



320



Statistical Bulletin on Escapes For 1986: A Profile of Escapes and Returns From Escape During 1986 and Individuals on Escape Status on December 31, 1986

Prepared By:

NCJRS

Linda K. Holt Manager of Operations Research

MAY 118 11988

ACCOLURCE

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

Michael V. Fair Commissioner

December 1987

PUBLICATION #: 15,148-21-250-12-87 Approved By Ric Murphy, State Purchasing Agent

.

111367

٨.

U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Massachusetts Department of Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Highlights

This statistical bulletin presents information on escapes and returns from escape that occurred during 1986. The bulletin contains descriptions of the escapes and returns including: institution and security level from which the escape occurred; type of escape; current status of the escape; length of time at large; and characteristics of the individuals escaping. Some highlights of the information contained in this report are:

- During 1986 there were 306 escapes and 305 returns from escapes, an increase of 22 escapes and 26 returns from the previous year.
- The escape rate in 1986 was 3.3 per 100. The escape rate is lower than nine of the preceeding ten years.
- Almost all escapes occur from lower security facilities and are walkaways from those facilities or failures to return from release programs such as furloughs or work release. In 1986 there were only 6 escapes from secure facilities and many secure facilities had no escapes at all.
- Most escapes are resolved quickly. Fifty-three percent of those returned were returned within one week of escape. Eighty-four percent of all 1986 escapees were returned to the DOC or known to be in the custody of another correctional agency at the end of the year.
- At the end of the year there were 92 individuals at large from the DOC, including 48 who escaped in 1986.

Introduction

The purpose of this bulletin is to provide some descriptive material regarding escapes from Department of Correction facilities that occurred during 1986. An escape is defined to be,

...any act by which an inmate, legally sentenced to the Department of Correction, leaves the confines of a correctional institution, or the custody of escorting officer(s), and/or fails to return from an authorized release to the community at the designated time...

An individual will be declared to be on escape status immediately when found to have left the confines of an institution or the custody of an officer. An individual will be declared to be on escape status two hours after the scheduled time of return from a release program.

Included in this bulletin are statistics on any individual who escaped during 1986, who returned to the DOC from escape during 1986 or who was on escape status on December 31, 1986. The bulletin includes descriptive information regarding the escape incident including: institution of escape, security level of the institution of escape, and status of the individual at the time of escape. The bulletin also includes some descriptive information about individuals involved in escape incidents including: offense, sentence and age.

Each escape incident is considered to be a single case. An individual involved in multiple escape incidents would be treated as multiple escape cases. (This happened six times in 1986). Individuals are considered to be escapes if an escape warrant was issued on them or if they were reported as released from their institution by reason of esce 2. Information for this bulletin was provided by the Apprehension Unit and the Operations Research Unit of the Research Division.

Escapes and Returns 1976 to 1986

The number of escapes and returns from escape during the last eleven years is shown in Table 1.: During 1986 there were 306 escapes, an increase of 8 percent from the number of escapes in 1985. During 1986 there were 305 returns to the DOC from escape, an increase of 9 percent from 1985.

Table 1

Escapes and Returns, 1976 to 1986

Year	Escapes	Returns
1976	208	212
1977	247	222
1978	191	164
1979	177	172
1980	176	169
1981	243	215
1982	301	283
1983	260	292
1984	234	276
1985	284	279
1986	306	305

While the absolute number of escapes and returns seems high in relation to the previous ten years, this does not take into account the large increase in population that occurred during the same time period. Escape rates can be determined by comparing the number of escapes with the total population in the Department and multiplying by 100. The total population in the Department, referred to as the base population, is equal to the population at the beginning of the year plus any new court commitments or parole violators admitted during the year. Table 2 shows escape rates for the period 1976 to 1986. The 1986 escape rate was 3.3 per 100, the second lowest escape rate of the past eleven years. The escape rate was only lower in 1984 when the escape rate was 3.2.

Table 2

Year	Number of Escapes	Base Population ¹	Escape Rate Per 100
1070	0.00	20000	
1976	208	3866	5.4
1977	247	4105	6.0
1978	191	4096	4.7
1979	177	4292	4.1
1980	176	4509	3.9
1981	243	5101	4.8
1982	301	6166	4.9
1983	260	6846	3.8
1984	234	7225	3.2
1985	2772	8064	3.4
1986	2882	8799	3.3

DOC Escape Rates, 1976 to 1986

¹ Base population is equal to the population on January 1st of the year plus all new admissions (court commitments and parole violators).

 2 Excludes 7 escapes from non-DOC facilities in 1985 and 18 escapes from non-DOC facilities in 1986.

Escapes During 1986

During 1986 there were 306 escapes. This includes 51 escapes for which no escape warrant was issued and 18 escapes of DOC offenders who were not in DOC facilities at the time of the escape (i.e., they were in county correctional facilities or state mental health facilities).

Institution. Ninety-two percent of all escapes occurred from lower security facilities, including 76 percent from pre-release facilities and 16 percent from minimum security facilities. The remaining 8 percent were from medium security facilities or other facilities. Table 7 shows escapes by specific institution and security level of the individual escapes.

Escape rates for individual institutions can be calculated by comparing the number of escapes from a particular institution with the base population of that institution. The base population of an institution is equal to the population at the beginning of the period plus any admissions to the institution during the period. Escape rates for each DOC facility are shown in Table 3. Escape rates were generally higher at lower security facilities.

1986 Escape Rates f	or DOC Facilities
---------------------	-------------------

Facility	Beginning Population	Admissions	Total Population	Escapes	Escape Rate
Cedar Junction	698	2063	2761	1	0.0
Lemuel Shattuck	17	531	548	1	0.2
Concord	663	3960	4623	0	0.0
Framingham	238	1071	1309	1	0.1
Norfolk	1124	1875	2999	· 0	0.0
NCCI	628	1144	1772	0	0.0
SECC	410	1127	1537	6	0.4
Bay State	141	254	395	6	1.5
Medfield	36	40	76	1	1.3
NCC	190	380	570	5	0.9
Plymouth	122	316	438	24	5.5
Warwick	84	142	226	4	1.8
Lancaster	130	289	419	8	1.9
Shirley	329	751	1080	22	2.0
Longwood T.C.	103	436	539	3	.0.6
Hodder Cottage	10	88	98	1	1.0
Boston State	91	196	287	38	13.2
Norfolk PRC	51	127	178	9	5.0
Park Drive	56	126	182	13	7.1
S. Middlesex	106	194	300	13	4.3
Charlotte House	15	52	67	10	14.9
Hillside PRC	39	74	113	15	13.3
Drug Rehab	3	18	21	2	9.5
MHHI	106	542	648	105	16.2

<u>Type of Escape.</u> An individual's status at the time of escape was used to classify escapes into various types. Escapes were classified into five groups: Program Related Activity (PRA) release, work release, furlough, walk-away and secure custody. Walk-aways were the single most common type of escape, accounting for 38 percent (N=117) of all escape incidents. Escapes from work release and PRA were also common escape types, accounting for 29 percent (N=88) and 26 percent (N=79) of all escapes respectively. Escapes from release programs of all types (PRA, work release and furlough) accounting for 60 percent (N=182) of all escapes. Escapes from secure custody (walled institution or transportation) were rare, accounting for two percent (N=7) of all escapes. Table 7 shows information regarding type of escape and institution.

As shown in the previous discussion of escape rates, the incidence of escapes is low in relation to the number of inmates in lower security facilities and community release programs; inmates who can be considered to have easy access to escapes. During 1986 the average daily population in lower security facilities throughout the DOC was 1,673 and there were 282 escapes from these facilities. During 1986 there were 8,896 furloughs taken by DOC inmates. During 1986 there were 1,557 work release placements and 101 education release placements made by various facilities. There is clearly a large opportunity for yet little incidence of escape.

<u>Time of Escape.</u> Escapes are seasonally related, occurring most frequently during the summer months and least frequently during the winter months. In 1986 the number of escapes during any month ranged from 10 in April to 42 in September. During the months of June, July, August and September there were 141 escapes (46 percent of the total); during the months of January, February, March, and December there were 77 escapes (26 percent of the total). Table 8

shows the month of escape for all 1986 escapes.

Escapes often occur within a relatively short time after arrival at a lower security institution. Twelve percent of the 1986 escapes from lower security occurred within one week of transfer and 36 percent occurred within one month of transfer to the facility. The time in a lower security placement is shown in Table 8. Of the 282 escapes from lower security, 141 (50 percent) involved inmates transferred from a secure facility and 141 (50 percent) involved inmates transferred from another lower security facility.

<u>Return of Escapees.</u> Escape incidents are often of a very short duration. Of all escapes during 1986, 248 (81 percent) were returned to the DOC before the end of the year and 9 (3 percent) were known to be in the custody of another agency. Of the 248 escapes that were returned, 67 (27 percent) came back the same day and 131 (53 percent) were returned within a week of the escape. Of those individuals escaping in 1986, 48 were still on escape status on December 31st. One individual died while on escape. Table 4 shows this information. For those 48 escapees remaining at large on December 31, 1986, the time on escape status ranged from four days to 356 days.

Status of 1986 Escapees On December 31, 1986

Escapee Status on December 31, 1986	Number	Percent
Returned to the DOC		
Same Day	67	(22)
One Day	25	(8)
Two Days	11	(4)
Three Days	7	(2)
Four Days	4	(1)
Five Days	5	(2)
Six Days	9	(3)
Seven Days	3	(1)
Eight Days	4	(1)
Nine Days	7	(2)
Ten Days	3	(1)
Eleven Days up to 1 Month	38	(12)
1 Month up to 2 Months	31	(10)
2 Months up to 3 Months	15	(5)
3 Months up to 6 Months	15	(5)
6 Months up to 1 Year	4	(1)
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	(1)
Total Returned	248	(81)
Custody of Another Agency	9	(3)
Died on Escape at Large	1	(0)
At Large on 12/31/86		
Less Than 1 Month	7	(2)
1 Month up to 2 Months	8	(3)
2 Months up to 3 Months	5	(2)
3 Months up to 6 Months	17	(6)
6 Months up to 9 Months	7	(2)
9 Months up to 1 Year	4	(1)
Total At Large	48	(16)
GRAND TOTAL	306	(100)

<u>Characteristics of Escapees</u>. Since most escapes take place from lower security facilities, the background characteristics of the escapee population can be contrasted with the overall lower security population on January 1, 1987.

Of the individuals who escaped during 1986, 57 percent were incarcerated for offenses against the person, 11 percent for sex offenses, 20 percent for property offenses, 8 percent for drug offenses and 4 percent for other offenses. This information is shown in Table 9. In contrast with the general lower security population, property and person offenders were over-represented among escapees (20 percent vs. 12 percent and 57 percent vs. 50 percent, respectively) while sex offenders, drug offenders, and "other" offenders were under-represented (11 percent vs. 16 percent, 8 percent vs. 13 percent, and 4 percent vs. 9 percent, respectively).

Of the individuals who escaped during 1986, 51 percent were serving Cedar Junction sentences, 41 percent were serving Concord sentences, 6 percent were serving Framingham sentences and 2 percent were originally committed to other jurisdictions. In contrast with the overall lower security population, escapees were more likely to be serving Concord sentences (41 percent vs. 20 percent) and less likely to be serving Cedar Junction sentences (51 percent vs. 66 percent) or to be transfers from other jurisdictions (2 percent vs. 8 percent). Table 9 shows sentences for all 1986 escapees.

The median age of escapees at the time of escape was 27 years and ranged from 17 to 61 years. This is younger than the general lower security population where the median age was 31 years on January 1, 1987. Table 9 shows the age distribution of the escapee groups.

<u>Summary</u>. In summary, there were 306 escapes during 1986. Most of these escapes took place from lower security institutions and involved walk-aways from the institutions or late returns from release programs. The escapee population was younger than the overall lower security population and was concentrated among less serious offenders as demonstrated by the over-representation of Concord sentences among the group.

Returns From Escape During 1986

During 1986 there were 305 returns from escape. This includes returns of the 51 escapees for whom no escape warrant was issued. It includes twelve returns of individuals who were known to be in the custody of another correctional agency before 1986 but were returned to the DOC during 1986. It excludes 14 individuals who were known to be in the custody of another agency in 1986 but were not yet returned to the DOC during the calendar year.

For the most part, the returnees were the same individuals who also escaped during 1986. Information concerning the offense, sentence and age of the returnee groups is contained in Table 9. Information on the institution they escaped from and the type of escape are included in Tables 10 and 11.

Length of time on escape is calculated as the time between the escape and apprehension. Thus, if the individual was in the custody of another correctional authority prior to returning to the DOC, length of escape is the time between escape and return to custody. Individuals who returned from escape during 1986 were on escape from less than one day to over eleven years. The median length of time on escape status is 12 days. Table 5 shows the length of time between escapes and return to DOC custody for all individuals returned during 1986.

Individuals returning to the DOC may have new charges resulting from

arrests that occurred while on escape or the discovery of old warrants. During 1986, of the 305 returns from escape there were 85 (28 percent) with new charges upon return and 220 (72 percent) with no new charges upon return. This information is shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Characteristics of Returns, All Returns From Escape During 1986

Offender Characteristics	Number	Percent
Time on Escape Status		
Less Than One Day	67	(22)
One Day	27	(9)
Two Days	11	(4)
Three Days	7	(2)
Four Days	5	(2)
Five Days	5	(2)
Six Days	9	(3)
Seven Days	3	(1)
Eight Days up to One Month	56	(18)
One Month up to Two Months	41	(13)
Two Months up to Three Months	20	(6)
Three Months up to Six Months	21	(7)
Six Months up to Nine Months	11	(4)
Nine Months up to One Year	2	(1)
One Year or More	20	(6)
TOTAL	305	(100)
Median – 7 Days		
Known New Charges Upon Return		
Yes	85	(28)
No	220	(72)
TOTAL	305	(100)

At Large Escapees

As of December 31, 1986, there were 92 individuals who were considered to be on escape status. Fifty-two percent (N=48) of this group escaped during 1986, the remaining 48 percent (N=44) escaped in 1985 or earlier. The time on escape status ranged from four days to over seventeen years. The median time on escape status is 316 days. Table 6 shows the time at large for this group.

Information on the offense, sentence and age at time of escape for this group of at-large escapees is shown in Table 9. Information regarding the escape institution and type of escape is shown in Tables 10 and 11.

Table 6

Time on Escape Status as of December 31, 1986 At Large Escapees

Time on Escape Status	Number	Percent
Less Than One Month	7	(8)
One Month up to Two Months	8	(9)
Two Months up to Three Months	5	(5)
Three Months up to Six Months	17	(18)
Six Months up to Nine Months	7	(8)
Nine Months up to One Year	4	(4)
One Year up to Two Years	7	(8)
Two Years up to Four Years	6	(6)
Four Years up to Five Years	1	(1)
Five Years up to Ten Years	16	(17)
Ten Years or More	14	(15)
TOTAL	92	(100)

Median - 316 days

Summary

During 1986 there were 306 DOC escapes, making 1986 the second lowest year since 1976 in terms of the rate of escapes. At the end of the year there were 92 individuals known to be at large.

Only a small proportion of DOC residents were involved in escape incidents during 1986. When they do occur, escapes generally occur from lower security institutions or from release programs. Escapes rarely occur from secure custody. Most escapees are returned to DOC custody within a short period of time. In terms of offense, sentence and age, individuals involved in escape incidents are generally younger and are serving shorter sentences than the general lower security offender population.

Type of Escape by Institution and Security Level, All 1986 Escapes

Institution & Security Level			Furlough	Walk- A way	Secure Custody	Total	
Maximum							
Cedar Junction Lemuel Shattuck	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 1	1 0	1 1	
Total Maximum	0	0	0	1	1	2	
Medium		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
SECC Framingham	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 1	2 0	3 1	
Total Medium	0	0	0	2	2	4	
Minimum						Ĩ	
Plymouth Warwick	0	0 0	0	16 2	0	16 2	
Shirley Lancaster	0 0	0	3 0	9 2	0	12 2	
Bay State NCC	0	0	1 2	5 3	0	6 5	
Medfield Longwood SECC	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0	0 3 3	0 0 0	1 3 3	
Total Minimum	0	0	7	43	0	50	
State Pre-Release							
Plymouth Warwick	5	3 1	0 0	0	0	8 2	
Shirley	0	6	2	1 2	0	10	
Boston State	8	23	ī	6	Õ	38	
S. Middlesex	1	5	0	7	0	13	
Park Drive	2	6	0	5	0	13	
Lancaster Norfolk PRC	0	3 6	0	3 2	0	6 9	
Hodder Cottage	0	0	0	1	0	9 1	
Total State	17	53	3	27	0	100	

Tabl**e** 7. (Continued)

Institution & Security Level	PRA	Work Release	Furlough	Walk- A way	Secure Custody	Total
Contract Pre-Release						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
McGrath House	12	2	0	6	0	20
Coolidge II	5	0	0	2	0	7
THP	8	3	0	5	0	16
Coolidge I	22	9	1	11	0	43
Brooke	5	7	1	6	0	19
Hillside	3	5	0	7	0	15
Charlotte House	6	2	0	2	Ö	10
Drug Rehab	0	0	0	2	0	2
Total Contract	61	28	2	41	0	132
Other						
Bridgewater TC/SH/AC	1	2	1	0	4	8
County Facility	0	5	2	2	Ō	9*
Hospitals	0	0	Ő	1	0	1
mospieuroj	U .	Ū	v .	-	U .	4
Total Other	1	7	3	3	4	18
GRAND TOTAL	79	88	15	117	7	306

Selected Characteristics of Escapes, 1986 Escapes

Escape Characteristics	Number	Percent
Month of Escape		anna ann an Aonaichtean ann ann ann ann ann ann ann ann ann
January	19	(6)
February	21	(7)
March	23	(8)
April	10	(3)
May	21	(7)
June	41	(13)
July	31	(10)
August	27	(9)
September	42	(14)
October	33	(11)
November	24	(8)
December	14	(5)
TOTAL	306	(100)
Time at Lower Security Institution Prior to Escape		
One Week or Less	33	(12)
One Week up to 1 Month	67	(24)
1 Month up to 2 Months	56	(20)
2 Months up to 3 Months	39	(14)
3 Months up to 6 Months	52	(18)
6 Months up to 9 Months	13	(5)
9 Months up to 1 Year	9	(3)
1 Year or More	13	(5)
TOTAL	282	(100)

Median - 45 days

Selected Characteristics of Individuals Escaping in 1986, Returning in 1986, At Large on December 31, 1986 and Lower Security Population on January 1, 1987

Offender		apes	Ret			Large	Lower :	Securîty
Characteristic	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Present Offense		<u></u>	· · · ·					- <u>1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999</u> - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999
Person	175	(57)	166	(54)	59	(64)	854	(50)
Sex	33	(11)	32	(10)	7	(8)	277	(16)
Property	61	(20)	71	(23)	15	(16)	211	(12)
Drug	24	(8)	24	(8)	7	(8)	216	(13)
Other	11	(4)	10	(3)	4	(4)	153	(9)
N.A.	2	(1)	2	(1)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Total	306	(100)	305	(100)	92	(100)	1711	(100)
Committing Institution								1000 - 1000 - 1000 - 1000
Cedar Junction	155	(51)	155	(51)	61	(66)	1138	(66)
Concord	125	(41)	128	(42)	23	(25)	340	(20)
Framingham	19	(6)	16	(5)	8	(9)	91	(5)
Other Jurisdiction	7	(2)	6	(2)	0	(0)	142	(8)
Total	306	(100)	305	(100)	<u>92</u>	(100)	1711	(100)
Age at Time of Escape								
19 or Younger	12	(4)	10	(3)	4	(4)	30	(2)
20 to 24	79	(26)	84	(28)	20	(22)	252	(15)
25 to 39	87	(28)	98	(32)	17	(18)	452	(26)
30 to 34	63	(21)	59	(19)	22	(24)	327	(19)
35 to 39	35	(11)	27	(9)	13	(14)	266	(16)
40 to 44	10	(3)	9	(3)	3	(3)	180	(10)
45 to 49	7	(2)	5	(2)	7	(8)	90	(5)
50 or over	3	(1)	4	(1)	5	(5)	114	(7)
N.A.	10	(3)	9	(3)	1	(1)	Ō	(0)
Total	306	(100)	305	(100)	92	(100)	1711	(100)
Median	27	y 75 .	27	vrs.	31	yrs.	31	yrs.

Escape Institution, Escapes, Returns, and Individuals At Large on December 31, 1986

Institution and Security Level	Esco	1009	Retu		At Large		
Security Level	N	<u>%</u>			N %		
Maximum		······································	······································		<u></u>	······································	
Walpole	1	(0)	2	(1)	1	(1)	
Lemuel Shattuck	1	(0)	1	(0)	0	(0)	
Total Maximum	2	(1)	3	(1)	1	(1)	
Medium	٥	(0)	· · ·	(0)	4	111	
Concord	0	(0)	0	(0)	1	(1)	
Framingham	1 0	(0)	4	(1)	5	(5)	
Norfolk SECC	3	(0)	1 3	(0)	7	(8)	
SECC	3	(1)	3	(1)	1	(1)	
Total Medium	4	(1)	. 8	(3)	14	(15)	
Minimum							
Plymouth	16	(5)	18	(6)	3	(3)	
Warwick	2	(1)	2	(1)	3	(3)	
Shirley	12	(4)	12	(4)	4	(4)	
Lancaster	2	(1)	1	(0)	0	(0)	
Bay State	6	(2)	6	(2)	3	(3)	
NČC	5	(2)	3	(1)	6	(6)	
Medfield	1	(0)	1	(0)	0	(0)	
Longwood T.C.		(1)	3	(1)	0	(0)	
SEČC	3	(1)	1	(0)	2	(2)	
Total Minimum	50	(16)	47	(15)	21	(23)	
State Pre-Release							
Plymouth	8	(3)	10	(3)	2	(2)	
Warwick	2	(1)	1	(0)	1	(1)	
Monroe	Õ	(0)	Ō	(0)	1	(1)	
Shirley	10	(3)	9	(3)	5	(5)	
Boston State	38	(12)	38	(12)	4	(4)	
S. Middlesex	13	(4)	12	(12)	4	(4)	
Park Drive	13	(4)	15	(5)	2	(2)	
Lancaster	6	(2)	6	(2)	1	(1)	
Norfolk PRC	9	(3)	11	(4)	3	(3)	
Hodder	1	(0)	1	(0)	0	(0)	
Total Pre-Release	100	(33)	103	(34)	23	(25)	

Table 10 (Continued)

Institution and						
Security Level	Escapes		Returns		At Large	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Contract Pre-Release		<mark>le na de Parto de Constante de Const 1</mark>				
McGrath House	20	(6)	18	(6)	6	(6)
Coolidge II	7	(2)	8	(3)	1	(1)
THP	16	(5)	14	(4)	2	$(\hat{2})$
Coolidge I	43	(14)	42	(14)	6	(6)
Brooke	19	(6)	19	(6)	7	(8)
Hillside	15	(5)	13	(4)	4	(4)
Charlotte	10	(3)	8	(3)	2	(2)
Drug Rehab	2	(1)	6	(2)	1	(1)
Total Contract	132	(43)	128	(42)	29	(32)
Other	18	(6)	16	(5)	4	(4)
GRAND TOTAL	306	(100)	305	(100)	92	(100)

Table 11

Type of Escape By Escapee Group

Type of Escape	Escapes		Returns		At Large	
	N	<u>ipes</u> %	N	<u>ums</u> %	$\frac{At}{N}$	<u>Large</u> %
an a						
PRA	79	(26)	73	(24)	18	(20)
Work Release	88	(29)	84	(28)	22	(24)
Furlough	15	(5)	18	(6)	17	(18)
Walk-Ăway	117	(38)	122	(40)	31	(34)
Secure Custody	7	(2)	8	(3)	4	(4)
TOTAL	306	(100)	305	(100)	92	(100)