



ENCLOSURE



**THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY**

Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project  
Institute for Studies in Justice and Social Behavior  
The American University Law School  
Washington, D.C.

39777

PLANNING AND PROGRAM ASSISTANCE TO  
LEWIS, MASON AND THURSTON  
COUNTIES, WASHINGTON

Consultants:

Rex C. Smith  
Honorable Robert H. Mason

August, 1974

NCJRS

MAR 8 1977

ACQUISITIONS

CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT  
The American University Law School  
2139 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
(202) 686-3800

This report was prepared in conjunction with The American University Law School Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project, under a contract with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Organizations undertaking such projects under Federal Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgement freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this report do not necessarily represent the official position of the Department of Justice. The American University is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material presented in this publication.

## INDEX

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	DESCRIPTION OF TRI-COUNTY REGION.....	5
III.	JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.....	7
IV.	COURT WORKLOADS-REFERRALS & DISPOSITION...12	
V.	CONCURRENT PLANNING.....16	
VI.	AVAILABLE RESOURCES.....18	
VII.	FEASIBILITY OF GROUP HOME DEVELOPMENT.....19	
VIII.	PLAN AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....21	
IX.	MASON COUNTY FACILITIES.....26	

## I. INTRODUCTION

This survey and technical assistance project was conducted under the auspices of the Washington College of Law, Institute for Studies in Justice and Social Behavior of the American University, Washington, D. C. The Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project of the Institute sponsored the Consultants: Mr. Rex C. Smith, Deputy Director, Maryland Department of Juvenile Services; and, the Honorable Robert H. Mason, of the Juvenile Court for Prince George's County, Maryland, for the conduct of the survey.

### A. History of Request

The Regional Planning Council, Criminal Justice Planning Section for Lewis, Mason, and Thurston Counties of the State of Washington made a request to the Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project. The Director of Criminal Justice Planning for the Regional Council is Mr. George R. Volker. The Project Coordinator in Washington was Mr. Thom O'Rourke, Associate Criminal Justice Planner for the Region.

### B. Goal of Survey

A Statement of Purpose for the Technical Assistance Project was set out in a letter to the Consultants, dated July 19, 1974, by Mr. William M. Trencher, Research Associate for the Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project, having had correspondence with Mr. Thom O'Rourke concerning the problem areas.

The scope of the Technical Assistance effort was considered to be a preliminary analysis of the problems set forth by the three Juvenile Court Directors and their respective counties of Lewis, Mason, and Thurston. This was to be accomplished with an eye toward financial resources and other means by which to establish alternative living arrangements for youth in trouble, if feasible.

The major part of the survey was to consider the establishment of a group home; the resources available currently; and, caseload requirements upon examination of existing needs and case flow. The conduct of the survey should determine whether the idea of a tri-county home is reasonable to put forward.

A second consideration deals with the present institutional facilities available to Mason and Lewis Counties as relates to staffing and building-architectural options.

Since this was a preliminary analysis, the overall goal was to provide technical assistance to the Court Directors concerning how they should go about further action planning.

The following report and analysis should not be viewed simply as a wholly complete or in depth ferreting out of important factors, but perhaps more importantly a guide for the Court Directors and Regional Planning personnel for a more sophisticated survey and analysis preparatory to planning for group homes or any juvenile justice program.

The Consultants went about their task looking at the goals of the project from a complete perspective of the tri-county area, inclusive of all formal and informal agencies, the law relating to each rule, procedure, and practice. Some attempt was made to address all matters which would prohibit or enhance the development of alternate resources such as group homes or foster care. To some degree, we considered the attitude and conceptualization of persons responsible for agency decisions and others such as line staff within the agencies in order to gain insight as to whether there was a prevailing commitment or lack of commitment to the development of these resources. Further, there was an attempt to observe the principles and guidelines and policies by which the courts operate, considering detention and institutionalization.

The principles by which the State of Washington and local communities provide for either the care and treatment or punishment of children as reflected in law are an important factor in considering feasibility in the level of support for programs, which we directed primarily to the interest of the child and to the family. The Consultants also looked at the community generally, its social and economic makeup, with an eye toward community and service organizations which would be supportive of progressive programming for children and youth. Increasingly, communities are found to have aggressive child advocacy groups (Legal Aid) which can contribute significantly to the prospects for increased care and treatment programs.

#### C. Description of Problem

The problems as reflected by the Regional Planning Council, the Criminal Justice Planning Arm, and the Court Directors is rather simply stated above and relates to establishing a group home to serve the tri-county area. Moreover, their concern revolves generally around development of alternate residential resources for children who cannot be maintained within their own homes, on probation, or protective supervision status.

The Consultants, as a preliminary step, held a forum with several midmanagement and line staff, representative of child serving agencies within the region and recorded the following

list of problem areas as they viewed them:

- More foster care is needed to avoid children, being placed in the detention centers.
- There are no group homes in the tri-county; therefore, children who are accepted must be sent all over the State instead of being maintained in their own home county, or nearby.
- The Union Street Center provides a service for Thurston County, but such programs are needed in Lewis and Mason Counties; and, the Union Street Center needs support financially or it will no longer be a resource.
- Group homes only serve the pre-delinquent and dependent child unless the adjudication labels are manipulated so that a delinquent child can be accepted in a home.
- The Department of Social and Health Services provides foster care; but, again, only for dependent children, not delinquents. The Juvenile Courts do not have the authority to place children in the care and custody of individual family homes or group homes, but must commit to the Department of Social and Health Services.
- Group homes are for children numbering up to ten, and while there are eighty-five in the State, there is only one (Skyway) in the tri-county area.
- Child care institutions serve between ten and twenty-four children, but while there are forty to fifty such facilities in the State, there is only one (O. K. Ranch) for thirteen children in the tri-county area. Even this facility recruits from the other parts of the State so there are not enough beds in the tri-county area.
- Admission criteria to the available group homes are restrictive.
- The State (DSHS) operates group homes but only for children who have been institutionalized.
- The Department of Social and Health Services will not pay for delinquent group home care since they only have responsibility for the dependent children (this category includes truants, runaways, and incorrigibles).

- The Court Services' personnel can purchase special services for delinquent youth through limited monies available via the State Subsidy Program.
- State mental hospitals have programs for children under thirteen, but those over thirteen go to the State correctional institution.
- The need for alternate residential placements, particularly for boys, is needed since treatment in State institutions is considered to be very poor.
- State and local industrialization, and a change in the social and economic patterns seem to be causing a mini-cultural shock; and, the programming has not caught up with the needs of youth in communities.
- State government workers and the military are highly represented in the population generally, and are equally represented in Juvenile Court.
- Girls' group home care is a greatly needed resource.
- Group Homes for the older boy with school problems and/or needs in the vocational-work areas are required.
- The school system provides no financial resources to problem children or dropouts.
- The Olympia Special Education Program funds the new detention center educational program.
- The Foster Care Program staffing is so severely limited that little recruitment, maintenance, or training of foster care homes is possible.
- Many in foster care really require group home care for more structured programming.
- Foster care for teenagers is an increasing requirement with proportionately decreasing availability.
- The State Department of Social and Health Services may be requesting more group homes, but these again will be for parolees from institutions only.
- The impact of the State institutions located in the tri-county has been negative and would effect the development of group homes to some extent.

One can readily see as a result of this forum that the various staff recognized the problem areas and even add insight into mitigating factors; however, turning these factors around in a

planned program of action may remove various obstacles.

## II. DESCRIPTION OF TRI-COUNTY REGION (LEWIS, MASON, AND THURSTON COUNTIES).

The Lewis, Mason, and Thurston County region is termed the "South Puget Sound Region" by the Department of Commerce and Economic Development of the State of Washington. Numerically, it is termed Region V of the thirteen planning regions of the State; and, these are contiguous regions under the State Law Enforcement Assistance Administration setup, which is in the Executive Branch of Government and termed "the Law and Justice Planning Office." The economic base for Lewis and Mason Counties centers around industrialization and forestry, while Thurston County centers around State Government in Olympia, the Capitol of the State. There are thirty-nine counties within the State of Washington, and the three in the South Puget Sound Region in 1966 accounted for 3.2 percent of the total Washington State personal income.

There has been a relatively stable population growth pattern of between five and six percent annually. The region ranks sixth of thirteen in the area of population growth. The trend through 1980 tends to be fairly stable for Lewis and Mason Counties or at about a two percent increase per year, while Thurston County has a somewhat higher projection at around five percent. Until the reduction in the Boeing Aircraft Manufacturing Corporation of approximately 75,000 employees, the region was one of the fastest growing in terms of employment. There is some comeback from that significant employment; and, therefore, population increased with Boeing gearing up recently.

The regional population totals approximately 150,000 with approximately 38,000 school age children. The 1970 census reveals the five to fourteen year old age group to be the largest single group of population in the region with the age group of fifteen to twenty-four the next largest.

A report of dropout rate between the years 1962 and 1972 is of concern and merits consideration for the purposes of this study. With consideration only of grades nine through twelve and, based solely on youth who dropped out during the school year (those who did not return for a Fall semester were not included), indicates a very significant increase for the region from a percentage of approximately 3.8 percent to 6 percent with the highest increase in Thurston County. If the school populations stabilize, as is projected generally over the next five to ten years, any continued increase in the dropout rate would have great significance for programming of youth services.

The State average for persons on public assistance is 6.5 percent of the total population. Twenty-five of the State's thirty-nine counties are at or below this percentage mark, and the region is at an average of about six percent.

The region's land mass approximates 4,000 square miles with the majority of the population concentrated in a very few urban centers as will be described in the following section.

### Lewis County

In 1973 the Lewis County population was 46,400, ranking fourteenth in the State. The land mass approximates 2,423 square miles, ranking it sixth out of thirty-nine counties in the State. Projected population trends are at about 2.1 percent increase over the next three years. The largest urban areas are the cities of Centralia, Chehalis, and Morton, comprising 17,466 population and the cities of Winlock and Toledo comprising 1,607 population. Again, the five to fourteen age group, and the fifteen to twenty-four year olds make up the largest segment of population of this county. School age population is approximately 12,000. The dropout rates between grades nine and twelve rose from 3.57 in 1962, based on a population in school of 3,111 to 5.13 percent of 3,745 students in 1973. The percentage of persons on public assistance was 6.2, ranking it seventeenth in the State.

There are no particularly significant trends or changes anticipated so far as the population being referred to Juvenile Courts is concerned as a result of this analysis. Therefore, any feasibility considerations for alternate resources will be determined generally by a statistical analysis of current and projected caseloads at Juvenile Court.

### Mason County

In 1973 the population in Mason County was 21,500, ranking it twenty-fourth amongst the counties in Washington. The land area is 962 square miles. The population trend projected is for about 2.8 percent increase over the next four years. The largest city is the County Seat of Shelton which has a population of 6,900. The age group of five to fourteen, and the age group of fifteen to twenty-four make up the bulk of population. The school enrollment population has been stable at about 5,500 since 1968. The dropout rate has increased from 4.29 percent of 1,258 students in 1962 to 5.1 percent of 1,514 students in 1973. This is not as high a rate of increase as for Lewis or Thurston Counties and may not be of serious significance. The percentage of persons receiving public assistance is 5.9, ranking the county nineteenth for the State and just at the State average. This has been level since 1971.

There are no particularly significant trends or changes anticipated so far as the population being referred to Juvenile Court is concerned as a result of this analysis. Therefore, any feasibility consideration for alternate resources will be determined generally by a statistical analysis of current and projected caseloads at Juvenile Court.

### Thurston County

The 1973 population for Thurston County was 81,300, ranking it ninth of the State's thirty-nine counties. The land area is 714 square miles and the population trends are difficult to project at this point because of the economic slump triggered by cutbacks in employment at the Boeing Aircraft Company which amounts to a loss of 75,000 manufacturing jobs and which is expected to result in a net out-migration of between 67,000 to 90,000 people from the State. There has also been a reduction in the birth

rate, as with national trends. The population projections range from 87,000 to 95,000 for 1975, and between a low of 110,000 to a high of 119,000 for 1980. Neither of these figures is of singular significance with respect to current feasibility of program development or a five year projection. Approximately one-half of the county's population lives within the three cities of: Olympia, 42,000; Lacey, 10,100; and, Tumwater, 5,720. Another 1,700 live within the two cities of Tenio and Yelm.

The school population has been at an even level of 21,000 since 1968; and from projections, it will not increase significantly over the next five years and then perhaps even experience a slight decline. The dropout rate, however, has increased significantly. For grades nine through twelve, in 1960, Thurston County had a rate of 4.2 percent of 4,159 students, and in 1973 it jumped to 7.80 percent of 6,664 students.

The percentage of population receiving public assistance was 5.9 percent, ranking the county as nineteenth in the State. There has been a general increasing trend since 1969.

During the 1960 to 1970 decade, Thurston County was the second fastest growing county in the State. This sudden change from the past resulted from an unusually high rate of net in-migration into the county. This is a result of the spill-over growth of Tacoma and from legislative centralization of State offices in Olympia. This has given the county some feeling of uncertainty and too rapid a change. It appears that the government will continue to be the largest employer group in Thurston County, with the State of Washington accounting for an upward growth of eight-five percent.

The Thurston County Comprehensive Plan does not envision any major changes in the existing pattern of commercial development, primarily because of new "nodes" of population are anticipated (the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan, revised March 1, 1973). It is interesting to note that the Thurston County Regional Plan has adopted as its seventh major conclusion that "Thurston County should work closely with the cities and towns of the region as well as with neighboring counties and local school and fire districts so that regional goals are achieved and local goals coordinated." This certainly has significance for the development of a regional plan for group homes.

There are no particularly significant trends or changes anticipated so far as the population being referred to Juvenile Court is concerned as a result of this analysis. Therefore, any feasibility or consideration for alternate resources will be determined generally by a statistical analysis of current and projected caseloads at Juvenile Court.

### III. JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

#### Judicial System - Legal Base

The best interest of the child is the paramount concern of the Juvenile Court. The court seeks to help a child attain a more successful

life by utilizing the strength of the individual and the resources of the community. All proceedings in the Juvenile Court are civil in nature; there is no criminal record attached to the child. The procedures ensure that each child and his problem are considered individually and that the constitutional and legal rights of both the child and his parents are protected. The essential philosophy of the Juvenile Court is individualized justice, which means that the disposition of every case is determined by the particular needs of each child and that its purpose is treatment and prevention rather than punishment. (Excerpted from 1973 Thurston County Annual Report of the Juvenile Court).

The present Juvenile Court Law can be found in Title 13, Chapter 13.04 of the Washington State Legal Code. The major thrust of the Code is embodied in Title 13.04, Section 140 Construction. "This chapter shall be liberally construed to the end that its purpose may be carried out, to wit: that the care, custody, and discipline of a dependent or delinquent child as defined in this chapter shall approximate as nearly as may be that which should be given by its parents, and in all cases where it can be properly done, the dependent or delinquent child as defined in this chapter shall be placed in an approved family and may become a member of the family by adoption or otherwise. No dependent or delinquent child as defined in this chapter shall be taken from the custody of its parent, parents or guardian, unless the court shall find such parent, parents or guardian is incapable or has failed or neglected to provide proper maintenance, training and education for said child; or unless said child has been tried on probation in said custody, and has failed to reform, or unless the court shall find that the welfare of said child requires that his custody shall be taken from said parent or guardian..." NOTHING IN THIS CHAPTER PRECLUDES THE DEVELOPMENT OF GROUP HOMES FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH; MOREOVER, IT PROVIDES THE IMPETUS FOR SUCH PROGRAMS.

Title 13.04, Section 030, Juvenile Courts—How Constituted. This Section of the Statute provides that the Juvenile Court Judges will reside in the Superior Courts of the several counties of the State. Special sessions designated as "Juvenile Court Sessions" provide for the hearing of juvenile cases and all records are separated into the juvenile record. The regional configuration of the three counties provides two separate judicial circuits. Mason and Thurston Counties are within one single judicial circuit, presided over by Superior Court Judges, Hewitt A. Henry, Frank E. Baker, Robert J. Doran, and Gerry L. Alexander. These judges rotate duties and sit in both counties. In Lewis County—a separate Judicial Circuit—the presiding Judge who sits full-time for the county in all matters is the Honorable D. J. Cunningham. The Prosecuting Attorney appears in delinquency matters; and, defendant representation in all matters is provided through private counsel, the Public Defender, or Legal Aid.

The existing law appears certain to undergo some change in the new legislative session. The proposed law has undergone many changes and probably will undergo more prior to the legislative session. If it is passed, as presently written, the bill will greatly change the status of those appearing before the Washington Juvenile Courts. However, in reviewing the changes carefully, it does not seem to be significant with

relation specifically to the development of group homes for delinquent youth.

### Lewis County

The Lewis County Court Director and his staff operate with a firm commitment to the philosophy and principles of the Juvenile Court Code. The staff operate out of a building on the campus of a State institution, Green Hill School. The cottage which is a part of the open campus is, however, somewhat set aside since it is the most distant campus from the administrative buildings of the Green Hill School. The cottage provides administrative offices for the Director, the Assistant Director, a Subsidy Probation Officer funded through the State Subsidy Program, and a female Probation Counselor. The cottage also serves as emergency overnight accommodations for shelter care and detention purposes for a capacity of approximately eleven children. There is a recreation area, a small kitchen and dining area, and the utilization of other facilities and grounds on the campus. The quarters are quite well kept, with a bright and cheerful atmosphere, particularly since the staff do not appear concerned about locking children in their rooms. It is a very open atmosphere and youth are taken to and from the facility at leisure in town or to fairs, etc.

Concerning the needs, it is a very reasonable approach to having a very few youngsters—generally there is no more than three or four youth in the facility for an average length of stay of about two to three days. There is some indication that the State will reclaim this building which is being rented by the County. Outside the fact that it is located on the Green Hill School grounds, with some probability that there is stigma attached to shelter care within the cottage, it is a very reasonable approach to the need for short-term or emergency shelter care.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COUNTY, WITH THE INFLUENCE OF THE JUDICIARY, STRIVE TO MAINTAIN THE CURRENT UTILIZATION OF THE COTTAGE ON THE CAMPUS OF THE GREEN HILL SCHOOL AND MAINTAIN THE INTEGRITY OF THE PURPOSE AND THE UTILIZATION AT THE PRESENT LEVEL.

Some of the problems related to in the Lewis County Report for 1973 are a high percentage of referrals for consumption or possession of alcoholic beverages, comprising of 33.5 percent of the total referrals. Also referrals for use of drugs reflect 11.8 percent of the total in the age groups in the referral category center around fourteen through seventeen which is essentially the same for the other counties. It is notable that fifty-two percent of the youths referred to Juvenile Court for delinquent behavior come from broken homes or living arrangements other than with their own parents. Lewis County has requested an L.E.A.A. Grant to establish a Youth Services Bureau that, hopefully, would have an impact on the number of referrals, which has markedly increased over the last few years. The Lewis County Court has previously had informal advisory boards which have fizzled out on a few occasions; however, for the purposes of the development of group homes or foster care homes, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT A SMALL ACTION-ORIENTED ADVISORY GROUP BE FORMED TO ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATE LIVING ARRANGEMENT PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH. This advisory council should include representatives

from local news media, civic organization, the professional community, police, and lay citizens.

#### Mason County

The mission of the Mason County Juvenile Court is to provide the best available judicial, investigation, child care, probation, and professional resources under the policies authorized by the Superior Court Judges of Mason County which promote protection to the child and will encourage protection to the community. The long-range objectives are to promote and develop the local community's capability to deliver alternative services to court referral and to develop resident group living as an alternative to family care. This statement is taken from the Annual Report for 1973. The daily authority for management of the Mason County Juvenile Court is the responsibility of the Court Director whose staff consists of three Probation Counselors and one full-time Secretary. One Probation Counselor is a Subsidy Counselor provided through State Subsidy Program funds. This Counselor, as other Subsidy Counselors, deals with those children who otherwise would have been committed to institutional care provided by the State. Another Probation Counselor who works primarily with the Indian population is provided through an L.E.A.A. grant.

The spirit of the Court Director and his staff is certainly in consonance with the law and the aforementioned statements in the Annual Report. There is consideration of a viable volunteer program and another L.E.A.A. Grant Application to provide a Youth Services Bureau for the county for prevention purposes.

The physical restraints of the Court House office space and detention facilities requires treatment in another section that follows. However, it can be said that physical restraints are such that it certainly prohibits full utilization of available counseling skills and other program development.

For the purposes of short-term or emergency overnight shelter care and/or detention care, Mason County contracts with the Thurston County Youth Services Center and transportation is provided by the Sheriff or, occasionally, by Probation Counselors themselves.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT A SMALL ACTION-ORIENTED ADVISORY GROUP BE FORMED TO ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATE LIVING ARRANGEMENT PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH. This advisory group should include representatives from local news media, civic organization, the professional community, police and lay citizens.

#### Thurston County

The Thurston County Juvenile Court maintains the same philosophy as earlier stated. The Court is buttressed with representatives of leaders in the community and the energetic activities of such, as Judge Baker. It is evident that the judicial interest and advisory board interest in the development of appropriate court services and detention facilities

for the capitol city resulted in the new Youth Services Center. It is a testimony to the effect of a concentrated effort of a few people to the accomplishment of a given mission. The Thurston County Juvenile Court is the largest, in terms of referrals, judicial time, and court services staff. The services, generally, within the capitol city community are of a greater variety and of more numbers than those existing in the counties of Lewis and Mason. Court manpower includes the Director, two Counselor II, and two Counselor I positions. In addition, there are two Subsidy Counselors who carry the careload of youngsters who would have otherwise been committed to State institutions. The latter are funded entirely by the State Subsidy Program. The court budget also includes the help required for shelter/detention care portion of the Youth Services Center. The number of youngsters referred for service has increased by over 400 percent since 1961. One will be reminded of earlier statements regarding population at the period of 1960 through 1970 which was a period of rapidly increasing immigration and population increased generally.

The Thurston Youth Services Society is a private non-profit corporate program which tends to be a Youth Services Bureau type of operation. However, it also serves directly the needs of some youngsters who appear at court for the purposes of diagnostic work-ups and follow-up counseling.

The Interaction Foundation has been a program for drug abusers. It is a largely volunteer operation.

The Mental Health Clinic seems to be more available to Thurston County than in Lewis or Mason Counties for psychiatric/psychological assessments, evaluation, and service.

Since the development of the Youth Services Center, there seems to have been more interest generated within the community, particularly those who wish to volunteer (i.e. colleges) to provide services in the Center. The Youth Services Center has become, to some extent, the hub of activities relating to services to youth who come before the Juvenile Court, in that inter-agency meetings are held at that spot for Thurston County and also on a regional basis.

The Regional Directors and other staff and resource people have evidently gotten together on the idea of alternate residential resources for youth and have this single purpose in mind enough that a ground swell of activity toward this end could easily be developed with one or two key persons spearheading the drive.

#### Summary

Each of the counties in the region supports, through its local government, the budget of the Juvenile Court and the court staff. It has already been set as precedence that a court budget may include monies to purchase services through contractual arrangement, i.e., Mason County contracts for shelter care with Thurston County. INCREASE IN COURT BUDGETS FOR CONTRACTURAL SERVICES, BY COUNTY, COULD PERMIT CONTRACTURAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR FOSTER CARE FAMILIES AND/OR GROUP HOMES FOR THE RESIDENTIAL CARE OF SELECTED YOUTH.

The Regional Directors concur, as do their staffs, with the problem associated with sending youth outside of their own region for group home services and that these facilities are generally not available after much work and preparation for referral. There is a great deal of regional effort and cooperativeness toward the end of having to share group homes for the tri-county. The problem of school placement for those youth coming from other counties into one of the three jurisdictions is said not to be an imposing problem. This is one barrier that is generally met, which appears not to be a factor here. The regional judicial community seems ripe for development of group home programs. Each judge indicated his one desire was to have alternative programs between probation and institutionalization. They are proud of the advances they have made in recent times, and they are looking for even more improvements. Each of the Judges indicated a willingness to assist in developing local support for the group home concept. This support would not only be public relations, but also as an aid to developing financial assistance within the respective county governments. The Judges are a key to creating a successful program and each one is willing to commit himself to the program development.

Another important group of persons to the project attainment and maintenance would be the Prosecuting Attorney for each county. One must remember that in Washington State, the Prosecuting Attorney serves the dual role as an Attorney for the State and as an Attorney for the County. As such, he sits in every county council meeting and gives advice to the Council members. Since he prosecutes criminal and delinquent cases and represents the county in civil matters, his advice is sought and respected by the County Commissioners. The Prosecuting Attorneys appear to have a good deal of understanding of the problem and support the concept of group homes.

Each of the counties has a number of community, civic, social, and economic groups which can be pursued vigorously as viable community support. SELECTING OUT KEY INTEREST GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH A SPIRIT OF ADVOCACY FOR YOUTH SHOULD BE THE FIRST STEP IN DEVELOPING BROAD-BASED COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND SUPPORT.

#### IV. COURT WORKLOADS - REFERRALS AND DISPOSITION

The three Juvenile Courts maintain a very low commitment rate to State Institutions. This is, in part, due to availability of a Subsidy Program and Subsidy Counselors as has been related earlier. However, it is due in even larger part to the concern of the judiciary and court staff about the institutional treatment programs provided by the State Department of Social and Health Services' correctional program. There exists a very negative feeling about the effects of those programs, thus resulting in every effort being made by the court staff and by the judiciary to deal with the problem within the community rather than through institutional commitments. While for many dependency youth (truancy, incorrigibles, runaways) State funded private or public group homes ostensibly are available, there are no such programs available for the delinquent youth prior to institutional commitment. It becomes evident that the main thrust of a group home program at this point should deal with the delinquent youth, both boy and girl, within the age ranges of fourteen through seventeen.

## Legal Base

Title 13.04, Section 010, Juvenile Court Law--Dependent and Delinquent Children Defined--Wards of State. This chapter in the Code defines dependent child and delinquent child. It is the basis upon which administrative decisions within the Department of Social and Health Services are made with respect to payment of facilities for care at this time. Dependent Child, by state legal definition, is all the children who are without parent or guardian or no home, or children who have been neglected or abused, or children who are laying in circumstances which are contrary to the health and welfare, and children who are incorrigible or who are truant.

A delinquent child is any child under the age of eighteen years who violates any law of the State, or any ordinance of any town, city or county of the State, or who has violated any federal law or law of another state defining a crime, and whose case has been referred to the Juvenile Court by any jurisdictional whatsoever. For the purpose of the Chapter, only children who have been adjudicated delinquent and dependent children within the State shall be considered wards of this State and their persons shall be subject to the custody, care, guardianship, and control of the court as hereinafter provided. This statement within the Code is not limiting and seems to contradict the belief of the Court Directors that the Judge has no power to commit or grant custody to a private individual or organizational vendor of residential services. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COURT DIRECTORS SEEK AN ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OPINION WHETHER THE COURT HAS THE AUTHORITY TO COMMIT TO THE CARE AND CUSTODY OF AN INDIVIDUAL OR PRIVATE VENDOR GROUP. If the courts have this authority and if a private vendor or organization operate a group home on private contributions or on contract with the Court Directors as for other services, programs for delinquent youth stand a better chance of being developed. The same would hold true for a private family who wishes to contract with the Court Directors for shelter care or longer term foster care for these children.

In furtherance and support of this view, the Code Title 14.04.095, Commitment of Child--Order of Court--Powers of Department of Institutions--Order Recinded When Reformation Complete, dictates that when any child shall be found to be delinquent or dependent, the court shall make such order for the care and custody or commitment of the child that the child's welfare in the interest of the State requires. The court may commit the child: 1) to the care of such child's parents; 2) to the custody and care of a probation officer; 3) to a reputable citizen or association able and willing to receive and care for such child; 4) to an appropriate private agency authorized to care for childre; 5) to the Department of Public Assistance; 6) to the Department of Institutions. Numbers 3 and 4 above appear to relate directly to the problem posed with regard to the Court Authority, if such facilities existed within his jurisdiction. The general preamble that the courts shall make such order for the care, custody, or commitment of the child is in the best interest of the child's welfare and covers a broad range of programs which the judge has full authority to commit.

Further, the court under this same title, Section 100, may order the parents to support; and secondly, perhaps more importantly for the purposes of this study, "In event, such child is ordered committed other than to the

Department of Institutions or the Department of Public Assistance, the court may further order that the Department of Public Assistance support or contribute to the support of the child to the extent that the total of such support will not exceed the rate per month as from time to time may be fixed..."

If these foregoing sections have not been conternvened by legislation establishing the Department of Social and Health Services, the court has full authority to commit where it feels necessary services are provided.

The following analysis of referrals and caseloads will be brief with respect to each county. Generally, however, it can be said that there will be cases referred who are eligible for receiving public assistance and that it well may be more than the average of six percent within the referral or caseload numbers. DETERMINATION SHOULD BE MADE TO THE NUMBER OF ADJUDICATED YOUTHS WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. To this end, there may be monies available for support services heretofore untapped.

#### Lewis County

In 1973 there were 521 delinquency referrals, including 65 drug violations, 49 burglaries, 32 auto thefts, 78 shoplifting, 58 larcenys, and other various offenses. The most populcus age ranges were ages fifteen, sixteen, and seventeen, numbering 128, 199, 181 respectively. The fourteen-year-old was also involved in 88 delinquent offenses. There were 263 dependency cases heard inclusive of 57 runaways, 7 cases of truancy, and 16 incorrigible children. The majority of these cases ranged in ages from thirteen through seventeen. Fifty-three cases were referred to the Division of Public Assistance, possibly for foster home placement.

The disposition of delinquency referrals found the majority to be placed on official or unofficial probation or otherwise adjudicated and closed. Only three youth were committed to the Division of Institutions, six were placed on suspended commitment, and three were placed in private institutions. Based on these statistics and with the knowledge that many children are placed on probation who otherwise would be in a group home, the estimate for those potential group home residents could be anywhere from twelve to fifteen during the period of a year.

Eighty-seven children were placed in foster care during 1973, but there is no way of knowing how many of those were in the incorrigible or runaway category.

#### Mason County

Delinquency and dependency referrals together have been on the decline since 1971 with approximately 450 total referrals for the year 1973.

Delinquencies accounted for 243 referrals during 1973, dependencies accounted for 211 referrals. Delinquent offenses encompassed various offenses such as: burglary, 29 cases; parole violation, 19; forgery, 18; and a range of other offenses. Within the dependency referrals, 12 were incorrigible, 43 were runaways, and fourteen were truants. The age range

for the majority of offenders was between fourteen and eighteen, with the highest number of youth being at age fifteen. In Mason County it is significant to note that twenty-four cases were waived to adult court; however, the majority of these were for traffic offenses. Twenty youth were placed on probation, 28 were provided foster care, and 3 were committed to the Department of Social and Health Services for institutional programs. The Consultants agree with the Court Director—again, in relation to the use of probation for high-risk individuals—that an average of eight to ten youth could be served by a group home setting within a given year.

It should be noted that the Special Supervision Program or Subsidy Program within the county does extremely well and only had to revert to three commitments during the year out of a caseload of 52. However, it is noted several of the cases would have done much better if they had had the availability of a group home. Thirty-seven children were committed to foster care and, again, this, coupled with public assistance programming, may provide indication as to availability of funds or needed foster care beds for the delinquent.

#### Thurston County

The 1973 Thurston County Court Services handled 2,631 cases, 490 of which were from out of the county. There was a total of 1,198 delinquent cases and 596 dependent cases. The age range was, again, primarily within the fourteen through seventeen-year-old group for delinquencies. The offenses with greatest frequency were assault, 24; robbery, 6; burglary, 103; auto theft, 21; shoplifting, 69; larceny 113; possession of marijuana 101. Again, it is noted that a good deal of alcoholic beverage charges were made - 185.

In the area of dependency, there were 69 boys and 54 girls charged with incorrigibility, 111 boys and 127 girls charged with runaway, and 20 boys and 10 girls charged with truancy.

The disposition of delinquency cases found 126 placed on the Subsidy Program caseload, a significant number of which were candidates for group home care; 614 placed on probation status; and 84 sent to the Department of Social and Health Services for foster care planning. Other dispositions included the use of various facilities for the dependent youth which are sometimes difficult to gain acceptance to, but nonetheless four children were placed in a local girls group home, three at a boys ranch, five in another private school, and most significantly, 24 boys were placed at the Kiwanis Boys Ranch located in Olympia. Again, it is noted that the payment for these services comes through the Department of Social and Health Services but only for the dependent child, not for the delinquent.

There were only 20 children committed to the Department of Institutions.

Again, considering the whole numbers and the trends which have been established within the probation and the Probation Subsidy Program, it is estimated that between thirty to forty additional group-home-type beds are needed.

In summary, the region should be planning for the current need of between sixty and sixty-five group home/foster home placement alternatives for boys and girls between the ages of fourteen and eighteen. The relative needs per county would begin to give one an indication as to the plan for location of a home or homes to serve these needs.

#### V. CONCURRENT PLANNING

Local, regional, and State planning for social, economic, vocational, and educational changes rarely take into account matters directly related to the juvenile justice system or the needs of youth. Much more attention is paid to transportation, water and sewer lines, and the amenities of an industrialized way of life. However, while county planning has tended to go in that direction, the Regional Planning Council for the State of Washington has, in conjunction with the State Planning Agency for the Administration of Justice, taken a strong view toward the juvenile justice arena and youth rehabilitation programs. Previous planning efforts have both described and prescribed actions yet to be taken and formed the basis for pursuit of clearly identifiable goals such as group homes and alternatives to institutionalized treatment.

The Thurston County Law and Justice Plan, Part 1 for 1973, describes existing systems, crime analysis, and problem statements. The Court Services' Director and others associated with proposals for group homes should capitalize on this and other program statements of an official nature. The Problem Statements found in that document, page 83, are the following: 1) a group home for girls; 2) a diagnostic treatment and processing program; 3) foster home, shelter care program; 4) work, vocational, educational programs; and 5) community resource cooperation. The plan goes on to describe the problems related to these areas. There is evidence of a present need for a structured domiciliary program for delinquent girls. The ability to offer shelter care in lieu of detention is limited. The problem is a lack of resources and the ability to tap potential resources. There is high concern over the lack of adequate foster home programs. Too many youngsters are placed on probation at home who require alternate living arrangements and they contribute significantly to recidivism rates and later commitments to the Institutional Division.

The Consultants suspect there are more foster home resources available than have been tapped for lack of staff to pursue this program. At the same time they can be as viable, if not more so, to the variety of services available to courts than group homes.

A WELL DEFINED CONCERTED AND SPIRITED EFFORT SHOULD BE MADE TO RECRUIT AND TRAIN FOSTER CARE HOMES FOR BOTH DELINQUENT AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN. A VOLUNTEER SERVICES AGENCY SUCH AS THE UNION STREET CENTER COULD ASSIST IN THE PROCESS AND PROVIDE VOLUNTEER COUNSELORS TO WORK DIRECTLY WITH THE MAINTENANCE OF HOMES, ONCE RECRUITED.

The State of Washington's Comprehensive Plan for Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, January 1, 1974 through December 31, 1974, is a statement of program priorities, and it details the problem areas under which federal grant applications will be considered. It speaks

directly to the need for alternate, very essential programs to institutionalization and will thereby reinforce any local effort to establish the same. The State Law and Justice Planning of Bylaws clearly establish the Regional Criminal Justice Planning Agency for the purpose of assisting local communities and counties in developing projects to conform with the programs identified in the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan has identified those problem statements addressing a development of grants for these purposes at the local level. Region V is considered in one of these but need to include in its regional plan, statements of intent so that they can be included in the State Comprehensive Plan and thereby have monies allocated for these specific purposes. This being done, individual grants can be then written for both programs. Currently, the 1975 Comprehensive Plan is being developed and should include perspective projects under these problem statements from the tri-county region. Of particular interest would be Problem Statement 4.2.0--Failure of the juvenile justice system to provide adequate community resources for delinquent youth; Problem Component 4.2.1--Failure to provide foster home or group living situations to delinquent youth critically in need of this alternative placement. Also applicable is Problem Component 4.2.3--Failure to provide adequate community-based counseling services.

The 1974 Comprehensive Plan projects under L.J.P.O. Problem Area C-1--Alternatives to Family Living--that Region V for the year 1975 will come in with a \$30,000 grant and increase that in 1976 to a \$55,000 grant, in 1977 to a \$30,000 grant, and in 1978 to a \$15,000 grant. It is evident here that the Regional Planning Council has had some impact at least on the 1975 Plan but that is a projection and not yet a part of the Comprehensive Plan for 1975.

Also under Program Area F-2--Provide community-based evaluation and treatment of offenders through locally administered programs, Region V for the calendar year 1974 has a grant of \$6,500 which continues through 1975 and is increased in 1976 to \$36,500; 1977 to \$60,000; 1978 to \$55,000. Again, these are simply projections which require work by the Court Directors at the Regional Planning Council level to firm up in those subsequent years actual plans.

THE COURT DIRECTOR SHOULD CAREFULLY STUDY THE STATE OF WASHINGTON'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND BECOME DIRECTLY INVOLVED INCREASINGLY WITH THE REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL TOWARD GREATER INPUT INTO THE STATE PLAN WITH REGARD TO DEFINITION OF PROBLEM STATEMENTS AND PROBLEM AREAS AND THE REGIONAL PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING SAME.

Under Program Area F-3--Provide evaluation and treatment of offenders through programs administered by State agencies, the State Department of Social and Health Services receives large block grants which may be tapped for purchase of foster care or group care programs at the local level.

The implementation of current 1974 projects by the courts of the region and the level of their effectiveness will determine, to some degree, the future development of federally funded programs through L.E.A.A. Therefore, it is important to get these projects underway and show some impact.

## VI. AVAILABLE RESOURCES

The Office of Juvenile Rehabilitation is situated within the Department of Social and Health Services. It is comprised of the Cascadia Juvenile Reception, and Diagnostic Center and the institutional programs inclusive of camps, parole, and probation subsidy services. Every child adjudicated delinquent and committed to the Office of Juvenile Rehabilitation enters the Cascadia Reception Center. This is the point of break between probation at home and commitment to the Department of Social and Health Services for alternate treatment to probation. Herein, there seems to be one alternate and that is institutionalization with the possibility of parole to a group home at a later date. The average length of stay in institutional care is thirteen months. Some youth who are committed to the Cascadia Reception Center are immediately referred to State-operated group homes. A youth on parole who has formerly been institutionalized could be placed in a State-operated group home without referral for another adjudication. There is no provision for a delinquent youth being placed directly in a group home setting without first being institutionalized. The old Department of Public Assistance has been incorporated into a super department--the Department of Social and Health Services--by act of Legislature, Title 43.20A.010. It is also noteworthy that the Department of Social and Health Services is the State agency responsible for the receipt of federal monies, Title 43.20A.300--Department as State agency for receipt of federal funds for vocational rehabilitation. Since vocational rehabilitation funds by federal guidelines can be utilized for delinquent youth or determined to be handicapped, there is no reason that such funds could not come through the Department of Social and Health Services as a conduit toward even the cost of residential care for the delinquent youth meeting federal guidelines and criteria as handicapped. This route should also be fully explored by the Director and the Regional Planning Council.

The proposed new Juvenile Court Statute may pose some problems if adopted, since shelter care would mean physical care in a foster family home or group care facility as defined in Title 74.15.020 and licensed by the Department of Social and Health Services. This is only problematic and simply means that the court could not place a child in a temporary shelter facility which has not been licensed by the Department of Social and Health Services. This takes away some of the authority of the judiciary to make emergency placement in temporary, unlicensed, private homes. New sections of the Juvenile Court Code 34 and 35 concerning disposition alternatives spells out quite clearly, by way of its purposes, that the group home concept is to be an integral part of the new statutes. According to these sections of the proposed code, it would give added mortar to the building block of a case for the development of group homes and foster care homes within the region.

It is evident that outside the programs under the auspices of the Department of Social and Health Services for dependent children and the limited programs available for delinquent children, the resources available to the court or probation staff for alternate living arrangements is severely restricted. It is evident that the Court Directors and their

staff have made the ultimate use of resources available to children in the community and in their own home in order to maintain a very low commitment rate. Many Washington State youth are financed in alternate living arrangement programs by the Department of Social and Health Services through the Public Assistance Program. Again, with some cognizance of eligibility for delinquents, it appears many of these could be placed as well. There are 1,862 youth in the institutional care program at a cost of \$479,763 according to the August 1973 Report. In agency foster home care there are a total of 722 youth at a cost of \$93,469 according to the same report. Further study would determine whether this does or does not include individual foster care families. It does not seem to include those cases. Table 15H would indicate that there are 6,520 licensed day care homes and 4,811 licensed family foster homes. Under definition of term, child care means care provided for children in a licensed day care center or licensed family day care home, or in their own home when the parents cannot assume parental supervision for part of the day. Child Welfare Services means specialized and individual social services provided to children who are dependent, neglected, or in danger of becoming delinquent, or to unmarried mothers. It includes services to children in their own homes or homes of relatives, supervision of foster homes, selection and evaluation of foster homes, day care facilities, etc. Neither of these definitions seems to categorically deny the service to the delinquent child. DETERMINATION SHOULD BE MADE WHETHER THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES IS LEGALLY MANDATED CATEGORICALLY TO PROVIDE OR NOT TO PROVIDE FOR CHILDREN ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT IN FOSTER CARE OR GROUP HOME CARE. Depending upon a decision, the courts would be able to place delinquent children prior to institutionalization into private organization group homes such as Kiwanis Boys Home with DSHS paying the cost of care as they do with dependents. It would also encourage other organizations to develop programs of a like nature for delinquent youth. It would permit the feasibility of L.E.A.A. funding groups for delinquency group home programs. IF, BY LEGISLATION, DSHS IS CATEGORICALLY PROHIBITED FROM PURCHASING CARE FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH, LEGISLATION SHOULD BE SOUGHT TO REMEDY THAT CONDITION.

## VII. FEASIBILITY OF GROUP HOME DEVELOPMENT

On December 19, 1973, the State Committee on Law and Justice designated the target population for receipt of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funds in the Youth and Delinquency Program areas to be: those youth under eighteen years of age who at one time had been identified by law enforcement to have violated any law of Washington or any ordinance of any town, city, or county of Washington State defining a crime, or who have violated any federal law or law of another State defining a crime. Not included in this definition are the following: Curfew violators, truancy offenders, traffic misdemeanors, drug usage, ungovernable, runaways, alcohol usage. Included in that group would be those youngsters who are involved in this latter list of offenses but who also may have had a past history of heroine usage or a history of alcohol abuse. It is the intention of the State Committee to have this population guideline apply to all youth and delinquency program areas (C-1, C-2, C-3) in the 1974 Comprehensive State Plan.

It is evident by this target population guideline adopted by the State of Washington Law and Justice Planning Office that delinquency was the target population to be served in current projects and, most probably, future projects funded by L.E.A.A. It is apparent from review of the State Comprehensive Plan for Law and Justice that the only stumbling block in the way of developing group homes or specialized foster homes for the delinquent is the continued funding or purchase of their services by the Department of Social and Health Services which, seemingly, is now prohibited.

From all that has been written to this point, the feasibility of developing group home care for delinquent youth can be said to be excellent in all respects.

The philosophy, practice, and manner in which the Court Directors approach their responsibilities is entirely supportive of making the concept work. The judicial concern and interest in these programs contribute not only to making the project work, but to the project development itself. The Prosecuting Attorneys and Defense Attorneys are favorably disposed to such resources being utilized.

Certainly, the legal base of the Juvenile Court Statute promotes the idea as does the Juvenile Court in practice by virtue of its extreme reluctance to commit to State institutions. The plans which have been developed by the Regional Planning Council and by the State Comprehensive L.E.A.A. Planning Agency include group homes as a first priority. The initial reaction of line and intermediate supervisory staff proposes this as the basic need of many. The statistical analysis of court caseloads and dispositions, particularly in relation to commitments and custody to the Department of Social and Health Services, indicate a population of both boys and girls to be served, numbering between fifty-five and sixty-five conservatively.

Even without projections for significant population increases or other social and economic occurrences, the need for this number of beds is substantiated and can be supported. A more sophisticated in depth study and analysis of all of these factors may give a better projection for a five to twenty-year plan.

Since community awareness and acceptance is crucial to the development of group home programming, it is important that some insight is gained in this area. The Advisory Board to the Thurston County Juvenile Court was instrumental in the development of the Youth Services Center. It is evident that such bodies can be an influential force. With proper leadership, the same can be true of similar bodies for the Mason County and Lewis County Juvenile Courts.

A rather specialized Youth Advocacy Group pulled together ideas and implemented the Union Street Center Program. The persons involved in that were high level officials in some of the major corporations within the Olympia community, as well as a city commissioner. Through their efforts, the Thurston Youth Services Society became a corporation providing extremely valuable services to the youth of Olympia and the Juvenile Court. This

corporation has continued efforts to develop innovative programming and has the potential for being a conduit for L.E.A.A. funding for group homes or foster home care or day center programs. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Juvenile Delinquency Planning, has grants available for runaway houses. This is the type of program that the Youth Services Society is interested in, and it is recommended that the Director apply for grants directly to Washington or through the Regional Office for funds to develop such programs.

Another indication of the viability of the local community is the Kiwanis Boys Ranch. The Kiwanis Club generally has, as a part of its credo, the establishment of programs for boys and youth generally. They have put this principle to work in the purchase of land and the construction of a building for the ranch. Certainly many people were involved in this venture, but through the leadership of a few, it was completed. This type of resource is invaluable to program planners and can be capitalized upon for further ventures in each of the counties or in the region as a whole. It is anticipated that the Kiwanis Boys Ranch may expand in the near future.

Private agencies such as these cannot exist serving the problem child without some level of support by the general lay citizen as well as some special interest groups. The community evidently has generally accepted the program since there has been no outrage registered at the intrusion of the Youth Services Society and program, nor the Kiwanis Boys Ranch. While some immediate neighbors to group home programs may offer resistance, the lack of community displeasure with current programs, due quite probably to leg work by various organizations, speaks well for future movement.

Testifying to community involvement in youth programs of all sorts, a recent compilation, in directory form, of the agencies providing direct or indirect services to youth numbers forty-seven organizations within Thurston County alone. This list is inclusive of the YMCA and the YWCA and the American Civil Liberties Union which itself can be a very strong advocate for treatment programs for children and youth.

In summary, the feasibility of group home and/or foster home development is demonstrated both by the need and by the probability that the community would support the concept, actively participate toward their establishment, and respond favorably to their utilization.

#### VIII. PLAN AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering all the data available at this time and without the benefit of the Planning Council and Court Directors and others delving more deeply into the subject matter of the population trends, statistical analysis of caseloads, urban centers, transportation, and local community and county government support, the Consultants RECOMMEND AGAINST THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TWENTY-BED REGIONAL FACILITY. Although this was the initial consideration and perhaps even feasible from an administrative and logistical point of view, such a center does not tend to serve the needs of youth who need a family-oriented or big brother, close-knit oriented group life experience.

The Consultants recommend outlining a strategy for establishing four group homes for the region which would serve up to thirty-two youth at eight beds each, and twenty specialized foster care family arrangements. This plan could extend over a three year period with a development of one group home each year—unless two separate corporations, i.e., T.Y.S.S. and Kiwanis Boys Ranch each develop a program simultaneously. The second two homes could be developed the second and third years, depending upon the administrative capacity of the corporation to handle such a task. It takes at least a year or two of experience in the group home business to be able to handle the administration of the group homes smoothly, and even then, the development of a second facility is nearly approximate to the pains, energy, and time required for the first.

The twenty shelter homes should be developed at a rate of ten each year for the first two years and, dependent upon further consideration of need, ten each year after that for the subsequent three year period. At the end of five years, that would give the Region eighty-two beds, seemingly sufficient for current needs.

Two of the group homes could be located in the metropolitan area of Olympia; one in the area of Chehalis, and one in the area of Shelton. Each of them should be relatively easily accessible to each of the three jurisdictions. The twenty shelter/foster homes will be developed where persons are interested, and this would generally lie around the more populated centers of each county. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT AN L.E.A.A. GRANT BE APPLIED FOR TO PROVIDE THE SERVICES OF A SPECIALIZED JUVENILE COUNSELOR FOR RECRUITMENT, TRAINING, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE REGIONAL FOSTER CARE FOR DELINQUENTS PROGRAM.

The following statements will be both recommendations and guidelines for further consideration by the Regional Council and Court Directors in deliberating the means by which these programs may be established and funded. It is essential that the effort be spearheaded by key identifiable figures who will provide the leadership toward community awareness and campaign fund resources within the community. Their leadership, whether honorary or real, should be geared to a small task force of very committed and dedicated bright people who will pull together all of the resources identified and pursue all avenues suggested by this report and others. Persons such as those serving on the T.Y.S.S. Board and the Kiwanis Board, the judiciary, a legislator, county commissioner, and direct service personnel should be involved in the task force, each of whom will accept responsibility for attainment of specific objectives in the various areas.

Earlier recommendations related to possible changes in law or regulations in regard to the Department of Social and Health Services' policies on funding group home and foster home programs for the delinquent. Some of their definitions and policies do, in fact, seem to include the delinquent population and none of them apparently, categorically, deny programs to the delinquent. Receiving home care is defined as "emergency and/or temporary foster home care resulting from a family crisis or prior juvenile court adjudication." This is care in a home specified for this purpose and the placement is for a limited time. Nothing in the definition deters placement

of a delinquent child.

Eligibility requirements for foster care (AFDC-FC) are such that a child must be under the age of eighteen and be a resident of the State and the child must: 1) have been removed from his home as a result of a judicial determination that he is neglected or in hazardous circumstances; 2) have been placed in a licensed foster family home or have been placed in a non-profit licensed group home or child care institution; 3) have received AFDC in/or for the month in which the court proceedings were initiated or have been eligible for AFDC, had application been made, for the month in which the court action was initiated or within the six months prior to this action; 4) be in the legal custody of DSHS or be a child for whom DSHS is responsible as is attested by Court Order. This fourth regulation would seem to indicate that the Juvenile Courts can, in fact, commit to DSHS delinquent children for such foster care or group home care as would be appropriate. It does not appear that the delinquent is left out under this consideration in the foster care program. It may be that there is a requirement to qualify under the poverty status. However, once qualified, it appears there is no reason that DSHS would not be held responsible for payment for group home or foster home care for the delinquent.

L.E.A.A. grants, as spoken to earlier in the State Comprehensive Plan for alternatives to family living, provide for monies in 1975, 1976, 1977, and 1978. The clarification concerning DSHS delinquent payment policy must be cleared before grants will be made by L.E.A.A.

THE REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL MUST INCLUDE IN THEIR PRIORITY PROGRAMS, GROUP AND FOSTER HOMES UNDER PROGRAM AREA C-1 SO THAT THEY WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE STATE PLAN FOR 1975 AND ADDITIONAL ONES FOR THE YEARS IN THE FUTURE.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Youth Development, has programs available and financial assistance to groups wanting to establish runaway houses. THE THURSTON YOUTH SERVICES SOCIETY SHOULD APPLY TO H.E.W. FOR A RUNAWAY HOUSE GRANT.

Title IV of the federal Social Security Act provides funding for services to eligible recipients. Evidently, this one has not been tapped by the State in large amounts even though it is applicable to eligible recipients who are delinquent. It will fund direct residential services and counseling services. THE COURT DIRECTORS SHOULD ESTABLISH THE NUMBERS OF YOUTH WHO ARE DELINQUENT AND WHO ARE WITHIN THE POVERTY LEVELS AND APPLY TO CONTRACT WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES FOR FINANCIAL AID TO SUPPORT COUNSELING AND OTHER DIRECT SERVICES.

The federal aid to education bill has provided the State with funds on a matching basis to permit "excess cost" associated with specialized residential or other educational programming for youth who are not educable in the local school systems. The handicapping conditions required for eligibility may be delinquency and other identifiable handicaps. THE COURT DIRECTORS AND REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL SHOULD SEEK TO DETERMINE IF THE STATE HAS TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF A FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION PROGRAMMING IN THIS AREA AND DETERMINE BY WHAT MECHANISM CHILDREN WITH SPECIALIZED PROBLEMS CAN BE IDENTIFIED AND PLACED IN APPROPRIATE SERVICES.

Federal guidelines for revenue sharing detail, specifically, programs for delinquent youth. Full advantage ought to be taken of the revenue sharing funds which have been made available to the State and the counties. Lewis County gained \$996,000 revenue sharing in 1973; Mason County gained \$268,000 in revenue sharing in 1973; and Thurston County received \$523,000 in revenue sharing in 1973. If the counties followed the guidelines and appropriated funds to the Juvenile Courts, the courts or the counties could contract with private group homes and foster homes for placement. THE COURT DIRECTORS SHOULD EXPLORE REVENUE SHARING AS A MEANS BY WHICH TO CONTRACT FOR ALTERNATE LIVING SITUATIONS.

The State Subsidy Program is twofold in that the counties may elect to have staff paid for in full or receive monies for those youth who are not institutionalized for the purchase of specialized services on a contractual basis. THE REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL AND THE COURT DIRECTORS, WITH THE JUDICIARY, SHOULD SEEK TO RECEIVE INCREASED BLOCKS OF DOLLAR ALLOCATION FROM THE SUBSIDY PROGRAM WITH WHICH TO CONTRACT, NOT SIMPLY FOR SPECIFIC SERVICES, BUT FOR FOSTER HOME AND GROUP HOME CARE. A close look at the law establishing the Subsidy Program may reveal that this type of program is within the principle and concept of the Subsidy Program.

The Y.M.C.A. in the cities of Baltimore and Philadelphia have developed, within their own physical structures, a group home setting on a contract basis with the State or local agency responsible for delinquency. The Y.M.C.A. may be a viable resource for such a program development since it is within their national scope. THE TASK FORCE OR COURT DIRECTORS SHOULD EXPLORE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE Y.M.C.A. WOULD BE INTERESTED IN REPLICATING VIABLE PROGRAMS ALREADY IN PLACE IN OTHER MAJOR CITIES.

The Kiwanis-sponsored ranch has experience and is a viable administrative reality which could be utilized for expansion into other group homes. The Kiwanis program should be a part and partial of planning for future group home care and, in particular, could be utilized to develop a network of foster care homes with its already established administrative and logistical structure. THE KIWANIS BOYS RANCH, BOARD AND STAFF, SHOULD BE REQUESTED TO DEVELOP A NETWORK OF FOSTER CARE FAMILIES FOR DELINQUENT YOUTH SUPPORTED BY AN L.E.A.A. GRANT FOR PERSONNEL TO ACCOMPLISH SAME.

The Thurston Youth Services Society Program is currently struggling to maintain its own program, but otherwise has the wherewithal and the leadership to accomplish more when it is stabilized. The same recommendation as made above for the Kiwanis would be applicable to this group.

The League of Women Voters, nationally, has adopted a program centered around juvenile justice. This group has engendered a great deal of enthusiasm in program development. The League, by virtue of the leadership of the Task Force, should be encouraged to set objectives and goals for itself in the accomplishment of tasks related to group home development.

The Rotary Club and the Jaycees are other national organizations which have sponsored various group home and foster care programs in different parts of the country. Each of these groups, as well as the Moose, Elks, and other

service organizations, should be encouraged to follow their national leadership in this area and sponsor a committee whose task would be in consonance with the efforts of the overall task force in the development of group homes and foster care.

Various churches, on the local and national level, have been involved directly in sponsoring and/or operating group home programs. Luthern Social Services operates several programs of this nature for the delinquent child.

The Federated Womens' Clubs of America have also adopted juvenile justice as their project for the two-year period through 1976. They have a specialized program in Juvenile Court termed "Court Watchers." Leaders from this group should be involved in the Task Force and should be encouraged to develop similar programs as in Michigan and Maryland toward the end of greater resources available for youth.

The local Committee of the Seventies of Olympia appears to be a viable resource for leadership and active participation and should be tapped for personnel to work toward the goals.

There are probably many more groups and many more ideas to be generated once the Task Force and its leadership design strategy. Some of the recommendations made earlier in the report are, however, very essential to the fruitful use of the community's efforts toward group homes and foster care for delinquents.

Whether to build or to rent is always a question. The Consultants are advised that the fire regulations for the State of Washington are such that renovation of a home which exists is out of the question. Therefore, a requirement has been that homes are built anew. This is an incredible misuse of funds and only exacerbates the time between developing the idea of a group home and its completion. While, in the best of all possible worlds, building a group home dream house is ideal, the need to provide services to the delinquent youngster is more immediate. If the State fire regulations have, in fact, a regulation concerning group homes—which the Consultants seriously doubt—and it prohibits renovation of the homes, the regulation should be viewed with a critical eye and recommendations for change should be made. In view of such circumstances regarding such fire and/or health codes, it is recommended that a sub-committee of the Task Force review for legislative recommendations at the county or State level, the adoption of codes and regulations which would permit the utilization of existing facilities with proper health and fire safety standards.

One way to alleviate some of the problems inherent in renovating old facilities and also deter the cost involved in construction of a building is the use of modular homes. Modular home plans have been developed in various states to suit the needs of eight to ten youngsters in a group home setting. For the purposes of group homes or parent/foster home programs, modular homes can be useful. It is recommended that the Task Force explore the possibility of land being donated by the city, by the county, by the private citizens' groups, or a private citizen alone. A modular home can be constructed and made a community affair.

## IX. MASON COUNTY FACILITIES

The Consultants during their visit were able to observe the operation in Mason County from a programmatic and physical standpoint. It becomes obvious that the program and services delivery with integrity to the people of Mason County is severely undermined by the current staff quarters. Not even the essential rights to privacy can be maintained in sensitive matters to families and children who come before the Juvenile Court. The county must be committed to effective programming for juveniles to avoid the exacerbated costs which result when left unattended and later criminal careers develop. The costs to the county in court time alone for juveniles who become adult criminals overrides the minimal cost involved in providing adequate services while they are under the age of eighteen and are susceptible to various treatment modalities. The Director of Court Services for Mason County has plans well laid out for provision of effective services to the youth in Mason County, but he will be limited by the deficiencies in administrative and logistical support provided by the county. The staff quarters should be based on an approximation of 150 square feet per employee.

The architectural plans for remodeling of the existing court house and construction of a new Law and Justice Building appear adequate for staff with the exception that the elevator which would bring youngsters from the holding rooms is positioned behind the solid walls of the courtroom which requires children coming off the elevator and heading for the court services staff offices to walk all the way around the entirety of the courtroom, past the jury rooms, a courtroom, two hallways, the library, and multi-purpose room before entering the probation staff offices. To avoid that, the wall between the holding room and the legal office immediately adjacent to the elevator would need to be relocated.

By far, the most serious facility deficiency exists in the present courthouse for the temporary holding of juveniles pending court action on a given day and often used overnight. The facility is so bad that it has been closed by the Court Director for some time and all children are transported to the Thurston County Youth Services Center. With respect to the Juvenile Code in the State of Washington, were any child to be held in the courthouse facility for any length of time, it is probable that a suit by the Attorney General's Office against the County would close it down immediately as being in direct conflict with the intent and spirit of the State Code.

The architectural configuration of the proposed plan provides enough cell space and day room space, but its location next to the violent criminal offender cell block for women, leaves much to be desired. Certainly within the space provided at that end of the third floor, a better arrangement could be made with proper utilization of space by combining the boys and girls day room. This might give space enough for a small class activities room. With no more than four to five children being held at a given time, with staff in the immediate area, in such a small special area there is not a great need for such wide separation of boys and girls as there seems to be with wasted space resulting in the current proposal.

The Consultants recommend, with respect to staff office conditions, that immediate steps be taken to rent appropriate space to the purpose of the Court Services Program in the building near the courthouse.

In relation to the facilities, the County should condemn immediately the use of the cell blocks in the Courthouse for any purpose at any time and provide, if necessary, twenty-four-hour-a-day transportation to the Thurston County Youth Services Center. Speedy development of the new construction plan would alleviate both problems.

SUMMARY

The Consultant agreed that the whole framework for the development of additional programs for youth, particularly group homes and foster care homes for delinquents, is in place. With concentrated leadership and division of labor around tasks as outlined by the Technical Assistance Survey, such programming should have no serious blockage. So long as the goals are set out clearly and the tasks alined in priority order as to the pieces having to fall into place, i.e., legislative action before hiring of counselor staff, and the strategy is maped out with particular objectives in relation to current resources, the ends of developing foster care programs and group home programs will readily come into sight.

**END**