



Corrections and Community Supervision

Proximity To Minor Children Legislative Report 2022

Proximity to Minor Children - 2022

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents.....	1
Introduction	2
Section 1: Incarcerated Individuals with Minor Children Under Custody on June 1, 2022 .	4
Number and Proportion of the Total UC Population	4
Sex, Age and Current Housing Facility	5
County of Commitment	6
Section 2: Incarcerated Individuals with Minor Children Requesting PMC Placement.....	7
PMC Placement Status: Requests from June 2021 to May 2022	8
Sex, Age, and Assessment Facility of Individuals Requesting PMC Placement Between June 2021 and May 2022	9
Section 3: Status of Incarcerated Individuals with Minor Children who Requested PMC Placement	10
Facilities of PMC Transfer: June 2021 - May 2022	11
Denial and Cancellation Reasons for PMC Transfer Request	12
Current Facility Of Individuals in a PMC Placement as of June 1, 2022	13
Conclusion	13

Proximity to Minor Children Legislative Report - 2022

Introduction

In 2020, Section 72-C was added to Correction Law to address the facility placement of individuals in DOCCS' custody with minor children. This new law, which became effective on December 23, 2021, requires DOCCS to place incarcerated individuals in a facility as close to their minor children as possible, whenever practicable. To address this requirement, procedures were developed to ensure that all parents of minor children under custody have an opportunity for such placement. DOCCS implemented these procedures prior to the effective date of the legislation. For purposes of this law, a minor child is defined as a biological, step or adopted child, who has not yet reached the age of eighteen.

As part of the initial assessment screening that takes place at the first general confinement facility, incarcerated individuals are assessed to determine if they have any minor children and, if so, whether or not they are interested in being placed in a correctional facility as close as possible to where the child(ren) resides. If an individual expresses interest in a proximity to minor child (PMC) placement, a transfer referral is initiated. Proximity to minor children transfer referrals are reviewed to determine the best interest of the child and whether a transfer is practicable. To ensure all incarcerated individuals had an opportunity for PMC transfer consideration, all individuals under DOCCS custody were assessed during 2021. Excludable criteria includes:

- Conviction of a crime against the child(ren) in question
- Active order of protection involving the child(ren) and/or the custodial parent or guardian of the child in question

In order for a proximity to minor child transfer review to proceed, the following is required:

- Child/children and custodial parent/legal guardian information is documented
- Questionnaire for Proximity to Child transfer response is received from the parent/legal guardian
- The child(ren) must reside in New York State or a bordering state
- An individual must *not* be currently serving a disciplinary confinement sanction
- An individual must *not* be currently in a specialized treatment program (e.g., SOCTP, CASAT, DWI treatment)
- An individual must be more than five months to a scheduled Parole Board appearance or release

Upon completion of the best interest of the child determination, written notification is provided to the requesting incarcerated individual by the Offender Rehabilitation Counselor (ORC). For approved requests, facility placement in close proximity to the child(ren) must be deemed suitable and appropriate, taking into consideration: security classification, mental health status, medical needs, facility bed space, and movement availability.

The status of a proximity to minor child transfer request will be discussed with the assigned ORC at scheduled quarterly Case Plan interviews. A transfer request can be approved, denied, or cancelled after initial approval.

Also, after an individual receives a proximity to minor child transfer, a reverse transfer will occur under any of the following circumstances:

- Refusal to participate in any mandatory program
- Two negative removals from the same mandatory program
- Sanction of 30 days or more disciplinary confinement within one year period
- Two Tier 3 hearing guilty findings within a one year period
- Four Tier 2 hearing guilty findings within a one year period

A reverse transfer from proximity to minor child placement for the above reasons will render the individual ineligible for another proximity to minor child transfer for at least one year from date of removal.

As required by Correction Law Section 72-C, this annual report provides general information about the number of incarcerated persons who are parents of minor children, the aggregate number of incarcerated parents by county of commitments, the number of incarcerated parents who are placed in a correctional facility in closest proximity to their children, the location of such facilities, the number of individuals for whom proximal placement was not provided (along with general reasons), and the number of parents who declined proximal placement.

DOCCS developed and implemented procedures for PMC assessment and transfer prior to the legislation's effective date. As a result, this report covers PMC activity between June 2021 and May 2022.

At the time that this report was produced, some operational aspects of the program were being modified. Future reports will provide additional data where possible.

Other Department Measures to Enhance Parent/Child Relationships

Separate and aside from the requirements of Correction Law Section 72-c, it is to be noted that the Department accords an enormous priority to the preservation, maintenance and sustenance of all family relationships, especially that of parent and child. This is evidenced by the following: i) the creation of child-friendly areas of facility visiting rooms that have toys where parents can spend quality time playing with their young children; ii) the establishment of Visitor Processing Centers for the convenience of arriving visitors; iii) the scheduling of Celebrate Your Children special events at selected facilities, which occurred with regularity before COVID, and created memories to last a lifetime; iv) the refurbishing of Family Reunion Program sites to make them welcoming and home-like to enrich the family visitation experience; v) the operation of the Nursery Program, the Children's Program and the Summer Program at Bedford Hills Correctional Facility, all of which nurture the mother and child bond in many important ways; vi) the delivery of tele-visiting services at various facilities through a contract with the Osborne

Association; vii) the availability of the Family Works Program, also by the Osborne Association; viii) the recent development by the Department of its own parenting program; and ix) at several facilities, an initiative where the facility will record a parent reading a children’s story, which is then sent to the home of the child, who can listen to the story as recorded by their parent.

Section 1: Incarcerated Individuals with Minor Children Under Custody on June 1, 2022

- Among the 30,622 incarcerated individuals under custody on June 1, 2022, 13,610 (44%) had children of any age (Table 1).
- 9,114 (30%) reported having at least one minor child (Table 1).
- Nearly half (46%) of incarcerated individuals with minor children were between the ages of 30 and 39 as of June 1, 2022 (Table 2).
- Sing Sing had the highest proportion of incarcerated individuals reporting minor children (455), comprising 5% of incarcerated individuals with minor children (Table 2).
- Consistent with the total custody population, approximately 4% of the individuals who reported having minor children were female (Table 3).
- Among males, the largest proportions of individuals under custody reporting minor children were convicted in New York County, followed by those in Kings County (Table 3).
- Among females, the largest proportions of individuals under custody reporting minor children were convicted in New York County, followed by those in Monroe County (Table 3).

TABLE 1. INCARCERATED INDIVIDUAL SELF-REPORTED PARENTHOOD; UNDER CUSTODY JUNE 1, 2022

	Frequency	Percent
Minor Children	9,114	29.8%
Non-Minor Children	1,955	6.4%
Child Age Unknown	2,511	8.2%
No Children	10,764	35.2%
Declined to Answer	3,676	12.0%
Unknown	2,602	8.5%
Total	30,622	100.0%

TABLE 2. SEX AND CURRENT HOUSING FACILITY OF INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS WITH MINOR CHILDREN BY AGE UNDERCUSTODY JUNE 1, 2022

SEX AND CURRENT HOUSING FACILITY		Age as of June 1, 2022						Total	
		18-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+		
MALE	ADIRONDACK	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	0.1%
	ALTONA	1	7	15	12	0	0	35	0.4%
	ATTICA	11	67	172	89	25	4	368	4.0%
	AUBURN	14	38	127	62	15	2	258	2.8%
	BARE HILL	14	42	106	54	13	1	230	2.5%
	CAPE VINCENT	11	35	69	37	5	0	157	1.7%
	CAYUGA	8	45	102	63	15	1	234	2.6%
	CLINTON	21	50	143	70	25	3	312	3.4%
	COLLINS	21	55	166	85	16	2	345	3.8%
	COXSACKIE	18	24	73	29	7	2	153	1.7%
	EASTERN	1	20	119	102	20	6	268	2.9%
	ELMIRA	5	36	74	27	7	0	149	1.6%
	FISHKILL	10	57	164	89	23	2	345	3.8%
	FIVE POINTS	21	44	121	46	11	1	244	2.7%
	FRANKLIN	36	51	130	48	19	1	285	3.1%
	GOVERNEUR	20	50	83	50	11	0	214	2.3%
	GREAT MEADOW	25	52	127	61	9	2	276	3.0%
	GREEN HAVEN	13	39	138	64	28	3	285	3.1%
	GREENE	58	61	169	81	23	3	395	4.3%
	GROVELAND	7	42	127	60	17	3	256	2.8%
	HALE CREEK	4	12	31	14	3	1	65	0.7%
	HUDSON	4	10	24	13	6	0	57	0.6%
	LAKEVIEW	5	14	42	14	1	0	76	0.8%
	MARCY	28	33	82	38	15	1	197	2.2%
	MIDSTATE	28	72	178	79	21	4	382	4.2%
	MOHAWK	24	58	204	97	25	6	414	4.5%
	ORLEANS	26	50	135	47	5	2	265	2.9%
	OTISVILLE	5	23	90	48	14	3	183	2.0%
	QUEENSBORO	1	8	35	13	6	1	64	0.7%
	RIVERVIEW	11	35	66	38	12	0	162	1.8%
	SHAWANGUNK	2	9	40	21	10	1	83	0.9%
	SING SING	10	57	216	132	33	7	455	5.0%
	SULLIVAN	4	10	33	18	7	1	73	0.8%
	ULSTER	3	9	25	22	7	1	67	0.7%
UPSTATE	28	55	109	36	12	0	240	2.6%	
WALLKILL	3	23	77	44	12	2	161	1.8%	
WASHINGTON	32	38	80	44	2	0	196	2.2%	
WENDE	16	28	87	41	18	2	192	2.1%	
WOODBOURNE	3	18	92	68	16	2	199	2.2%	
WYOMING	44	61	170	72	14	4	365	4.0%	
	Subtotal	597	1,438	4,041	2,028	528	78	8,710	95.6%
FEMALE	ALBION	16	34	88	59	10	0	207	2.3%
	BEDFORD HILLS	3	24	57	21	5	0	110	1.2%
	EDGECOMBE	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0.0%
	LAKEVIEW	1	1	3	2	0	0	7	0.1%
	TACONIC	4	10	37	18	6	1	76	0.8%
		Subtotal	24	69	189	100	21	1	404
GRAND TOTAL		621	1,507	4,230	2,128	549	79	9,114	100.0%
		6.8%	16.5%	46.4%	23.3%	6.0%	0.9%	100.0%	

TABLE 3. COUNTY OF COMMITMENT BY SEX OF INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS WITH MINOR CHILDREN; UNDERCUSTODY JUNE 1, 2022

COUNTY OF COMMITMENT	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
ALBANY	345	4.0%	5	1.2%	350	3.8%
ALLEGANY	14	0.2%	2	0.5%	16	0.2%
BRONX	538	6.2%	8	2.0%	546	6.0%
BROOME	178	2.0%	22	5.4%	200	2.2%
CATTARAUGUS	30	0.3%	4	1.0%	34	0.4%
CAYUGA	71	0.8%	5	1.2%	76	0.8%
CHAUTAUQUA	44	0.5%	0	0.0%	44	0.5%
CHEMUNG	103	1.2%	4	1.0%	107	1.2%
CHENANGO	33	0.4%	6	1.5%	39	0.4%
CLINTON	83	1.0%	12	3.0%	95	1.0%
COLUMBIA	26	0.3%	2	0.5%	28	0.3%
CORTLAND	38	0.4%	1	0.2%	39	0.4%
DELAWARE	10	0.1%	3	0.7%	13	0.1%
DUTCHESS	156	1.8%	6	1.5%	162	1.8%
ERIE	567	6.5%	22	5.4%	589	6.5%
ESSEX	22	0.3%	2	0.5%	24	0.3%
FRANKLIN	24	0.3%	6	1.5%	30	0.3%
FULTON	29	0.3%	1	0.2%	30	0.3%
GENESEE	49	0.6%	4	1.0%	53	0.6%
GREENE	20	0.2%	2	0.5%	22	0.2%
HERKIMER	25	0.3%	2	0.5%	27	0.3%
JEFFERSON	52	0.6%	6	1.5%	58	0.6%
KINGS	728	8.4%	14	3.5%	742	8.1%
LEWIS	12	0.1%	2	0.5%	14	0.2%
LIVINGSTON	21	0.2%	2	0.5%	23	0.3%
MADISON	29	0.3%	2	0.5%	31	0.3%
MONROE	633	7.3%	24	5.9%	657	7.2%
MONTGOMERY	38	0.4%	0	0.0%	38	0.4%
NASSAU	274	3.1%	11	2.7%	285	3.1%
NEW YORK	947	10.9%	29	7.2%	976	10.7%
NIAGARA	145	1.7%	7	1.7%	152	1.7%
ONEIDA	244	2.8%	8	2.0%	252	2.8%
ONONDAGA	414	4.8%	19	4.7%	433	4.8%
ONTARIO	77	0.9%	5	1.2%	82	0.9%
ORANGE	217	2.5%	11	2.7%	228	2.5%
ORLEANS	25	0.3%	5	1.2%	30	0.3%
OSWEGO	76	0.9%	8	2.0%	84	0.9%
OTSEGO	37	0.4%	3	0.7%	40	0.4%
PUTNAM	14	0.2%	1	0.2%	15	0.2%
QUEENS	538	6.2%	18	4.5%	556	6.1%
RENSSELAER	77	0.9%	5	1.2%	82	0.9%
RICHMOND	171	2.0%	2	0.5%	173	1.9%
ROCKLAND	58	0.7%	4	1.0%	62	0.7%
ST LAWRENCE	82	0.9%	10	2.5%	92	1.0%
SARATOGA	83	1.0%	8	2.0%	91	1.0%
SCHENECTADY	207	2.4%	12	3.0%	219	2.4%
SCHOHARIE	9	0.1%	0	0.0%	9	0.1%
SCHUYLER	10	0.1%	1	0.2%	11	0.1%
SENECA	6	0.1%	1	0.2%	7	0.1%
STEUBEN	50	0.6%	7	1.7%	57	0.6%
SUFFOLK	359	4.1%	15	3.7%	374	4.1%
SULLIVAN	95	1.1%	4	1.0%	99	1.1%
TIOGA	23	0.3%	2	0.5%	25	0.3%
TOMPKINS	30	0.3%	1	0.2%	31	0.3%
ULSTER	106	1.2%	5	1.2%	111	1.2%
WARREN	42	0.5%	6	1.5%	48	0.5%
WASHINGTON	41	0.5%	5	1.2%	46	0.5%
WAYNE	40	0.5%	3	0.7%	43	0.5%
WESTCHESTER	259	3.0%	12	3.0%	271	3.0%
WYOMING	20	0.2%	4	1.0%	24	0.3%
YATES	16	0.2%	3	0.7%	19	0.2%
GRAND TOTAL	8,710	100.0%	404	100.0%	9,114	100.0%
		95.6%		4.4%		100.0%

Section 2: Incarcerated Individuals with Minor Children Requesting PMC Placement

- Among individuals assessed between June 2021 and May 2022, more than half of those with minor children (59%) requested placement closer to a minor child (Table 4).
- 26% of individuals at female facilities requested placement closer to a minor child compared with 61% at male facilities (Table 4).
- Sing Sing had the largest number of incarcerated individuals requesting placement closer to their minor children (371) (Table 5).

**TABLE 4. INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS WITH MINOR CHILDREN ASSESSED JUNE 2021 THRU MAY 2022
PMC PLACEMENT REQUEST STATUS BY FACILITY AT TIME OF ASSESSMENT**

SEX AND ASSESSMENT FACILITY		NOT REQUESTING PLACEMENT		REQUESTING PLACEMENT		TOTAL	
MALE	ADIRONDACK	1	0.0%	4	0.1%	5	0.0%
	ALTONA	31	0.8%	25	0.4%	56	0.6%
	ATTICA	107	2.6%	301	5.0%	408	4.0%
	AUBURN	89	2.2%	158	2.6%	247	2.4%
	BARE HILL	117	2.8%	231	3.9%	348	3.4%
	CAPE VINCENT	92	2.2%	122	2.0%	214	2.1%
	CAYUGA	96	2.3%	131	2.2%	227	2.2%
	CLINTON	93	2.3%	232	3.9%	325	3.2%
	COLLINS	157	3.8%	196	3.3%	353	3.5%
	COXSACKIE	40	1.0%	106	1.8%	146	1.4%
	DOWNSTATE	12	0.3%	2	0.0%	14	0.1%
	EASTERN	145	3.5%	136	2.3%	281	2.8%
	EDGECOMBE	16	0.4%	16	0.3%	32	0.3%
	ELMIRA	36	0.9%	114	1.9%	150	1.5%
	FISHKILL	70	1.7%	184	3.1%	254	2.5%
	FIVE POINTS	79	1.9%	186	3.1%	265	2.6%
	FRANKLIN	115	2.8%	275	4.6%	390	3.9%
	GOUVERNEUR	78	1.9%	145	2.4%	223	2.2%
	GREAT MEADOW	53	1.3%	213	3.6%	266	2.6%
	GREEN HAVEN	76	1.8%	127	2.1%	203	2.0%
	GREENE	161	3.9%	322	5.4%	483	4.8%
	GROVELAND	189	4.6%	174	2.9%	363	3.6%
	HALE CREEK	117	2.8%	59	1.0%	176	1.7%
	HUDSON	25	0.6%	3	0.1%	28	0.3%
	MARCY	135	3.3%	145	2.4%	280	2.8%
	MIDSTATE	228	5.5%	221	3.7%	449	4.4%
	MOHAWK	243	5.9%	285	4.8%	528	5.2%
	OGDENSBURG	6	0.1%	9	0.2%	15	0.1%
	ORLEANS	144	3.5%	106	1.8%	250	2.5%
	OTISVILLE	66	1.6%	115	1.9%	181	1.8%
	QUEENSBORO	41	1.0%	20	0.3%	61	0.6%
	RIVERVIEW	98	2.4%	123	2.1%	221	2.2%
	SHAWANGUNK	24	0.6%	48	0.8%	72	0.7%
	SING SING	74	1.8%	371	6.2%	445	4.4%
	SOUTHPORT	7	0.2%	6	0.1%	13	0.1%
	SULLIVAN	18	0.4%	46	0.8%	64	0.6%
	ULSTER	42	1.0%	29	0.5%	71	0.7%
	UPSTATE	29	0.7%	130	2.2%	159	1.6%
	WALLKILL	106	2.6%	70	1.2%	176	1.7%
	WASHINGTON	109	2.6%	133	2.2%	242	2.4%
	WENDE	57	1.4%	144	2.4%	201	2.0%
	WOODBOURNE	121	2.9%	98	1.6%	219	2.2%
	WYOMING	191	4.6%	291	4.9%	482	4.8%
	Subtotal	3,734	90.6%	5,852	97.7%	9,586	94.8%
		39.0%		61.0%		100.0%	
FEMALE	ALBION	285	6.9%	49	0.8%	334	3.3%
	BEDFORD HILLS	57	1.4%	63	1.1%	120	1.2%
	TACONIC	47	1.1%	23	0.4%	70	0.7%
	Subtotal	389	9.4%	135	2.3%	524	5.2%
		74.2%		25.8%		100.0%	
	Grand Total	4,123	100.0%	5,987	100.0%	10,110	100.0%
		40.8%		59.2%		100.0%	

**TABLE 5. INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS REQUESTING PMC PLACEMENT ASSESSED JUNE 2021 THRU MAY 2022
AGE AT ASSESSMENT BY FACILITY AT TIME OF ASSESSMENT**

SEX AND ASSESSMENT FACILITY		Age at Assessment						Total	
		18-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+		
MALE	ADIRONDACK	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0.1%
	ALTONA	0	8	12	5	0	0	25	0.4%
	ATTICA	20	66	143	59	10	3	301	5.0%
	AUBURN	12	38	77	27	4	0	158	2.6%
	BARE HILL	18	45	102	55	10	1	231	3.9%
	CAPE VINCENT	11	28	56	25	2	0	122	2.0%
	CAYUGA	2	23	66	33	7	0	131	2.2%
	CLINTON	24	56	115	29	8	0	232	3.9%
	COLLINS	13	41	97	37	7	1	196	3.3%
	COXSACKIE	15	20	50	18	2	1	106	1.8%
	DOWNSTATE	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0.0%
	EASTERN	0	17	61	46	10	2	136	2.3%
	EDGECOMBE	1	5	7	3	0	0	16	0.3%
	ELMIRA	7	31	52	20	4	0	114	1.9%
	FISHKILL	2	34	86	47	14	1	184	3.1%
	FIVE POINTS	19	44	90	25	8	0	186	3.1%
	FRANKLIN	44	64	107	41	17	2	275	4.6%
	GOUVERNEUR	13	29	62	33	8	0	145	2.4%
	GREAT MEADOW	21	46	100	39	6	1	213	3.6%
	GREEN HAVEN	8	24	64	23	8	0	127	2.1%
	GREENE	63	56	135	48	18	2	322	5.4%
	GROVELAND	11	30	83	37	10	3	174	2.9%
	HALE CREEK	4	11	29	9	6	0	59	1.0%
	HUDSON	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	0.1%
	MARCY	22	31	67	22	3	0	145	2.4%
	MIDSTATE	19	42	107	40	12	1	221	3.7%
	MOHAWK	26	48	145	50	11	5	285	4.8%
	OGDENSBURG	1	2	4	2	0	0	9	0.2%
	ORLEANS	12	18	49	21	5	1	106	1.8%
	OTISVILLE	4	20	56	22	9	4	115	1.9%
	QUEENSBORO	0	2	10	6	1	1	20	0.3%
	RIVERVIEW	10	29	54	23	7	0	123	2.1%
	SHAWANGUNK	2	6	24	12	4	0	48	0.8%
	SING SING	10	54	175	104	24	4	371	6.2%
SOUTHPORT	1	2	3	0	0	0	6	0.1%	
SULLIVAN	4	7	19	13	3	0	46	0.8%	
ULSTER	1	2	15	8	3	0	29	0.5%	
UPSTATE	13	29	66	16	6	0	130	2.2%	
WALLKILL	1	6	32	23	7	1	70	1.2%	
WASHINGTON	21	26	56	27	3	0	133	2.2%	
WENDE	12	26	64	30	10	2	144	2.4%	
WOODBOURNE	2	14	47	30	5	0	98	1.6%	
WYOMING	48	57	121	52	11	2	291	4.9%	
Subtotal	517	1,140	2,710	1,160	283	42	5,852	97.7%	
FEMALE	ALBION	2	8	19	15	5	0	49	0.8%
	BEDFORD HILLS	2	20	27	12	2	0	63	1.1%
	TACONIC	4	2	12	4	1	0	23	0.4%
	Subtotal	8	30	58	31	8	0	135	2.3%
Grand Total		525	1,170	2,768	1,191	291	42	5,987	100.0%
		8.8%	19.5%	46.2%	19.9%	4.9%	0.7%	100.0%	

Section 3: Status of Incarcerated Individuals with Minor Children who Requested PMC Placement

- Due to the time required to receive necessary approval from guardians of minor children and to review the suitability for PMC transfer, there is a lag between making a PMC transfer request and receiving approval or having the request denied. As a result, a number of PMC requests were still in the review process at the time of report production.
- Over 1,500 PMC transfers took place between June 2021 and May 2022 (Table 6). Fishkill was the most common destination for PMC transfers during that time period, with 249 (16%) of the transfers (Table 6).
- Among those whose PMC transfer request was denied or cancelled, the most common reason was that it was determined to not be in the best interest of the child(ren) (19%), followed by poor custodial adjustment (17%). For 9% of cases, the transfer request did not take place because it was determined that the present placement was appropriate (e.g. the individual was already housed in the closest appropriate facility) (Table 7).
- Among those under custody on June 1, 2022, whose most recent transfer was for placement closer to minor children, the most common destination was Sing Sing (16%) followed by Fishkill (15%) (Table 8).

TABLE 6. DESTINATION OF REFERRALS FOR PMC TRANSFERS BETWEEN JUNE 2021 AND MAY 2022

FACILITY	PMC Transfers	Total
ALBION	8	0.5%
ATTICA	29	1.9%
AUBURN	22	1.4%
BARE HILL	2	0.1%
BEDFORD HILLS	1	0.1%
CAPE VINCENT	3	0.2%
CAYUGA	94	6.1%
CLINTON	2	0.1%
COLLINS	72	4.6%
COXSACKIE	9	0.6%
EASTERN	13	0.8%
ELMIRA	17	1.1%
FISHKILL	249	16.0%
FIVE POINTS	5	0.3%
FRANKLIN	5	0.3%
GREAT MEADOW	15	1.0%
GREEN HAVEN	75	4.8%
GREENE	57	3.7%
GROVELAND	35	2.3%
MARCY	34	2.2%
MIDSTATE	19	1.2%
MOHAWK	27	1.7%
ORLEANS	53	3.4%
OTISVILLE	128	8.2%
RIVERMEW	6	0.4%
SHAWANAGUNK	31	2.0%
SING SING	230	14.8%
SULLIVAN	22	1.4%
TACONIC	15	1.0%
ULSTER	1	0.1%
WALLKILL	106	6.8%
WASHINGTON	24	1.5%
WENDE	45	2.9%
WOODBOURNE	68	4.4%
WYOMING	31	2.0%
TOTAL	1,553	100.0%

**TABLE 7. REASON FOR DENIAL OR CANCELLATION OF PMC TRANSFER REQUEST
PMC REFERRALS JUNE 2021 THROUGH MAY 2022**

	Frequency	Percent
CRIME RE: CHILD(REN) IN QUESTION	22	5.1%
NOT IN BEST INTEREST OF CHILD(REN)	82	18.9%
POOR CUSTODIAL ADJUSTMENT	75	17.2%
PRESENT PLACEMENT APPROPRIATE	40	9.2%
PROTECTION ORDER RE: CHILD/GUARDIAN	48	11.0%
RELEASED OR DISCHARGED	15	3.4%
REPLACED BY NEW REFERRAL	6	1.4%
REQUEST WITHDRAWN BY INCARCERATED INDIVIDUAL	51	11.7%
TOO CLOSE TO PAROLE BOARD OR RELEASE	37	8.5%
TRANSFER NOT PRACTICABLE	59	13.6%
Total	435	100.0%

**TABLE 8. CURRENT FACILITY OF PMC TRANSFEREES;
UNDER CUSTODY ON JUNE 1, 2022**

CURRENT FACILITY	# Transferred for PMC	% Total
ADIRONDACK	1	0.1%
ALBION	5	0.4%
ATTICA	21	1.9%
AUBURN	14	1.2%
BARE HILL	2	0.2%
BEDFORD HILLS	1	0.1%
CAPE VINCENT	3	0.3%
CAYUGA	66	5.8%
CLINTON	2	0.2%
COLLINS	52	4.6%
COXSACKIE	9	0.8%
EASTERN	9	0.8%
ELMIRA	12	1.1%
FISHKILL	168	14.9%
FIVE POINTS	5	0.4%
FRANKLIN	3	0.3%
GREAT MEADOW	11	1.0%
GREEN HAVEN	58	5.1%
GREENE	50	4.4%
GROVELAND	27	2.4%
MARCY	26	2.3%
MIDSTATE	13	1.2%
MOHAWK	22	1.9%
ORLEANS	43	3.8%
OTISVILLE	86	7.6%
RIVERVIEW	3	0.3%
SHAWANGUNK	24	2.1%
SING SING	181	16.0%
SULLIVAN	14	1.2%
TACONIC	12	1.1%
ULSTER	2	0.2%
WALLKILL	68	6.0%
WASHINGTON	13	1.2%
WENDE	29	2.6%
WOODBOURNE	47	4.2%
WYOMING	27	2.4%
Total	1,129	100.0%

Conclusion

As detailed in this report, the Department is fully committed to ensuring full compliance with the requirements of Correction Law Section 72-c, which is yet one more important measure, among many other well-established Department measures, that are designed to preserve and enhance the parent/child relationship.

Prepared by:

Division of Program Planning,
Research and Evaluation