

MASS, J. 6.3 vol. 12/NO. 2



U. OF MASS AMHERST LIBRARY
MASSACHUSETTS
PROBATION
GOVERNMENT COLLECTION
JUL 28 1977

BULLETIN FROM THE OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF PROBATION

Volume 12 Number 2

July 1977

TASK FORCE STUDIES COX COMMITTEE REPORT

A Probation Service Task Force, consisting of Deputy Commissioners Joseph P. Foley, Chairman, Angelo R. Musto and Sidney Barr, Supervisors William R. MacGregor and Richard J. Villa, Associate Planner William Dow, Supervisor John F. Feeny, Assistant Supervisor Edward J. Leary, Superior Court Probation Service, Chief Probation Officers John W. Belyea, Robert B. Clifford, Anthony J. DiNatale, Delbert A. Greenwood, Manuel Moutinho, George R. Skelly, Joseph M. Souza and Marie R. Williams, was activated in February, 1977 to study the role of the Office of the Commissioner of Probation and the Probation Service in the implementation of the recommendations of the Select Committee on Judicial Needs (Cox Committee Report), as incorporated in House Bill 4400 now before the Massachusetts Legislature. A report was issued by the Probation Service Task Force on May 15, 1977. Following is the text of that report:

The Select Committee on Judicial Needs has presented excellent recommendations for the improvement of delivery of service in the Judicial Branch of Massachusetts State Government.

The Probation Service Task Force, representing the Office of the Commissioner of Probation and certain select Supervisory Probation Officers from Superior, Probate, District and Juvenile Courts, however, has concern that House Bill 4400 provides little statutory direction concerning the Probation Service other than the establishment of ultimate power in all areas of Probation in the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court. Certainly the development of probation policies at levels below the Supreme Judicial Court Chief Justice should be provided for, so that his authority is one of review and approval or disapproval, rather than initiation.

The Annual Report of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court, dated March 8, 1977, in Summary of Part 1, "The Report of the Committee on Judicial Needs" states, "Checks and balances should be inserted to insure that no person has sole authority to make important and final administrative decisions."

The Probation Service Task Force feels this is a most opportune time to set forth its principles
Task Force cont. p. 2

Editor: Michael Hutner

Assistant Editor: Ann Cronin

The bulletin is published quarterly for the information of the Probation Service, the Judiciary, and the interested public. Correspondence should be sent to: Editor, Room 206, New Court House, Boston, MA 02108.

Publication Number: 6351

- 1 -

Approved by Alfred C. Holland
State Purchasing Agent

Task Force cont. from p. 1

and positions concerning the operation of the Massachusetts Probation Service. Formal Probation in Massachusetts is completing its first century, having commenced with the enactment of an 1878 statute authorizing the appointment of a probation officer for the Suffolk County Courts. The Massachusetts Probation Service has grown dramatically in the past fifteen years, now totaling over 800 officers in the Superior and the various Probate, District and Juvenile Courts. This is not the same Probation Service as functioned over twenty years ago when the very limited powers and responsibilities of the Commissioner of Probation were enacted in General Laws Chapter 276, Section 99 (Chapter 731 of 1956).

Commissioner of Probation

The growth, the multiplicity of service and the increasing complexity of the Massachusetts Probation Service make it imperative that there be a strengthening of both authority and responsibility in the Office of the Commissioner of Probation. The Commissioner, subject to the review of the Supreme Judicial Court Chief Justice, should exercise executive control and supervision of the Probation Service and should have clearly defined responsibility and authority in the following areas:

1. Establishing certain reports and forms to be maintained in various probation offices.
2. Establishing certain procedures to be carried out in various probation offices.
3. Establishing standards and basic policies of probation work to be followed in various probation offices.

4. Enforcing requirements as to reports, procedures and standards to be maintained or followed in various probation offices.

5. Certifying persons eligible for appointment as probation officers; certifying persons eligible for promotion to various supervising probation officer positions.

6. Establishing standards for evaluation of line and supervising probation officers.

7. The authority to transfer a probation officer position from one court to another subject to the approval of the Chief Justice of the tier court, no salaries or grades of existing probation personnel to be adversely affected by such a transfer.

8. Investigating and reporting on all requests for discipline of probation officers received from a Justice, Supervisor or a Chief Probation Officer; and where appropriate, initiating disciplinary action against a probation officer.

9. Maintaining personnel and fiscal records of probation officers.

10. Establishing criteria and procedures concerning the use of volunteers as deputy probation officers and aides.

11. Conducting surveys and certifying probation offices.

12. Appointing such Deputy Commissioners of Probation as authorized by law and also such Supervisors, Directors and others necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the Commissioner's office.

COMMISSIONER OF PROBATION
FOR MASSACHUSETTS

Commissioner Sands, whose retirement was effective June 27, 1977, has been reappointed for a period of ninety days to allow for a search for a new full-time Commissioner of Probation. Statutory salary limit: \$31,000. A search committee, members listed below, has been appointed by the Committee on Probation. Michael Evans is staff secretary to the committee.

Requirements:

Master's Degree

No less than 10 years in probation, corrections, parole, or other criminal justice or related human services, at least three of which must have been in an administrative capacity.

Examples of Duties:

Administration of probation work in the 103 probation departments of the Commonwealth.

Establishment of standards for probation operations.

Maintenance of probation central record file and performing related tasks including administration of the record sealing statute and the adult and juvenile interstate compacts.

Coordination, supervision, and hiring of senior level staff.

Development of state wide training opportunities for the probation service.

Gathering of statistics relating to criminal record offender information and local operations management.

Participation on interagency committees and boards.

Preparation of legislation relating to probation.

Task Force cont. from p. 2

Committee on Probation

The Committee on Probation, consisting of the Chief Justices of the tiers of various Courts having probation officers and two appointees of the Supreme Judicial Court Chief Justice, should be the judicial body advising the Commissioner of Probation and recommending principles and action concerning the Probation Service to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court. It should have responsibility in the following areas:

1. Establishing qualifications for and appointing the Commissioner of Probation.
2. Acting in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner in the development of probation policies.
3. Acting as an appellate body in disciplinary actions against probation officers.

Probation Officers

The Probation Service received brief mention in both the Report of the Select Committee on Judicial Needs (Cox Committee) and House Bill 4400. All legislation concerning probation officer qualifications, appointment, job position structures, salaries, and other related matters has been eliminated in the House 4400 proposal.

The Cox Committee stated clearly that its purpose was to allow the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court the ultimate power in these matters affecting the Probation Service. The Task Force affirms the following propositions concerning probation officers:

1. Probation officers are profes-

sional people providing investigation, counseling, mediation, evaluation, recommendation, supervision and resource referral services to the Court and parties before the Court.

2. The Commissioner of Probation should establish certain grades of probation officer (such as Intern Probation Officer, Probation Officer, Senior Probation Officer) and certain grades of supervising probation officer (such as Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Chief Probation Officer and Supervisor) and should establish qualifications for all such grades.

3. The Commissioner of Probation should establish and implement procedures necessary to determine eligibility of applicants for appointment or promotions in the Probation Service.

4. To encourage a more open and competitive process for the appointment and promotion of probation officers, the following alternatives are proposed:

a) The Chief Justice of the tier court (or his designee(s)) shall appoint and promote probation officers after a review and comment by the Presiding Judge, the Commissioner of Probation, the Chief Probation Officer, and the Supervisor, from lists of eligible and qualified candidates who apply or whose names are submitted to the Office of the Commissioner.

b) The Commissioner of Probation shall screen all applicants for probation officer appointment and promotions from lists of eligible and qualified candidates who apply or whose names

TWOMEY RETIRES FROM OCP

Cornelius J. Twomey, Supervisor of Court Probation Services in the Office of the Commissioner of Probation will retire to private life on August 31, 1977, it was announced recently by the Office of the Commissioner.

Mr. Twomey has a long history of public service spanning more than three decades. His public career began when he was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives where he served two terms from 1939-1942. In 1949, he was elected to the Governor's Council where, among other duties, he served as chairman of the Pardon Committee. In 1952, he resigned from the Council to accept an appointment from the then Governor Dever as a member of the Massachusetts Parole Board. He was subsequently re-appointed by Governor Furcolo and twice re-appointed by Governor Volpe. In all, Mr. Twomey served twenty years as a member of the Parole Board, 1952-1972, eight of them as its chairman, from 1957-1964.

During his years as a Parole Board member, Mr. Twomey saw many changes in the rules and regulations governing the paroling of inmates from the state's penal institutions. It was during his tenure, the longest ever for a member of the Board, that an annual review of cases was instituted. Prior to that time, an offender served his maximum or minimum sentence or was paroled on a designated eligible date. It was also during Mr. Twomey's tenure that the Parole Board assumed responsib-

ility for the paroling of House of Correction inmates who were serving sentences of more than one year. Previously, this had been done by the county commissioners.

In 1972, he was appointed by Commissioner C. Eliot Sands as Supervisor of Court Probation Services in the Office of the Commissioner, the position which he holds at the present time. In this capacity, he is responsible, in part, for the monitoring of services delivered to probation clients by the various courts.

Twomey has no definite plans for the future. Right now, he intends to "do a little traveling and play a little golf" after his return to private life. For a person of Twomey's energy and capabilities, that sounds like a wonderful vacation.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Since March 1 the Staff Development Unit of the Office of the Commissioner of Probation has sponsored a variety of training programs for probation officers. Forty-eight new Probation Officers have gone through two, eight-day Orientation Training Programs. The Juvenile Probation Training Committee worked in conjunction with the Staff Development Unit in planning, implementing and evaluating four workshops dealing with Adolescent Sexuality. The Superior Court Probation Staff Development Committee also worked with the Staff Development Unit in offering a specialized workshop for Superior Court

Task Force cont. from p. 4

are submitted to the Office of the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall certify and submit no less than five names from such list to the Court making such request for appointments or promotion. The Justice(s) and the Chief Probation Officer of the requesting court shall join in such appointment or promotion from the eligible list in accordance with this procedure. Appointments and promotions shall be subject to the approval of the Chief Justice of the tier court.

5. Requests for discipline of a probation officer, including reprimand, fine, suspension, demotion or discharge may be made by a Justice or Chief Probation Officer to the Commissioner of Probation who shall cause an investigation to be made and a report, with recommendations, to be written. Copies of the report and recommendations shall be furnished to the Justice, Chief Probation Officer and the probation officer cited. If either the complainant or the probation officer cited declines to accept the recommendations of the Commissioner as the order of disposition, the matter shall be set up for a full hearing and disposition by the Committee on Probation, subject to any review procedure established by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court. The Commissioner of Probation may also cite a probation officer for disciplinary action, shall give him notice of the charge(s) and a hearing on same and shall make an order of disposition. The probation

officer cited may decline to accept the Commissioner's disposition order, at which time the matter, likewise, shall be set up for a full hearing and disposition by the Committee on Probation.

6. The process for the training of newly appointed probation officers and the ongoing training for line and supervising probation officers should be established by the Commissioner of Probation.

7. Vacation and sick leave provisions for probation officers should be established by the Commissioner of Probation subject to approval of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court.

8. The Salaries of the various line and supervising probation officers should be maintained at levels reflecting the professional status and responsibilities of these officers in the judicial system. The salary schedule should incorporate an "educational incentive pay plan" in order to encourage additional professional knowledge and competence. Moreover, consideration should be given to a "longevity incentive pay" increase for probation officers after a number of years on the job.

Summary

The Select Committee on Judicial Needs in its section on "The Causes of Delay and Waste" states:

"A sharp distinction must be made between the trial and decision of cases and the management of judicial business.

CHANGE OF PERSONNEL

DESIGNATIONS AS CHIEF
PROBATION OFFICER

John J. Fleming, Acting, Middlesex Superior Court, effective April 12, 1977.

Andrew R. Klein, 117 Amory Street, Cambridge, District Court of East Norfolk, Quincy, effective May 21, 1977, a graduate of Harvard College with an M.A. from Northeastern University and a former project director for the Quincy District Court.

Edward J. Lee, Second District Court of Southern Worcester, Uxbridge, effective February 14, 1977.

James W. Mulford, First District Court of Northern Middlesex, Ayer, effective April 1, 1977.

Daniel P. Toomey, Acting, Superior Court for Suffolk County, effective May 31, 1977.

George L. Woods, District Court of Western Norfolk, Wrentham, effective April 25, 1977.

DESIGNATIONS AS ASSISTANT
CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

Luis Duran, Municipal Court for the Roxbury District, effective April 1, 1977.

James H. Kazeniak, First District Court of Northern Middlesex, Ayer, effective April 1, 1977.

Joan (Anton) Rahavy, Probate Court for Middlesex County, effective May 1, 1977.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS

Laura R. Alfieri, Suffolk Superior Court, effective March 22, 1977.

Harvey Calichman, District Court of Peabody, Northampton, effective June 18, 1977.

Michael J. Dubuc, District Court of Hampshire, Northampton, effective June 18, 1977.

Andrew Gassman, District Court of Western Norfolk, Wrentham, effective June 15, 1977.

Kevin J. Hoar, Probate Court for the County of Hampden, Springfield, effective March 7, 1977.

Marianne Kelly, East Boston District Court, effective February 22, 1977.

Richard Malynn, Essex Juvenile District, effective April 25, 1977.

William P. Nagle, Jr., First District Court of Barnstable, Barnstable, effective April 7, 1977.

Francis J. Pedersen, Municipal Court for the South Boston District, effective April 27, 1977.

John G. Rubeski, Superior Court for Essex County, effective April 12, 1977.

Personnel cont. p. 8

Personnel cont. from p. 7

Frank Siano, Superior Court for Hampshire and Franklin Counties, effective April 1, 1977.

John L. Sullivan, District Court of Newton, effective April 4, 1977.

Joseph J. Underwood, Jr., Municipal Court of the Roxbury District, effective April 20, 1977.

William J. Winn, District Court of Lowell, effective March 20, 1977.

William F. Woldman, District Court of East Norfolk, Quincy, effective March 23, 1977, formerly a probation officer in the Municipal Court of the City of Boston.

Samuel Yanka, First District Court of Southern Worcester, Dudley, effective May 15, 1977.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

John K. Cahill, 89 Elmwood Park, Quincy, Boston Municipal Court, effective April 13, 1977, a graduate of Boston College and a former director of operations for the Court Resource Program.

Paul J. Chebator, 20 Harris Road, Medford, Second District Court of Barnstable, Orleans, effective May 2, 1977, a graduate of the University of Massachusetts.

Joseph K. Kattar, Jr., 142 Osgood Street, Andover, District Court of Lawrence, effective April 1, 1977, a graduate of St. John's University.

Norbert F. Leary, Jr., 24 Kilburn Street, Revere, Boston Municipal Court, effective February 16, 1977, a graduate of American Technological University

Jean McInerney, 986 Main Street, Haverhill, Essex Juvenile District, effective June 1, 1977, a graduate of Lowell State College with an M.Ed. from Boston University.

William Moynihan, 734 Main Street, Haverhill, Central District Court of Northern Essex, Haverhill, effective December 1, 1976, a graduate of Boston College.

Judith A. O'Leary, 67 Pine Street Wakefield, Probate Court for the County of Suffolk, effective March 21, 1977, a graduate of Salem State College.

Mary F. Prior, 1190 Charles Street, North Providence, Rhode Island, Probate Court for the County of Suffolk, effective April 4, 1977, a graduate of Catherine Spalding College, Louisville, Kentucky, with an M.A. from the same school.

Timothy F. Sullivan, 41 Howard Street, Norwood, Municipal Court of the Dorchester District, effective April 27, 1977, a graduate of Boston State College.

Frederick R. Wilkey, Jr., 585 Chelmsford Street, Lowell, First District Court of Northern Middlesex, Ayer, effective April 1, 1977, a graduate of New Hampshire College.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Francis J. Coughlin, Municipal Court for the Dorchester District, effective April 4, 1977, for one year.

Michael J. Coyne, Municipal Court for the Dorchester District, effective May 10, 1977, for one year.

Personnel cont. from p. 8

Laurellen Foster, Essex Juvenile District, effective April 18, 1977 for one year.

Nicholas J. Ricciuti, Middlesex Juvenile District, effective April 1, 1977 for six months.

RESIGNED

A. Gerard Beauchamp, Essex Juvenile District, effective April 24, 1977.

C. Ryan Buckley, District Court of Lawrence, effective March 1, 1977.

Margaret Gustavis, Northampton District Court, effective June 4, 1977.

James H. Norton, Jr., Municipal Court of the Roxbury District, effective April 5, 1977.

Robert E. Triulzi, Central District Court of Northern Essex, Haverhill, effective April 30, 1977.

RETIRED

John J. O'Connor, Chief Probation Officer, Superior Court for Suffolk County, effective May 31, 1977. Mr. O'Connor entered the probation service in 1935.

James J. O'Malley, Chief Probation Officer for the First District Court of Northern Middlesex, Ayer, effective March 31, 1977. Mr. O'Malley entered the probation service in 1955.

Robert J. Verge, Chief Probation Officer for the District Court of East Norfolk, Quincy, effective May 21, 1977. Mr. Verge entered the probation service in 1934.

DECEASED

Daniel F. Loughry, Chief Probation Officer for the Middlesex Superior Court on April 12, 1977. Mr. Loughry entered the probation service in 1948.

CORRECTION

In the April, 1977 issue of Massachusetts Probation, it was incorrectly stated that Denyse Williams had been appointed a probation officer for the Probate Court for Suffolk County. Ms. Williams was appointed a probation officer for the Superior Court for Suffolk County on March 22, 1976 and remains in that position.

Staff Development cont. from p. 5

Probation Officers dealing with the Sexually Dangerous Persons. Twenty-five Local Trainers have completed a nine-week training program in Systematic Human Relations Training Skills.

In addition, the following Local Trainers have set up a number of successful training programs in their local courts that have helped to improve the job performance of the staff in special areas: Al Pizzi, Wrentham District, in the area of Community Resources; Pat Griffin, Fitchburg District Court in the areas of drugs and case management; Tony Sicuso and Charlie Ashe at Middlesex Juvenile Probation District have offered a program on Probation Revocation Procedures John Campbell at Brockton District Court held a special Law Day program; For these local programs, the Office of the Commissioner of Probation has awarded training credits that help meet the 45 training credit requirement for probation officers.

Task Force cont. from p. 6

In rendering decisions each judge and jury must be free of external controls, subject only to their own good consciences in conforming to law. In managing resources and the general flow of business, however, the need is not for the independence of the individual judge; the need is for the same kind of overall executive management that every large scale undertaking requires. Only overall direction, matching total resources to total demand, will avoid waste and secure the expeditious and economical conduct of business. Only overall management permits adequate planning. Only by improved and co-ordinated administration through the judicial system can the uniformity of records, practices and personnel policy necessary to efficient administration be achieved. The responsibility for expediting case flow must be fixed."

Twenty years have passed since Chapter 731 of 1956 following the Wessel Report, mandated qualifications for probation personnel, salaries and organizational changes within the Office of the Commissioner of Probation. Over that period the service has grown from 185 to 822 probation officers. Unfortunately, the central administration has not been provided the statutory support needed to cope with this growth.

The Probation Service Task Force confidently asserts that its principles and proposals as outlined in this paper will provide a

strong, unified, efficient Probation Service with authority, responsibility and accountability for this important segment of the judicial services operation placed squarely on its Commissioner of Probation, with necessary "checks and balances" on his policies and action by the review and overruling power of the Supreme Judicial Court Chief Justice. Again, this can be an area where "checks and balances" might originate with the tier court Chief Justices, assisted by the recommendations of their administrative committees, but subject to final approval by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

This Task Force agrees most firmly that the Probation Service best serves the Courts and the parties before the Court as a segment of the judicial branch. In this paper the Task Force has addressed itself only to the probation operation and its conclusions as to how best such a probation operation can function with effective management.

We are grateful to the Cox Commission for having the courage to focus attention on the need to improve the organization and administration of the Judicial System. It is our hope that together we can work toward the major goal:.....to develop and implement standards, procedures and policies that will strengthen and improve the Probation Service and make it an all important element in the administration of the Judicial System.

The public has a right to expect this and deserves nothing less.

PROBATION CHIEF SANDS REVIEWS CAREER

Below is an interview by Michael Evans, staff secretary for the Search Committee, who interviewed Mr. Sands recently incidental to the national search for a successor to the Commissioner.

At the conclusion of a 37 year career in the Massachusetts Probation Service, Commissioner C. Eliot Sands says that "being a probation officer is one of the finest jobs a person could have."

Commissioner Sands will retire later this year, after a successor is selected by the Committee on Probation, which oversees the operation of the probation service. When Sands retires, he will leave a mark of service which includes work in the field as a probation officer, assistant chief probation officer, and chief probation officer in the Boston Juvenile Court where he assisted the late Judges John Forbes Perkins and John T. Connelly in establishing that court's Citizenship Training Department, and at the administrative level as Deputy Commissioner, and as State Commissioner since 1965.

In a recent interview, Commissioner Sands spoke of the changes that have come about during his years in the department. "The philosophy of probation service has not changed," he stated, "but improved resources, such as a fourfold increase in the number of officers, have made the probation department more able to perform the services it was formerly supposed to do, but was actually able to perform in only a small number of cases. Previously, a

number of courts, with substantial caseloads, were served by a single, half-time probation officer, and very little investigation or supervision was possible." Sands also pointed out that today's probation officer is better trained than his counterpart ten years ago, noting that "the massive infusion of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funds, within the past decade, has enabled us to provide a more thorough orientation, in-service and specialized training program for our personnel."

The Harvard-educated Sands can cite many accomplishments since coming to the office of Probation Commissioner. A single salary scale and uniform job qualifications have been promulgated for all state probation officers, eliminating the wide variations among counties and courts. A loose-leaf annually updated probation manual is in effect, regional coordination of probation office operation has been initiated, and the legislature has enacted record sealing statutes which protect the offender, who has gone straight for 10 and 15 years following completion of sentence for a misdemeanor or felony respectively, from injury through use against him of an old record. The Department is presently involved in the final phase of an innovative "probation office accreditation program" to improve management techniques. And probation officers, who Sands says "must possess a healing personality, and be able to feel the pulse of the community," have recently, beginning in 1973, been handling domestic relations and other problems in the Probate Courts.

Several pressing issues will confront Sands' successor. The proba-

Evans' Interview cont. from p. 12

tion Commissioner presides over a mammoth criminal records file, the central criminal records file of the Commonwealth, which Sands says "must be automated, to increase efficiency, while preserving the privacy of the individual." The question of who will ultimately control the records -- the courts, through the probation service, or the executive branch -- has been a matter of concern. Collective bargaining, extended to probation officers and other employees of the judiciary by recent legislation, is also on the horizon. In addition, as Mr. Sands declares, the new Commissioner must continue to "build and improve probation service, particularly in the still understaffed Probate and Superior Court systems."

The Committee on Probation will select the next Commissioner from a list of names submitted by a special Probation Search Committee chaired by Retired Appellate Court Judge David A. Rose, and made up of individuals with particular interest and expertise in probation and correctional issues. Interested parties can contact the Probation Search Committee at 209 Essex Street, Salem, Massachusetts, 01970.

Eliot Sands is looking forward to "traveling, reading and hanging up my shingle to practice law." He says that the "personal rewards" of his years in the probation service will be lasting. "Some people just seem addicted to trouble," he stated. "But when they get helpful attention, they will always remember you."

MONEY COLLECTIONS REACH
ALL TIME HIGH

Money collections made under order of the court by probation offices of the superior and district courts of the Commonwealth have been increasing steadily since their inception. In 1976, the trend continued with increases in all categories except that of accommodations. A new category showing monies collected as assessments under the DUIL law was added in 1976. During the first year, collections in this area amounted to \$1,484,958.62. A comparison of monies collected in 1975 and 1976 is shown below.

1975

Restitution	\$ 1,831,315.32
Non-support	4,794,753.68
URESAs	
Rec'd from other states	2,483,090.56
Paid to other states	2,309,553.24
Accommodations	1,940,230.63
DUIL Assessments	-
Miscellaneous	<u>2,837,938.92</u>
Total	\$ 16,196,882.35

1976

Restitution	\$ 2,192,416.20
Non-support	4,592,364.78
URESAs	
Rec'd from other states	2,791,880.66
Paid to other states	2,281,255.06
Accommodations	1,722,955.89
DUIL Assessments	1,484,958.62
Miscellaneous	<u>2,978,412.71</u>
Total	\$ 18,044,243.92