

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/LEAA
U.S. Dept. of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

FLORIDA JUROR UTILIZATION AND MANAGEMENT
INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Final Report

November 25, 1981

86924

INTRODUCTION

The following element analysis of all participant counties in the Florida Juror Utilization and Management Incentive Program provides an overview of the measurable improvements in jury management accomplished over the past two years resulting from the project. Significant changes are still in the process of being implemented in many JUM participant counties. For example, not all answering devices have been installed because computer program changes necessary to utilize new computer summons mailers containing the necessary call-in information are still being revised.

Similarly, many planned administrative changes to reduce the term of service have yet to be implemented pending computer program changes and various other technical delays. Major changes in administrative procedures such as the summoning of jurors daily rather than weekly (one-day/one-trial) or the reduction of a five day pool to one day (single-day empanelment) requires extensive planning following the initial commitment to change.

In summary, the following element profiles do not reflect all accomplishments of the JUM grant. Many counties are still making preparations for the implementation of major administrative changes. Fortunately, the Florida Legislature has provided funds to support jury management assistance throughout the state.

NCJRS

AUG 25 1981

ACQUISITIONS

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

The following discussion and definitions will aid the reader unfamiliar with jury management in understanding those elements which utilize specific jury management terminology.

Element Three - Summoning Yield

The summoning yield is the ratio of the number of jurors who are retained for service to the number of jurors called for service. The contributing factors to the summoning yield are the number of persons who do not respond to the summons and those who are excused, postponed, or dismissed after response.

The summoning of prospective jurors may be completed in a two step qualification and summoning process or in a combined one step process. If a county summons in two steps, prospective jurors are placed on a qualified wheel before they are actually summoned for jury service. The two step process has been proven to be ineffective and inefficient because it essentially doubles the paper work, time and money needed to enlist citizens as jurors with no appreciable increase in the yield. Currently, all JUM participant counties use one-step summoning which combines the qualification and summoning process.

Element Six - Term of Service

Although the term of service is set by statute to be one week, various administrative changes have been implemented by some courts to reduce the term of service to less than a week. A description of these administrative changes follows.

One-day/One-trial is usually implemented by large pool courts and effectively reduces the term of service to one day or one trial. A different group of prospective jurors (venire) are summoned to report for service each day of the week. Prospective jurors not selected as trial jurors are dismissed; trial jurors serve only until the end of the trial for which they are selected.

Two-day/One-trial, a modification of one-day/one-trial, reduces the term of service to two days or one trial. A separate venire is summoned to report on two days of the week, usually on Monday and Wednesday. Prospective jurors summoned for Monday report back for service again on Tuesday, similarly Wednesday's venire

reports back again on Thursday. Usually no trials are scheduled to begin on Fridays. Jurors selected as trial jurors serve the length of the trial.

Single-Day Empanelment is usually used by medium size courts to reduce the term of service to one day or the length of a trial. In general, all jury selection is scheduled for one day of the week, usually Monday, with trial starts set sequentially for the week. Thus judges share or pool the jurors participating in voir dire or empanelment day. Prospective jurors not selected for a trial are dismissed while trial jurors return only for the single trial for which they were selected.

Multiple Voir Dire is usually implemented by small courts and consists of one judge selecting all his juries for the week from one panel on one day of the week. The juries then report back to the court on the day their trial is scheduled to begin.

Element Seven - Juror Utilization

The efficiency with which jurors are used is measured by these indices. These indices apply only to large pool courts.

Voir Dire Attendance is a ratio of the number of prospective jurors who experience voir dire to the number of prospective jurors reporting for service. Juror utilization is considered satisfactory if voir dire attendance equals or exceeds 100%. Juror utilization may exceed 100% through the reuse of challenged jurors.

Trial Attendance is a ratio of the number of prospective jurors sworn as trial jurors to the number of prospective jurors reporting for service. The standard for this index is 50%. Because Florida utilizes predominantly six-person juries, no Florida court achieved this standard. A panel size of twelve would be needed to achieve the 50% standard and this would rarely satisfy voir dire needs. The recommended panel size is eighteen, therefore, a more realistic trial attendance standard would be 30%.

Overcall measures the difference between the number of prospective jurors reporting for service less the maximum number of jurors needed for trial and voir dire. This difference is compared to the total number of jurors reporting for service. The resulting ratio should not exceed 20/100 or 20%.

Element Eight - Panel Sizes

A panel is a group of prospective jurors sent to a courtroom for voir dire to select a jury. The maximum recommended panel size is eighteen for a trial requiring a six-person jury.

A panel member is referred to as "unreached" if he/she does not participate in voir dire. The standard for this element states that the number of panel members not reached in voir dire should not exceed 10 percent of the maximum recommended panel size. This standard also has proven to be unrealistic for Florida. If the standard or maximum recommended panel size is eighteen for a six-person jury, then only one person would not have participated in voir dire if the standard were achieved. This is a very small margin of safety even for a "typical" trial.

Element Nine - Calendar Coordination

The following calendar coordination standards apply only to pool courts.

The number of Panel Calls Per Day refers to the number of groups of prospective jurors sent from the jury pool assembly room to a courtroom for the purpose of selecting a jury. For a pool court to operate efficiently, the number of trial starts (i.e., voir dire begun) should be three or larger for every day the venire is called in. The number of days that the venire is called in and no trial starts occur (referred to as zero panel days) should be less than 10 percent of the total number of days prospective jurors report for jury selection.

Element Twelve - Monitoring and Control

The two most important jury management indices in determining a court's efficiency level are the Juror Days Per Trial (JDPT) and the People Brought In (PBI).

The Juror Days Per Trial (JDPT) is a ratio of the total number of jurors reporting for service for some time period (e.g., one month) divided by the total number of trials occurring during the same period of time. LEAA has set standards for both six and twelve-person trials. Because of the small number of twelve-person trials occurring, the JDPT was not computed separately for six and twelve-person trials. Therefore, the computed JDPT may be inflated due to the inclusion of twelve-person trial figures. The JDPT multiplied by the amount paid in per diem, \$10, will provide a county with the average per diem cost per trial.

The index, People Brought In (PBI), is the average number of prospective jurors needed to start a trial (i.e., meet voir dire needs). This measure is computed by dividing the number of juror days served, less the juror days on continuing voir dire or trials, by the number of trials. Unlike the JDPT, this index is not biased by trial length and is therefore comparable between counties.

JUROR USAGE AND MANAGEMENT
PROGRAM ELEMENTS

- ELEMENT 1 - THE JURY SYSTEM PLAN
- ELEMENT 2 - SOURCE LIST
- ELEMENT 3 - QUALIFICATION AND SUMMONING
- ELEMENT 4 - EXEMPTIONS, EXCUSES AND POSTPONEMENTS
- ELEMENT 5 - ORIENTATION
- ELEMENT 6 - TERM OF SERVICE
- ELEMENT 7 - JUROR UTILIZATION
- ELEMENT 8 - STANDARD PANEL SIZES
- ELEMENT 9 - CALENDAR COORDINATION
- ELEMENT 10 - STANDBY JURORS
- ELEMENT 11 - VOIR DIRE
- ELEMENT 12 - MONITORING AND CONTROL

ELEMENT ONE - JURY SYSTEM PLAN

Standards

- Develop a jury system plan for all counties. The plan should include a written description detailing the responsibilities for managing the system, the operating steps and the policies of the court.
- The plans must be reviewed by the State Planning Agency.

Current Level

- Jury plans for JUM participant counties include the following:
 1. a description of the jury system prior to the implementation of any new procedures;
 2. the responsibilities of each person involved in making the system work;
 3. a description of the paper work flow of the jury system;
 4. an analysis of six-months of data on which the recommendations for improvements were based;
 5. a detailed description of proposed changes specifying recommendations for each program element.
- Jury plans have been considered by the SPA and are on file at the Office of the State Courts Administrators.

ELEMENT TWO - SOURCE LIST

Standard

- Eligible population coverage > 85%

Current Level

- The county's voters registration list is the sole source list for prospective jurors as specified in Chapter 40 of the Florida Statutes.

County	Population > 18*	Voters** Registration List	Coverage
Alachua	101,491	59,857	58%
Bay	68,450	41,762	61%
Bradford	12,443	7,483	60%
Brevard	209,969	150,254	71%
Broward	742,722	518,302	69%
Charlotte	47,092	36,857	78%
Columbia	21,065	16,940	80%
Dade	1,151,910	672,683	58%
Duval	404,607	226,312	55%
Escambia	161,952	110,370	68%
Flagler	5,894	5,518	93%
Gadsden	24,618	17,549	71%
Gulf	7,642	6,946	90%
Hernando	26,148	21,384	81%
Hillsborough	450,128	240,467	53%
Lake	74,250	48,377	65%
Manatee	112,346	86,115	76%
Marion	76,036	52,091	68%
Martin	44,317	37,104	83%
Monroe	40,895	29,622	72%
Okaloosa	78,278	45,928	58%
Orange	309,099	187,993	56%
Palm Beach	430,104	293,593	68%
Polk	212,181	123,296	58%
Santa Rosa	35,566	30,067	84%
Sarasota	159,513	121,081	72%
Seminole	105,472	67,814	64%
Taylor	10,444	7,676	70%
Volusia	186,445	127,620	65%
Walton	14,141	12,359	87%

* Estimates of age, race and sex components of Florida's population, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, Bulletin #52, May, 1980.

** Tabulation of Official Votes, Florida Primary Elections, September 9, and October 7, 1980.

ELEMENT THREE - QUALIFICATION/SUMMONING

Standards

- One-step summoning
- First class mail
- Total yield > 40%

Current Level

County	One-Step	First Class	Yield
Alachua	yes	yes	45%
Bay	yes	yes	43%
Bradford	yes	yes	49%
Brevard	yes	yes	43%
Broward	yes	yes	36%
Charlotte	yes	yes	55%
Columbia	yes	yes	43%
Dade	yes	yes	33%
Duval	yes	yes	41%
Escambia	yes	yes	44%
Flagler	yes	yes	N/A
Gadsden	yes	yes	45%
Gulf	yes	yes	46%
Hernando	yes	yes	47%
Hillsborough	yes	yes*	35%(before) 43% (after)
Lake	yes	yes	36%
Manatee	yes	yes	41%
Marion	yes	yes	39%
Martin	yes	yes	58%
Monroe	yes*	yes*	19%(before) 38% (after)
Okaloosa	yes	yes	41%
Orange	yes	yes	42%
Palm Beach	yes	yes	43%
Polk	yes*	yes	21%(before) 41% (after)
Santa Rosa	yes	yes	39%
Sarasota	yes	yes	32%
Seminole	yes	yes	53%
Taylor	yes	yes	47%
Volusia	yes*	yes	19%(before) 46% (after)
Walton	yes	yes	45%

* Implemented administrative changes to achieve standard during JUM program.

Summary of Savings

TABLE I

ESTIMATE OF ANNUAL SAVINGS IN MAILING COSTS

<u>County</u>	<u>One-Step Summoning</u>	<u>First Class Mail</u>
Hillsborough		\$20,000
Monroe	\$ 1,327	11,000
Polk	3,500	
Volusia	<u>4,630</u>	
TOTAL	\$40,457	\$31,000

ELEMENT FOUR - EXEMPTIONS, EXCUSES, POSTPONEMENTS

Standards

- No class exemptions
- Excuses granted for hardship only
- Written excuse policy
- Postponements allowed
- Exclusions handled by mail or phone prior to reporting

Current Level

- The following exemptions, disqualifications, and excusals are listed in Chapter 40 of the Florida Statutes.

A. Exemptions (Optional)

1. Expectant mothers;
2. Mothers not employed full time with children under 15 years of age;*
3. Persons 70 years of age or older;
4. Served on jury duty within two years of January 1.

B. Disqualifications (Mandatory)

1. Governor and his Cabinet; clerk of court, judges; sheriff or deputy sheriff;
2. Municipal police officer;
3. Convicted felon, civil rights not restored;
4. Under prosecution for any crime;
5. No longer reside in county.

C. Excuses (Judge's Discretion)

1. Practicing attorney, physician, or person who is physically infirm;
2. Showing of hardship, extreme inconvenience or public necessity.

- Postponements are allowed in all counties for up to six months.

- Palm Beach County has a written excuse policy delegating the authority for granting excusals to the jury manager. No excuses are granted to persons listed under discretionary excusals, with the exception of persons who are physically infirm and so verify with a doctor's certificate. Postponements are granted for hardship and extreme inconvenience. While no other county has a written excuse policy, both Bay and Polk Counties practice the same excusal policies as Palm Beach County.

* This exemption was recently challenged and ruled unconstitutional by the First District Court of Appeals because it does not extend the same right to fathers.

- All counties handle the majority of excuses by mail (summons includes an excusal form, see Appendix A) or by phone prior to reporting.

ELEMENT FIVE - ORIENTATION

Standard

- Juror orientation on the first day of attendance less than one hour.

Current Level

- A standardized juror orientation slide show, 16 minutes in length, was disseminated to 26 of the 30 participant counties. (See Appendix B for narration and shot list)
- Roll call on the first day of service has been eliminated in 12 of the 30 counties. The majority of the remaining counties intend to eliminate their roll call procedure as well.
- An information sheet containing information about parking, attire, compensation, length of service, and excusals was included in the computer mailer summonses as well as the non-computerized summonses ordered for all participant counties. (See Appendix A)
- An automated information message is also used by the larger counties to provide jurors with information. A recorded telephone message containing general information about jury service is placed on the code-a-phone during courthouse working hours. In the evening, the same code-a-phone line may be used for on-call jurors.

ELEMENT SIX - TERM OF SERVICE

Standard

- One-day/one-trial

Current Level

- Jury service for the state of Florida is one week as stipulated in Chapter 40 of the Florida Statutes.
- Several counties have reduced the term of service in their counties through the following administrative changes:

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE

	One-Day/ One-Trial	Two-Day/ One-Trial	Single Day Empanelment	Multiple Voir Dire
Avg. Length of Service	1	2	1-2	1-2
Counties	Dade (Civil)	Broward Palm Bch. Polk	Alachua Bay Escambia Hillsborough*	Bradford Gulf Okaloosa Santa Rosa Volusia Walton

* Implementing procedure in near future.

ELEMENT SEVEN - JUROR UTILIZATION

Standards

- Voir dire attendance \geq 100%
- Trial attendance $>$ 50%
- Overcall \leq 20%

Current Level

- Only six of the participant counties utilized a jury pool. The following table lists the current level* of the juror utilization indices for these courts.

County	Index		
	Voir Dire Attendance (\geq 100%)	Trial Attendance ($>$ 50%)**	Overcall (\leq 20%)
Dade - civil	84%	30%	34%
Broward	78%	20%	32%
Escambia (before changes)	58%	13%	47%
Escambia (after changes)	126%	38%	21%
Hillsborough	63%	17%	37%
Orange	93%	23%	28%
Palm Beach	71%	24%	27%

* Data was collected prior to recent changes in the term of service. Escambia County is the only county where post-implementation data is currently available.

** This standard is not relevant for Florida courts. A more realistic standard would be 30%, determined from past history.

ELEMENT EIGHT - PANEL SIZES

Standards

- The number of jurors not reached during voir dire should be less than or equal to 10% of the standard panel size.
- Prior notification should be given to the jury clerk when a larger than standard size panel is needed.

Current Level

COUNTY	AVERAGE PANEL SIZE	PERCENT NOT REACHED
Alachua	16*	28%
Bay	14*	17%
Bradford	16*	25%
Brevard	22	48%
Broward	28	47%
Charlotte	43	72%
Columbia	32	53%
Duval	24	33%
Escambia	14*	25%
Gadsden	25	57%
Hernando	49	72%
Hillsborough	22	46%
Lake	29	55%
Manatee	27	60%
Marion	40	70%
Martin	18	34%
Monroe	32	49%
Okaloosa	44	69%
Orange	22	23%
Palm Beach	20	35%
Polk	19	28%
Santa Rosa	17*	24%
Sarasota	25	56%
Seminole	32	58%
Taylor	46	74%
Volusia	18*	--

- The not reached standard of 10% was not accomplished by any Florida court, even in the most efficient jurisdiction. This does not appear to be a realistic standard for Florida.

* Multiple voir dire courts

- The standard panel size for a six-person trial is 18, as recommended in all jury plans. All multiple voir dire and single-day empanelment courts have achieved this standard.
- For most cases requiring twelve-member juries, prior notification is given to the jury clerk so that a larger number of jurors may be summoned in anticipation of the increased voir dire need.

ELEMENT NINE - CALENDAR COORDINATION

Standards

- Panel calls per days should be ≥ 3
- Zero panel call days should be $< 10\%$

Current Level

Element nine applied only to the 6 participant pool courts. Data does not reflect the term of service changes made in late summer 1981, in Dade, Broward, Hillsborough, Orange, or Palm Beach counties.

County	Average Number of Panel Calls/Day	Average Number of Zero Days
Dade - civil	5.1	9%
Broward	4.7	13%
Escambia (before)	1.3	29%
Escambia (after)	5.3	0%
Hillsborough	1.7	12%
Orange	2.6	4%
Palm Beach	2.4	7%

ELEMENT TEN - STANDBY PANELS

Standards

- Develop standby call-in procedures
- Consider instituting mid-day notice
- Develop a prediction formula

Current Level

- All participant counties received Code-A-Phone answering devices along with two cassette tapes. The Code-A-Phones are utilized in the following manner: A general information message about jury service is recorded on one tape which operates during courthouse working hours. A message telling the juror whether or not to report is recorded on the second tape and replaces the information cassette at the end of the day. Instructions for jurors to call the Code-A-Phone number are listed on the information sheet enclosed in the summons. Savings in juror per diem fees as a result of "calling-off" jurors whose services are no longer needed are summarized in Table II.
- Mid-day notice is not currently used in any Florida court. However, Broward County, Palm Beach County and Dade County are all considering instituting mid-day notice with the change to a reduced term of service.
- A juror-need prediction formula was developed at the state level to assist courts implementing multiple voir dire or single day empanelment. The purpose of the formula is to trim the number summoned after plea day and prior to the first day of service based on the actual number of trials expected to occur. The Code-A-Phone is utilized, after the correct number of jurors-needed has been determined, to reduce the original number summoned, if necessary. The formula is as follows:

$$N = XY + Z(W - X) \text{ where;}$$

- X = number of judges hearing trials
- Y = maximum recommended panel size
- Z = size of jury (e.g., 6 plus an alternate = 7)
- W = number of anticipated trials for term (e.g., week)
- N = number of juror needed for voir dire

The number of jurors to call-off is then determined by writing the summoning yield as a fraction (e.g., 40% = 40/100) and inverting the fraction and multiplying by $N(100/40 \times N)$.

If the number summoned is greater than the predicted juror-need, the difference is called-off on the Code-A-Phone.

7
7

Summary of Savings*

TABLE II

Juror Per Diem Savings Utilizing an Answering Device

	ALACHUA	CHARLOTTE	COLUMBIA	ESCAMBIA	HERNANDO	LAKE	MARION	MARTIN	POLK
June 1980	\$ 430	\$	\$	\$ 300	\$2,400	\$ 2,500	\$ 380	\$	\$
July 1980	2,690			410		1,400	460		
August 1980	390					700	240		
September 1980	220			550		1,420	440		
October 1980							180		
November 1980	430			200			230		
December 1980	200				500		200		
January 1981							610		
February 1981				1,420			250		
March 1981		490			1,300		200		
April 1981		1,060			600		260		
May 1981		150							
June 1981	190	450	200			1,000	370		
July 1981	440	680	660			2,500			
August 1981				250		2,000	490	220	16,430
TOTAL	\$4,990	\$2,830	\$ 860	\$3,130	\$4,800	\$11,520	\$4,076	\$ 220	\$16,430

* Figures are based on a juror per diem fee of \$10 per day. Alachua, Escambia, Hernando, Lake and Marion Counties were participants in the 1978-79 Florida Jury Procedures Study and have used their Code-A-Phones to place jurors on-call since the beginning of the JUM project. Other JUM participant counties are still in the process of installing their answering devices.

ELEMENT ELEVEN - VOIR DIRE

Standards

- Consider multiple voir dire
- Consider single-day empanelment

Current Level

The following counties are currently using multiple voir dire or single-day empanelment.

COUNTY	MULTIPLE VOIR DIRE	SINGLE-DAY EMPANELMENT
Alachua	X	
Bay	X	
Bradford	X	
Escambia		X
Gulf	X	
Okaloosa	X	
Santa Rosa	X	
Walton	X	

Hillsborough and Seminole Counties are considering implementing single-day empanelment and multiple voir dire in the near future. Duval, Lake, Polk and Volusia Counties utilize a modified form of multiple voir dire. Generally, multiple selection of juries is conducted by circuit court judges in these counties while county court judges require panels to report throughout the week.

Summary of Savings

On the average, Florida courts expend between \$400 and \$500 in juror per diem fees per trial. This cost is reduced 50% to 60% through the use of single-day empanelment or multiple voir dire jury selection procedures. Examples of juror per diem savings resulting from the change to single-day empanelment or multiple voir dire are shown in Table III.

TABLE III

COUNTY	AVERAGE TRIAL COST		PREDICTED ANNUAL SAVINGS
	BEFORE CHANGE	AFTER CHANGE	
Alachua	\$ 447	\$ 281	\$ 31,377
Bay	588	252	3,864
Bradford	568	300	964
Escambia	418	221	44,800
Santa Rosa	500	192	8,008

ELEMENT TWELVE - MONITORING AND CONTROL

Standards

	6-Member Jury	12-Member Jury
• Juror Day Per Trial (JDPT)	24	40
• People Brought In (PBI)	18	30

Current Level

The following figures are for both 6-member and 12-member juries combined. Because 12-member juries constitute less than 5% of the total number of trials in Florida, the indices were not calculated separately. Generally, larger pool courts utilize 12-member juries more often than smaller courts and it is not possible to divide the jurors reporting for service into who is reporting for selection on a 6-member or 12-member jury. Capital and condemnation cases are the only trials requiring 12-member juries in Florida.

COUNTY	JDPT	PBI
Alachua *	23.4	15.7
Bay	39.9	22.4
Bradford *	22.0	16.0
Brevard	37.6	33.1
Broward	39.2	28.5
Charlotte	45.1	43.9
Columbia	37.0	32.0
Dade - Civil	26.8	19.5
Duval	40.0	34.4
Escambia (before)	47.4	42.2
Escambia (after) *	21.9	14.8
Gadsden	46.0	38.0
Gulf	25.0	25.0
Hernando	30.0	30.0
Hillsborough	42.1	31.5
Lake	24.9	24.2
Manatee	31.3	27.4
Marion	50.1	39.8
Martin	31.4	25.6
Okaloosa	75.7	55.6
Orange	37.1	26.4
Palm Beach	35.9	25.4
Polk	37.0	35.0
Santa Rosa (before)	50.8	47.3
Santa Rosa (after) *	18.4	12.4
Sarasota	25.4	21.3
Seminole	37.2	31.8
Taylor	46.5	46.5
Walton (no trials since change to MVD)	47.0	40.00

* Multiple voir dire or single-day empanelment courts.

ELEMENTS AND STANDARDS††

ION*	CALENDAR COORDINATION*		MONITORING & CONTROL**		PANEL SIZES		
	OVERCALL (<u><</u> 20%)	PANEL CALLS (<u>></u> 3)	ZERO PANEL CALLS (<u><</u> 10%)	JDPT (24)	PBI (18)	AVERAGE PANEL SIZE (18)	PERCENT NOT REACHED (<u><</u> 10%)
				23.4	15.7	16	28%
				39.9	22.4	14	17%
				22.0	16.0	16	25%
				37.6	33.1	22	48%
32%	4.7	13%		39.2	28.5	28	47%
				45.1	43.9	43	72%
				37.0	32.0	32	53%
34%	5.1	9%		26.8	19.5		
				40.0	34.4	24	33%
47% 21% †	1.3 5.3 †	29% 0% †	47.4 21.9 †	42.2 14.8 †	14	25%	
				46.0	38.0	25	57%
				25.0	25.0		
				30.0	30.0	49	72%
37%	1.7	12%		42.1	31.5	22	46%
				24.9	24.2	29	55%
				31.3	27.4	27	60%
				50.1	39.8	40	70%
				31.4	25.6	18	34%
						32	49%
				75.7	55.6	44	69%
28%	2.6	4%		37.1	26.4	22	23%
27%	2.4	7%		35.9	25.4	20	35%
				37.0	35.0	19	28%
			50.8 18.4 †	47.3 12.4 †	17	24%	
				25.4	21.3	25	56%
				37.2	31.8	32	58%
				46.5	46.5	46	74%
						18	
				47.0	40.0		

nd 12-person trials combined and will therefore be slightly higher.
 †) administrative changes were made to achieve standards.
 ment.

END