	2		7	6	2		52	49	100
SPECIAL	1052	591	45	9	187	186	55	58	1339	844	54
CLALLAM	12	8			6	3		1	18	12	66
GRANT	18	11	1		1	1			20	12	57
ISLAND	4	1			1	1			5	2	25
JEFFERSON	2	1			2			2	4	3	50
KITSAP	18	19		2	13	4		4	31	29	116
KLICKITAT		2	1	1					1	3	300
LEWIS	7	13				1			7	14	185
MASON	10	6			2	3	1		13	9	60
WALLA WALLA	9	9		1	2	1	1	1	12	12	111
ALTERNATE	80	70	2	4	27	14	2	8	111	96	90

TABLE 2 (Continued)

ADMISSIONS TO CASCADIA JR-DC DURING 1969 AND 1970 BY COUNTIES GROUPED BY  
TYPE OF PARTICIPATION IN PROBATION SUBSIDY PROGRAMS

COUNTY	TYPE OF ADMISSION BY YEAR								TOTAL:		%: 1970
	FIRST COMMITMENT		RE-COMMITMENT		RET'N FROM PAROLE		OTHER		ALL ADMISSIONS		FIRST & RE-COMMITMENTS OF 1969
	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	FIRST & RE-COMMITMENTS
ADAMS	3	4			2				5	4	133
ASOTIN	3	7	2		1	2			6	9	140
COLUMBIA	1	1							1	1	100
DOUGLAS	5	7							5	7	140
FERRY		1							0	1	0
GARFIELD	1	1				1			1	2	100
GRAYS HARBOR	14	12		2	10	4	1		25	18	100
KITTITAS	4	5			3	2			7	7	125
LINCOLN		6							0	6	0
OKANOGAN	10	11			2	3			12	14	110
PACIFIC	3	5			1	1			4	6	166
PEND OREILLE	3	1			1				4	1	33
SAN JUAN	1	1							1	1	100
SKAMANIA	1				1	1			2	1	0
STEVENS	5	4				2			5	6	80
THURSTON	23	27			6	4		1	31	32	117
WAHKIAKUM	1						1		2	0	0
WHATCOM	32	37			10	7	2	3	44	47	115
WHITMAN	5	3							5	3	60
NONE	115	133	2	2	37	27	6	4	160	166	115
STATEWIDE TOTALS	1247	794	49	15	251	227	63	70	1610	1106	62

NOTE: YEARS IN THIS REPORT ARE CALENDAR YEARS

TABLE 3

## 1970 ADMISSIONS CHARGEABLE TO PROBATION SUBSIDY

COUNTY	First Comm. OJR	Re-Comm. OJR*	First Comm. OAC†	Total Admissions
Benton	26	0	0	26
Chelan	7	0	1	8
Clark	25	0	1	26
Cowlitz	21	0	0	21
Franklin	6	0	0	6
King	207	2	7	216
Pierce	166	4	0	170
Skagit	11	0	0	11
Snohomish	32	0	0	32
Spokane	47	2	3	52
Yakima	43	0	0	43
Clallam	8	0	0	8
Grant	11	0	0	11
Island	1	0	0	1
Jefferson	1	0	0	1
Kitsap	19	2	0	21
Klickitat	2	1	0	3
Lewis	13	0	0	13
Mason	6	0	0	6
Walla Walla	9	1	1	11

\*Recommitments occurring within 30 days of discharge from Juvenile Parole Services are not included.

†Only persons admitted to Adult Corrections with an admission age of less than 18 years old are included.

**END**