June, 2016

Risk and Protection Profile for Substance Abuse Prevention in Washington Communities:

Lamont

Whitman County



:2016

Research & Data Analysis Division

Vera Barga, B.S.

Irina V. Sharkova, Ph.D.

David Mancuso, Ph.D.

in conjunction with the

Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery

Chris Imhoff, Director

Washington State Department of Social & Health Services

RDA Research & Data Analysis Division

These tables provide a comprehensive update of data published in previous *Profiles* . They are among the timeliest data available to planners for understanding the risks of substance abuse among youth in their communities. Community, family, peer, and school-related factors are presented within the Hawkins and Catalano risk and protective factor framework that is used by many substance abuse prevention planners across the country.

These data are reported by the lowest geography available for each indicator, beginning with school districts, followed by the locale, county, and state levels of geography.
Locales are single school districts or groups of school districts. If school districts are grouped into a single locale, the following rules were used:

i. The total population within the grouping had to be at least 20,000 people.
ii. The school districts grouped were part of a single Educational Service District.
iii. The school districts grouped were similar in character (for example, they had similar proportions of students receiving school lunches).

For more information about the data, framework, definitions, and other topics, see the 1997 *Profile on Risk and Protection for Substance Abuse Prevention Planning in Washington State*, (Report 4.15-40). That report and subsequent years' Profiles are available on the RDA website at: https://www.dshs.wa.gov/sesa/rda/core-profile-archive.

Lamont

Table of contents: **(Resize document window to access navigation tabs)**

Cover page

Introduction

Interpreting Indicator Profiles:
Interpreting Annual Trend Charts:

Indicator Comparison Profiles: (A comparison of standardized five-year rates at county, locale, and school district levels by domain, factor, and indicator)

1. Indicator Profile 1
2. Indicator Profile 2
3. Indicator Profile 3
4. Indicator Profile 4

Community:

5. Availability of Drugs
6. Extreme Economic & Social Deprivation
7. Transitions & Mobility
8. Antisocial Behavior of Community Adults
9. Low Neighborhood Attachment and Community Disorganization

Family:

10. Family Problems

Schools:

11. Academic Achievement
12. School Climate

Individual/Peer:

13. Early Criminal Justice Involvement

Problem Outcomes:

14. Child and Family Health
15. Criminal Justice
16. Substance Use

Appendices

17. Technical Notes
18. Understanding Locales
19. Populations Subtracted for Police Agencies not Reporting Arrests to UCR
20. Police Agencies that did not Report Arrests to UCR

This school district is associated with the county in which it is located and the locale(*) to which the district has been assigned. A locale covers an area large enough to provide a stable population for rates and minimize the choppiness caused by small number issues. The locale and the district areas are the same for districts of sufficient size. For districts too small to get reliable rates for analysis, the locale grouping can provide a helpful picture of your areas progress and a way to compare your area to other larger districts. Your locale contains the districts most like your district which share your geographic area, in essence, your neighbors in the prevention effort. *(*) To learn more about locales, see Technical Notes, section/tab "Understanding Locales."*

School District: Lamont
County: Whitman County

Locale 13

County District Code	School District	County	District Population (Census 2010)	Total Locale Population (Census 2010)
38039	Colfax S.D.	Whitman County	3,989	12,891
38041	Colton S.D.	Whitman County	1,105	
38069	Endicott S.D.	Whitman County	545	
38083	Garfield S.D.	Whitman County	789	
38115	Lacrosse S.D.	Whitman County	678	
38120	Lamont S.D.	Whitman County	177	
38167	Oakesdale S.D.	Whitman County	837	
38185	Palouse S.D.	Whitman County	1,391	
38216	Rosalia S.D.	Whitman County	1,088	
38240	St John S.D.	Whitman County	1,070	
38246	Steptoe S.D.	Whitman County	280	
38255	Tekoa S.D.	Whitman County	942	



The Indicator Profile compares rates for County, Locale, and School District to the state. The Profile displays *standardized scores* to allow comparison between indicators. See Technical Notes for a definition of a standardized score.



Understanding the CORE Trend Charts and Tables

The presentation of risk factor data in the CORE reports is organized by domain (Community, Family, School, and Individual/Peer) and by risk factor within domains. Each risk factor may include one or more indicators

These data are reported by school district with comparisons to the county and locales for that district. Locales are single school districts or groups of school districts. If school districts are grouped into a single locale, the following rules were used:

i. The total population within the grouping had to be at least 20,000 people.
ii. The school districts grouped were part of a single Educational Service District.
iii. The school districts grouped were similar in character (for example, they had similar proportions of students receiving school lunches).

To see the school districts included into your locale, go to the tab "Community Definition." You may want to check out CORE reports prepared for these school districts and their counties.

Please note these IMPORTANT ISSUES:

The tabs are labeled with the name of the risk factor. Each risk factor may in turn include several indicators. Be sure to **scroll down the page** to review all of the available indicators for a given risk factor. The workbook is designed to print with one indicator on each page.

Understanding the chart scales:

Users should be careful to interpret the chart scales correctly. The chart scales are automatically adjusted to enhance differences between the indicators. Users should consider whether the differences they observe between geographic areas or across years are significant. The unit of measurement is displayed at the left of each chart scale. Often the unit of measurement is a rate expressed as the number of events or a count of individuals per 100 population (or, "percent"), or sometimes per 1,000 or 100,000 population.

Review the example:

On the following page (below, scroll down) is an example indicator for Alcohol Retail Licenses in "Your District" . The number of alcohol retail licenses is expressed as a rate per 1,000 population.

Each risk factor may include several indicators, so **remember** to page down. For example, the risk factor *Availability of Drugs* has two indicators: Alcohol Retail Licenses (shown below) and Tobacco Retail And Vending Machine Licenses.

Alcohol Retail Licenses

Pay close attention to these scales. The **differences** between the rates may appear more or less important depending on the scale used.

Rate Per 1,000

This is the factor. Different rates use different factors- some per 100 (percent), 1,000 or 100,000.



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	1.55	1.67	1.89	1	2.07	1.91	1.89	1.78	1.66	1.59
Cascadia County	2.12	2.06	2.03		00	1.98	1.96	1.91	1.91	1.91
Locale 999	3.27	3.12	NR		96	2.88	2.77	3.17	3.17	3.17
My School District	5.08	5.23	NR		86	4.99	4.32	5.93	5.85	5.89
Licenses	32	34	35		35	35	31	43	43	43
All Persons	6,295	6,497	6,703	6,899	7,198	7,012	7,177	7,250	7,350	7,298

A suppression code is listed for suppressed rates. These codes are explained in Technical Notes. Be aware that these values can seem to indicate a zero value.

Note: The rates are the annual number of alcohol retail licenses active during the year, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Retail licenses include restaurants, grocery stores, and wine shops but do not include state liquor stores and agencies. Retail alcohol facilities on military bases and reservations are not licensed by the State and therefore are not included in these data. Policies on licensing distributors, taxing the proceeds, and determining who can sell alcohol varies substantially from state to state. Consequently, there is no consistent comparable source for national data. Data from 1999 to present is now geocoded from the facility address, rather than apportioned from zip code. This results in a more accurate, but different data total per county.

State Source: Washington State Liquor Control Board, Annual Operations Report
Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Each indicator graph is followed by data source and rate definitions as well as any special information for the data.

Updated 1/27/2015

When the newest data was added.

--Rate Formula--

Rate = (numerator / denominator) x factor

Example in 2003: (32 / 6,295) x 1,000 = 5.08

Read the rate as *5.08 licenses per 1,000 people*.

Domain/Factor	Indicators
Community Domain	
Availability of Drugs	Alcohol Retail Licenses
	Tobacco Retail and Vending Machine Licenses
Extreme Family Economic Deprivation	Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP)
	Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Child Recipients
	Unemployed Persons (Age 16+)
Transitions and Mobility	Free or Reduced Price Lunch Eligibility
	Net Migration
	Existing Home Sales
Antisocial Behavior of Community Adults	New Residence Construction
	Alcohol- or Drug-Related Deaths
	Clients of State-Funded Alcohc or Drug Services (Age 18+)
	Arrests, Alcohol-Related (Age 18+)
	Arrests, Drug Law Violation (Age 18+)
	Arrests, Violent Crime (Age 18+)



Domain/Factor	Indicators	Whitman County	Locale 13	Lamont
Community Domain (continued)				
Low Neighborhood Attachment and Community Disorganization	Prisoners in State Correctiona Systems (Age 18+)	-0.76		
	Population Not Registered to Vote	2.29		
	Registered and Not Voting in the November Election	-0.51		
Family Domain				
Family Problems	Divorce	-3.03		
	Victims of Child Abuse and Neglect in Accepted Referrals	-0.26	0.32	-0.84
School Domain				
Academic Achievement	Poor Academic Performance, Grade 10 (Age 15)	-1.70	-0.55	
	Poor Academic Performance, Grade 7 (Age 12)	-1.22	-0.44	0.89
	Poor Academic Performance, Grade 4 (Age 9)	-1.17	-0.63	
	High school Cohort (Cumulative) Dropouts	-1.14	-1.55	-1.76
	Annual (Event) Dropouts	-0.79	-1.57	
Academic Achievement: Protective Factors	On-time Graduation	1.42	1.66	
	Extended Graduation	1.15	1.50	

lower state rate higher

Beginning with the Dec. 2015 report series, On-time and Extended Graduation are shown as protective factors. In previous reports, standardized rates above indicated a negative factor: risk of not graduating (see Technical Notes for details).

Domain/Factor	Indicators	Whitman County	Locale 13	Lamont
School Domain (Continued)				
School Climate	Weapons Incidents at School	-1.46	-1.56	-1.36
	Unexcused Absence	-1.66	-1.15	-0.93
Individual/Peer Domain				
Early Criminal Justice Involvement	Arrests, Alcohol- or Drug-Related (Age 10-14)	-0.19	0.16	
	Arrests, Vandalism (Age 10-14)	0.71	1.33	
	Total Arrests (Age 10-14)	0.94	0.93	
Problem Outcomes				
Child and Family Health	Child Injury and Accident Hospitalizations	-0.09	1.86	
	Infant Mortality (Under 1 Year)	-0.25	1.65	
	Child Mortality (Ages 1-17)	0.13	1.91	-0.51
	Births to School-Age (10-17) Mothers	-0.97	-1.04	
	Sexually Transmitted Disease Cases (Birth-19)	0.73		
	Suicide and Suicide Attempts (Age 10-17)	0.42	1.18	
	Low Birth Weight Babies	-0.56	0.78	
	Women Injury and Accident Hospitalizations	-0.09	1.61	

lower state rate higher

Domain/Factor	Indicators
Problem Outcomes	
Criminal Justice	Offenses, Domestic Violence
	Total Arrests, (Age 10-17)
	Arrests, Property Crime (Age 10-14)
	Arrests, Property Crime (Age 10-17)
	Arrests, Property Crime (Age 18+)
	Arrests, Violent Crime (Age 10-17)
Substance Use	Alcohol-Related Traffic Fatalities Per All Traffic Fatalities
	Arrests, Alcohol Violation (Age 10-17)
Note: Check other Domains for substance use of community adults and early teens.	Arrests, Drug Law Violation (Age 10-17)
	Clients of State-Funded Alcohol or Drug Services (Age 10-17)



Alcohol Retail Licenses



	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
State	1.96	1.96	1.94	1.95	1.96	1.98	2.15	2.03	2.22	2.20	2.23	2.21
Whitman County	1.68	1.83	1.92	1.99	1.92	1.96	2.05	1.90	1.98	1.98	2.02	1.99
Locale 13	2.47	2.84	3.09	3.29	3.08	3.20	3.34	2.79	2.87	2.86	3.00	2.92
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Licenses	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
All Persons	219	190	187	182	182	178	177	186	186	187	187	185

Note: The alcohol retail licenses active during the year, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Retail licenses include restaurants, grocery stores, and wine shops but do not include state liquor stores and agencies. Retail alcohol facilities on military bases and reservations are not licensed by the State and therefore are not included in these data. Policies on licensing distributors, taxing the proceeds, and determining who can sell alcohol vary substantially from state to state. Data from 1999 to present is now geocoded from the facility address, rather than apportioned from zip code. This results in a more accurate, but different data total per county.

State Source: Washington State Liquor Control Board, Annual Operations Report
Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
4/21/2016

Tobacco Retail and Vending Machine Licenses



	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
State	1.32	1.27	1.13	1.27	1.11	1.00	1.02	1.01	0.94	0.94	0.90	0.89
Whitman County	1.13	1.15	0.97	1.02	1.01	0.87	0.89	0.83	0.85	0.81	0.82	0.81
Locale 13	1.96	2.08	1.78	1.96	2.08	1.64	1.63	1.47	1.47	1.39	1.39	1.38
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Licenses	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Persons	219	190	187	182	182	178	177	186	186	187	187	185

Note: The tobacco retailer and vending machine licenses active during the year, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Tobacco retailers on military bases and reservations are not licensed by the State and therefore are not included in these data. Tobacco sales licenses include tobacco retailer licenses (stores that sell tobacco products) and tobacco vending machines.

State Source: Department of Health (from the Department of Licensing), Tobacco Prevention Program, Tobacco Statistics
Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
4/21/2016

Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP)



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	10.35	11.25	11.92	12.11	12.07	12.60	15.11	18.00	20.44	21.35	21.45	20.95
Whitman County	6.55	7.37	7.77	7.78	7.96	7.58	8.34	9.07	10.59	11.37	11.78	11.72
Locale 13	9.91	10.29	11.07	11.40	11.86	10.95	11.99	14.14	15.46	16.93	17.89	18.19
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Recipients	21	28	21	21	23	26	20	27	27	31	42	40
All Persons	219	219	190	187	182	182	178	177	186	186	187	187

Note: Persons (all ages) receiving Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP), formally called food stamps in the fiscal year, per 100 persons (all ages). Suppression code definitions for yearly rates and a comparison of economic indicators are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis, Automated Client Eligibility System and Warrant Roll. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
9/24/2015

Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Child Recipients



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	10.27	10.43	10.18	9.74	8.97	8.78	9.72	10.28	10.98	9.58	8.24	7.40
Whitman County	6.36	6.71	6.57	5.66	5.74	5.02	5.83	5.31	6.18	5.36	4.72	4.23
Locale 13	6.95	7.24	7.87	7.25	6.88	5.96	6.26	5.95	5.78	5.68	5.38	5.15
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
TANF Children	4	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1
Children, birth-17	63	62	48	48	44	44	40	40	42	43	45	46

Note: The children (age birth-17) participating in Aid to Families (AFDC/TANF) programs in the fiscal year, per 100 children (age birth-17). The population used is for the calendar year which ends the fiscal period. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Research and Data Analysis, Automated Client Eligibility System and Warrant Roll. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated

9/24/2015

Unemployed Persons (Age 16+)



	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
State	6.26	5.53	4.99	4.54	5.34	8.90	9.61	9.17	8.16	7.01	6.24	5.65
Whitman County	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.87	4.10	5.37	6.10	6.60	6.28	6.18	5.52	4.67

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: The persons (age 16 and over) per 100 persons in the civilian labor force. Unemployed persons are individuals who are currently available for work have actively looked for work, and do not have a job. The civilian labor force includes persons who are working or looking for work. The monthly numbers are a snapshot in time done approximately the 12th of each month. A yearly estimate is then produced by averaging the monthly numbers. Historical data has been updated. The last year of data should be considered preliminary. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Employment Security Department, Labor Market and Economic Analysis, County Unemployment File

Updated
4/27/2016

Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch



	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
State	37.11	37.65	36.84	38.01	39.04	42.22	43.75	45.17	45.87	45.50	45.60	44.51
Whitman County	31.31	30.30	31.59	32.29	31.91	31.99	33.64	34.55	35.34	33.75	35.37	34.60
Locale 13	36.73	35.60	38.42	40.50	39.84	40.26	40.73	42.08	43.18	40.96	43.97	40.97
Lamont	56.76	66.67	54.29	71.88	59.38	SN	SN	SN	SN	62.50	48.39	59.38
Eligible Students	21	24	19	23	19	19	10	12	17	20	15	19
Enrolled Students	37	36	35	32	32	26	19	20	27	32	31	32

Note: The students eligible for free or reduced price lunch per 100 students enrolled. Eligibility requirements are discussed in Technical Notes.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

Updated
5/11/2016

Net Migration



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	5.45	7.57	8.59	13.01	9.69	6.29	3.33	1.73	0.85	1.76	4.09	7.10
Whitman County	2.37	13.40	15.04	3.68	-6.03	23.74	-5.75	12.82	-3.84	21.16	-4.27	6.70

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: Net migration is the annual number of new residents that moved into an area minus the number of residents that moved out of an area, per 1,000 persons. The Office of Financial Management estimates annual net migration for twelve months ending on March 31st of a given year. For example, annual net migration in 2009 refers to the period from April 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009. Previously Net migration was calculated as a 3-year moving average which smooths changes over time. Now, annual rates, numerators and denominators are based on single-year data.

State Source: Office of Financial Management, Net Migration Data

Updated
9/4/2015

Existing Home Sales



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	22.36	23.97	25.34	22.52	18.50	12.94	12.71	12.62	12.92	11.67	13.62	12.89
Whitman County	13.17	13.91	16.58	15.89	13.96	8.69	8.67	7.37	8.72	6.54	8.71	8.18

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: The previously-owned homes sold, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Previously-owned homes sold is rounded to the tens. Existing homes sold are estimated based on data from multiple listing services, firms that monitor deeds, and local Realtors associations. Adjustments were made by the data provider to remove refinanced, rather than sold homes from the counts of sales.

State Source: Washington Center for Real Estate Research, Washington State University, Washington State's Housing Market: A Supply/Demand Assessment. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated

8/11/2015

New Residence Construction



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	7.07	8.18	8.53	7.83	7.29	4.38	2.55	3.08	1.94	2.42	2.67	2.57
Whitman County	6.20	7.79	10.52	8.04	7.05	2.38	1.80	2.01	0.74	1.53	2.18	1.61

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: The new building permits issued for single and multi-family dwellings, per 1,000 persons (all ages). Each unit in a multi-family dwelling (for example, each apartment in a building) has a separate building permit.

State Source: Washington Center for Real Estate Research, Washington State University, Washington State's Housing Market: A Supply/Demand Assessment. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
8/11/2015

Alcohol- or Drug-Related Deaths



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	10.16	11.08	10.11	11.69	11.78	11.68	12.43	12.45	12.70	12.80	10.80	13.12
Whitman County	6.57	6.57	8.13	8.91	9.62	8.17	11.66	9.82	8.94	8.44	8.49	11.24
Locale 13	4.86	6.72	8.78	8.21	9.30	9.16	8.63	9.77	9.42	7.97	7.86	12.50
Lamont	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
AOD-related	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Deaths	1	1	2	3	0	2	1	1	1	3	3	2

Note: The deaths, with alcohol- or drug-related causes, per 100 deaths. Evaluation is based on all contributory causes of death for direct and indirect associations with alcohol and drug abuse. For a complete explanation of the codes and methods used please see Technical Notes: Counting Alcohol- or Drug-related Deaths. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Rates are not reported when fewer than 100 deaths occurred in an area.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Death Certificate Data File

Updated
10/12/2015

Clients of State-Funded Alcohol or Drug Services (Age 18+)



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	11.82	11.98	12.73	13.39	13.52	13.84	14.35	14.33	13.43	12.86	12.04	12.13
Whitman County	5.98	5.87	6.30	6.44	6.30	6.15	5.63	5.65	5.21	4.04	2.27	2.45
Locale 13	8.09	7.85	9.61	10.87	9.54	7.77	7.10	8.15	7.79	5.76	2.97	4.13
Lamont	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.25	7.25	0.00	6.94	6.99	7.04
Admits, 18+	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
Persons, 18+	156	157	157	142	138	138	138	138	137	144	143	142

Note: The adults (age 18 and over) receiving state-funded alcohol or drug services, per 1,000 adults. Counts of adults are unduplicated so that those receiving services more than once during the year are only counted once for that year. State-funded services include treatment, assessment, and detox. Persons in Department of Corrections treatment programs are not included.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery, Treatment and Assessment Report Generation Tool (TARGET). Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/6/2014

Arrests (Age 18+), Alcohol-Related



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	11.80	11.75	10.56	10.67	10.38	9.62	9.87	9.31	9.43	7.29	6.72	6.03
Whitman County	22.96	24.50	22.64	25.03	21.77	21.14	24.44	20.90	19.71	10.53	13.93	13.51
Locale 13	7.01	10.11	11.52	13.28	11.41	8.72	8.60	8.47	5.52	3.16	11.36	9.82
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 18+	2	2	3	4	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2
Adjusted Pop 18+	157	157	142	138	138	138	138	137	133	143	142	141

Note: The alcohol violations (age 18+), per 1,000 adults (age 18+). Alcohol violations include all crimes involving driving under the influence, liquor law violations, and drunkenness. DUI arrests by the Washington State Patrol are included in the state trend analysis. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR/NIBRS. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Arrests (Age 18+), Drug Law Violation



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	5.78	5.31	5.34	6.35	6.16	5.08	4.60	4.39	4.56	2.35	2.23	2.17
Whitman County	4.46	6.29	4.99	8.86	6.75	5.95	6.95	5.92	8.24	4.21	3.17	2.85
Locale 13	2.27	5.43	7.02	4.94	3.71	4.92	4.35	3.72	4.07	3.38	4.02	3.80
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 18+	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Adjusted Pop 18+	157	157	142	138	138	138	138	137	133	143	142	141

Note: The arrests of adults (age 18+) for drug law violations, per 1,000 adults (age 18+). Drug law violations include all crimes involving sale, manufacturing, and possession of drugs. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to WASPC. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Arrests (Age 18+), Violent Crime



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	1.58	1.59	1.56	1.53	1.52	1.46	1.62	1.57	1.63	1.45	1.51	1.47
Whitman County	0.57	0.65	0.65	0.58	0.27	0.11	0.27	0.29	0.26	0.13	0.99	0.71
Locale 13	0.52	1.06	1.54	1.32	0.40	0.37	0.21	0.21	0.39	0.11	2.72	1.45
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 18+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Adjusted Pop 18+	157	157	142	138	138	138	138	137	133	143	142	141

Note: The arrests of adults (age 18+) for violent crime per 1,000 adults (age 18+). Violent crimes include all crimes involving criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Simple assault is not defined as a violent crime. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to WASPC. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Prisoners in State Correctional Systems (Age 18+)



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	198.09	291.89	346.64	366.62	411.27	403.04	400.08	400.37	367.85	401.63	465.70	470.68
Whitman County	60.98	43.16	40.84	37.96	61.50	48.04	50.19	58.07	37.99	32.69	23.94	45.22

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: The adult (age 18 and over) admissions to prison, per 100,000 persons (all ages). Admissions include new admissions, re-admissions, community custody inmate violations, and parole violations. Counts of admissions are duplicated so that individuals admitted to prison more than once in a year are counted each time they are admitted. The admissions are attributed to the area where the conviction occurred. In 2003 prisoners being electronically monitored are included in the data. This causes a jump in numbers for counties which use this incarceration option. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Corrections, Inmates File. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
8/14/2015

Population Not Registered to Vote



	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
State	24.49	29.08	32.87	33.61	27.84	29.66	29.98	29.55	25.54	26.19	27.05	27.18
Whitman County	39.04	43.36	49.20	47.92	44.42	47.84	49.71	50.63	45.04	45.83	49.73	47.60

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: The persons not registered to vote in the November elections, per 100 adults (age 18 and over). As part of the November Current Population Survey (the Voting and Registration Supplement), the Bureau of the Census collects data on voting and registration in years with presidential or congressional elections (i.e. every other year).

State Source: Office of the Secretary of State, Elections Division, Registered Voters. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
1/22/2016

Registered and Not Voting in the November Election



	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
State	17.81	45.18	35.45	49.96	15.39	49.11	28.76	47.05	18.75	54.73	45.84	61.55
Whitman County	14.30	46.57	26.46	45.06	13.22	44.66	27.77	44.59	18.07	54.44	39.47	55.76

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: The persons registered to vote in the November elections but not voting, per 100 adults (age 18 and over) registered to vote. As part of the November Current Population Survey (the Voting and Registration Supplement), the Bureau of the Census collects data on voting and registration in years with presidential or congressional elections (i.e. every other year).

State Source: Office of the Secretary of State, Elections Division, Registered Voters. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
1/22/2016

Divorce



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	5.53	5.59	5.37	5.08	4.97	4.84	4.89	5.19	5.13	4.90	4.80	4.62
Whitman County	2.67	2.62	3.36	2.70	2.85	2.75	2.45	2.76	2.50	2.26	2.17	2.71

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: The divorces per 1,000 persons (age 15 and over). Divorce includes dissolutions, annulments, and unknown decree types; it does not include legal separations. Divorce data is reported by the woman's residence, if in Washington at the time of decree. If the woman lived outside Washington, the man's residence was used. If both parties residence was unknown the event is not assigned to a county, but is included in the state rate. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Dissolution and Annulment Data. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
8/12/2015

Victims of Child Abuse and Neglect in Accepted Referrals



	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
State	38.06	35.04	34.11	34.01	31.64	32.01	31.81	33.88	34.25	34.37	32.36	31.94
Whitman County	45.23	43.23	41.16	37.83	37.16	40.54	32.64	31.26	27.44	30.70	27.50	30.62
Locale 13	57.67	65.74	64.11	50.75	47.60	59.17	51.46	42.50	36.08	41.53	34.54	35.41
Lamont	32.26	20.83	62.50	136.36	159.09	75.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.44	43.48	0.00
Accepted Victims	2	1	3	6	7	3	0	0	0	2	2	0
Persons, birth-17	62	48	48	44	44	40	40	42	43	45	46	45

Note: The children (age birth-17) identified as victims in reports to Child Protective Services that were accepted for further action, per 1,000 children (age birth-17). Children are counted more than once if they are reported as a victim more than once during the year. A "referral" is a report of suspected child abuse which may have multiple listed victims. Numbers may differ due to corrections or changes in location definition made in the database extraction process. Child location is derived from the residence at the time of referral. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Children's Administration, FamLink Data Warehouse. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
2/1/2016

Poor Academic Performance, Grade 10



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	69.78	66.38	72.68	57.50	63.93	62.97	62.80	65.02	75.62	50.86	40.12	31.61
Whitman County	54.40	56.00	61.97	39.77	49.85	49.04	49.84	49.06	60.42	34.67	27.66	21.07
Locale 13	56.63	61.58	61.81	42.86	54.71	60.95	56.10	64.46	69.71	43.31	28.36	26.97
Lamont												
Low Scorers												
Tested, 10th grade												

Note: The students tested who failed one or more content areas as a percent of all students tested at the 10th grade level. Some districts have chosen to test students in both grades 9 and 10 for the 10th grade assessment. All students being tested at the 10th grade level are included in these data regardless of their grade placement. Tests are given in the spring of the year. For example, data for 2008 is for students in the 10th grade during the school year 2007/2008. By contractual agreement data is suppressed when less than ten students were tested to avoid individual student identification.

In 2009-10 the tenth grade WASL was replaced by the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE). This test was built on the same framework as the WASL, but contain fewer questions. It is considered equivalent by OSPI.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Programs, Curriculum and Assessment, Grade 10 Failing In One Or More Content Areas.

Updated
4/14/2014

Poor Academic Performance, Grade 7



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	77.90	72.76	63.80	58.74	60.11	53.91	57.41	58.30	56.42	57.04	49.58	47.83
Whitman County	72.15	63.39	58.38	48.41	53.80	45.24	45.88	48.41	39.60	48.23	42.37	38.04
Locale 13	76.59	68.50	63.90	56.63	60.87	57.38	49.74	53.50	44.20	54.49	46.26	45.10
Lamont	SN	SP	SP	SN	SN		SN	SN	SP	SP	SP	SP
Low Scorers	9	6	6	10	11		9	9	2	7	3	3
Tested, 7th grade	13	9	9	11	15		11	11	7	8	5	5

Note: The students tested who failed one or more content areas as a percent of all students tested at the 7th grade level. Tests are given in the spring of the year. Data for 2008 is for students in the 7th grade during the school year 2007/2008. By contractual agreement data is suppressed when less than ten students were tested to avoid individual student identification.

In 2009-10 the 7th grade WASL was replaced by Measurements of Student Progress (MSP). This test was built on the same framework as the WASL, but contain fewer questions. It is considered equivalent by OSPI.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Programs, Curriculum and Assessment, Grade 7 Failing In One Or More Content Areas.

Updated
4/14/2014

Poor Academic Performance, Grade 4



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	70.86	65.56	56.39	54.79	52.82	54.08	56.47	58.27	59.80	54.96	54.27	51.70
Whitman County	64.45	54.14	51.21	47.44	39.86	38.72	47.56	43.97	50.60	49.56	43.53	35.53
Locale 13	62.43	55.06	54.36	46.67	38.52	46.10	53.95	42.11	58.28	53.47	53.28	34.00
Lamont												
Low Scorers												
Tested, 4th grade												

Note: The students tested who failed one or more content areas as a percent of all students tested at the 4th grade level. Tests are given in the spring of the year. Data for 2008 is for students in the 4th grade during the school year 2007/2008. By contractual agreement data is suppressed when less than ten students were tested to avoid individual student identification.

In 2009-10 the 4th grade WASL was replaced by Measurements of Student Progress (MSP). This test was built on the same framework as the WASL, but contain fewer questions. It is considered equivalent by OSPI.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Programs, Curriculum and Assessment, Grade 4 Failing In One Or More Content Areas.

Updated
4/14/2014

High school Cohort (Cumulative) Dropouts



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State				21.43	21.01	21.39	19.43	17.62	13.93	13.57	12.96	12.31
Whitman County				6.50	8.74	8.17	8.84	6.91	5.54	4.41	4.73	3.80
Locale 13				5.72	8.06	7.86	9.31	6.08	6.49	3.87	7.01	5.81
Lamont				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				

Note: The percent of students dropping out prior to graduation. The High School Cohort Dropout rate (may also be referred to as the longitudinal, cumulative, or freshmen cohort dropout rate) measures what happens to a single group (or cohort) of students over a period of time. This rate is most useful for seeing the long-term impact on the community. The Estimated Cohort (old method) rate formula used data from multiple grades in a single year. The Adjusted Cohort (new method) rate is the number of students in the same freshman cohort dropping out prior to graduation divided by the adjusted freshman class cohort of the graduates. Beginning with the 9-grade cohort due to graduate in the 2010/2011 school year, OSPI has started using the actual cohort of students for their calculations.
For more information on the changes in rate computation and cohort methodology, see the Technical Notes.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington.

Updated
3/25/2015

Annual (Event) Dropouts



	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State						5.69	5.55	5.63	5.10	4.61	4.39	4.13
Whitman County						1.65	2.25	2.10	2.26	1.77	1.54	1.47
Locale 13						1.50	2.00	2.03	2.40	1.51	1.90	1.22
Lamont												
Dropouts						0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students						0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: The Annual Dropout rate measures the proportion of students enrolled in grades 9-12 who drop out in a single year without completing high school as a percentage of all students in grades 9 through 12 that year. When districts try new policies or projects to keep students in school the impact of those actions will be more immediately visible in this rate. This rate is much more time intensive to compute with the new cohort designations for students as it draws information from four separate cohorts. This indicator will have a break in data production while data collection transitions to using the adjusted cohort for most other calculations. The formula for this indicator has not changed.
For more information on the changes in rate computation and cohort methodology, see the Technical Notes.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington.

Updated
3/25/2015

Protective Factor: On-time Graduation



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State				70.45	72.47	72.03	73.53	76.46	76.61	77.18	76.04	77.24
Whitman County				86.70	88.19	89.23	88.19	92.81	90.09	89.53	86.12	90.19
Locale 13				89.01	90.91	91.08	88.62	93.39	90.81	90.97	82.80	90.97
Lamont												

Note: The percent of students who graduate in four years by completion of the graduation requirements. The Adjusted Cohort (new method) rate divides the number of students in the same freshman cohort graduating in their fourth year by the adjusted freshman cohort for those students. In this method there are no adjustments for Special Ed or Limited English students who are expected to take longer, and transfers from out of state or other districts who are credit deficient may not be reclassified into a lower grade. Prior to the 2011 the Estimated Cohort method used a complex formula to estimate the graduation rate from data for multiple grades during the graduation year. The differences in graduation rates from 2010 to 2011 is likely to be due to the change in computation method.

For more information on the changes in rate computation and cohort methodology, see the Technical Notes.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington.

Updated
3/25/2015

Protective Factor: Extended Graduation



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State				75.12	77.47	77.05	79.23	82.62	78.23	78.91	78.81	79.88
Whitman County				90.90	89.72	90.53	89.00	95.05	90.49	91.91	90.59	89.56
Locale 13				89.01	90.91	92.14	88.62	97.10	94.71	92.97	87.26	83.87
Lamont												

Note: The percent of students who graduate including those students who stay in school and take more than four years to complete their degree. The Estimated Cohort (old method) Extended Graduation rate formula is: (the number of on-time and late graduates in the same year)/(the number of on-time graduates divided by the on-time graduation rate). The Adjusted Cohort (new method) rate is the number of students graduating within five years divided by the adjusted freshman cohort for the graduates. The new method does not include graduates after year 5 to the extended graduation rate.

For more information on the changes in rate computation and cohort methodology, see the Technical Notes.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Graduation and Dropout Statistics for Washington.

Updated
3/25/2015

Weapons Incidents in School



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	2.88	2.75	2.96	3.25	3.07	2.92	2.85	2.80	2.66	2.61	2.00	1.89
Whitman County	1.07	1.06	2.41	0.88	1.55	1.54	1.10	0.67	1.77	0.89	0.88	1.75
Locale 13	2.06	0.82	3.89	1.76	1.75	2.64	0.92	0.48	2.41	0.00	0.00	1.52
Lamont	0.00	SN	81.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	SN	SN	SN	SN	0.00
Incidents	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enrollment	34	27	37	36	35	32	32	26	19	20	27	32

Note: The reported incidents involving guns and other weapons at any grade level per 1000 students enrolled in October of all grades.

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Information Services, Safe and Drug-free Schools: Report to the Legislature on Weapons in Schools RCW 28A.320.130

Updated
5/8/2015

Unexcused Absences for Students in Grades 1 to 8



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State			4.53	4.15	4.28	3.91	3.82	3.76	3.61	3.80	4.29	5.13
Whitman County			2.58	0.85	0.75	0.85	0.90	0.55	0.64	0.93	0.47	0.50
Locale 13			4.47	0.73	1.33	1.12	1.37	1.08	1.01	1.87	0.82	0.98
Lamont			0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.55	0.67	0.29	0.26	0.00
Absences			3	0	0	0	3	3	3	1	1	0
Potential Days			4,498	6,364	6,228	5,916	5,676	5,504	4,498	3,460	3,780	5,104

Note: The unexcused absences for students in grades 1-8 per thousand potential school days. Potential school days are the number of days students were taught from the first day of school through May 31 in each school building multiplied by the net served students in grades 1-8 in that building. The definition of an unexcused absence is a local decision, so the definition differs among schools and districts. In general, a student who has an unexcused absence has not attended a majority of hours or periods in a school day, or has not complied with a more restrictive district policy, and has not met the conditions for an excused absence (see RCW 28A.225.020).

State Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, Washington State Report Card, Unexcused Absence Files.

Updated
10/16/2013

Arrests (Age 10-14), Alcohol- or Drug-Related



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	3.07	2.95	2.61	2.63	2.69	2.42	2.44	2.84	2.82	1.98	1.88	1.67
Whitman County	1.01	1.04	4.37	0.00	0.63	0.62	0.00	0.57	1.48	0.00	0.67	6.78
Locale 13	1.97	1.04	6.76	0.00	1.45	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.00	0.00	1.49	11.09
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted Pop 10-14	12	12	10	10	9	12	11	11	10	11	11	11

Note: The arrests of younger adolescents (age 10-14) for alcohol and drug law violations, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-14). Alcohol violations include all crimes involving driving under the influence, liquor law violations, and drunkenness. For children, arrests for liquor law violations are usually arrests for minor in possession. Drug law violations include all crimes involving sale, manufacturing, and possession of drugs.
1) Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR/NIBRS. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.
2) The DUI portion of this measure is likely understated, because arrests made by the State Patrol are not attributable to smaller areas. State Patrol arrests are included in the state rates.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Arrests (Age 10-14), Vandalism



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	2.42	2.39	2.19	2.23	2.36	2.35	1.73	1.64	1.60	1.21	1.03	0.71
Whitman County	4.05	3.11	2.19	1.68	5.02	2.48	1.15	4.00	2.97	0.65	1.34	0.68
Locale 13	4.93	2.08	3.38	2.30	1.45	2.76	0.00	4.78	4.75	1.39	1.49	1.58
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted Pop 10-14	12	12	10	10	9	12	11	11	10	11	11	11

Note: The arrests of younger adolescents (age 10-14) for vandalism (including residence, non-residence, vehicles, venerated objects, police cars, or other) per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-14). Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR/NIBRS. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Total Arrests of Adolescents (Age 10-14)



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	27.87	26.57	23.17	22.08	21.34	19.97	17.76	17.75	16.75	12.42	11.94	11.14
Whitman County	27.86	42.03	34.45	27.48	17.55	8.67	11.46	17.70	20.04	5.81	26.10	38.67
Locale 13	19.70	21.83	20.29	14.96	8.68	9.67	7.12	15.53	12.66	4.16	32.79	49.13
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Adjusted Pop 10-14	12	12	10	10	9	12	11	11	10	11	11	11

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-14) for any crime, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-14).

Washington State has transitioned from Summary UCR to the NIBRS system for reporting. Summary UCR collects eight (8) Part One Crime offenses: criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft and arson. NIBRS collects information on twenty-three (23) different offenses, including all Part One Crimes plus others including forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, fraud, kidnapping, and drug violations. Care must be taken when interpreting the yearly trend of "total arrest" rates for an area. In areas where large amounts of arrests are likely for crimes not previously reported, a substantial increase in total arrests could be expected starting with the 2012 data.

Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to WASPC. For more information, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Injury or Accident Hospitalizations for Children



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	3.33	3.87	4.20	4.02	3.86	3.95	4.07	4.20	4.28	4.47	4.36	4.41
Whitman County	3.40	6.01	4.27	3.54	4.08	2.53	3.25	3.41	4.30	3.55	4.38	5.44
Locale 13	2.75	6.96	6.60	4.21	8.46	3.95	5.99	5.13	7.19	3.14	7.10	11.67
Lamont	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Injuries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Hospitalizations	2	2	5	2	3	2	1	1	3	2	4	5

Note: The child injury or accident hospitalizations as a percent of all hospitalizations for children (age birth-17). Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for areas with less than 100 hospitalizations.

State Source: Department of Health, Office of Hospital and Patient Data Systems, Comprehensive Hospital Abstract Reporting System (CHARS)

Updated
10/9/2015

Infant Mortality (Under 1 Year)



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	567.47	569.11	484.22	467.98	469.87	551.50	484.20	418.20	420.58	479.70	436.67	438.85
Whitman County	1049.87	520.83	261.10	260.42	257.73	0.00	495.05	0.00	508.91	507.61	726.39	235.85
Locale 13	1503.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	751.88	0.00	1449.28	0.00	735.29	740.74	2142.86	0.00
Lamont	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Deaths, infants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Infants < 1 year	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Note: The deaths, of infants under one year of age, per 100,000 population of infants under one year of age. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Rates are not reported when fewer than 100 deaths occurred in an area.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Death Certificate Data File. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
10/12/2015

Child Mortality (Ages 1-17)



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	22.34	20.45	19.18	17.62	16.67	18.10	16.09	16.19	15.19	16.34	15.41	13.56
Whitman County	0.00	14.85	0.00	46.91	31.75	31.46	31.84	31.60	0.00	0.00	42.19	13.39
Locale 13	0.00	0.00	0.00	67.32	34.94	69.78	72.67	36.54	0.00	0.00	96.43	31.08
Lamont	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Child Deaths	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children (age 1-17)	60	59	47	46	42	42	37	38	40	41	42	43

Note: The deaths, of children 1 to 17 years of age, per 100,000 population of children 1 to 17 years of age. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Rates are not reported when fewer than 100 deaths occurred in an area.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Death Certificate Data File. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
10/12/2015

Births to School-Age (10-17) Mothers



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	5.95	6.07	5.89	6.13	6.58	6.34	5.56	5.14	4.56	4.18	3.45	3.24
Whitman County	3.02	1.21	2.62	0.67	4.83	0.00	2.15	2.14	1.18	0.54	1.54	0.00
Locale 13	5.56	2.24	3.80	1.31	6.88	0.00	4.39	0.00	1.22	0.00	2.17	0.00
Lamont	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Birthed, 10-17	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Females, 10-17	16	16	11	10	8	10	8	8	10	10	10	11

Note: The live births to adolescents (age 10-17) per 1,000 females (age 10-17). Rate changes in data result from on-going updates to birth records. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for areas with less than 100 births.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Birth Certificate Data File. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
10/9/2015

Sexually Transmitted Disease Cases (Birth-19)



	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
State	3.85	3.97	3.74	3.84	4.24	4.11	3.94	4.06	4.08	3.81	3.93	4.13
Whitman County	3.68	3.85	2.55	3.19	3.35	3.58	3.00	3.87	3.90	4.21	6.48	5.70

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: The reported cases of gonorrhea, syphilis, or chlamydia in children (age birth-19) per 1,000 adolescents (age birth-19). Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for populations less than 100.

State Source: Department of Health, Sexually Transmitted Disease (STD) Services, Sexually Transmitted Disease Reported Cases. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
4/28/2016

Suicide and Suicide Attempts (Age 10-17)



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	42.65	56.31	51.27	48.21	38.58	47.75	44.05	44.25	40.65	52.04	55.27	61.67
Whitman County	0.00	0.00	0.00	129.66	0.00	33.29	34.00	135.46	0.00	0.00	78.80	98.60
Locale 13	0.00	0.00	0.00	188.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	68.87	0.00	0.00	107.82	205.34
Lamont	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Suicide & Attempt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons, 10-17	30	30	24	20	18	18	15	15	18	18	19	19

Note: The adolescents (age 10-17) who committed suicide or were admitted to the hospital for suicide attempts, per 100,000 adolescents (age 10-17). Suicides are based on death certificate information. Suicide attempts are based on hospital admissions, but do not include admissions to federal hospitals. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for locations with adolescent populations less than 100.

State Source: Department of Health, Office of Hospital and Patient Data Systems, Comprehensive Hospital Abstract Reporting System (CHARS) and Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics Death Certificate Data. Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
10/9/2015

Low Birthweight Babies



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	60.35	61.96	61.04	65.16	63.27	63.39	62.47	63.15	61.46	61.24	64.19	64.44
Whitman County	72.64	77.13	46.40	82.52	67.44	56.56	36.04	71.26	61.58	39.09	62.36	59.36
Locale 13	76.34	57.85	46.98	67.16	98.48	34.25	7.25	62.02	80.88	44.12	94.49	66.18
Lamont	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Low-weight Babies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
All Births	1	1	3	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	3	2

Note: The babies born with low birthweight, per 1,000 live births. Low birthweight is less than 2,500 grams. Rate changes in data result from on-going updates to birth records. No rate is given when the number of live births is less than 100 in the geographic area. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

State Source: Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Birth Certificate Data File

Updated
10/9/2015

Injury or Accident Hospitalizations for Women



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	12.24	13.21	13.32	13.52	13.44	14.27	15.07	15.42	16.12	16.74	16.75	17.39
Whitman County	11.53	14.31	11.12	10.13	12.86	13.68	15.93	15.52	15.80	15.99	15.88	18.13
Locale 13	13.47	16.83	12.13	13.12	14.54	15.67	18.35	18.84	21.05	21.24	21.15	21.23
Lamont	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Injuries	1	0	2	1	1	1	5	3	0	3	4	2
Hospitalizations	9	10	8	8	7	6	11	5	2	9	9	9

Note: The injury or accident hospitalizations for women as a percent of all hospitalizations for women (age 18+). Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes. Due to contractual agreement data may not be displayed for areas with less than 100 hospitalizations.

State Source: Department of Health, Office of Hospital and Patient Data Systems, Comprehensive Hospital Abstract Reporting System (CHARS) .

Updated
10/9/2015

Offenses, Domestic Violence



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	6.51	6.46	6.43	6.02	5.76	5.30	5.67	5.65	5.64	5.92	5.81	5.94
Whitman County	2.06	2.74	2.83	2.74	2.40	2.78	2.62	3.06	3.01	3.64	6.05	5.21
Locale 13	2.16	2.71	3.24	3.00	2.79	2.28	3.20	3.73	2.38	4.79	10.05	5.55
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Offenses	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	1
Persons	219	219	190	187	182	182	178	177	186	186	187	187

Note: The domestic violence-related offenses, per 1,000 persons. Domestic violence includes any violence of one family member against another family member. Family can include spouses, former spouses, parents who have children in common regardless of marital status, adults who live in the same household, as well as parents and their children.

Offenses differ from arrests. While funding and grants are associated with participation, reporting is not mandatory. Offenses are incidence reporting. When more than one victim is involved an offence is filed for each victim. Multiple property violations performed at the same incident are counted as one offence. However when both types of events happen, only the victim incidents are reported as offenses. Offenses focus on the nature of the crime, while arrests focus on the apprehended accused perpetrator. Many offenses occur without arresting perpetrators.

Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report offenses. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted and the agencies not reporting, see the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population. Suppression code definitions for yearly rates are explained in Technical Notes.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Total Arrests of Adolescents (Age 10-17)



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	54.31	51.76	48.10	48.41	48.97	45.54	41.43	39.37	37.15	26.75	27.67	25.64
Whitman County	63.26	72.85	53.56	45.95	49.48	27.63	31.37	22.85	24.93	11.40	61.07	50.61
Locale 13	53.53	53.02	38.80	34.79	36.29	27.53	16.94	21.60	14.95	5.01	90.28	66.80
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	1
Adjusted Pop 10-17	30	30	24	20	18	18	15	15	16	18	19	19

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for any crime, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17).

Washington State has transitioned from Summary UCR to the NIBRS system for reporting. Summary UCR collects eight (8) Part One Crime offenses: criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft and arson. NIBRS collects information on twenty-three (23) different offenses, including all Part One Crimes plus others including forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, fraud, kidnapping, and drug violations. Care must be taken when interpreting the yearly trend of "total arrest" rates for an area. In areas where large amounts of arrests are likely for crimes not previously reported, a substantial increase in total arrests could be expected starting with the 2012 data.
Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to WASPC. For more information, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Arrests (Age 10-14), Property Crime



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	11.84	10.97	9.41	8.59	8.57	7.47	6.67	5.92	5.78	4.03	3.61	3.44
Whitman County	9.63	22.83	14.76	8.41	3.76	0.62	5.16	8.57	8.17	5.16	6.69	17.64
Locale 13	5.91	13.51	5.64	2.30	0.00	1.38	3.56	5.97	3.16	2.77	2.98	20.60
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted Pop 10-14	12	12	10	10	9	12	11	11	10	11	11	11

Note: The arrests of younger adolescents (age 10-14) for property crimes, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-14). Property crimes include all crimes involving burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR/NIBRS. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the area will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Arrests (Age 10-17), Property Crime



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	19.12	18.12	16.64	15.71	16.32	15.41	13.75	12.40	12.27	8.93	8.34	7.77
Whitman County	17.67	35.48	17.96	11.15	11.24	2.95	10.00	9.00	8.56	2.92	10.18	17.05
Locale 13	13.53	25.89	6.02	6.82	5.91	3.24	7.06	9.36	2.36	1.25	11.99	19.65
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted Pop 10-17	30	30	24	20	18	18	15	15	16	18	19	19

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for property crimes, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17). Property crimes include all crimes involving burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR/NIBRS. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Arrests (Age 18+), Property Crime



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	6.50	6.82	6.68	6.06	6.09	5.59	6.15	6.20	6.66	6.08	6.83	6.72
Whitman County	5.12	5.58	5.23	3.90	3.66	2.56	3.66	2.73	3.06	2.17	3.71	5.09
Locale 13	3.30	4.15	4.72	2.30	2.25	3.07	1.97	3.72	3.02	2.26	4.02	5.36
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 18+	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Adjusted Pop 18+	157	157	142	138	138	138	138	137	133	143	142	141

Note: The arrests of adults (age 18+) for property crimes, per 1,000 adults (age 18+). Property crimes include all crimes involving burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR/NIBRS. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Arrests (Age 10-17), Violent Crime



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	2.33	2.22	2.15	2.25	2.46	2.25	2.31	2.13	1.80	1.48	1.66	1.59
Whitman County	0.93	1.58	1.33	1.35	1.12	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.37	0.00	1.70	0.83
Locale 13	1.76	3.08	2.01	1.36	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.79	0.00	3.16	1.31
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted Pop 10-17	30	30	24	20	18	18	15	15	16	18	19	19

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for violent crime per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17). Violent crimes include all crimes involving criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Simple assault is not defined as a violent crime. Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR/NIBRS. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Alcohol-Related Traffic Fatalities Per All Traffic Fatalities



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	36.83	37.74	41.76	39.65	40.81	43.57	48.98	41.09	39.65	36.07	36.93	34.42
Whitman County	100.00	42.86	0.00	63.64	16.67	80.00	40.00	57.14	20.00	0.00	0.00	50.00

Information for this rate is not available for areas smaller than a county.

Note: The alcohol-related traffic fatalities, per 100 traffic fatalities. "Alcohol-related" means that the officer on the scene determined that at least one driver involved in the accident "had been drinking." Thus, "Alcohol-related" includes but is not limited to the legal definition of driving under the influence. Care should be taken since small numbers of events can cause unreliable rates in some counties.

State Source: Washington State Patrol, Records Section, Traffic Collisions in Washington State, Accident Records Database

Updated
1/22/2016

Arrests (Age 10-17), Alcohol Violation



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	7.81	7.36	6.45	7.43	7.69	6.74	5.82	4.82	3.92	2.66	2.43	2.01
Whitman County	16.43	11.09	8.98	10.81	11.99	12.53	7.24	3.12	2.23	4.09	5.94	3.85
Locale 13	12.94	6.78	10.70	6.14	10.13	10.53	1.41	1.44	0.00	0.63	7.58	4.58
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted Pop 10-17	30	30	24	20	18	18	15	15	16	18	19	19

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for alcohol violations, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17). Alcohol violations include all crimes involving driving under the influence, liquor law violations, and drunkenness. For children, arrests for liquor law violations are usually arrests for minor in possession.

1) Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR/NIBRS. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

2) The DUI portion of this measure is likely understated, because arrests made by the State Patrol are not attributable to counties. State Patrol arrests are included in the state rates.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Arrests (Age 10-17), Drug Law Violation



	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State	4.87	4.22	4.30	4.51	4.62	4.32	4.28	4.77	5.15	3.32	3.17	2.90
Whitman County	6.82	4.75	2.00	3.72	3.75	2.21	4.14	2.42	4.09	2.63	7.63	6.60
Locale 13	7.06	1.85	2.68	4.09	5.06	1.62	2.12	4.32	4.72	1.88	11.36	9.82
Lamont	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN	UN
Arrests, 10-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted Pop 10-17	30	30	24	20	18	18	15	15	16	18	19	19

Note: The arrests of adolescents (age 10-17) for drug law violations, per 1,000 adolescents (age 10-17). Drug law violations include all crimes involving sale, manufacturing, and possession of drugs.

Denominators are adjusted by subtracting the population of police agencies that did not report arrests to UCR/NIBRS. In spite of this population adjustment, when the non-reporting police jurisdiction is where much of the crime occurs, the rate for the county will be lower than it would be if that jurisdiction was included. For percent subtracted, suppression code definitions and the agencies not reporting, see the Technical Notes and the appendix on Non-Reporting Agencies and Population.

The crimes types used within this rate are represented in both Summary UCR and NIBRS systems and are not likely to be substantially impacted by the system change.

State Source: Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC): Uniform Crime Report (UCR), National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/9/2015

Clients of State-Funded Alcohol or Drug Services (Age 10-17)



	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State	11.35	11.16	11.05	10.63	10.24	10.63	11.32	11.02	11.10	11.52	11.36	11.09
Whitman County	10.88	10.57	3.62	7.96	8.43	13.96	8.66	5.10	6.43	5.11	1.95	0.53
Locale 13	8.85	11.76	4.50	9.21	10.05	13.76	7.87	4.80	5.51	3.63	1.70	0.54
Lamont	0.00	0.00	33.33	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Admits, 10-17	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons, 10-17	31	30	30	24	20	18	18	15	15	18	18	19

Note: The adolescents (age 10-17) receiving state-funded alcohol or drug services, per 1,000 adolescents 10-17. Counts of clients are unduplicated so that those receiving services more than once during the year are only counted once for that year. State-funded services include treatment, assessment, and detox. Persons in Department of Corrections treatment programs are not included.

State Source: Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery, Treatment and Assessment Report Generation Tool (TARGET). Population Estimates: Washington State Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division

Updated
11/6/2014

Topics:

Population Denominators Used in This Report
Counting Alcohol- or Drug-related Deaths
Duplicated and Unduplicated Counts
Transition Summary UCR to National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)
Uniform Crime Report - Non-Reporting Police Jurisdictions
CORE Conversion Process and Weighted Reliability Index
Rates – Why is Raw Data Converted to Rates?
Standardization of CORE Indicators
Graduation and Dropout Data Methodology Changes
Where are the roadblocks to learning?
Suppression Codes
Understanding Locales

Population Denominators Used in This Report

Population is updated as the data becomes available. If events for the numerator are available, but the population is not yet available the population for the year previous is used for calculating rates. Those data years are marked with an asterisk, like this: 2011*. The asterisk is removed when the population, and the rate are updated.

Counting Alcohol- or Drug-related Deaths

AOD deaths are identified by matching all the contributory causes of death from death certificate records to a list of causes that are considered AOD-related. The deaths identified as AOD-related then may be summed to provide area totals. Dividing the total AOD-related deaths by all deaths in an area gives the percent of all deaths that are alcohol and drug related. Lists of underlying causes of death that are AOD-related have been developed in several studies. Citations for these studies are listed prior to the AOD attribution tables. AOD-related deaths used in this report are determined using a comprehensive assembly of disease, accident, and injury codes identified in those studies. The codes are based upon the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) from 1990 to 1998 or International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10) after 1998.

The identified AOD-related causes of death may be either fully attributable or sometimes attributable to alcohol or drugs. Some contributory causes of death are explicit in their mention of alcohol or drugs. Examples include alcoholic cirrhosis of the liver (ICD-9 code 571.2), alcohol and drug dependence syndromes (ICD-9 codes 303 and 304, respectively), and drug poisonings (ICD-9 codes E850 through E859). All deaths of this sort are fully, or 100%, attributable to alcohol or drug abuse and are considered direct AOD-related deaths.

Other contributory causes of death are related only sometimes to alcohol or drugs. For example, epidemiological studies have shown that, among persons over 35 years of age, 60% of deaths due to chronic pancreatitis (ICD-9 code 577.1) and 75% of malignant neoplasms of the esophagus (ICD-9 code 150) are alcohol-related. For persons of all ages, 42% of motor vehicle traffic and nontraffic deaths (ICD-9 codes E810 through E825) are alcohol-related. The appropriate percentage of such indirectly attributable deaths are also counted toward totals for AOD-related deaths.

The tables on the following pages characterize the different diseases, injuries, and accidents by: name, ICD-9 or ICD-10 code, percent attributable to alcohol or drugs, age of inclusion. Information sources are listed below.

1. Schultz J, Rice D, & Parker D. 1990. Alcohol-related mortality and years of potential life lost - United States, 1987. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 39, 173-178.

2. Rice D, et al. 1990. The Economic Costs of Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Illness: 1985. Report submitted to the Office of Financing and Coverage Policy of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and mental health Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Health and Aging, University of California.

3. Fox K, Merrill J, Chang H, & Califano J. 1995. Estimating the Costs of Substance Abuse to the Medicaid Hospital Care Program. American Journal of Public Health, 85(1), 48-54.

4. Seattle-King County HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Unit and Washington State Office of HIV/AIDS Epidemiology and Evaluation. 1994. Washington State/Seattle-King County HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Report (2nd Quarter, 1994), p. 4.

Disease Category	ICD-10 Code	ICD-9 Code	Attrib	Age
Diseases Directly Attributable to Alcohol				
Alcoholic psychoses	F10, F10.3-F10.9	291	100%	>=15
Alcohol dependence syndrome	F10.2	303	100%	>=15
Alcoholic polyneuropathy	G62.1	357.5	100%	>=15
Alcoholic cardiomyopathy	I42.6	425.5	100%	>=15
Alcoholic gastritis	K29.2	535.3	100%	>=15
Alcoholic fatty liver	K70.0	571.0	100%	>=15
Acute alcoholic hepatitis	K70.1, K70.4	571.1	100%	>=15
Alcoholic cirrhosis of the liver	K70.3	571.2	100%	>=15
Alcoholic liver damage, other	K70.2, K70.9, K70	571.3	100%	>=15
Excessive blood level of alcohol, toxic effect of alcohol	R78.0, T51	790.3. 980	100%	>=0
Accidental poisoning by alcohol	X45, Y15	E860	100%	>=0
Nondependent abuse of Alcohol	F10.1	305.0	100%	>=0
Alcohol-induced pseudo-Cushing's	E24.4	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=15
Degeneration of nervous system due	G31.2	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=15
Alcoholic myopathy	G72.1	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=15
Maternal care for (suspected) damag	O35.4	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=15
Newborn affected by maternal use o	P04.3	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=0
Fetal alcohol syndrome (dysmorphi	Q86.0	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=0
Suicide attributable to alcohol	X65	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	>=0
Alcoholic Pellagra	E52	265.2	100%	>=0
Diseases Indirectly Attributable to Alcohol				
Neoplasms				
Breast	C50, D05	174.0-174.9, 233.0	13% F	>=35
Esophagus	C15, D00.1	150.1-150.9, 230.1	75%	>=35
Larynx	C32 , D02.0	161.0-.161.9, 231.0	50% M, 40% F	>=35
Lip, oral cavity, pharynx	C00-C14, D00.0	140.1-141.9, 143.0-149.9, 230.0	50% M, 40% F	>=35
Liver	C22, D01.5	155.0-155.2, 230.8	29%	>=35
Cardiovascular				
Cardiomyopathy	I42.0 - I42.2, I42.5, I42.7- I42.9	425.1, 425.4, 425.9	40%M	>=35
Hypertension	I10-113, O10-O14, O16	401.0-404.9, 642.0, 642.2, 642.9	11%	>=35
Digestive System				
Cirrhosis	K71.7, K74.5-K74.6	571.5	74%	>=35
Duodenal Ulcers	K26	532.0-532.9	10%	>=35
Pancreatitis, acute	K85	577.0	47%	>=35
Pancreatitis, chronic	K86.1- K86.3, K86.9	577.1, 577.2, 577.9	72%	>=35
Other Diseases or Conditions				
Epilepsy	G40.3,G40.4,G40.6,G40.9	345.1, 345.3, 345.9	30%	>=15
Seizures	R56	780.3	41%	>=15
Tuberculosis	A16-A19	011-013, 017, 018	25%	>=15
Accident or Injury Causes : Motor vehicle traffic and non-traffic accidents	V02–V04, V09.0, V09.2, V12–V14, V19.0–V19.2, V19.4–V19.6, V20–V79, V80.3–V80.5, V81.0–V81.1, V82.0–V82.1, V83–V86, V87.0–V87.8, V88.0–V88.8, V89.0, V89.2	E810-E825	42%	>=0

Disease Category	ICD-10 Code	ICD-9 Code	Attrib	Age
Pedal cycle and other road vehicle accidents	V01, V05–V06, V09.1, V09.3–V09.9, V10–V11, V15–V18, V19.3, V19.8–V19.9, V80.0–V80.2, V80.6–V80.9, V82.2–V82.9, V87.9, V88.9, V89.1, V89.3, V89.9	E826-E829	20%	>=0
Water transport accidents	V90-V94	E830-E838	20%	>=0
Air & space transport accidents	V95-V97	E840-E845	16%	>=0
Accidental falls	W00-W19	E880-E888	35%	>=15
Accidents caused by fire	X00-X09	E890-E899	45%	>=0
Accidental drowning and submersion	W65-W74	E910	38%	>=0
Suicides due to alcohol or drugs are now considered direct AOD-related deaths, other suicides are not apportioned. This brings our definitions into compliance with NCHS definitions.				
Homicide & other purposely inflicted injury	X86–Y09, Y87.1	E960-E962, E962.1-E969	46%	>=15
Other	X31, W79, W50-W52, W20- W34, Y15-Y19	E901, E911, E917-E920, E922	25%	>=15
Other category includes: Excessive cold, Choking on food in airway; Striking against or struck accidentally by objects or persons; Caught accidentally in or between objects; Accidents caused by machinery; Accidents caused by cutting and piercing instruments.				
Diseases Directly Attributable to Drugs				
Drug psychoses	F11-F16, F18-F19	292	100%	>=0
Drug dependence syndrome	F11-F16, F18-F19	304	100%	>=0
Polyneuropathy due to drugs	G62.0	357.6	100%	>=15
Drug dependence during	F11-F16, F18-F19	648.3	100%	>=0
Suspected damage to fetus from drugs	O35.5,	655.5	100%	>=0
Noxious influences affecting fetus	P04.4	760.7	100%	>=0
Drug reactions, intox., withdrawal specific to newborn	P96.1	779.4, 779.5	100%	>=0
Selected drug poisonings	R78,R78.1-R78.6, T38 ; excludes Y40-59.9 (therapeutic use)	962, 965, 967-971, 977 excludes E930-949	100%	>=0
Selected accidental drug poisonings	X40-X44	E850-E858	100%	>=0
Accidental Poisonings (magic mushrooms, huffing and other drug use)	X46-X49	E861-E869	100%	>=0
Nondependent abuse of drugs	F11-F16, F18-F19	305.2-305.9	100%	>=0
Assault by poisoning using drugs and medicaments	x85	E962.0	100%	>=0
Drug induced myopathy	G72.0	Not Available in ICD-9	100%	
Poisoning by drugs, accidentally or purposely inflicted	Y10-Y14	E980.0-E980.5	100%	>=0
Suicides attributable to drugs	x60-64	E950.0-E950.5	100%	>=0
Diseases Indirectly Attributable to Drugs				
AIDS (from IV drug use exposure)	B20-B24	042.0-044.9	5%	>=15
Cardiovascular				
Endocarditis	I33.0, I33.9	421.0, 421.9	75%	>=15
Other				
Hepatitis A	B15.9	70.1	12%	>=15
Hepatitis B	B16-B16.9	70.2, 70.3	36%	>=15
Hepatitis C	B17-B19.9	70.5, 70.9	10%	>=15

Suppression Codes for Yearly Trend Data

UN=Unreliable conversion of events to report geography, failure of weighted reliability index (WRI). The WRI evaluation process is further explained in the section labeled 'CORE Conversion Process and Weighted Reliability Index'.

SP=Suppressed by agreement with data provider when denominator is below agreed level and may compromise a person's rights to confidentiality.

SN=Small Number Sample. Geography has less than 30 events in the denominator. More reliable at 5 year level or for larger area.

NR=Not reliable due to non-reporting of police jurisdictions data. Fifty percent or more of the population is not represented by the data due to non-reporting jurisdictions.

Duplicated and Unduplicated Counts

In an unduplicated person count, each person is counted only once in a year for the specified activity or service type, even if they receive that service multiple times during the year. Examples include Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) Child Recipients, Food Stamp Recipients, and alcohol or drug treatment. Duplicated counts are made of events such as prison admissions, child victims in accepted referrals, or admission to a hospital for attempted suicide. For instance, for each identified child victim in an accepted referral, that "event" is counted. Therefore, a child identified as a victim in more than one referral during the year is included more than once. Additionally more than one victim can be identified in a single accepted referral. Both the victims and the referrals are duplicated.

Transitioning from Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) to National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)

Over 80 years ago, standards were established for the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program so agencies could report their crime and arrest information in the same format and at the same level of detail and accuracy. Under the traditional UCR system agencies report monthly of the eight (8) "Part One" offenses and values of property stolen, as well as counts of arrests. The FBI Crime Index reports only designated Part One Crimes. These are criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft and arson. This is now referred to as Summary UCR. Most law enforcement agencies report arrest and offense data to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC), which in turn provides data to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting Program (UCR).

In 1989, the FBI instituted a new crime-reporting system called the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) to provide a more detailed and comprehensive view of crime in the United States. While Summary UCR collects only counts on eight (8) offense types, NIBRS collects information on twenty-three (23) different offenses. Some of the additional offenses in NIBRS are forcible and non-forcible sex offenses, fraud, kidnapping, and drug violations.

Washington State has transitioned to the NIBRS system for reporting. This was a costly staged process which was particularly difficult for smaller communities. Washington State became certified to begin submitting NIBRS data to the FBI in December 2006. Summary reporting was phased out and all reporting agencies began submitting NIBRS data by January 1, 2012. The rates for Part One offenses we previously reported should show no impact of the system change. However, the rates for *total arrests* by age group include all arrests for offenses reported which now cover the twenty-three offense categories rather than the previous eight categories. Care must be taken when interpreting the yearly trend of "total arrest" rates for an area. In areas where large amounts of arrests are likely for crimes not previously reported, a substantial increase in total arrests could to be expected starting with the 2012 data.

Uniform Crime Report - Non-Reporting Police Jurisdictions

Most law enforcement agencies report arrest and offence data to the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC), which in turn provides data to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting Program. This is the source of our data. Some jurisdictions do not report all arrests and offenses, some report partial years, and some withhold certain categories of arrests or offenses. Reporting is voluntary for arrests and offenses. Offenses are more likely to be reported since some funding is associated with reporting. Offenses are incidence reporting. When more than one victim is involved an offence is filed for each victim. Multiple property violations performed at the same incident are counted as one offence.

However when both types of events happen, only the victim incidents are reported as offenses. Offenses focus on the nature of the crime, while arrests focus on the apprehended accused perpetrator. Many offenses occur without arresting perpetrators. Sometimes charges are dropped and sometimes no perpetrator is ever found. No perpetrator age can be assigned to offence data so the entire age range of population is used as the denominator. Prior to 2012 data reported to WASPC in NIBRS format, which was not yet compatible with UCR output reports, was only included in their reports to the FBI. We listed those jurisdictions as non-reporting in UCR although WASPC considered them to have reported. Only part one offenses are reported in the Uniform Crime Report, some agencies have no part one crimes to report. Those agencies are listed with zero events, not as non-reporting.

Information on the Non-reporting Population and Non-reporting Agencies are available only in the individual county, district, and locale level reports. Each area report shows how and when that area's police jurisdictions reported data to the Washington Association of Sheriff's and Police Chiefs. If your area is one with jurisdictions having a significant amount of incomplete data, be very careful that you adjust your risk assessment to reflect this. In other words, the reported arrest rates may not adequately reflect the entire area. This will be true especially in those cases where the non-reporting police jurisdictions have either very high or very low arrest rates, compared to the rest of the area.

In order to compensate for missing police reports, we have adjusted the denominator in the rate calculation so that it reflects only the proportion of the area for which we do have data. For instance, say area A, with a population of 40,000, has eight police districts. Now, if one of the police districts in the area did not report their arrests, the number of arrests would not be representative of the whole area. Therefore, we would not want to use the population of the whole area in the denominator because that would make the rate lower than it should be. The solution used in this report is to subtract the population of that missing police district from the area population. We follow the same procedure for police districts that report partial years: if they report only six months, we use only half of the population to calculate the rate.

Due to the uneven geographic distribution of crime, missing police data can cause spikes or dips in the trend data comparison of multiple consecutive years. We do not run into this problem in the state report because the county rates there (as opposed to the individual county reports) only report 5-year averages. However for individual county reports and reports for smaller areas like locales or districts the trend data can become unstable due to non-reporting. Alternately, the conversion of data from certain police jurisdictions to other areas like locales may not apportion directly causing too much of the data to be apportioned based on population rather than clearly assigned to one area. We use a weighted reliability index (WRI) to determine when the conversion is no longer reliable. An explanation of that process follows. We have tried to compensate for these and other issues by suppressing data which is likely to be affected.

CORE Conversion Process and Weighted Reliability Index

CORE obtains data from many government agency sources. The data are represented as events (e.g. # of teen births, # of crimes, # of clients) occurring within a given geographic unit. This geographic unit is generally the smallest that can be obtained from the agency source. For example, data may be available by school district, by zip code, by census tract or by police jurisdictions. CORE calls these geographic units the "source geography."

CORE data is usually reported at the geographic level of county or community – called in the rest of this report the "destination geography." Therefore, data usually needs to be converted from the "source geographies" to the "destination geography."

The conversion is based on an overlay process, in which the events occurring in small source geographies that are totally contained within the destination are combined with synthetic estimates of events occurring in source geographies that are partly within and partly outside the destination geography. The synthetic estimation is weighted by the population distribution between the source and destination areas. Therefore, it requires a small-scale count of the population underlying both source and destination geographies. This process is explained below through examples.

Data being converted from a smaller geography (source geography) like school district to a larger geography (like a county) is usually fairly reliable because most of the smaller pieces fit neatly and wholly into the new geography. (See example 1).

The rectangles represent two possible data source geographies (one densely populated school district – Urban School District -- and one thinly populated school district – Suburban School District -- surrounding it). The large oval represents a report's destination geography such as county, locale or network.

Example 1



The following statements refer to the first example:

All of the events occurring in the urban school district can be attributed entirely to the destination geography.

The events occurring in the split source geography (suburban school district, in this example) are distributed to the destination geography in the same proportion as the underlying population is distributed. If 40% of the suburban school district population lies within the destination geography, then 40% of its events are attributed to the destination geography.

These events are split by age, race and gender subgroups whenever possible, as are the populations. So the synthetic estimation is broken down that way also. If 40% of the young White population of the suburban school district lives in the destination geography, then 40% of the events occurring to young White people are attributed there. If, on the other hand, only 10% of the young American Indian population of the suburban school district lives in the destination geography, then only 10% of the events occurring to young American Indian people are attributed there.

While we can develop an algorithm to distribute all source geography populations to all destination geography populations, that distribution will not always be reliable.

For example, see the situation depicted in Example 2 below. Here we are trying to estimate the number of events contained in two very small destination geographies (the ovals). Could this synthetic estimate be reliable? Perhaps, if the small area within the ovals really is representative of the whole area -- but more likely not.

Example 2



A statistic is needed to assist researchers in determining when a destination geography's events cannot be reliably estimated using these processes. For CORE, that statistic is the Weighted Reliability Index (WRI).

The amount of overlap between source and destination populations can vary from less than 1% to 99% -- only a little of a source population can live in a destination, or almost all of the source population can live in a destination.

The key underlying assumption behind the CORE Weighted Reliability Index is as follows:

When most of the population for the source geography is also in the destination geography, we can be more certain of the reliability of the estimation process.

Therefore, the weighting process lets us calculate, for each source-geography/destination-geography combination, the reliability of each destination geography's estimate.

In the figure for Example 3, for zip code 2 the source area population is mostly in the destination oval (encased in the dashed line), but the majority population from the other contributing source area is not.

Example 3



The oval represents the destination geography boundary -- the edge of a destination city. The rectangles represent the source geography boundaries for two zip codes. The numbers are population of people living in each place: 10 people live both in Destination City and in the first source (Zip code 1), and 900 people live both in Destination City and in the second source (Zipcode2).

The formula for **Weighted Reliability Index** for a single destination is the total weighted destination population as a percent of total population. To understand this formula, see the calculations below.

	Percent of source population attributed to destination	Multiplied by the population attributed to the destination	Amount of destination
zip code 1	10/80 = 12.5%	* 10	1.25
zip code 2	900/1000 = 90%	* 900	810.00
	Total for Destination	**910**	**811.25**

In the above example, the **Weighted Reliability Index** for Destination City is **811.25 / 910 = 89%. Basically, 89% of the event locations were directly attributed to the area they occurred.** Along with the WRI a cut point for reliable reporting is needed. When half or more of the events have been imputed to the destination geography, rather than directly attributed from the source geography, the data is considered unreliable and rates are suppressed.

WRI for Areas with Non-Reporting of Data

There is a second way that data may become unreliable. Some police jurisdictions do not report data to the state sources, use a reporting method which cannot be included in our files, fail to report for either adults or juveniles, or report for only part of a year. This is particularly true for court data – arrests or offenses. In order to accurately evaluate the reliability of data conversions for destination geographies containing those jurisdictions, non-reporting jurisdiction populations were excluded from the calculations for WRI and the non-reporting jurisdiction issue is evaluated separately.

Partial Reporting, part of a year or part of a population, is also taken into consideration when computing the percentage of non-reporting in a destination geography. Adult and juvenile rates are evaluated separately. Some areas may pass for one, but not for the other due to their reporting habits. For partial year reporting the percentage of the year with data reported is used to evaluate each category.



The second test of reliability is to determine whether the population for the rate is adequately represented. In this example, allow the numbers inside the oval to represent a population of 100 allocated to the destination geography. Two source jurisdictions are entirely located in the destination geography represented by the oval. Their events when reported would be directly attributed. The non-reporting jurisdiction would have its population of 50 excluded from the calculation for WRI, while the reporting jurisdiction would have its population included in the calculation. In this case the completely contained reporting jurisdiction would represent 30 of the remaining 50 population (60%) in the destination oval. The imputed portion is 40% allowing the destination geography to pass the first test for WRI.

CORE also requires that the excluded non-reporting jurisdiction population (50 of 100) are less than 50% of the total population for the destination geography. With an exclusion rate of 50%, this destination geography would fail the reliability criteria.

The reliability of arrest rates is calculated each year based on non-reporting. For five year rates, three out of five data years must be considered reliable by both tests and the average of the yearly WRI for all five years must reach the WRI cut point value.

Rates: why is "raw data" converted to rates?

In order to make comparisons between counties and the state, and between counties that have different sizes, we use rates to describe an event in terms of a standard size population---either per 100 (percent), per 1,000 or per 100,000. For instance, what does it mean if County A has 42 alcohol retail licenses, and County B has 399? Does it mean that based on this indicator, the risk factor (Availability) is much higher in County B than it is County A? No, not if County B is a much bigger county. If County B is bigger, then the "rate" of liquor licenses per population might be the same or even lower. The only way to compare them is to convert the raw numbers to rates, based on the same population factor.

For instance:
County A: # of licenses – 42, # of persons (all ages) – 14, 297
County B: # of licenses – 399, # of persons (all ages) – 186,185
To calculate the rate per 1,000:
42 / 14,297 = .002937 .002937 X 1,000 = 2.94
399 / 186,185 = .002143 .002143 X 1,000 = 2.14
So the rate of alcohol retail licenses is 2.94 per 1,000 people in County A, and 2.14 per 1,000 people in County B.

Standardization of CORE Indicators

An individual indicator by itself is interesting because you can compare your county (school district, locale) to all other counties (school districts, locales), and to the state. You can also look at how the indicator changes over time. But it is more difficult to compare several indicators to each other, for example, if you want to see which indicator of risk is extremely high and which is just average. For instance, you cannot directly compare the number (or rate) of alcohol retail licenses to the number (or rate) of Food Stamp recipients---this would be like comparing apples and oranges and would not be meaningful.

The preferred way to compare different indicators is to find out how much each individual indicator varies from some common point; in CORE reports the point we use is the indicator's value for the state. In more technical terms, we transform the original absolute rates to a common scale: the relative deviation from the state rate. This is called a **standardized score,** and is based on the mathematical calculation of the standard deviation. For a particular indicator, the county (school district, locale) with the highest absolute rate will have the highest standardized score. A standardized score of 1.2, for instance, means that the county's rate is 1.2 standard deviations above the state rate, and a –1.2 would be 1.2 standard measures *below* the state rate. Approximately 95% of all counties (school districts, locales) in the state will fall between +2 and –2 standard deviations from the state rate.

Here is an example. Let's say an indicator for extreme family economic deprivation (Food Stamp recipients per 100 people) has a standardized score of 2.5 and an indicator for availability of drugs (alcohol retail licenses per 1,000 people) has a score of 1.2. We can say that, other things being equal, the county (school district, locale) in question has a higher risk for extreme family economic deprivation than for availability of drugs.

CORE indicators are standardized using a formula similar to the calculation of a z-score. A typical z-score for an observation (a county, a locale, a school district) is calculated as a difference between an observation and the mean (average) of all observations, divided by the standard deviation for all observations. A CORE standardized score for a county (school district, locale) is instead calculated using the state rate in place of the mean for all counties (school districts, locales). A standardized CORE indicator avoids the problem of using an unweighted mean of all counties (school districts, locales) that would give counties of very different size equal weight, and therefore provides a more meaningful comparison.

CORE standardized indicators for counties are calculated using the following formula. The same formula is used for locales and for districts, by substituting locale or district rates for county rates in the formula.

$$stdiz_score = \frac{county_{rate} - state_{rate}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (county_{rate,i} - state_{rate})^2}{N}}}$$

Graduation and Dropout Data Methodology Changes

Beginning with the 2011-2012 school year major changes were made in how to measure dropouts and graduation for students in Washington State. "Graduation Rate Calculations in Washington State", a March 2012 publication by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, does an excellent job of explaining these changes. The following chart is an extract from that document (page 4).

How do the methods differ?

Estimated Cohort (old method) Prior to 2011-2012 school year	Adjusted Cohort (new method) 2011-2012 and beyond
Is a composite cohort. Uses dropout rates for all grades within one school year to determine an estimate of the number of students graduating.	Is an actual cohort; individuals are tracked over 4 years with adjustments made for transfers in/out.
Allows for alternate expected graduation year for students in special education or ELL programs.	Imposes concept of four-year timespan. There are no adjustments for Special Ed or Limited English students who are expected to take longer.
May adjust for deficient credits.	All students are expected to graduate four years after first entering 9th grade. Transfers from out of state or other districts who are credit deficient may not be reclassified into a lower grade.

Where are the roadblocks to learning in our communities?

Academic Achievement:
The CORE measures academic achievement using three groups of indicators:

1. Poor Academic Performance on statewide tests (risk factor);
2. Students who graduate from high school (protective factor);
3. Students who drop out of high school, failing to complete their education (risk factor).

Student Assessment

The indicators for *Poor Academic Performance* , are available for grades 4, 7 and 10. The indicators are calculated as a percentage of students tested in each grade assessment. Earlier years of information are from the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). In 2009-10 the WASL was replaced by the Measurements of Student Progress (MSP) for grades 3 through 8 and the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) for grade 10. Some districts have chosen to test students in both grades 9 and 10 for the 10th grade assessment, giving freshmen a second chance to pass the test. Passing the HSPE is essential for high-school graduation. Ninth graders who were tested are included with the tenth graders in the calculation of the Academic Achievement indicator for grade 10.

Graduating from High School

According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), protective factors are characteristics that decrease an individual's risk for a substance abuse disorder. Among the protective factors listed are: aspirations or expectations to go to college, high commitment to schooling, education is valued and encouraged, and academic competence. Children who graduate share many of these protections, therefore, CORE has chosen to categorize On-time and Extended Graduation as protective factors.

Two types of high school graduation rates are listed in the CORE reports, On-time Graduation and Extended Graduation.

For *On-time Graduation* , a student must graduate within four years by completion of the graduation requirements. The **Estimated Cohort (old method)** On-Time Graduation rate formula uses dropout rates discussed below; the formula is: 100*(1-grade 9 dropout rate)*(1-grade 10 dropout rate)*(1-grade 11 dropout rate)*(1-grade 12 dropout rate-grade 12 continuing rate). The on-time graduation rate is the inverse of the cumulative dropout rate with the senior class adjusted to remove those students who stay in school for more

than four years from the calculation. The **Adjusted Cohort (new method)** rate divides the number of students graduating in their fourth year by the adjusted freshman cohort for those students.

Extended Graduation requires more resources and dedication from district staff. It includes those students who stay in school after their senior year and complete the graduation requirements. Districts which have high extended graduation rates may also have higher dropout rates since the students attempting extended graduation are also at highest risk of again dropping out. A large difference in the size of the on-time and extended graduation rates may indicate that a district or school is working hard to keep students in school or to have dropouts return to school and attempt to graduate. The **Estimated Cohort (old method)** Extended Graduation rate formula is: (the number of on-time and late graduates)/(the number of on-time graduates divided by the on-time graduation rate). The **Adjusted Cohort (new method)** rate is the number of students graduating within five years divided by the adjusted cohort for the freshman class of the graduates.

Dropping Out of High School

Two types of high school dropout rates are listed in the CORE reports, Annual (Event) Dropouts and High School Cohort (Cumulative) Dropouts.

The *Annual Dropout* rate measures the proportion of students enrolled in grades 9-12 who drop out in a single year without completing high school as a percentage of all students in grades 9 through 12 that year. When districts try new policies or projects to keep students in school the impact of those actions will be more immediately visible in this rate. This rate is much more difficult for the data provider to compute from data stored within the new cohort designations for students as it draws information from four separate cohorts. Data production during the transition to the new method will likely have at least one year of data which will probably never be produced. The formula and the data for this rate have not been changed by the new methodology.

The *High School Cohort Dropout* rate (may also be referred to as the longitudinal, cumulative, or freshmen cohort dropout rate) measures what happens to a single group (or cohort) of students over a period of time. This rate is most useful for seeing the long-term impact on the community. The **Estimated Cohort (old method)** Cohort (Cumulative) Dropout rate formula is: 100-(100*(1-grade 9 dropout rate)*(1-grade 10 dropout rate)*(1-grade 11 dropout rate)*(1-grade 12 dropout rate)). The cohort rate is significantly higher than the annual rate for the same area as it measures the cumulative effect of the multiyear loss of students from their freshmen cohort. The **Adjusted Cohort (new method)** rate is the number of students dropping out prior to graduation divided by the adjusted cohort for the freshman class of the graduates.

School Climate:

Indicators listed under School Climate give an idea of how safe students may feel in their school or how committed they and their fellow students are to learning. These indicators are *Weapons Incidents in School* (rate per 1,000 students) and *Unexcused Absences for Students in Grades 1 to 8* (as a percentage of total student days possible in the school year). When weapons incidents are common or it is acceptable for young students to frequently miss school without explanation the school climate is not conducive to learning.

Extreme Family Economic Deprivation:

Hungry students find it difficult to focus their attention long enough to learn. Those with inadequate housing or clothing may find it difficult to interact with their peers. There are three indicators which evaluate levels of poverty.

Child Recipients of TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) gives the rate of children from birth to 17 who receive income assistance. The child must be a citizen or legal alien and their caregiver must not have exceeded the 60 month maximum. There is a requirement for the adults to seek work and an income evaluation. Teen parents must attend school.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Recipients. The SNAP program was formerly called the Food Stamps program, and shows a more generalized level of need. While the persons must be citizens or legal aliens who seek work and meet the income guidelines there is no cutoff time limit for benefits.

Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch gives a much broader look at poverty in your area. Children of people who are “working poor”, who have exceeded 60 months in benefits, are not legal aliens, or are not seeking work can still receive meals and free

milk. The free guidelines are at or below 130 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines and the reduced price guidelines are between 130 and at or below 185 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines.

However, there are other ways to qualify. Many persons earning a gross income up to 200% of the Federal Poverty Level apply for income assistance because their children are automatically eligible for free school lunch if they meet the adjusted income guidelines. These are sometimes called $0 grants. Households receiving assistance under SNAP, TANF for their children, Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) or, with children who are homeless, fostered, runaway, migrant, or in Head Start Programs are eligible for free benefits. If any child or household member receives benefits under Assistance Programs all children who are members of the household are eligible for free school meals.

Understanding Locales



Locales are school districts or groups of school districts that, when added together, include 20,000+ residents. At this population threshold we are able to report rare events.

Additionally, the school districts grouped into a locale are:

i. Part of a single Educational Service District,

ii. Similar in character (for example, they have similar proportions of students receiving free or reduced price school lunches), and

iii. Typically, occupy contiguous territory.

Your Locale contains the school districts most like your own School District which share your geographic area, in essence, your neighbors in the prevention effort. Comparing your School District to your Locale allows you to get an idea how your community is doing compared to the other communities nearby. Your Locale covers an area large enough to provide a stable population for the rates and minimize the choppiness caused by small numbers (rare events). For smaller, lower-population school districts, more stable locale rates may help interprete their district's data. If your District is too small population-wise to get reliable rates for analysis, the Locale grouping can provide a helpful picture of your general area's progress and a way to compare it to other, larger districts. While there will be differences between your District and others in your Locale, these areas should be close enough for you to be aware of those differences and how your community fits in the grouping.

School Districts by Locale Number

School District	Loc.	School District	Loc.	School District	Loc.
Aberdeen	99	Bellingham	52	Burlington-Edison	44
Adna	96	Benge	12	Camas	116
Almira	12	Bethel	77	Cape Flattery	107
Anacortes	43	Bickleton	20	Carbonado	67
Arlington	47	Blaine	40	Cascade	36
Asotin-Anatone	28	Boistfort	97	Cashmere	36
Auburn	79	Bremerton	105	Castle Rock	114
Bainbridge Island	87	Brewster	35	Centerville	118
Battle Ground	110	Bridgeport	33	Central Kitsap	101
Bellevue	74	Brinnon	107	Central Valley	2



School Districts by Locale Number (cont.)

School District	Loc.	School District	Loc.	School District	Loc.	School District	Loc.	School District	Loc.
Centralia	92	Glenwood	118	Mercer Island	86	Peninsula	63	Starbuck	26
Chehalis	96	Goldendale	20	Meridian	41	Pioneer	100	Stehekin	35
Cheney	7	Grand Coulee Dam	33	Methow Valley	31	Pomeroy	26	Steilacoom Hist.	64
Chewelah	9	Grandview	16	Mill A	118	Port Angeles	102	Steptoe	13
Chimacum	103	Granger	21	Monroe	55	Port Townsend	103	Stevenson-Carson	118
Clarkston	28	Granite Falls	45	Montesano	98	Prescott	26	Sultan	45
Cle Elum-Roslyn	18	Grapeview	100	Morton	95	Prosser	24	Summit Valley	10
Clover Park	76	Great Northern	7	Moses Lake	39	Pullman	4	Sumner	66
Colfax	13	Green Mountain	115	Mossyrock	95	Puyallup	65	Sunnyside	16
College Place	27	Griffin	94	Mount Adams	20	Queets-Clearwater	37	Tacoma	69
Colton	13	Harrington	12	Mount Baker	41	Quilcene	18	Taholah	100
Columbia (Stevens)	11	Highland	19	Mount Pleasant	117	Quillayute Valley	67	Tahoma	82
Columbia (Wal Wal)	26	Highline	73	Mt Vernon	46	Quinault	49	Tekoa	13
Colville	9	Hockinson	116	Mukilteo	56	Quincy	17	Tenino	93
Concrete	45	Hood Canal	100	Naches Valley	19	Rainier	98	Thorp	18
Conway	46	Hoquiam	99	Napavine	96	Raymond	97	Toledo	95
Cosmopolis	99	Inchelium	11	Naselle-Grays Riv	113	Reardan-Edwall	12	Tonasket	31
Coulee-Hartline	33	Index	45	Nespelem	33	Renton	62	Toppenish	22
Coupeville	48	Issaquah	78	Newport	10	Republic	11	Touchet	26
Crescent	107	Kahlotus	26	Nine Mile Falls	8	Richland	30	Toutle Lake	114
Creston	12	Kalama	114	Nooksack Valley	41	Ridgefield	115	Trout Lake	118
Curlew	11	Keller	11	North Beach	100	Ritzville	12	Tumwater	90
Cusick	10	Kelso	112	North Franklin	23	Riverside	8	Union Gap	22
Damman	18	Kennewick	25	North Kitsap	106	Riverview	61	Valley	64
Darrington	45	Kent	71	North Mason	101	Rochester	93	Valley	10
Davenport	12	Kettle Falls	11	North River	97	Roosevelt	118	Vancouver	108
Dayton	26	Kiona Benton	24	North Thurston	88	Rosalia	13	Vashon Island	63
Deer Park	8	Kittitas	18	Northport	11	Royal	18	Wahkiakum	113
Dieringer	66	Klickitat	118	Northshore	75	San Juan Island	42	Wahluke	18
Dixie	26	La Conner	46	Oak Harbor	57	Satsop	98	Waitsburg	26
East Valley (Spok.)	5	La Center	115	Oakesdale	13	Seattle	68	Walla Walla	27
East Valley (Yak.)	21	Lacrosse	13	Oakville	98	Sedro-Woolley	58	Wapato	22
Eastmont	37	Lake Chelan	35	Ocean Beach	113	Selah	19	Warden	33
Easton	18	Lake Stevens	53	Ocosta	97	Selkirk	10	Washougal	117
Eatonville	67	Lake Washington	70	Odessa	12	Sequim	102	Washtucna	12
Edmonds	49	Lakewood	47	Okanogan	32	Shaw Island	42	Waterville	35
Ellensburg	17	Lamont	13	Olympia	89	Shelton	94	Wellpinit	10
Elma	98	Liberty	7	Omak	32	Shoreline	80	Wenatchee	38
Endicott	13	Lind	12	Onalaska	95	Skamania	117	West Valley (Yak.)	15
Entiat	35	Longview	111	Onion Creek	11	Skykomish	61	West Valley (Spok.)	6
Enumclaw	84	Loon Lake	10	Orcas Island	42	Snohomish	59	White Pass	95
Ephrata	34	Lopez Island	42	Orchard Prairie	6	Snoqualmie Valley	83	White River	85
Evaline	96	Lyle	118	Orient	11	Soap Lake	33	White Salmon	118
Everett	50	Lynden	40	Orondo	35	South Bend	97	Wilbur	12
Evergreen (Clark)	109	Mabton	20	Oroville	31	South Cent-Tukwila	62	Willapa Valley	97
Evergreen (Stevens)	10	Mansfield	33	Orting	67	South Kitsap	104	Wilson Creek	33
Federal Way	72	Manson	35	Othello	23	South Whidbey	48	Winlock	96
Ferndale	51	Mary M Knight	100	Palisades	35	Southside	100	Wishkah Valley	100
Fife	65	Mary Walker	10	Palouse	13	Spokane	1	Wishram	118
Finley	25	Marysville	54	Pasco	29	Sprague	12	Woodland	114
Franklin Pierce	81	Mc Cleary	98	Pateros	35	St John	13	Yakima	14
Freeman	7	Mead	3	Paterson	24	Stanwood-Camano	60	Yelm	91
Garfield	13	Medical Lake	7	Pe Ell	97	Star	26	Zillah	21

Locales are comprised of 1 or more school districts…

Loc.	School District	Loc.	School District
1	Spokane	34	Ephrata, Quincy
2	Central Valley	35	Brewster, Entiat, Lake Chelan, Manson, Orondo, Palisades, Pateros, Stehekin, Waterville
3	Mead	36	Cascade, Cashmere
4	Pullman	37	Eastmont
5	East Valley (Spokane)	38	Wenatchee
6	Orchard Prairie, West Valley (Spokane)	39	Moses Lake
7	Cheney, Freeman, Great Northern, Liberty, Medical Lake	40	Blaine, Lynden
8	Deer Park, Nine Mile Falls, Riverside	41	Meridian, Mount Baker, Nooksack Valley
9	Chewelah, Colville	42	Lopez Island, Orcas Island, San Juan Island, Shaw Island
10	Cusick, Evergreen (Stevens), Loon Lake, Mary Walker, Newport, Selkirk, Summit Valley, Valley, Wellpinit	43	Anacortes
11	Columbia (Stevens), Curlew, Inchelium, Keller, Kettle Falls, Northport, Onion Creek, Orient, Republic	44	Burlington Edison
12	Almira, Benge, Creston, Davenport, Harrington, Lind, Odessa, Reardan, Ritzville, Sprague, Washtucna, Wilbur	45	Concrete, Darrington, Granite Falls, Index, Sultan
13	Colfax, Colton, Endicott, Garfield, Lacrosse, Lamont, Oakesdale, Palouse, Rosalia, St John, Steptoe, Tekoa	46	Conway, La Conner, Mt Vernon
14	Yakima	47	Arlington, Lakewood
15	West Valley (Yakima)	48	Coupeville, South Whidbey
16	Grandview, Sunnyside	49	Edmonds
17	Ellensburg	50	Everett
18	Cle Elum-Roslyn, Damman, Easton, Kittitas, Royal, Thorp, Wahluke	51	Ferndale
19	Highland, Naches Valley, Selah	52	Bellingham
20	Bickleton, Goldendale, Mabton, Mount Adams	53	Lake Stevens
21	East Valley (Yakima), Granger, Zillah	54	Marysville
22	Toppenish, Union Gap, Wapato	55	Monroe
23	North Franklin, Othello	56	Mukilteo
24	Kiona Benton, Paterson, Prosser	57	Oak Harbor
25	Finley, Kennewick	58	Sedro Woolley
26	Columbia (Walla Walla), Dayton, Dixie, Kahlotus, Pomeroy, Prescott, Star, Starbuck, Touchet, Waitsburg	59	Snohomish
27	College Place, Walla Walla	60	Stanwood
28	Asotin-Anatone, Clarkston	61	Riverview, Skykomish
29	Pasco	62	Renton, South Central
30	Richland	63	Peninsula, Vashon Island
31	Methow Valley, Oroville, Tonasket	64	Steilacoom, University Place
32	Okanogan, Omak	65	Fife, Puyallup
33	Bridgeport, Coulee-Hartline, Grand Coulee Dam, Mansfield, Nespelem, Soap Lake, Warden, Wilson Creek	66	Dieringer, Sumner
67	Carbonado, Eatonville, Orting	101	Central Kitsap, North Mason
68	Seattle	102	Port Angeles, Sequim
69	Tacoma	103	Chimacum, Port Townsend
70	Lake Washington	93	Rainier, Rochester, Tenino

Locales are comprised of 1 or more school districts… (cont.)

Loc.	School District	Loc.	School District
71	Kent	94	Griffin, Shelton
72	Federal Way	95	Morton, Mossyrock, Onalaska, Toledo, White Pass
73	Highline	96	Adna, Chehalis, Evaline, Napavine, Winlock
74	Bellevue	97	Boistfort, North River, Ocosta, Pe Ell, Raymond, South Bend, Willapa Valley
75	Northshore	98	Elma, Mc Cleary, Montesano, Oakville, Satsop
76	Clover Park	99	Aberdeen, Cosmopolis, Hoquiam
77	Bethel	100	Grapeview, Hood Canal, Mary M Knight, North Beach, Pioneer, Quinault, Southside, Taholah, Wishkah Valley
78	Issaquah	104	South Kitsap
79	Auburn	105	Bremerton
80	Shoreline	106	North Kitsap
81	Franklin Pierce	107	Brinnon, Cape Flattery, Crescent, Queets-Clearwater, Quilcene, Quillayute Valley
82	Tahoma	108	Vancouver
83	Snoqualmie Valley	109	Evergreen (Clark)
84	Enumclaw	110	Battle Ground
85	White River	111	Longview
86	Mercer Island	112	Kelso
87	Bainbridge Island	113	Naselle-Grays River, Ocean Beach, Wahkiakum
88	North Thurston	114	Castle Rock, Kalama, Toutle Lake, Woodland
89	Olympia	115	Green Mountain, La Center, Ridgefield,
90	Tumwater	116	Camas, Hockinson
91	Yelm	117	Mount Pleasant, Skamania, Washougal
92	Centralia	118	Centerville, Glenwood, Klickitat, Lyle, Mill A, Roosevelt, Stevenson-Carson, Trout Lake, White Salmon, Wishram

Lamont

Populations subtracted for police agencies not reporting

Police agencies are not required to report arrests or offences to UCR/NIBRS, they do so voluntarily. For a variety of reasons, a jurisdiction may report part or none of the arrests or offences for a year. In these cases, the denominator is the population of the areas that did report. For example, if juvenile arrests for one agency are not reported, the juveniles for that jurisdiction are not included in the population denominator either.

The tables below show the values that comprise the adjustment for your county for each age range we report. "% Subtracted" is the percent of the county's population subtracted for non-reporting. "Subtracted" is the amount subtracted. "Persons" is the locale's population. "Adjusted Pop" is the denominator used to calculate indicator rates. Nevertheless, rates can differ markedly from year to year particularly if a jurisdiction, where most of the crime in the county occurs, did not report. When 50% or more of the population is not reported the yearly rate is suppressed. Jurisdictions crossing county boundary lines are apportioned to each area by age, and sex of the population. When more than 40% of the reported events have been apportioned, "synthetically estimated", the yearly rate is suppressed.

All **Arrests** for 10-14 year olds have 5 year rates which represent **98.18** % of the population.

Adjustments for Non-reporting Arrests (age 10-14)

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
% Subtracted	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtracted, 10-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Persons, 10-14	12	10	10	9	12	11	11	11	11	11	11
Adjusted Pop 10-14	12	10	10	9	12	11	11	10	11	11	11

All Arrests for 10-17 year olds have 5 year rates which represent **97.78** % of the population.

Adjustments for Non-reporting Arrests (age 10-17)

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
% Subtracted	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtracted, 10-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Persons, 10-17	30	24	20	18	18	15	15	18	18	19	19
Adjusted Pop 10-17	30	24	20	18	18	15	15	16	18	19	19

All Arrests for adults have 5 year rates which represent **98.47** % of the population.

Adjustments for Non-reporting Arrests (age 18+)

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
% Subtracted	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.64	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtracted, 18+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0
Persons, 18+	157	142	138	138	138	138	137	144	143	142	141
Adjusted Pop 18+	157	142	138	138	138	138	137	133	143	142	141

All Offenses for persons have 5 year rates which represent **100.00** % of the population.

Adjustments for Non-reporting Offenses

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
% Subtracted	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subtracted, 18+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons, 18+	219	190	187	182	182	178	177	186	186	187	187
Adjusted Pop 18+	219	190	187	182	182	178	177	186	186	187	187

Lamont
Percent of Adult Arrests Not Reported to UCR/NIBRS by Year

Police agency jurisdictions which are located at least partially in your district are listed below. The table shows the percentage of non-reporting by jurisdiction for each year.

Jurisdictions	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Adams CO								8.0			
Whitman CO								8.0			

Lamont

Percent of Juvenile (Age 10-17) Arrests Not Reported to UCR/NIBRS by Year

Police agency jurisdictions which are located at least partially in your district are listed below. The table shows the percentage of non-reporting for juvenile arrests each year.

Jurisdictions	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Adams CO								8.0			
Whitman CO								8.0			

Lamont

Percent of Offenses Not Reported to UCR/NIBRS by Year

Police agency jurisdictions which are located at least partially in your district are listed below. The table shows the percentage of non-reporting for offenses each year.

Jurisdictions	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Adams CO											
Whitman CO											