If you have issues viewing or accessing this file contact us at NCJRS.gov.



STATE OF NEW YORK

137148

CHESTER H. CLARK

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

THE STATE OFFICE BUILDING CAMPUS

ALBANY, N.Y. 12226

THOMAS A. COUGHLIN III COMMISSIONER

DIVISION OF PROGRAM PLANNING, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

FACILITY ESCAPE INCIDENTS

1986 - 1990

This report provides descriptive information on incidents of escape from the correctional facilities of the New York State Department of Correctional Services between 1986 and 1990. The report also presents information on demographic characteristics and legal history characteristics of escapees. When appropriate, escapees are compared with the general under custody population. The analysis uses a series of variables including facility security level, age, commitment offense, minimum sentence, maximum sentence, time served, prior adult criminal history, and duration of escape. The report is preceded by a brief summary of the main findings.

1991

ICIRS

19 1992

ACQUISITIONS

CHESTER H. CLARK Assistant Commissioner

G. RONALD COURINGTON Director of MIS/Research

PAUL KOROTKIN Assistant Director MIS/Research

HENRY C. DONNELLY Director, Program Planning Research and Evaluation

137148

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 in microfiche only has been granted by New York State Department

of Correctional Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Prepared by:

JAMES A. LYONS Program Research Specialist II Division of Program Planning Research and Evaluation

INMATE ESCAPES FROM CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

1986 - 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SU	JMMARY	i
INTRODUCTIO	Ν	,1
Section One	Number of Escapes	.2
Section Two	Escapes by Facility Security Level	4
Section Three	Commitment Offense of Escapees	5
Section Four	Age and Ethnicity of Escapees	6
Section Five	Prior Criminal Record of Escaped Inmates	.8
Section Six	Sentence Length of Escapees	. ,9
Section Seven	Time Served to Date of Escape	.11
Section Eight	Duration of Escape	12
APPENDIX A	Summary of Escapes by Facility, 1986-1990	13
APPENDIX B	Summary of Methods of Escapes, 1986-1990	. 15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Most Escaped Inmates from Minimum Custody

The majority of escapees (78%) in the time period of 1986 - 1990 were from minimum security facilities or medium security inmates assigned to work details outside of the security perimeter. The rate of escapes from secure custody in the time span of 1987 - 1990 fell dramatically from 1986 rate levels (see Table 1.2, p.3).

2. Number and Rate of Escaped Inmates, 1986 - 1990

In the five year time period of 1986 - 1990, 58 inmates escaped from custody. Ten inmates escaped in calendar year 1990. The rate of escapees per 1000 inmates has shown a downward trend during the five year time span (see Table 1.1, p.2).

3. Number of Escaped Inmates by Facility Security Level

In 1990 four inmates escaped from maximum security facilities, and six inmates escaped from minimum security facilities. Over the time period of 1986 through 1990, 16% of escapes occurred at maximum security prisons, 24% at medium facilities and 60% at minimum facilities (see Table 2.1, p.4).

1

4. Incarceration Offenses of Escapees

In 1990 escapees were most likely to have been incarcerated in prison for the offenses of burglary (30%), murder (20%), or robbery (20%). Forty-seven percent of escaped inmates during 1986 - 1990 had been imprisoned for burglary (see Table 3.1 and Table 3.2, p.5).

5. Age of Escaped Inmates

Escapees were younger when compared to the total inmate population. In the period of 1986 - 1990, 43% of escapees were under 25 years of age while 25% of undercustody inmates were under 25 years of age (see Table 4.1, p.6 and Chart 4.1, p.6).

6. Ethnicity of Escaped Inmates

During the 1986 - 1990 time span, 67% of escapees were White. The total is in contrast to the total undercustody population where 19% were White. In 1990, 40% of escaped inmates were White (see Chart 4.2, p.7).

7. **Prior Incarcerations of Escapees**

Of the total 58 escapees in 1986 - 1990, 43% had served a prior commitment at a state prison while 33% had been previously incarcerated at a local jail (see Table 5.2, p.8).

8. Instant Offense Sentences

During the time period of 1986 - 1990, 57% of escaped inmates were serving a minimum sentence of less than three years. This percentage total compared to 42% in the inmate undercustody population (see Table 6.2, p.9).

9. Time Served by Inmates Prior to Escapes

Sixty-two percent of escapees between 1986 - 1990 had served less than one year in Department custody, only 14% had served more than three years. Of 1990 escapees, 60% had served less than one year in custody and 30% had served more than three years (see Table 7.1 and Table 7.2, p.11).

10. Time of Escape Status Prior to Apprehension

Of the 58 escapees between 1986 - 1990, 47% (N=28) were caught within 12 hours and 83% (N=48) were apprehended within 48 hours. In 1990, 60% of escapees were caught within 12 hours (see Table 8, p.12).

11. Crimes Committed by Escapees in 1989

Four escapees in 1990 were arrested for additional crimes while on escape status. Three inmates were charged with theft of a motor vehicle and one escapee was arrested for theft of a bicycle. All charges were for non-violent offenses (see Appendix B, p.18).

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Correctional Services maintains data files on undercustody inmates and, together with specific information on escapes, produces the annual department report on facility escapes. This report profiles inmate escapees and the circumstances surrounding escape incidents for the previous year. Characteristics of escapees are examined for the time period of 1986 through 1990, and escaped inmates are compared to the undercustody population for the same time span. Appendix B presents a brief description of each escape incident.

There were 58 inmates who escaped in 47 separate incidents during the 1986 - 1990 time period. With the exception of 1988 when five inmates escaped, the number of escape incidents and inmate escapees remained relatively constant at 9 to 14 escape incidents per year involving a total of between 10 and 19 inmates. However, the rate of escaped inmates per thousand inmates in custody declined over the five year period from .49 in 1986 to .18 in 1990. This trend may be explained by (1) fewer escapes, and (2) an increase in the number of inmates undercustody in correctional facilities. The inmate population increased 42% from 1986 (N=38,681) to 1990 (N=54,912). The decline in the rate of escapes is noteworthy in consideration of the rapid addition of new correctional facilities and correctional officers during the same five year time span.

Section One Number of Inmate Escapes

There were 58 inmates who escaped from Department custody between 1986 and 1990. In the most recent year 1990, 10 inmates escaped from correctional facilities or correctional officers. Table 1.1 presents data on the frequency and rate of escapes for the years 1986 - 1990.

The number of escapes fell between 1989 (12) and 1990 (10), and the total number of 1990 escapes was slightly less than the five year average of 12 escapes per year.

The end of year undercustody population in New York correctional facilities increased 42% between 1986 and 1990. Therefore the use of rates, based upon the number of escapes per thousand inmates under custody, allows for standardized comparison between years. Rate data are important in discerning the level of escape activity when there are large fluctuations in year to year totals of incarcerated inmates. The 1990 rate of escape, .18 per thousand inmates, was well below the five year average of .25.

Table 1.1Frequency and Rate of Escapes1986 - 1990

-2-

Calendar Year	Number of Escapes	Rate per Thousand Inmates		
1986	19	.49		
1987	12	.29		
1988	5	.11		
1989	12	.23		
1990	10	.18		
Total	58	.25		

Chart 1.1 Number of Inmate Escapes 1986 - 1990



Year

Escapes From Secure Custody

A total of 58 inmates escaped from custody between 1986 and 1990. However, 13 inmates escaped from a secure custody setting while a larger number of escapees walked out of minimum security facilities, or escaped from work assignments or community activities located outside of the prison. Inmates who effect their escape from minimum security facilities or from less secure areas outside of the perimeter fence of medium or maximum security prisons are commonly referred to as 'walkaways'. That is, since the inmate was assigned to a less secure area, he or she could escape from immediate custody by walking away. The escapee would not have to use more elaborate methods necessary in a higher security assignment.

Of a total of 58 escapees, 60% (N=35) were from minimum security facilities and 17% (N=10) were walkaways from maximum or medium security facility assignments outside of the perimeter fence. The remaining 23% (N=13) of escapees were persons who escaped from secure custody at maximum or medium security prisons. When escape rates of Table 1.1 and Table 1.2 are compared, both the rate of escapes from secure custody and the total rate of escapes in 1990 is consistent with the 5 year average of the 1986-1990 time period.

Table 1.2
Frequency and Rate of Escapes
1986 - 1990

Calendar Year	Escap Secure (e from Custody	Walkaways or from Minimum Custody			
	<u>#_</u>	Rate	<u>#</u>	Rate		
1986	6	.16	13	.34		
1987	0	.00	12	.29		
1988	0	.00	5	.11		
1989	3	.06	9	.18		
1990	4	.07	6	.11		
Total	13	.06	45	.20		

Section Two Escapes by Facility Security Level

New York State correctional facilities are classified as maximum, medium or minimum security. This designation is based upon the physical characteristics of each facility that enable the Department to safely and securely house inmates. Several criteria are taken into consideration in determination of the security classification:

- * perimeter the type of enclosure surrounding the inmates within a correctional facility;
- * internal control the capacity to isolate internal areas of a prison through the use of control gates;
- * housing the range of occupational units from individual cells with remote controlled locks to open barrack-type housing;
- * special housing the need of facilities to securely control and isolate disruptive individual inmates from the general inmate population; and

* operational configuration - the ability to monitor and control inmate movement and interaction within the facility.

Table 2.1 reveals the security level of inmates who escaped from custody in the years from 1986 through 1990. As indicated in the table, 60% (N=35) of the escapees were in minimum security facilities, 24% (N=14) were located at medium security prisons, and 16% (N=9) were housed in maximum security institutions.

Table 2.1Facility Security Level of Inmate Escapes1986 - 1990

•	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	Т	'otal
Security Level	N	N	N	N	N	N	%
Maximum	3	2	0	0	4	9	16%
Medium	7	1	0	6	0	14	24%
Minimum	9	9	5	6	6	35	60%
Total	19	12	5	12	10	58	100%

Chart 2 Number of Escapees by Year and Security Level



Section Three Commitment Offense of Escapees

The most serious current offense for each escaped inmate is shown in Table 3.1. The most common commitment offenses among 1990 escapees were burglary at 30% (N=3), murder 20% (N=2), and robbery 20% (N=2).

Data on the commitment offenses for all inmates under custody of the Department of Correctional Services are compared to escaped inmates from 1986 -1990 in Table 3.2. Noteworthy are the percentage differences in the undercustody population and the escape population in the offense types of robbery, burglary, drugs, and stolen property. The percentage of offenders in the undercustody population convicted of robbery and drug offenses is considerably higher when compared to the offense types in the escape population. Conversely, a higher percentage of escaped inmates were convicted of burglary or stolen property as compared to the general population.

One reason for these differences is that offense type consideration is part of inmates' security assessment. Robbery may be considered a more serious offense than crimes such as larceny or forgery, and offenders are more likely to assigned to higher security facilities, reducing escape opportunities. Stolen property offenses may not be considered as serious an offense as murder, robbery, sex offenses, assault, or other crimes of violence, and offenders convicted of these offenses may be assigned proportionately to lower security facilities.

Table 3.1Commitment Offense Type by Year of EscapeInmate Escapees 1986 - 1990

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	Т	DTAL
Crime							
Туре	N	Ν	N	N	Ν	Ν	%
Murder	2	0	0	0	2	4	7%
Other Homicide	e 0 -	0	0	1	0	1	2%
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Other Sex Off.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Robbery	0	· 1 ·	1	2	2	6	10%
Assault	0	0	0	0	1	1	2%
Burglary	11	5	4	4	3	27	47%
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Grand Larceny	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Drugs	2	2	0	3	0	7	12%
Stolen Property	3	4	0	0	1	8	14%
Forgery	0	0	0	1	1 .	2	3%
DWI	0	0	0	1	0	1	2%
Youthful Off.	· : 0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Other Felony	1	0	0	0	0	1	2%
Total	19	12	5	12	10	58	100%

Table 3.2Commitment Offense of Escapees and
Undercustody Population

١

Crime	Escapees	Average Undercustody
Туре	1986 - 1990	Population 1986 - 1990
Murder	7%	10%
Other Homicide	2%	5%
Rape	0%	3%
Other Sex Off.	0%	3%
Robbery	10%	22%
Assault	2%	3%
Burglary	47%	11%
Arson	0%	0%
Grand Larceny	0%	2%
Drugs	12%	31%
Stolen Property	14%	2%
Forgery	3%	1%
DWI	3%	1%
Youthful Off.	2%	0%
Other Felony	2%	5%
Total	100%	100%

Section Four Age of Escapees

The average age of inmate escapees in 1990 was 25 years old. Of the ten escaped inmates, three were 22 years old or younger; five were between the ages of 23 and 26; and two were between 33 and 41. An examination of Table 4.1 reveals that the distribution of ages of escapees remained consistent over the years of 1986 through 1990. The majority of inmates were under 31 years old (approximately 80% in 1990 as compared to 78% in the 1986-1990 period). There were no escaped inmates over age forty in 1990 in contrast to the five inmates in the 1986-1990 time period (8%).

A comparison of the ages of escapees in 1986-1990 with the total number of inmates in the undercustody population from 1986-1990 shows that 43% of the escapees were under the age of 25 and 78% were 30 years old or less, while 25% of the undercustody population were under 25 years old and 57% were 30 years old. See Table 4.2 for a comparison of ages of inmates whescaped with total undercustod population. In general, escapees wer younger than other inmates in th undercustody population.

Table 4.1Age at Time of Escape by Year of EscapeInmate Escapees 1985 - 1989

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	Т	otal
Age In Years	N	N	Ν	N	N	N	%
<u>< 18</u>	1	0	0	0	2	3	5%
19-20	2	2	1	1	1	7	12%
21-22	1	0	0	3	0	4	7%
23-24	3	3	1	2	2	11	19%
25-26	4	1	1	3	3	12	21%
27-28	4	2	0	0	0	6	10%
29-30	0	1	1	0	0	2	3%
31-35	1	2	0	1	1	5	9%
36-40	0	0	1	1	1	3	5%
41-45	1	0	0	1	0	2	3%
46-50	2	1	0	0	0	3	5%
> 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Total	19	12	5	12	10	58	100%

Chart 4.1 Age of Inmate Escapees and Undercustody Population



Escapees 💹 Undercustody

Ethnicity of Escapees

Table 4.2 presents information on the ethnicity of escaped inmates for the years 1986-1990. During the five year span, 67% of escapees were White, 9% Black, and 22% Hispanic. Proportionately fewer inmates classified as White escaped in 1990 as compared to the five year totals.

Chart 4.2 presents information on the ethnicity of the undercustody population and escapes for the time period of 1986-1990. Comparisons between ethnicity of escapees and undercustody population for the five year time period reveal that 67% of escapees were White as compared to 19% of the total inmate population; 9% of escapees were Black compared to 50% in the undercustody population; and, 22% of escapees were Hispanic compared to 30% of the undercustody population. The reader should note that ethnic group totals have changed from 1986 to 1990 with a larger percentage of Hispanics incarcerated and a concomitant decrease in inmates classified as White within the total inmate population.

Hispanics consist of a greater portion of the total population in 1990 as compared to 1986 and they also make up a greater portion of the escapee group in 1989 and 1990 as compared with escapees in earlier years.

Table 4.2Ethnicity of Escapees by Year of EscapeInmate Escapees 1986 - 1990

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	Т	otal
Ethnic Group	N	N	N	N	N	N	%
White	17	8	5	5	4	39	67%
Black	0	2	0	2	1	5	9%
Hispanic	2	2	0	5	4	13	22%
Other	0	0	0	0	1	1	2%
Total	19	12	5	12	10	58	100%

Chart 4.2 Ethnicity of Inmates Escapees vs Undercustody, 1986 - 1990



Escapees 🗱 Undercustody

Percent

Section Five Prior Criminal Record of Escaped Inmates

Prior Adult Convictions

Table 5.1 shows the conviction status for prior offenses for the escapee. population. Inmates are categorized according to the most serious prior criminal record (i.e., felony conviction more serious than misdemeanor conviction which in turn is treated as more serious than no prior conviction). Inmates are incarcerated for their instant commitment offense; prior offense refers to convictions before the most recent instant commitment offense. For example, consider the case of a inmate convicted of misdemeanor DWI in 1975, a felony offense of burglary in 1980, and a felony of armed robberv in 1987 whereby he received a prison sentence. For purposes of this discussion and Table 5.2, the most serious prior offense was the felony burglary and the 1987 armed robbery is the instant commitment offense for which the inmate is currently serving a prison sentence. Since the burglary felony is more serius tthan a misdemeanor of DWI. only the felony is counted.

Examination of the data reveals that the majority (N=42; 72%) of the escapees between 1986 and 1990 had been convicted of at least one prior felony offense. Fourteen percent of the escapees (N=8) did not have any prior convictions while eight inmates had a prior misdemeanor conviction.

Prior Adult Commitments

Table 5.2 shows prior jail and prison commitments for the 58 escapees over the time period of 1986-1990. Only the most serious level of commitment is shown for each inmate. If an inmate's prior incarceration included one local commitment and one state prison commitment, the escapee's most serious commitment, the prison term, would be counted. Looking at escapees over the five year period 1986 to 1990 shows that forty-three percent had a previous prison incarceration.

Table 5.1Most Serious Prior Adult Criminal ConvictionInmate Escapees 1986 - 1990

Prior Adult	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	Т	DTAL
Conviction	Ν	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	N	%
No Prior	1	3	1	1	0	8	14%
Misdemeanor	3	0	1	1	3	8	14%
Felony	15	9	3	8	7	42	72%
Total	19	12	5	12	10	58	100%

Table 5.2
Most Serious Prior Adult Criminal Commitment
Inmate Escanees 1986 - 1990

Prior Adult	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	T	DTAL
Commitment	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	N	N	%
None	2	4	1	3	4	14	24%
Jail	9	4	2	2	2	19	33%
Prison	8	4	2	7	4	25	43%
Total	19	12	5	12	10	58	100%

Section Six Sentence Length of Escapees

The New York State Penal Law stipulates that an indeterminate sentence be imposed upon convicted felony offenders sentenced to the state correctional system. The indeterminate sentence is comprised of a range of years - a minimum and maximum time period that an inmate may serve. The minimum sentence is the least amount of time an inmate will serve before eligibility for parole. The maximum sentence is the greatest amount of time an inmate can serve prior to release from custody of the Department of Correctional Services.

The structure of the minimum and maximum sentence range may vary according to the prior felony convictions of the inmate. The length of the range of sentences for first time offenders, convicted of one felony, and sentenced prison, is determined by the tò seriousness of the offense. The minimum sentence is normally one-third of the maximum sentence. For example, a first time offender convicted of 1st degree burglary may be sentenced to prison for an indeterminate term of 2-6 years. The two years is the minimum period of incarceration; the six years is the maximum time that can be served.

Aggregate Minimum Sentence

Table 6.1 shows the aggregate minimum sentence of escapees for the years of 1986-1990. An examination of the table reveals that most prison escapees were serving relatively short minimum sentences and the totals of the minimum sentence categories are similar from year to year. Forty percent of inmates who escaped in 1990 had less than two year minimum sentences and 70% were serving a minimum sentence of less than three years. Percentage totals for the five year span are similar to 1990 in that 57% of escapees were serving a minimum sentence of less than 3 years.

Table 6.2 shows the minimum sentence in months of escaped inmates. When the

Table 6.1Aggregate Minimum Sentence by Year of EscapeInmate Escapees 1986 - 1990

Aggregate Minimum	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	T	DTAL
Sentence	Ν	Ν	N	N	Ν	Ñ	%
(in months)							
12-23	7	5	2	3	4	21	36%
24-35	0	2	3	4	3	12	21%
36-47	6	3	0	1	0	10	17%
48-59	1	2	0	2	0	5	9%
60-71	3	0	0	1	1	5	9%
72-83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
84-95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
96-107	0	0	Ó	1	0	1	2%
108-119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
120-179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
180-239	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
240-299	1	0	0	0	0	1	2%
<u>≥</u> 300	1	0	0	0	2	3	5%
Total	19	12	5	12	10	58	100%

Table 6.2 Aggregate Minimum Sentence of Escapees and Undercustody Population 1986 - 1990

Minimum	Escapees	Average Undercustody
Sentence	1986 - 1990	Population 1986 - 1990
(in months)		
12-23	36%	20%
24-35	21%	22%
36-47	17%	13%
48-59	9%	9%
60-71	9%	6%
72-83	0%	5%
84-95	0%	4%
96-107	2%	4%
108-119	0%	1%
120-179	0%	5%
180-239	0%	4%
240-299	2%	2%
<u>≥</u> 300	5%	4%
Total	100%	100%

escapee population is compared to the undercustody population for the years of 1986 - 1990, a larger percent of escapees were serving shorter minimum sentences. Thirty-six percent of escapees were serving a minimum sentence of less than two years as compared to only 20% of the undercustody population for the same five year period; and, while 9% of escapees were serving a minimum sentence of more than six years, 29% of the undercustody population were serving a minimum sentence of at least six years.

Aggregate Maximum Sentence

Table 6.3 shows the maximum sentences of inmate escapees for the time period of 1986-1990. The percentage totals of maximum sentence categories show dissimilarity in year to year comparisons. In 1988, 60% and, in 1989, 58% of escapees were serving maximum sentences of less than five years, but in 1986 (63%), 1987 (59%), and 1990 (60%) most escapees were serving sentences of more than five years. Additionally, the percentages reveal that in the total for the five year span, 45% of escapees were serving maximum sentences of less than five years but 21% (N=12) were serving maximum sentences of at least ten years.

The maximum sentences for escapees are compared to the entire undercustody population for the years 1986-1990 in Table 6.4. The largest differences occurred at both ends of the maximum sentence continuum. While 31% of escaped inmates in the five year period had maximum sentences of less than four years, only 14% of the total correctional population had a maximum sentence of less than four years. In contrast. although 10% of escapees had maximum sentences of 25 years to life, 21% of the total undercustody population had sentences of that severity. The two inmate groups showed more similarity in the maximum sentence range of between 5 and 15 years where 39% of escapees had received maximum sentences in that range and 38% of undercustody inmates received a maximum sentence of between 5 and 15 years.

Table 6.3Aggregate Maximum Sentence by Year of EscapeInmate Escapees 1986 - 1990

1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	T	DTAL
ЪŢ	NT	NT	NT	NT	Ж.Т	0/
N	IN	IN	IN	1N	11	%
6	5	2	3	2	18	31%
1	0	1	4	2	8	14%
0	0	0	0	1	1	2%
1	2	2	1	0	6	10%
4	2	0	0	0	6	10%
0	2	0	2	1	5	9%
1	1	0	0	0	2	3%
3	0	0	0	0	3	5%
0	0	0	2	1	3	5%
0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
3	0	0	0	3	6	10%
19	12	5	12	10	58	100%
	1 0 1 4 0 1 3 0 0 3	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Table 6.4 Aggregate Maximum Sentence of Escapees and Undercustody Population 1986 - 1990

Aggregate	Escapees	Average Undercustody
Maximum Sent.	1986 - 1990	Population 1986 - 1990
(in months)		
36-47	31%	14%
48-59	14%	16%
60-71	2%	5%
72-83	10%	10%
84-95	10%	4%
96-107	9%	4%
108-119	3%	5%
120-179	5%	10%
180-239	5%	8%
240-299	0%	3%
300-Life	10%	21%
Total	100%	100%

Section Seven Time Served to Date of Escape

The amount of time the escaped inmates had served at the time of their escape is displayed in Table 7.1. For 1990, 60% (N=6) of the inmates had served less than 18 months of their prison sentence, while the remaining 40% (N=4) had served between 18 months and seven years. One explanation of the short average time period served by the inmates is that many inmates who are assigned to minimum custody facilities are serving relatively short sentences for less serious offenses. As most escapes occur from minimum custody facilities, the amount of time served is also less.

A comparison of time served in 1990 to the time period of 1986-1990 reveals that the two time periods are similar. In both periods 60% of escaped inmates had served less than one year.

Table 7.2 presents a comparison of the amount of time served in prison between inmate escapees for 1986 through 1990 and the total undercustody population for the same five years. The data for the undercustody population is derived from the correctional population as of December 31 for each year. An examination of Table 7.2 reveals that escapees, on average, have served less time when compared to the total inmate population.

Differences are most pronounced at both the low and high end of the time served continuum. For example, 40% of escaped inmates had served less than six months, and 62% had served less than one year. In comparison, 24% of the undercustody population had served less than six months and 41% had served less than one year. Additionally, while 4% of the escaped inmates from 1986-1990 had served four or more years, 22% of the total number of inmates undercustody had served more than four years.

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	тс	TAL
Time							
Served	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	%
(in months)							
< 6	5	6	1	5	6	23	40%
6-11	7	1	3	2	0	13	22%
12-17	.3	1	0	2	0	6	10%
18-23	2	2	1	0	1	6	10%
24-35	1	0	0	1	0	2	4%
36-47	0	2	0	2	2	6	10%
48-59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
60-71	0	0	0	0	Ö	0	0%
<u>≥</u> 72	1	0	0	0	1	2	4%

19

12

Table 7.1					
Time Served Prior to Escape by Year of Escape					
Inmate Escapees 1986 - 1990					

Table 7.2
Time Served of Escapees and Undercustody Population
1986-1990

5

12

10

58 100%

Time	Escapees	Average Undercustody
Served	1986 - 1990	Population 1986 - 1990
(in months)		
< 6	40%	24%
6-11	22%	17%
12-17	10%	13%
18-23	10%	10%
24-35	4%	9%
36-47	10%	6%
48-59	0%	6%
60-72	0%	6%
> 72	4%	8%
Total	100%	100%

Total

Section Eight Duration of Escape and Subsequent Crimes

In 1990, 10 inmates escaped from custody but all were apprehended by correctional staff or police. Six escapees were caught within 12 hours of their escape, while two remained at large for three days.

Of the 58 inmates who escaped from custody during the time period of 1986-1990, 47% (N=27) were caught within 12 hours and 81% (N=47) were taken into custody within 48 hours. Chart 8.1 graphically depicts the time inmates were on escape status prior to apprehension.

While any escapes by inmates are of concern to correctional officials and the public, an added consideration is whether any escapee commits additional crimes while on escape status. Of the 10 escapees in 1990, four were arrested on additional charges. A maximum custody inmate stole a vehicle to escape from the prison locale. A minimum custody escapee stole a bicycle, and two minimum custody inmates stole a vehicle, left the state, and were arrested for shoplifting.

Table 8Duration of EscapeInmate Escapees 1986 - 1990

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	T	DTAL
Escape							
Duration	N	N	N	N	N	Ν	%
< 6 hrs	7	Û	0	3	5	15	26%
7-12 hrs	2	3	1	5	1	13	21%
13-18 hrs	0	1	2	1	0	4	7%
19-24 hrs	0	4	0	0	1	.5	9%
25-30 hrs	3	1	0	0	0	4	7%
31-36 hrs	0	0	1	1.	0	2	3%
37-42 hrs	0	0	0	0	1	1	2%
43-48 hrs	3	0	1	0	0	4	7%
3 days	0	1	0	1	2	4	7%
4 days	1	0	0	0	0	1	2%
5 days	0	1	0	0	0	1	2%
6 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
7 days	1	0	0	0	0	1	2%
2-4 wks	1	1	0	0	0	2	3%
2-6 months	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0%
> 6 months	1	0	0	0	0	1	2%
Total	19	12	5	12	10	58	100%

Chart 8 Duration of Escapes Inmate Escapees 1986 - 1990



MAXIMUM	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	TOTAL	8
Attica	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auburn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bedford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coxsackie	0	0	0	0	l	1	1.7
Downstate	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
Eastern	0	2	Ō	0	0	2	3.4
Elmira	Ō	ō	ō	Ō	1	1	1.7
Great Meadow	Ō	Ō	Ō	Ō	Ō	ō	0
Green Haven	0	0	õ	Ō	Ō	Ō	Ō
Shawangunk	õ	Ő	ŏ	Õ	Č	Õ	ŏ
Sing Sing	3	õ	Ő	õ	ĩ	4	6.9
Southport			Ő	õ	ō	Õ	0
Sullivan	0	0	0	0	Ö	0	0
Wende	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
wende	0	0	U	U	U	U	0
TOTAL	. 3	2	O	0	4	9	15.5
MEDIUM							
Adirondack	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Albion (M-F)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Altona	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arthurkill	0	0	0	2	0	2	3.4
Bayview (M-F)	0	0	0	0	0.	0	0
Cayuga			0	Ō	0	Ō	Ō
Collins	0	1	-0	2	Ō	3	5.2
Fishkill	Õ	ō	Ō	ō	Ö	õ	0
Franklin	Õ	ŏ	õ	õ	õ	Ŭ,	0
Greene	õ	ŏ	Ö	Ö	ŏ	Ö -	, Ö
Groveland (M-F)	-	0	ŏ	Ŏ.	ŏ	Ő	Õ
Hudson	4	0	Ö	0	0 0	4	6.9
Marcy		0	0	0	0	- 4 0	0.9
Mid-Orange	1	0	0	1	0	2	3.4
Mid-State	ō	0	· 0	0	0	0	3.4
	0	0	•			· · ·	1.7
Mt. McGregor	0		0	1	0	1	
Ogdensburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oneida			0	0	0	0	0
Orleans	2	0	0	0	0	2	3.4
Otisville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Taconic (M-F)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wallkill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watertown	0	0	0	0	Q	0	0
Woodbourne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

APPENDIX A NUMBER OF INMATE ESCAPES BY FACILITY 1986-1990

APPENDIX A

NUMBER OF INMATE ESCAPES BY FACILITY 1986-1990 (Continued)

MINIMUM 1	.986	1987	1988	1989_	1990	TOTAL	ક
Edgecombe	1	1	0	2	0	4	6.9
Fallsburg Annex	l	0	1	0	0	2	3.4
Fulton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lakeview(Recep)			. — —	0	0	0	0
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lyon Mountain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mohawk	0	0	0	0	1	l	1.7
Parkside	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queensboro	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.4
Rochester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Butler Shock				0	2	2	3.4
Lakeview Shock				0	0	0	0
Monterey Shock		0	0	0	0	0	0
Moriah				0	0	0	Ċ
Summit Shock-M			0	0	0	0	0
Summit Shock-F				0	0	0	C
Camp Beacon	Ó	l	1	0	1	3	5.2
Camp Gabriels	2	ō	ō	1	0	3	5.2
Camp Georgetown	ō	2	1	2	1	6	10.3
Camp Groveland				ī	0	i	1.7
Camp McGregor	2	l	0	0	ĩ	4	6.9
Camp Monterey	3	1			ō	6	6.9
Camp Pharsalia	ŏ	Ö.	2	0	0,	2	3.4
Camp Summit	õ	ĩ	Õ			ī	1.7
TOTAL	9	9	5	6	6	35	60.4
New York City Facilities							
Cape Vincent	· ·		0	0	0	0	c
Riverview			0	0	o	0	C
GRAND TOTAL	19	12	5	12	10	58	100

 \underline{A} A dash appears in those cells on the table for those years in which a correctional facility was not yet operating or where the facility changed its designation. For instance, in 1988 Camp Summit became Summit Shock.

APPENDIX B

METHOD OF ESCAPES 1986 - 1990

<u>ESCAPES - 1986</u>

FACILITY	MODE OF ESCAPE
Edgecombe	Through window
Hudson	Walk away from F cottage
Hudson	Over fence
Fallsburg Annex	Over fence
Camp Monterey	Walk away
Camp Gabriels	Walk away
Orleans	Walk away from outside work site
Orleans	Walk away from outside work site
Camp McGregor	Walk away
Camp McGregor	Walk away
Camp Monterey	Walk away from dorm
Camp Monterey	Walk away from dorm
Mid-Orange	Outside worker, walk away
Hudson	Over fence
Hudson	Over fence
Camp Gabriels	Walk away
Sing Sing	Used 35' rope from tunnel over r.r. tracks
Sing Sing	Used 35' rope from tunnel over r.r. tracks
Sing Sing	Used 35' rope from tunnel over r.r. tracks

ESCAPES - 1987

<u>FACILITY</u> Eastern Eastern Camp Monterey Collins Edgecombe

Camp McGregor Camp Georgetown Camp Georgetown Queensboro Queensboro Camp Beacon Camp Summit MODE OF ESCAPE Car from farm annex Car from farm annex Car from farm annex On foot from dorm Walk away from work site Over fence (minimum security facility) Walk away from work site From work detail by jeep From work detail by jeep Front door on work release Walked out front door Walk away from dorm Walk away from dorm

<u>ESCAPES - 1988</u>

FACILITY

Camp Georgetown Camp Pharsalia Camp Pharsalia Fallsburg Annex Camp Beacon MODE OF ESCAPE On foot from boiler room Via conservation truck Walk away from dorm Walk away Walk away from dorm FACILITY

Edgecombe Collins

Arthur Kill

Arthur Kill

Camp Georgetown

Camp Georgetown Camp Groveland Camp Gabriels

Mid-Orange

Camp McGregor Edgecombe

Collins

.

MODE OF ESCAPE

Ran out of front door

Walk away outside work detail

Hidden inside dumpster

Hidden inside dumpster later charged with criminal possession of stolen instrument

Walk away from dorm later charged with theft of motor vehicle

Walk away from dorm

Walk away from housing unit

Walk away from outside work crew

Walk away from outside work crew

From SHU over fence

Messhall - walked out the door

Walk away from outside garage

<u>ESCAPES - 1990</u>

FACILITY

Elmira

Downstate

Camp McGregor

Sing Sing

Butler Shock

Butler Shock

Camp Georgetown

Mohawk

Camp Beacon

Coxsackie

MODE OF ESCAPE

Out to court, jumped from window

In transit, jumped from van

Walk away

Out to hospital

Walk away from work site, stole vehicle

Walk away from work site, stole vehicle

Walk away

Over fence, stole bicycle

Walk away

Cut through cell window bars, stole vehicle