

---

## What We Know about Youth who had a Mandatory Allegation: Descriptive Statistics

Certification Research Brief #2  
December 2012

---

Christine Patterson, Ph.D., Lead Analyst

According to Missouri Statute,<sup>1</sup> a juvenile *may be* certified (e.g., the case transferred to adult court for prosecution) during a certification court hearing for any felony allegation based on a review of criteria<sup>2</sup> established in statute. A certification hearing can be held for one of three reasons. First, if a petition is filed that alleges the youth committed one of the mandatory allegations, a certification hearing is required by statute. The mandatory allegations are first degree murder, second degree murder, forcible rape, forcible sodomy, first degree robbery, first degree assault, and distribution of drugs.<sup>3</sup> Second, if a youth has allegedly committed a third *unrelated* felony, a certification hearing is required by statute.<sup>4</sup> Third, a certification hearing can be court ordered or ordered based on a motion filed by the juvenile office. Therefore, this hearing is discretionary. The law *requires* a hearing be held for a mandatory allegation or the 3<sup>rd</sup> unrelated felony, but it *does not require* a youth to be certified. This decision is left up to the judge. Statute also does not require a finding of probable cause prior to transferring the case to adult court.<sup>5</sup>

This brief reports the descriptive statistics of the 947 youth, alleged to have committed one of the *mandatory* offenses. It describes racial differences in offending rates as well as differences in certification rates. The patterns describe *disproportionality* or overrepresentation; not *disparity* or unequal treatment. Disproportionality itself is not inherently good or bad. However, because *disparity* indicates unequal outcomes/treatment, it is problematic. Because the analysis described below only addresses *associations*, another analysis will address the question of racial *disparity*. Please see Certification Research Brief #4 for a discussion of the multivariate analysis (inferential statistics) which addresses *racial disparity*.

Certification Research Brief #3 will discuss the demographics of the youth certified in greater detail. For the present discussion of youth who had a mandatory allegation, it is worth noting that of 368 certified youth during 2008-2011, just half, 186 youth, were certified based on a *mandatory* allegation. Thirty-eight of the 186 youth certified with a mandatory allegation were Caucasian youth and 141 were African American youth. Of the Caucasian youth certified, 30 percent had a mandatory allegation compared to 62 percent of the certified African American youth. Therefore, the issue of mandatory allegations impacts African American youth to a greater extent than Caucasian youth.

### METHOD

Please see Certification Research Brief #1 for a detailed discussion of the method of the certification study. This brief will discuss a subset of that dataset which only includes the youth who had a *mandatory allegation*.

During 2008-2011, 947 youth allegedly committed a mandatory allegation.<sup>6</sup> A mandatory allegation was determined by the major allegation on the most serious felony referral for each youth. In other words, if a youth had one of the felony allegations listed in endnote 3, then they were included.

Non-Caucasian and non-African American racial/ethnic categories were combined into a generic “Other” category. Given that not all youth who had a mandatory allegation had a risk assessment, completed risk assessment data were only available for 792 youth. Data are not currently entered in JIS

for the date of the certification hearing nor is the reason for the outcome of the hearing tracked. Consequently, the analysis could not include this information.<sup>7</sup>

Chi square analyses were conducted to identify significant *associations* between races and juvenile justice and risk characteristics. Only statistically significant findings at the level of ( $p < .001$ ) were reported. In other words, we were 99.9 percent confident that the findings were not due to chance alone. The chi square and p value were included at the bottom of each table.

## FINDINGS

### *Demographic Information*

- Of the 947 youth, 53 percent were African American and 43 percent were Caucasian.
- Males made up 89 percent of the youth who had a mandatory felony allegation.

#### Location

- The 16<sup>th</sup> (Jackson County), 21<sup>st</sup> (St. Louis County) and 22<sup>nd</sup> (St. Louis city) had the most youth with a mandatory allegation, and 81 percent of African Americans with mandatory allegations were processed in these three circuits. See Table 1A in the appendix for a complete breakdown of youth with a mandatory allegation by circuit and race. There are notable differences among circuits in the percentage of Caucasian and African American youth with a mandatory allegation who were certified.

### *Juvenile Justice Background Statistics*

#### *Outcome of Mandatory Allegation Referrals (Referring to Table 1)<sup>8</sup>*

#### Descriptive Statistics for Mandatory Allegations

- **One-fifth of the youth who had a mandatory allegation were certified.**
- The most common outcome was a DYS commitment or court monitored supervision.
- About one-fifth of the cases were handled informally (e.g., without court involvement).

**Table 1: Outcome of the Referral for Youth Who Had a Mandatory Felony Allegation by Race/Ethnicity**  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011

<i><b>Findings/Outcome</b></i>	Caucasian		African American		Other		Total	
	Youth	Percent	Youth	Percent	Youth	Percent	Youth	Percent
<i><b>Formal Court Processing</b></i>								
Allegation Found True-Out-of-Home Placement (DYS)	80	19.4%	162	32.2%	14	43.8%	256	27.0%
Allegation Found True-In-Home Services (Court Monitored Supervision)	114	27.7%	131	26.0%	1	3.1%	246	26.0%
Allegation Found True-No Services	2	0.5%	11	2.2%	0	0.0%	13	1.4%
Sustain Motion to Dismiss for Certification	38	<b>9.2%</b>	141	<b>28.0%</b>	6	18.8%	185	19.5%
<i><b>Informal Processing (No Court Involvement)</b></i>								
Informal Adjustment without Supervision	60	14.6%	8	1.6%	4	12.5%	72	7.6%
Informal Adjustment with Supervision	68	16.5%	23	4.6%	2	6.3%	93	9.8%
Informal Adjustment - No Action	35	8.5%	9	1.8%	2	6.3%	46	4.9%
<i><b>Other</b></i>								
Transfer to Other Agency (DYS Custody)	15	3.6%	18	3.6%	3	9.4%	36	3.8%
<b>Total</b>	412	100.0%	503	100.0%	32	100.0%	947	100.0%
Pearson Chi Square 178.665 $p < .001$								

Race Findings

- Salient area of *disproportionality*: More than one-fourth of the African American cases resulted in certification, whereas less than 10 percent of the Caucasian cases resulted in certification.

Compared to Caucasian youth, African American youth had:

- a higher percentage of cases (88%) *formally processed*.
- a higher percentage of DYS placements.

Compared to African American youth, Caucasian youth had:

- a higher percentage of cases (40%) handled informally.
- a slightly higher percentage who received court monitored supervision.
- a higher percentage of all three informal outcomes.

*Level of Offense (Referring to Table 2)*

Descriptive Statistics for Mandatory Allegations

- A majority of the mandatory allegations were a Felony A or B offenses.
- One-third of the Felony A cases were certified, the largest percentage.
- Almost one-fifth of the unclassified felonies were certified, but none of the felony C cases.

**Table 2: Type of Felony for Youth Who Had a Mandatory Offense by Race/Ethnicity and Percent of Offenses Certified**  
**OSCA Extract of JIS Data**  
**2008-2011**

Type of Felony	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified
Unclassified Felony	68	16.5%	<b>10.3%</b>	56	11.1%	<b>26.8%</b>	4	12.5%	33.3%	128	13.5%	18.0%
Felony A	80	19.4%	<b>26.3%</b>	320	63.6%	<b>34.4%</b>	17	53.1%	33.3%	417	<b>44.0%</b>	32.6%
Felony B	236	57.3%	<b>4.2%</b>	115	22.9%	<b>13.9%</b>	11	34.4%	0.0%	362	<b>38.2%</b>	7.2%
Felony C	28	6.8%	<b>0.0%</b>	12	2.4%	<b>0.0%</b>	0	0.0%	0.0%	40	4.2%	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>503</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>947</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

Pearson Chi Square 188.449 *p*<0.001

Race Findings

- A higher percentage of African American youth had a Felony A case.
- A higher percentage of Caucasian youth had a Felony B case.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of all types of felonies resulted in certification for African American youth, with the largest discrepancy for unclassified felonies. The smallest discrepancy was for Class A felonies, but even in this case a higher percentage of African American youth were certified.

*Kind of Offense (Referring to Table 3)*

Descriptive Statistics for Mandatory Allegations

- Two-thirds of mandatory allegations were person offenses and one-third were drug offenses.
- About a quarter of youth who had a mandatory person offense were certified, but only a small percentage of mandatory drug offenses were certified.
- None of the mandatory allegations were property or weapons offenses.

**Table 3: Kind of Offense for Youth Who Had a Mandatory Felony Offense by Race/Ethnicity and Percent Certified**  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011

Kind of Offense	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of Kind of Offense	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Kind of Offense	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Kind of Offense	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Kind of Offense	% of Offense Certified
Person	178	43.2%	17.4%	438	87.1%	31.5%	24	75.0%	25.0%	640	67.6%	27.3%
Property	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Weapon	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug and other	234	56.8%	3.0%	65	12.9%	4.6%	8	25.0%	0.0%	307	32.4%	3.3%
<b>Total</b>	412	100.0%		503	100.0%		32	100.0%		947	100.0%	

Pearson Chi Square 200.135 p<0.001

### Race Findings

- Almost all of the African American mandatory allegations were person offenses.
- More than half of the mandatory allegations for Caucasian youth were drug offenses.
- Therefore, many of the African American certified youth are certified because of the emphasis placed on person offenses in statute.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: There is an almost 15 percentage point discrepancy in African American youth being certified for mandatory person offenses compared to Caucasian youth.

### Offense Type (Referring to Table 4)

### Descriptive Statistics for Mandatory Allegations

- The most common offense types were dangerous drugs<sup>9</sup> and robbery,<sup>10</sup> about one-third of each.
- Assaults and sexual assaults made up less than 20 percent of the allegations.
- Homicide was the smallest percentage, but in most of the cases, the youth was certified.
- A quarter of the robbery cases and one-fifth of the assault cases were certified.
- Less than one-fifth of the sexual assault cases were certified, and very few of the youth who had a mandatory dangerous drug offense were certified.

**Table 4: Offense Type For Youth Who Had a Mandatory Felony Offense by Race/Ethnicity and Percent of Youth Certified**  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011

Offense Type	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified
Homicide	11	2.7%	72.7%	37	7.4%	83.8%	3	9.4%	100.0%	51	5.4%	82.4%
Sexual Assault	68	16.5%	10.3%	56	11.1%	26.8%	4	12.5%	33.3%	128	13.5%	18.0%
Robbery	35	8.5%	25.7%	258	51.3%	25.6%	12	37.5%	20.0%	305	32.2%	25.2%
Assault	64	15.5%	10.9%	87	17.3%	29.9%	5	15.6%	0.0%	156	16.5%	21.2%
Dangerous Drugs	234	56.8%	3.0%	65	12.9%	4.6%	8	25.0%	0.0%	307	32.4%	3.3%
<b>Total</b>	412	100.0%		503	100.0%		32	100.0%		947	100.0%	100.0%

Pearson Chi Square 279.848 p<0.001

### Race Findings

- About half of the African American youth alleged to have committed robbery, while a little more than half of Caucasian youth alleged to have committed a dangerous drug offense.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of African American youth were certified for homicides, assaults, sexual assaults, and dangerous drugs. The largest discrepancy, about 20 percentage points, was for assaults.

*Secure Detention (Referring to Table 5)*

Descriptive Statistics for Mandatory Allegations

- Because secure detention is often considered a gateway into the juvenile justice system, this variable was included in the analysis.
- Almost two-thirds of the youth who had a mandatory allegation were held in secure detention.
- A little more than a fourth of the youth held in secure detention for a mandatory offense were certified.

**Table 5: Held in Secure Detention for Youth Who Had a Mandatory Allegation by Race/Ethnicity and Percentage of Youth Certified**  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011

Secure Detention	Caucasian			American African			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of youth in Secure Detention	% of Youth Certified	Youth	% of youth in Secure Detention	% of Youth Certified	Youth	% of youth in Secure Detention	% of Youth Certified	Youth	% of youth in Secure Detention	% of Youth Certified
No	224	54.9%	4.5%	108	21.5%	9.3%	15	46.9%	0.0%	347	36.8%	5.8%
Yes	184	45.1%	14.7%	395	78.5%	33.2%	17	53.1%	41.2%	596	63.2%	27.7%
<b>Total</b>	408	100.0%		503	100.0%		32	100.0%		943	100.0%	

Pearson Chi Square 109.702 p<0.001

Race Findings:

- More than three-fourths of African American youth who had a mandatory allegation were held in secure detention compared with less than half of the Caucasian youth who had a mandatory offense.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of African American youth held in secure detention for a mandatory allegation were certified.

*Risk Assessment (Referring to Table 6)*

Descriptive Statistics for Mandatory Allegations

- The majority of youth who had a mandatory allegation scored at the moderate level on the risk assessment.
- Almost a third of youth scored at the high level.
- About a fourth of youth who scored at the high level were certified.
- A larger percentage of youth who scored at the low risk level were certified compared to youth who scored at the moderate level.

**Table 6: Risk Level for Youth Who Had a Mandatory Allegation by Race/Ethnicity and Percentage of Youth Certified**  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011

Risk Level	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of Risk Level	% of Risk Level who are Certified	Youth	% of Risk Level	% of Risk Level who are Certified	Youth	% of Risk Level	% of Risk Level who are Certified	Youth	% of Risk Level	% of Risk Level who are Certified
Low	68	20.1%	7.4%	30	6.9%	36.7%	3	14.3%	33.3%	101	12.8%	16.8%
Moderate	197	58.1%	5.6%	232	53.7%	19.0%	13	61.9%	7.7%	442	55.8%	12.7%
High	74	21.8%	14.9%	170	39.4%	31.8%	5	23.8%	20.0%	249	31.4%	26.5%
<b>Total</b>	339	100.0%		432	100.0%		21	100.0%		792	99.9%	

Pearson Chi Square 45.413 p<0.001

## Race Findings

- More African Americans scored at the high risk level compared to Caucasians.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of African American youth at all three risk levels were certified, with the largest discrepancy (almost 30 percentage points) for low risk African American youth. Also, a higher percentage of low risk African American youth were certified compared to high risk African American youth.

## CONCLUSION

The findings of the study demonstrate that African Americans had more mandatory allegations and a higher percentage of more serious felonies, particularly the mandatory person offenses. They also had higher risk levels. While the nature of the offense and risk levels may help to explain why more African American youth are certified, this information does not explain the *disproportionality* that exists when one compares the percentage of Caucasian and African American youth who are certified by level of offense, kind of offense, offense type etc. A higher percentage of African American youth at all felony levels were certified. A higher percentage of African American youth were certified for the two kinds of offenses (person and drug) that resulted in certification. Even with the most serious allegation, homicide, African American youth were *disproportionately* certified. Finally, a higher percentage of youth held in secure detention were certified. The totality of these findings *appears* to suggest that there *may be* more of an inclination to certify African American youth than Caucasian youth, possibly indicating *racial disparity* or unequal treatment. Certification Research Brief #4 addresses racial disparity, by providing an answer to whether *racial disproportionality* indicates *racial disparity*.

Some may argue that the way to address the racial disproportionality is to formally process and certify all youth with a mandatory felony allegation. Instead, rather than certifying more youth, it may be prudent to use the results of the completed risk assessment in conjunction with the criteria discussed in statute to evaluate whether a youth should be certified. Including the risk information in the decision process may allow the same discretion currently shown to Caucasian youth to also be shown to African American youth, particularly low risk African American youth. Because the current risk assessment guidelines do not require a youth to have a completed risk assessment prior to certification, a recommendation of this study is to revisit the risk assessment guidelines and consider making a completed risk assessment a requirement prior to certification.

The findings of this brief suggests that more research is necessary to address several questions: What policies and procedures lead to a higher percentage of African American youth being formally processed? Is the difference in rates of African American youth who are formally processed one of the causal mechanisms that produces differential outcomes for African American youth? Why are low risk African American youth certified at a higher rate than low risk Caucasian youth and high risk African American youth? Are African American youth more likely to be represented by public defenders than private attorneys? If so, how does type of legal representation impact who gets certified? The high percentage of African Americans certified, particularly low risk African American youth, suggests that more research into case processing factors is needed.



---

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Missouri Revised Statute 211.071

<sup>2</sup> The ten criteria are:

- (1) The seriousness of the offense alleged and whether the protection of the community requires transfer to the court of general jurisdiction;
- (2) Whether the offense alleged involved viciousness, force and violence;
- (3) Whether the offense alleged was against persons or property with greater weight being given to the offense against persons, especially if personal injury resulted;
- (4) Whether the offense alleged is a part of a repetitive pattern of offenses which indicates that the child may be beyond rehabilitation under the juvenile code;
- (5) The record and history of the child, including experience with the juvenile justice system, other courts, supervision, commitments to juvenile institutions and other placements;
- (6) The sophistication and maturity of the child as determined by consideration of his home and environmental situation, emotional condition and pattern of living;
- (7) The age of the child;
- (8) The program and facilities available to the juvenile court in considering disposition;
- (9) Whether or not the child can benefit from the treatment or rehabilitative programs available to the juvenile court; and
- (10) Racial disparity in certification.

<sup>3</sup> The mandatory allegations are:

- 1st degree murder under section 565.050 RSMo (charge number 10021),
- 2nd degree murder under section 565.021 RSMo (charge numbers: 10031, 10034, & 10036),
- forcible rape under section 566.030 RSMo (charge numbers: 11005, 11008, 11012, & 11016),
- forcible sodomy under section 566.060 RSMo (charge numbers: 11082, 11084, 11086, & 11088),
- first degree robbery under section 569.020 RSMo (charge number: 12010),
- first degree assault under section 565.050 RSMo (charge number: 13011 & 13020), and
- distribution of drugs under section 195.211 RSMo (charge numbers: 32461, 32463, 32465, & 32470).

Please note that one must look at the particular statute and the corresponding charge number to determine if a charge is mandatory. For example, not all rape or sodomy charges are mandatory. Only the rape charges that fall under section 566.030 RSMo and only the sodomy charges under section 566.060 RSMo are mandatory.

<sup>4</sup> Analysis revealed no consistent understanding of what is meant by a third unrelated felony. It is clear that the third felony has to be unrelated to the 2<sup>nd</sup>, but do the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> felonies have to be unrelated to each other? Do the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> felonies have to be adjudicated (processed formally through the court system)? Do informally processed felonies (no court involvement) count? Based on the data submitted from all 45 juvenile offices, consensus does not exist on these issues.

<sup>5</sup> A recommendation would be to require that the previous felony allegations to be adjudicated and a finding of probably cause on the current allegation prior to a youth being certified.

<sup>6</sup> This is an unduplicated count. Therefore, only one felony per youth is counted.

<sup>7</sup> A recommendation is to start collecting this information so that it can be tracked.

<sup>8</sup> This information is entered in COASITE in the FINDINGS field in JIS

<sup>9</sup> The dangerous drug offenses that require a mandatory certification hearing have to do with manufacturing and distribution of drugs.

<sup>10</sup> This is first degree robbery.

## APPENDIX

**Table 1A: Reporting Circuit for Youth with Mandatory Felonies by Race/Ethnicity and % of Youth Who Were Certified  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011**

Reporting Circuit	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Count	% by Circuit	% of Mandatory Felonies Certified	Count	% by Circuit	% of Mandatory Felonies Certified	Count	% by Circuit	% of Mandatory Felonies Certified	Count	% by Circuit	% of Mandatory Felonies Certified
2	6	1.5%	0.0%	1	0.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	7	0.7%	0.0%
3	1	0.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.1%	0.0%
5	8	1.9%	12.5%	2	0.4%	50.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	10	1.1%	20.0%
6	3	0.7%	66.7%	2	0.4%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	5	0.5%	80.0%
7	32	7.8%	6.3%	8	1.6%	37.5%	5	15.2%	0.0%	45	4.8%	11.1%
8	1	0.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.1%	0.0%
10	7	1.7%	0.0%	3	0.6%	33.3%	1	3.0%	0.0%	11	1.2%	9.1%
11	11	2.7%	9.1%	7	1.4%	42.9%	1	3.0%	0.0%	19	2.0%	21.1%
12	9	2.2%	44.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	9	1.0%	44.4%
13	8	1.9%	12.5%	14	2.8%	28.6%	1	3.0%	0.0%	23	2.4%	21.7%
14	10	2.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	10	1.1%	0.0%
15	4	1.0%	50.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	4	0.4%	50.0%
16	14	3.4%	21.4%	117	23.3%	31.6%	14	42.4%	21.4%	145	15.3%	29.7%
17	11	2.7%	0.0%	7	1.4%	0.0%	1	3.0%	100.0%	19	2.0%	5.3%
18	9	2.2%	22.2%	1	0.2%	0.0%	1	3.0%	100.0%	11	1.2%	27.3%
19	3	0.7%	33.3%	10	2.0%	60.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	13	1.4%	53.8%
20	6	1.5%	0.0%	1	0.2%	0.0%	1	3.0%	0.0%	8	0.8%	0.0%
21	49	11.9%	6.1%	155	30.9%	22.6%	1	3.0%	0.0%	205	21.6%	18.5%
22	1	0.2%	0.0%	135	26.8%	25.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	136	14.4%	25.0%
23	34	8.3%	5.9%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	34	3.6%	5.9%
24	6	1.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	6	0.6%	0.0%
25	9	2.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	3.0%	0.0%	10	1.1%	0.0%
26	7	1.7%	14.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	7	0.7%	14.3%
27	6	1.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	6	0.6%	0.0%
28	10	2.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	3.0%	0.0%	11	1.2%	0.0%
29	32	7.8%	3.1%	4	0.8%	25.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	36	3.8%	5.6%
30	8	1.9%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	8	0.8%	0.0%
31	24	5.8%	12.5%	9	1.8%	11.1%	1	3.0%	0.0%	34	3.6%	11.8%
32	7	1.7%	14.3%	2	0.4%	0.0%	1	3.0%	100.0%	10	1.1%	20.0%
33	7	1.7%	0.0%	12	2.4%	58.3%	1	3.0%	100.0%	20	2.1%	40.0%
34	1	0.2%	100.0%	3	0.6%	66.7%	0	0.0%	0.0%	4	0.4%	75.0%
35	8	1.9%	50.0%	4	0.8%	50.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	12	1.3%	50.0%
36	1	0.2%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.1%	100.0%
37	2	0.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	0.2%	0.0%
38	10	2.4%	10.0%	1	0.2%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	11	1.2%	9.1%
39	4	1.0%	25.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	4	0.4%	25.0%
40	23	5.6%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	23	2.4%	0.0%
41	4	1.0%	0.0%	1	0.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	5	0.5%	0.0%
42	4	1.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	4	0.4%	0.0%
43	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	3.0%	0.0%	1	0.1%	0.0%
44	4	1.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	4	0.4%	0.0%
45	8	1.9%	0.0%	4	0.8%	25.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	12	1.3%	8.3%
	412	100.0%		502	100.0%		32	100.0%		947	100.0%	