# Addendum:E Lost Person Behavior Checklists

PCSAR Doc-93 page 1 of 12

By analyzing the behavior of past lost persons in similar situations, it may be possible to "predict" what the subject now being sought might do, where he/she might be.

This concept is a search planning tool, dealing with generalities, and not absolutes.

### 1.0 Lost Subject Profile.

A lost subject profile is a useful tool when trying to determine where, when and how to search for the subject. The profile is the compilation of all information regarding the subject, which might provide clues as to actions he/she may have taken that either contributed to the disappearance, or in response to becoming lost.

Components of a complete subject profile are:

- (1) Physical abilities.
- (2) Mental condition.
- (3) Experience.
- (4) Personality.
- (5) Behavior statistics.

Sources for most of the lost subject profile components are persons such as family, friends, co-workers, and medical professionals. The fifth component listed above, behavior statistics, is constructed by studying past incidents.

### 2.0 Lost Person Behavior Statistics.

Lost person behavior statistics refers to the analysis of historical search data for the purpose of gaining insight into the likely actions of persons being searched for.

William Syrotuck pioneered the concept of analyzing the behavior of lost persons. In 1976 he published a study of 229 cases from the states of New York and Washington.

In 1984 Barry Mitchell analyzed 2,814 cases that NASAR had compiled from across the United States. Ken Hill reported on 203 cases from Nova Scotia in 1994.

In 1992 Koester and Stooksbury studied 25 cases involving Alzheimer's patients in Virginia. Bob Koester has continued his research into Alzheimers and now has a data set of 87 which is included here. Bob has also looked at the category 'walkaways' and he now suggests two new categories – "Psychotics" and "Mentally Retarded" to replace this. He has sufficient data to support these two new categories, and with his kind permission we include them here.

Information from these studies is presented in the following charts.



# "Children (1 – 6 years)"

| Category<br>Characteristics  | Where?   | How?  |
|--|--|---|
| (Hill, Syrotuck):  | (Hill, Syrotuck):  | Passive attraction methods are rarely successful and confine-                   |
| Young Children, 1 - 3 years,<br>unaware of the concept of be-<br>ing lost  | They often seek out a place to lie down and go to sleep – under thick brush, an overhanging rock, a picnic table, inside a car boot,   | ment is a low priority  Air scenting dog teams along- side rapid response teams |
| Navigational skills and sense of direction almost non-existent   | inside an abandoned appliance etc.   | Thorough searching of high priority areas close to IPP - Urgent                 |
| Tend to wander aimlessly   | They are difficult to detect   | response needed   |
| Do not respond to whistles or calls  | Rarely walk out by themselves  | Sign cutting teams along main trails  |
| Good survivability because of tendency to find shelter  Children, 3 – 6 years, have a developing concept of being lost and will attempt to return home or go back to a familiar place  They may panic and become further lost as they attempt to 'find themselves'  Do not understand the fact that a return trip is needed – their explorations are usually one way | Statistics (n = 12):         Distance from IPP         Km's       Miles         10% - 0.47       0.29         20% - 0.54       0.34         30% - 0.61       0.38         40% - 0.72       0.45         50% - 0.95       0.60         60% - 1.16       0.73         70% - 1.51       0.94         80% - 1.89       1.18         90% - 2.27       1.42         100% - 2.65       1.66 |   |
| Tracks, trails etc. plus 'short cuts' that may not readily appear as a well defined track to an adult  |  |   |
| More mobile than children 1 – 3 years  May become lost following an animal or group of older children  |  | <b>~</b> .  |
| dren into the undergrowth or in exploring  |  |   |

# "Child (7 - 12 years)"

#### Category Characteristics

#### Where?

#### How?

(Hill, Syrotuck):

skills are much more developed than 1 - 6 year olds. They are learning to construct primitive 'mental maps' of their environments which may be highly inaccurate

Frequently become lost while attempting a short cut to a familiar location

May become lost during fantasy play - adventuring etc., and may find the play and reality confusing

They may become upset and confused when lost and react irrationally

Often resort to trail running which may take them some distance from the PLS/LKP

They may respond more maturely if with a friend or sibling

They will attempt to find themselves' though often lack adult tactics

(Hill, Syrotuck):

Navigational and directional Tracks, trails, shortcuts - check with friends for any 'secret' places and/or favorite places, hideouts or routes

> Landmarks, high points, features - ponds lakes. Steams, drainages, forest edges and clearings

Any 'known' places - secret play places

Statistics (n = 9):

Distance from IPP Km's Miles

| 10%  | - | 1.12 | 0.70 |
|------|---|------|------|
| 20%  | - | 1.29 | 0.81 |
| 30%  | - | 1.46 | 0.91 |
| 40%  | - | 1.68 | 1.05 |
| 50%  | - | 2.10 | 1.31 |
| 60%  | - | 2.62 | 1.64 |
| 70%  | - | 2.97 | 1.86 |
| 80%  | - | 4.24 | 2.65 |
| 90%  | - | 6.78 | 4.24 |
| 100% | - | 8.00 | 5.00 |
|      |   |      |      |

Data adapted from Hill (1997)

Confinement should be a high priority

Rapid response teams to high priority areas

Use air scenting dog teams

Passive attraction methods are rarely successful



# "Youth (13 - 15 years)"

| Category<br>Characteristics  | Where?  | How?  |
|--|---|---|
|  |   |   |
| (Hill, Syrotuck):  | (Hill, Syrotuck):   | Confinement a low priority un-<br>less subject is alone |
| Navigational and directional<br>skills ar e much mor e developed<br>than 6 - 12 year olds. | Tracks, trails, shortcuts – check with friends for any 'secret' places and/or favorite places, hideouts or routes | Rapid r esponse teams to high priority areas            |
| Frequently become lost in  | places, indeouts of Toutes  | Use air scenting dog teams                              |
| groups whilst engaged in ex-<br>ploring or adventure activity                              | Landmarks, high points, fea-<br>tures - ponds lakes. Steams,<br>drainages, for est edges and                      | Passive attraction methods can be successful            |
| They rar ely travel far in groups  | clearings   |   |
| Will usually respond to calls and whistles   | Any 'known' places – secret play places   | .*  |
| Often resort to 'direction sampling', looking for a familiar                               | Statistics (n = 20):  |   |
| place or landmark  | Distance from IPP   |   |
| They may respond more ma-  | Km's Miles<br>10% - 0.56 0.35   |   |
| turely if with a friend or sibling   | 20% - 0.72 0.45   |   |
| J. Company   | 30% - 0.87 0.54   |   |
| They will attempt to find them-  | 40% - 1.13 0.71   |   |
| selves' though often lack adult  | 50% - 1.80 1.13<br>60% - 2.68 1.68  |   |
| tactics  | 70% - 3.73 2.33   |   |
| May panic and resort to irratio-   | 80% - 4.82 3.00   |   |
| nal tactics to locate themselves   | 90% - 5.91 3.70   |   |
| nai taches to locate themselves  | 100% - 7.00 4.38  |   |
|  | Data adapted fr om Hill (1997)  |   |

# "Despondents"

### Category Characteristics

#### Where?

How?

(Hill, Syrotuck, Koester):

It is not usually their intention to travel far, but to find a place where they can be alone and possibly contemplate suicide

Frequently located at the interface of two types of terrain and/or vegetation boundary

Often head for a scenic location or well known beauty spot such as a hill which may over look civilization

Sometimes these places are well known to them

Rarely found in dense under - · brush or trees

They rar ely r espond to calls and whistles and may even hide and avoid searchers

There is an extremely high fatality rate – drugs and/or alcohol are frequently involved (Hill, Syrotuck, Koester):

Scenic locations, high points overlooking beauty spots and/or civilization

Places well known to them, favorite places previously/frequently visited - Favorite walks, tracks, trails

Terrain inter faces – vegetation changes, breaks of slope, clif fs

Two distinct groups: (1) subjects mer ely seeking to get out of sight; (2) subjects seeking out a specific location, often scenic and/or significant in their life. This second group may travel long distances to get there. The first group will be close to IPP"

### Statistics (n = 74):

Distance from IPP Km's Miles

| 10%  | - | 0    | 0    |
|------|---|------|------|
| 20%  | - | 0.16 | 0.1  |
| 30%  | - | 0.16 | 0.1  |
| 40%  | - | 0.24 | 0.15 |
| 50%  | - | 0.32 | 0.2  |
| 60%  | - | 0.4  | 0.25 |
| 70%  | - | 1.2  | 0.75 |
| 80%  | - | 2.0  | 1.25 |
| 90%  | - | 6.4  | 4.0  |
| 100% | - | 32.0 | 20.0 |

Data adapted fr om Koester, Personal Communication (2000)

Investigation important – speak with friends, family, work colleagues etc. to build an accurate subject profile

Response should be urgent

Thorough search of small area (upto 70%)

Confinement is a low prior-

Passive tactics not success-



# "Psychotics"

### Category Characteristics

#### Where?

How?

(Koester):

May be evasive and run away and/or hide

Most do not respond to name

Rarely travel purposefully to an identifiable taget

Associated medication and/ or lack of it may be a problem

May be frightened of author ity and of being found

Can be aggressive – be aware of safety of searchers – seek advice

Rarely 'lost' in the traditional sense of the word

Behavior may be dificult to predict

(Koester):

Tend not to penetrate woods and/or thick undegrowth

Often found in woods (edges) - 20%; buildings - 23%; along roads - 23%

Detailed checks of buildings in search area should be done by Police

Drainages, streams, tracks and trails

21% walked out

Statistics (n = 25):

Distance from IPP Km's Miles 10% - 0 0 20% - 0.16 0.10 - 0.4 30% 0.25 40% - 0.5 0.3 50% - 0.64 0.4 - 0.8 60% 0.5 70% - 1.6 1.0 80% 2.0 - 3.2 90% 6.0 4.8 100% - 12.8

Data adapted from Koester, Personal Communication (2000) Search urgency high

Investigation is important – speak to any professionals involved as well as family and friends to build an accurate subject profile

Air scenting dogs around woods and drainages starting near to IPP

Containment along roads/ tracks a priority

Re-search areas and tracks

Use of trackers near to IPP

Cut for sign along roads and tracks

Detailed investigation essential

Ongoing thorough systematic search of buildings and residence

# "Mentally Retarded"

| Category<br>Characteristics                           | Where?   | How?   |
|---|--|--|
|   |  |  |
| (Koester):  | (Koester):   |  |
| Blend of Young Children<br>and Alzheimers – lack con- | Dense undergrowth, 11%, forest edges and will pen- | Search urgency is high                                     |
| cept of being 'lost'                                  | etrate inside 16%, often to<br>seek shelter        | Investigation is important –<br>speak to any professionals |
| Good survivability                                    | Buildings, (21%) yards, gar-                       | involved as well as family and friends to build an ac-     |
| Rarely respond  | dens (16%) and outbuildings                        | curate subject profile                                     |
| Possible associated physical impairment               | Not 'route' orientated                             | Early deployment of air scenting dogs near to IPP          |
| Rarely travel to a set target                         | 21% found in drainages                             | Detailed ground search of                                  |
| though often make for a                               |  | areas up to the 50% zone                                   |
| random building to seek shelter                       | Statistics $(n = 29)$ :                            | Check any streams and                                      |
| Will travel and penetrate                             | Distance from IPP  Km's Miles                      | drainages  |
| into woods, forests and un-                           | 10% - 0 0  | Re-search of areas is impor-                               |
| dergrowth   | 20% - 0.16 0.1                                     | tant - plan for short search                               |
| _   | 30% - 0.3 0.2                                      | assignments  |
| Subject may run away from                             | 40% - 0.4 0.25                                     |  |
| and avoid searchers                                   | 50% - 0.8  | Use trackers from IPP                                      |
|   | 60% - 1.2  | Cut for sign along roads and                               |
|   | 80% - 2.8 1.7                                      | tracks   |
|   | . 90% - 4.8 3.0                                    |  |
|   | 100% - 6.0 4.8                                     | •  |
|   | Data adapted from Koester,                         |  |
|   | Personal Communication (2000)                      |  |
|   |  |  |

PCSAR Doc-93 page 7 of 12



# "Alzheimer's"

| Category<br>Characteristics   | Where?  | How?  |
|---|---|---|
| (Koester):  | (Koester):  |   |
| This profile is based upon search subjects suffering                                | 50% are found within 0.6 miles of IPP; 96% are found                                    | (Koester):  |
| from possible Alzheimer's<br>disease and related disor-                             | within 1.5 miles of IPP   | Search urgency is high  |
| ders  | Usually found a short distance from a road  | Early containment is essential  |
| Poor memory   | Usually found in a creek or   | Early use of trackers at IPP  |
| Impair ed ability to make<br>sense of surroundings, and<br>recognize hazards        | drainage and/or caught in<br>briars/bushes and often con-<br>tinue until they get stuck | Early use of tracking dogs at IPP and along roadways  |
| May experience hallucina-<br>tions or perceptual distor-<br>tions                   | May cross roads and/or trails, tracks   | Early deployment of air scent<br>dog teams in drainages and<br>streams, starting near est IPP |
| Loss occurs when subject<br>leaves residence or nursing<br>home, possibly with last | May attempt to travel to a place previously known to them                               | Early deployment of hasty<br>ground teams into drainages<br>and streams nearest IPP           |
| sighting on a roadway  Previous history of wander-                                  | Statistics (n = 87):  | Thoroughly search the residence/nursing home and sur-   |
| ing   | <u>Distance from IPP</u> Km's Miles   | rounding grounds and build-<br>ings; repeat every few hours                                   |
| Coexisting medical prob-<br>lems limiting mobility                                  | 10% - 0.16 0.1<br>20% - 0.16 0.1  | Cut for sign along roadways   |
| Possibly looking for a private  | 30% - 0.4 0.25<br>40% - 0.5 0.3   | Search heavy briars/bushes  |
| location in which to urinate  | 50% - 0.8   | Search nearby previous home   |
| Will not cry out for help or respond to shouts                                      | 70% - 1.1 0.7<br>80% - 1.6 1.0<br>90% - 2.0 1.25  | sites and the region between<br>home sites and IPP  |
| Will not leave many physi-<br>cal clues   | 100% - 3.2 2.0  |   |
| Usually succumbs to the environment (hypothermia, dehydration)                      | Data adapted fr om Koester<br>(2000)  |   |

# "Miscellaneous Adults"

### Category Characteristics

#### Where?

#### How?

(Hill, Syrotuck):

This category includes mushroom / fruit pickers, photographers, rock hounds and generally people engaged in some outdoor occupational activity such as surveyors, forestry workers, conservation officers etc.

Often inadequately equipped and prepared for activity or the circumstances they find themselves in

Many subjects found away from trails and tracks

May panic on realization of situation

Poorly developed wayfinding skills and may not have map and compass

Attempts to 'find themselves' often exacerbate the situation

(Mitchell):

40-50% are adequately equipped

Cause is subject error

50% followed a trail or drainage at some time while missing

30-50% move at night

High percent are communicative

90% are found within five miles of IPP

(Hill, Syrotuck):

Frequently located near natural boundaries and vegetation interfaces – forest edge, stream, steep slope – and navigation aids – walls, fencelines, shelters etc.

Sometimes wander away from regular tracks and trails and become lost

Need to identify 'magnets' that may have attracted them

Miles

Statistics (n = 29):

Distance from IPP

Km's

- 0.39 0.24 20% - 0.68 0.4330% - 0.98 0.61 40% - 1.35 0.84 50% - 2.05 1.28 60% - 3.34 2.08 - 3.77 70% 2.36 80% - 5.37 3.36 90% - 8.60 5.38 100% - 19.00 11.88

Data adapted from Hill (1997)

Investigation is especially important for this 'mixed bag' category

Through careful terrain analysis, need to identify relevant locations (magnets) which may have attracted the person

Rapid response teams and air scenting dogs to cover trails, tracks, streams, forest edges, fencelines, lines of least resistance etc.

Trackers and trailing dogs at PLS/LKP



# "Hikers"

| Category<br>Characteristics                              | Where?                             | How?  |
|--|------------------------------------|---|
| (Hill, Syrotuck):  | (Hill, Syrotuck):                  |   |
| They are trail oriented and                              | Tracks, trails, lines of least     | Confinement a priority                                      |
| often become lost when                                   | resistance for est edges (navi-    | A   |
| their trail becomes ob-                                  | gation aids)                       | Aerial survey to plot lines<br>of least resistance, trails, |
| scured or when they en-<br>counter a confusing junc-     | Sheltered points                   | navigation points and                                       |
| tion or intersection of trails                           | Shellered points                   | 'likely spots'  |
| don or microcolon or mano                                | High ground – lookouts             | J 1   |
| They tend to travel further                              | 5 . 6                              | Check Route plans   |
| than other categories                                    | Statistics $(n = 24)$ :            |   |
|  |                                    | Small, widely spaced, rapid                                 |
| Sometimes poorly pre-                                    | Distance from IPP                  | response teams and air                                      |
| pared and lack experience                                | Km's Miles                         | scenting dogs   |
| of remote areas  | 10% - 0.87 0.54                    | Two alsings doors and two alsons                            |
| Will attempt to find them                                | 20% - 1.21 0.76<br>30% - 1.55 0.97 | Tracking dogs and trackers from IPP                         |
| Will attempt to find them-<br>selves by trail running or | 40% - 1.93 1.21                    | n om iff  |
| finding a high spot                                      | 50% - 2.33 1.46                    | Clue aware searchers  |
| mang a mgn spot  | 60% - 2.74 1.71                    | tasked to run   |
| May follow lines of least r e-                           | 70% - 3.14 1.96                    | Trails  |
| sistance' such as a stream,                              | 80% - 5.64 3.53                    | • •   |
| forest edge etc  | 90% - 10.87 6.80                   | Be aware of potentially                                     |
| <u> </u>   | 100% - 24.00 15.0                  | large distances and area                                    |
| May regress to less ef fec-                              |                                    | that may be involved  |
| tive methods when panicky                                | Data adapted fr om Hill (1997)     |   |
| May look for shelter at nightfall or if injured          |                                    |   |

# "Hunters"

| Catagory   |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Category<br>Characteristics  | Where?  | How?   |
| (Hill, Syrotuck):  | (Hill, Syrotuck):   |  |
| Their concentration on game often distracts them from navigation   | Trails, tracks and for est roads  | Confinement is a priority  |
| Frequently become disori-<br>ented chasing wounded<br>game into thick areas of   | Drainages, stream/river banks   | Thorough investigation (subject profile) is important                      |
| They tend to overextend themselves in darkness and   | Forest edges, clearings, points for shelter                               | Aerial survey to plot tracks,<br>trails, forest roads and any<br>clearings |
| push beyond their physical<br>abilities  When game laws prescribe  | Check local knowledge for fa-<br>vorite places and curr ent<br>conditions | Attractive methods may be effective  |
| the wearing of 'hunter or-<br>ange', they can be easily<br>detected from a distance or   | Statistics (n = 100):   | Clue aware teams along trails and river banks                              |
| Will respond to calls and whistles – may fire shots to attract searchers  May try to walk out unaided at daybreak after building shelter for the night  On average 1 in 3 walk out unharmed  High survivability rate  (Mitchell):  A common cause is subject error  Weather a factor in 18% of | Distance from IPP  Km's Miles  10% - 0.80                                 | Small, rapid r esponse gr oups<br>to high priority areas                   |
| cases; Darkness a factor in 33% of cases 39% follow drainages  |   |  |
| Significant number wanders and go cross-country  Many are communicative  |   |  |
| 66% found within two miles   |   |  |



# Fishermen (Syrotuck)

- Generally, they are very well oriented because of the directional flow of a river or the position of a lake.
- The reason they are overdue is most often accident related, such as slipping into the water, falls over cliffs while trying to move up or down stream, or swept off of feet in fast moving water.
- A very high percentage of this mission category is boat related.
- · Often this will be a recovery mission.

### Climbers (Syrotuck)

- The individuals in this category are generally well equipped and self sufficient.
- They tend to remain on or near designated routes.
- A primary factor for these incidents is weather or hazardous conditions which limit an individual's abilities.
- · Other major factors are falling debris and avalanche.
- Technical expertise is generally needed for both search and recovery.
- For backcountry mountaineers, the cause is often due to the climbers taking longer to complete the route than planned, or lower limb injuries on non-technical terrain.

### Skiers (Mitchell)

- Cause is human error, weather (33%) or darkness (20%).
- Generally follow paths, trails, drainages; 25% attracted by civilization, .
- Almost all are communicative, 50% are mobile.
- 85% found within 5 miles of IPP.
- 83% are not moving after the first 24 hours; 30-45% move at night.
- 50% found by SAR effort using hasty search, visual tracking: 50% find themselves.