February 2017

Recidivism Reduction from an Intensive Reentry Program with an Experimental Design: The initial results of the 9 Yards Program

Report by OpenDoors
Results and data analysis independently verified by Rebecca Goldstein, PhD student, Harvard Department of Government.

Abstract: The 9 Yards program provided intensive, long-term reentry support through a controlled, randomized, experimental design to high risk offenders leaving prison. 48 individuals in the control cohort were compared to 33 individuals in the experimental cohort. Those selected for the program were convicted of 71% fewer serious felonies (p=.05) and spent 67% less time in prison due to recidivism during the twelve months after release, for an average reduction of 145 days per person (p=.09). Those selected for 9 Yards were resentenced to prison at a 29% lower rate than those not selected for 9 Yards (p=.51). The program also increased the parole rates of clients by 25 percentage points, from 39% to 64% (p=.01), a 63% increase. The overall results demonstrate that to a high degree of confidence, 9 Yards reduced the reported crime rate and time spent in prison, and also increased the parole rate, amongst clients relative to similarly situated nonparticipants for the first year after release from prison.

Introduction:

9 Yards is a prisoner reentry program that provides a range of supportive services to select cohorts of men starting while they are at the Rhode Island Adult Department of Corrections (DOC). The pool of eligible individuals are identified based on a set criteria, and program participants are randomly selected from this eligible pool, with those not selected then comprising the control group. The eligibility criteria for this eligible pool, which is the same as the eligibility for the 9 Yards program, is explained in the next section. The primary analysis in this report compares recidivism for 33 selected individuals in the experimental group to 48 individuals in the control group.

9 Yards is an intensive program that provides opportunities for a large amount of services to all participants. These services in prison include: academic classes, vocational classes, cognitive self-change classes, and pre-release preparation, all provided in a group setting to the same selected cohort of individuals. All participants in the program have the opportunity for synchronized parole reviews, and if paroled they are released to the second phase of the program. Those that do not receive parole enter the second phase when they complete their sentence. Phase II includes six months of transitional supportive housing, intensive case management, employment coaching and placement, and addiction treatment and drug testing. Those on parole are monitored by GPS.

This analysis compares two distinct cohorts: those that had the opportunity to enroll and participate in 9 Yards and those that did not. Because the assignment between these two groups was random, this is an experimental design without selection bias.

Those selected into the program all have the opportunity to participate in a range of services, but their participation varies considerably. Some drop out of the program in prison, some drop out after release, some are paroled to the transitional house, and some participate in the program post-release but do not opt to live in the transitional housing.

This analysis first evaluates the effect of the program by comparing recidivism results for the experimental and control cohorts. Program participants that drop out or have lower levels of participation are all included together in the experimental group. High-risk participants would be comparatively likely to drop out or not participate, so keeping them in the analysis avoids the pitfall of only including outcomes for the more motivated participants.

In order to attempt to determine if the program had an effect on recidivism, recidivism outcomes for new sentences to prison, felony convictions, and days in prison are compared between the experimental and control cohorts. In addition, this report looks at the outcomes specifically for program participants and for parolees.

9 Yards Services:

The first phase of the program includes a range of classroom instruction offered in prison. These classes have changed and developed since the start of the program, but for the individuals analyzed here, they may have included, at various points: Rhode Island Community College enrollment in several general studies classes, Algebra, Math for the Trades, the Thinking 4 Change cognitive self-change curriculum, Personal Finance, and Composition. Some of the later rounds of participants also took part in computer repair and computer literacy class and a small number were enrolled in a 250 hour welding program. Most clients also took part in a range of other classes offered by the DOC, including Victim's Impact, Anger Management, and Addiction Treatment. The term "clients" is used throughout this report to refer to individuals selected to be in the 9 Yards program, and is synonymous with the sample of individuals in the experimental cohort. The term "participant" is used to refer to clients that actively participated in the program.

The second phase of the program starts when clients are either paroled to the program as a group or finish their sentence naturally. The transitional supportive housing is an apartment style living in which clients have their own bedrooms. There is consistent residential supervision on-site. Clients must either work, be enrolled in school, or be actively participating in the structured employment readiness and job search program. 9 Yards places some clients into work directly, but does not manage a transitional employment program itself.

Individuals that are granted parole are released specifically to the 9 Yards program. They must reside at the transitional housing program for 6 months or the duration of their parole if it is less than 6 months. Part of the program criteria selects for individuals that will still have time left on their sentence so that they will have time left to serve on parole. During this time, they are monitored through GPS ankle bracelets, see their parole officer weekly, take weekly drug tests, and must fulfill various conditions of their parole such as addiction treatment, mental

health counseling, and community service. Those clients with significant histories of opiate abuse are highly encouraged to participate in Medication Assisted Treatment using Methadone or Suboxone. Those that are not paroled are released on probation at the end of their sentences and still have the option to participate in the 9 Yards program.

Methodology

Selection:
Individuals are selected for the program by analyzing data provided by the Department of Corrections that includes information on the below criteria on all inmates at the ACI at that time. At the time of selection, from the roughly 2,400 inmates, between thirty and sixty fit the program criteria.

9 Yards randomly selected 15 clients in July, 2013, 15 in January 2014, and 26 in August, 2015. At the same time, the eligible individuals that were not selected for 9 Yards became part of the control group. In addition, a pseudo control of 13 individuals was selected in December of 2013. The control cohort had access to a large number of other possible services aside from 9 Yards that were also available to 9 Yards participants, including the many generally available courses offered by the DOC, discharge planning, and a variety of community based post-release services. However, they did not have the opportunity to participate in 9 Yards.

The eligibility criteria is as follows:

Age: Individuals must be 22-40 years old. In the first round of 9 Yards, the maximum age was 34 years old. In later rounds the upper age limit was increased to 40.

Time left on sentence: At the time of selection, the individual had 16-28 months left on their sentence. Selection also required that they would have served at least 45% of their sentence at the time of the 9 Yards parole review.

Holds: Individuals with out-of-state holds or immigration holds were not deemed eligible.

In Medium Security Men's Facility: The program only operates in the Medium Security Men's Facility at the ACI, so only individuals in that building at the time of selection were eligible.

Parole: The individual had not already been paroled.

Origin: Originally, individuals had to be from the Providence Metro region. In later rounds, this criteria was relaxed to only require a Rhode Island address. Because individuals were identified from database records, geographic origin was determined using all records of previous reported addresses.

Education level: Initially, individuals had to test high enough on the CASAS assessment offered by the DOC to be eligible for GED classes. Later on, an additional criteria requiring a GED was added.

Demographic Comparisons:
The two cohorts are compared based on several demographic variables to demonstrate their similarity: length of sentence, charge type, age, amount of time left on their sentence at time of selection, % without a GED, LSI-R, and race. In prison rule infractions are also compared since

this indicates risky behavior and behavioral problems. Rule infractions are quantified by comparing the average number of days individuals went to Disciplinary Confinement preceding selection. In addition, the samples are compared with a composite standardized risk factor, the LSI-R. The LSI-R is an industry standard, means-tested risk assessment that parametrizes risk factors including employment, education, family, peers, substance abuse, mental health, and criminal history.

Approaches to recidivism analysis:

Three outcomes were tested for this report, summarized below:

Outcome	Type of analysis	9 Yards cohort sample size	Control Cohort sample size
1 year recidivism	Compares the recidivism of the 9 Yards cohort versus the control cohort across a number of recidivism indicators for recidivism occurring within one year of release	33	48
3 year recidivism	Compares the recidivism of the 9 Yards cohort versus the control cohort across a number of recidivism indicators for recidivism occurring within three years of release	13	35
Parole rate	Compares the rate of receiving parole for 9 Yards participants and the control cohort that have a final parole outcome	50	51

In the 1 year recidivism analysis, a control cohort of 48 is compared to an experimental cohort of 33. Only individuals that have been out of prison for at least 10 months are included in the analysis. Only recidivism events that occurred within 12 months of release are included.

A three year recidivism analysis was also conducted, which included a control cohort of 35 compared to an experimental cohort of 13. Only individuals that have been out of prison for at least two years are included in the analysis. This analysis was conducted because a three year rate of recidivism is a very typical form of recidivism analysis in this field. Despite the small sample sizes and the fact that most subjects have not been out of prison for the full three years, this analysis was conducted because there is considerable additional data outside of the 12 month timeline. Although the sample size of the experimental group is quite small, the time period of observation is quite long and thus looks at results that persist for a considerable time.

Limitations: There were several methodological limitations to the study, none of which have created any substantial bias in the results.

Dropouts: Five clients were considered to have dropped out of the program of a total of 33--an 85% participation rate.[1] These dropouts are included in the analysis of the experimental cohort, so dropouts do not bias the results.

Deaths in Cohorts: Two individuals originally in the experimental group died of opiate overdoses. Both died less than nine months after release. Because they were no longer at risk of recidivating, they were removed from the recidivism analysis. One individual in the control cohort also died of an opiate overdose, however this was two and a half years after release, so he was not removed from the recidivism analysis.

Pseudo-control: Thirteen individuals in the control group are actually a 'pseudo' control. The Pseudo Control Cohort is identical aside from a six month difference in selection time. The demographic characteristics of the pseudo controls are equivalent to the other cohorts. The only assumption required for their inclusion is that the conditions in the prison and outside of the prison did not change in any substantial way due to this six month shift. If they are excluded from the analysis, the 9 Yards effect size actually increases, since the pseudo control group exhibited less severe recidivism than the rest of the control group.

Differences in observation periods: This experiment has not been long enough to ensure that all subjects have been out of prison for the full length of the observation period. In order to include as much data as possible, subjects were included as long as they were out of prison for at least ten months. However, the control cohort has been out of prison, at risk of recidivating for slightly longer than the experimental cohort. These differences are small for the 1 year recidivism numbers, less than 1%, in comparison to the total length of the observation period. However, these are relevant for the 3 year recidivism data, wherein some individuals included in the analysis have only been released for 2 years. The difference in observation period for the 3 year analysis is 5% of the total observation period. For comparison sake, results are also included in Appendix B that artificially compensate for this difference by proportionally increasing the recidivism in the experimental cohort.

Cases that have not been disposed: There was the possibility in this analysis that subjects would have been charged with new crimes but the cases would not have been disposed. There is one such cases in the experimental cohort for the 12 month recidivism analysis. For any such cases, a standard procedure was created to estimate the result of the sentence, so as to avoid bias but still include the data.[2]

Parole Rate: In addition to a recidivism analysis, an analysis of parole rates was also conducted. The goal was to determine whether or not 9 Yards increased the rate the Parole

[1] The dropouts left the program for the following reasons: they were uninterested in classes or engagement in prison or after release and were then transferred to Minimum Security and so could not participate; they were paroled almost immediately upon acceptance into the program to a different post-release environment and had no involvement after release; they were uninterested in classes and then transferred to Maximum and had no contact after release; they participated while in prison but then refused all engagement after release.

[2] If a defendant is held without bail on the new charge and corresponding probation violation, the study estimated they would be convicted of the charge and receive a new sentence that is one year greater than their last prison sentence. If the probation violation was dismissed and the individual was released on personal recognizance, the study estimated that the charge would also be dismissed or would result in a plea to straight probation. The one case in the data for the 12 month analysis corresponds to the second type.

Board granted parole. This analysis uses different samples of individuals than the recidivism analysis, because it includes individuals in the cohorts that have had their parole determined but have not yet been released from prison or been out of prison for a substantial amount of time. This analysis thus includes individuals that are part of the third round of 9 Yards, which started in August of 2015. There are 49 individuals in the control group and 51 individuals in the experimental group.[3] In addition to calculating parole rates, the average amount of time spent on parole was also determined for each cohort.

Participant Cohorts: Results are also shown for the individuals selected for 9 Yards that actually participated. While these results cannot be compared to non-participants due to selection bias issues, they are still of interest.

Participants spent a large amount of time in prison in 9 Yards classes. The total number of classes attended on average per participant was reported using attendance records. Employment rates of the participants are reported by evaluating whether participants were working consistently three months after release. This is determined by analyzing program records including case notes to determine if participants worked at least two weeks out of the fourth month after release. Participation in education and vocational training is reported based on the number of participants that enrolled in such programs and the number that completed.

Recidivism Indicators:

Three types of recidivism are analyzed:

Portion of Individuals who Recidivated: This includes the portion of individuals from each cohort that recidivated by being resentenced to prison, including both new charges and probation and parole violations. This metric does not include any consideration of the severity of each recidivism event or the amount of recidivism committed by each individual. An individual that is resentenced to prison for 30 days on a parole violation is analyzed equally to someone who recidivates three times, including a new felony. This metric was included despite these limitations because it is a very common definition of recidivism.

Portion of Individuals who Recidivated with a Felony: This is the portion of individuals from each cohort that recidivated by being resentenced to prison for a new felony. This metric has the advantage of focusing on new, serious crimes, which are of particular interest in this analysis. It has the disadvantage of generalizing between felonies--a felony drug possession charge leading to 90 days in prison is tallied the same as a felony gun possession charge leading to 13 years in prison.

---

[3] If an individual waived parole this is recorded as 'not paroled,' even though the decision was not made by the Parole Board. Many individuals who know they are unlikely to receive parole will waive parole, so removing these individuals would have biased the results. If an individual was selected for 9 Yards and paroled, but not paroled to 9 Yards, they are still recorded as 'paroled.' This applied to 8 of the 45 in the experimental cohort.

There were five individuals selected in the very first round of 9 Yards that had already been denied parole at the time of orientation into 9 Yards. They are removed from this sample because they never had an opportunity to go up for parole with 9 Yards.

Recidivism days: This variable represents the total number of days spent in prison as part of recidivism. This includes parole violations, probation violations, and new charges. It does not include prison time that is not the result of a sentence, such as being held prior to release on bail for a charge that doesn't result in a sentence, or incarceration for court debt. If an individual has finished serving this sentence, the actual days served is reported. If an individual has not finished serving the sentence, 65% of the sentence is reported for the purpose of recidivism comparisons, since on average these defendants only serve 65% of the total sentence due to parole and good-time sentence reduction[4]. This recidivism result is probably the most reliable of the four recidivism indicators and it also probably most accurately answers the question 'what effect does 9 Yards have on incarceration?'

		Total individuals selected	Percent paroled	Age at start	Race (% black or hispanic)	Average LSI-R Score	Days in disciplinary confinement (prior to selection)
9 Yards		50	64%	29	69%	30	27
Control		51	39%	28	75%	30	30

Table 2--Complete Experimental and Control Cohorts

Results:

Each comparison of means between the 9 Yards treatment group and the control group is presented along with a p-value, which is the probability that these differences in means would have occurred by chance if the study were repeated many times and the true program effect was zero (a low p-value thus indicates that the results are statistically significant, since it is unlikely that they could have arisen due to random chance if the program effect were zero).

Cohort demographics: Those selected and those not selected for 9 Yards were compared along a number of demographic variables as shown in Table 2 for the full samples. The two groups were highly similar across all indicators for each of the four analyses, even those with small sample sizes. Both cohorts had average LSI-R scores of 30, which is considered moderate risk.

The random assignment between the two cohorts guarantees that there was no bias in assignment of risk to the two cohorts, however due to the small sample size there can be random, important differences in risk and likelihood to recidivate that cannot be controlled for. There are no systematic demographic differences in the analyzed variables between the 9 Yards treatment group and control group which would give cause for concern that differences in the outcomes are due to differences in demographics between the two groups.

[4] This estimate is based on the percentage of time served for the preceding incarcerations for the control cohort.

Recidivism: Those picked for 9 Yards were sentenced to prison less, were convicted of fewer felonies, and spent less time in prison than those not in 9 Yards. The results of all analyses are shown in Appendix A.

29% fewer of those selected for 9 Yards were resentenced to prison within 12 months (p=.51). 71% fewer of those selected for 9 Yards were reconvicted of felonies (p=.05) during that time. They spent 67% less time in prison due to recidivism after release from prison (p=.09), or 145 days fewer on average.

In the three year analysis, 9% more of those selected for 9 Yards were resentenced to prison within 36 months. 64% fewer of those selected for 9 Yards were reconvicted of felonies during that time. They spent 55% less time in prison due to recidivism after release from prison or 244 days fewer on average. Because the sample size was so small for the experimental cohort for the three year recidivism analysis, it was not possible to model this comparison to calculate a p-value. It was not possible to test if this result was statistically significant, and so the reliability of the result is unknown, but should be interpreted with caution.

Parole Rate: The results show a higher rate of parole for those selected in the 9 Yards program, 63% versus 39% (p=.01), a 61% increase, with sample sizes of 49 and 51 respectively. This result is statistically significant, indicating strong evidence that 9 Yards increased the rate of parole. There is a 2% chance that these results could have occurred by random if the true program effect were zero.

On average, those that made parole from both cohorts were on parole for similar amounts of time. Those in the experimental cohort were on parole averaged 248 days on parole, versus 240 days on parole for the control cohort.

Participants: The results for participants are biased because there were several drop-outs and these dropouts could be higher risk. In the first two rounds of 9 Yards, 27 individuals have been selected for the program, all of whom have been out of prison for five months.

Participants had very similar recidivism results in comparison to the overall experimental cohort. This indicates that dropouts as a whole so far have not demonstrated to be higher or lower risk than those that participate. Likely there are some that are higher risk and some that are lower risk, although the sample size of five is far too small to draw any conclusions.

Of the 40 clients that have been released from prison, 29 lived in the transitional housing program, or 73%. Most participants had weekly or biweekly contact with a case manager for six months after release, and the case manager had a caseload of between 9-12 cases at a time. 85% were working consistently three months after release from prison.

Opiate use and Deaths of Cohort Members: Two individuals in the 9 Yards cohort died of opiate overdoses either while in the program or shortly after completing the program, both less than eight months after release from prison. In addition, one member of the control cohort died of an opiate overdose.

Removing the opiate user subgroup entirely would actually increase the recidivism reduction effect size of 9 Yards participation because one of the largest felony events in the experimental group involved an opiate user. Instead, the conservative decision was made to specifically remove the two members of the experimental group that died shortly after release.

Due to the small size of this subgroup, it is impossible to analyze any outcomes in comparison to the control group members with opiate addictions. However, it is clear that this is a particularly at risk-group both in terms of mortality and recidivism.

Conclusions:

Recidivism: This report is not a complete evaluation of how 9 Yards clients progress after release. It instead focuses on comparing recidivism rates between those selected for 9 Yards and those not selected. According to this analysis, Yards resulted in a reduction in reported criminal activity, time in prison, and prison spending during the first year after release from prison. These results were conclusive, indicating a high confidence that the program resulted in in an effect on recidivism. The effect on felony recidivism is significant to a 95% level of confidence, and the effect on days in prison due to recidivism is significant to a 91% degree of confidence. The study found a mean reduction in days in prison of 145 days. The rate of felony recidivism decreased from 21% in the control cohort to 6% amongst the 9 Yards cohort.

Despite the high degree of confidence and large effect sizes, the results in this report should be considered preliminary for several reasons. Not all the data is in yet on these cohorts, and the sample size is small such that single events can have a large impact on results. Nevertheless, while the magnitude of the effect on crime and incarceration is unclear, the results prove that the 9 Yards program decreased both in the year after release.

The important, remaining question is whether or not these results persist. The three year recidivism data is highly preliminary due to the small sample size. However, there is nothing in those results to indicate that the effect goes away with time. The preliminary results do show a reduction in proportional effect on days in prison due to recidivism from 67% to 56%. However the total effect on days actually continues to increase--from 145 days to 244 days. The projected impact on incarceration rates thus shows no sign of dwindling over time.

While the impact on felony recidivism was clear, the effect on rate of resentence to prison was smaller. This indicates that 9 Yards seems to be having a bigger effect on serious criminal activity than other types of recidivism, including parole violations, technical probation violations, and misdemeanor offenses. The reduction in prison time is thus tied to the effect on felony activity, which seems to generate most of the potential to reduce incarceration levels.

This study does not provide definitive evidence of a specific mechanism for the overall recidivism reduction; however, the 9 Yards program design points to several possible causes. Studies of recidivism show that the risk of recidivism is influenced by an array of factors, including antisocial personality, antisocial peers, family support systems, education, employment, stability of housing, and substance abuse.[5] 9 Yards clients all experienced very targeted provision of reentry services which resulted in a guarantee of stable housing for six months after release and high rates of employment. These services alone would be expected to

[5] James Bonta and Don Andrews, *Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation (*Ottawa: Public Safety Canada, 2007); Visher, et al. *Employment After Prison: A Longitudinal Study of Releases in Three States (*Washington: urban Institute, 2008); Baer, et. al, *Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry: Research Findings from the Urban Institute's Prisoner Reentry Portfolio* (Washington: Urban Institute, 2006).

reduce recidivism. They also were provided with intensive academic instruction and cognitive self-change classes in prison, frequent case management after release, addiction treatment and drug testing, and a group of peers that were also engaged in positive, pro-social activities. All of these could have assisted in the rehabilitative process.

Parole also could have had an important influence on these results. A larger portion of those in 9 Yards were on parole. To the extent that parole mandates treatment and closely supervises the reentry process, it is possible that this could have resulted in fewer recidivism events.

Parole Rate: The results suggest an increase in parole rates for those selected in 9 Yards. Rates increased from 39% to 63%, or a 61% increase in parole rates (p=.02). This increase represents a statistically significant and substantively large effect on parole rates.

The parole process is a key component of the 9 Yards program. A higher parole rate allows for sooner releases from prison. On average, clients served 240 days on parole, so an additional 50 people on parole would result in a total of 32 beds saved a year.

A program that creates a safe, effective parole experience and that increases parole rates has cost saving potential for the state. Parole is a rehabilitative environment, so higher parole rates also increase the opportunity for rehabilitation, in contrast to releasing individuals straight from prison to an unsupervised life. Higher parole rates also provide an incentive to clients to participate, which could decrease the chances of dropouts in the future.

Participants: 9 Yards participants recidivated less than those that did not participate in 9 Yards. Recidivism results are very similar to those reported for the more objective comparison between those selected and those not selected into the program. Both results suggest that those in 9 Yards commit fewer crimes and spend less time in prison than those not in 9 Yards.

Without more detailed data on the progress of those not in 9 Yards post-release, no conclusions can be drawn as to how or why 9 Yards seems to have an effect on recidivism. Attempts were made to gather this data on the control group, but there was not a high response rate. As a result, all data on 9 Yards participant post-release progress is analyzed without any points of comparison.

Just looking at the participants, however, data indicates that employment rates were very high. Three months after release, 85% of participants were working or in a full-time training program. Although a high portion of 9 Yards participants enrolled in college or training programs, only about a quarter have completed a course at this point. This reflects the challenge of keeping participants engaged with long-term educational goals.

Cost and Savings: The total effect of 9 Yards on incarceration time is of interest because of financial considerations in addition to crime reduction considerations. It is estimated that the 33 clients that have completed 9 Yards have, based on current 1 year recidivism outcomes, spent 145 fewer days in prison per person, or 4,785 days total. This is a total of 12.6 prison years. A conservative estimate would look at only the per diem savings associated with the cost of a single inmate at the ACI. The DOC uses a figure of $13.26/bed-day[6] to estimate per-diem savings, which includes food, medical, clothing and other basic supply costs. It does not include any administrative, Correctional Officer, programming, facility, or counseling costs.

[6] 2016 estimate provided by DOC Department of Research and Planning

Using this figure, those in 9 Yards so far cost Rhode Island an estimated $63,449 less in prison spending in the first 12 months after release.

This is not a complete cost benefit analysis of the 9 Yards program. That would have to include the savings associated with crime reduction, reduction in associated judiciary spending, increased tax revenue due to possible increases in employment, and other possible financial repercussions of rehabilitation. This estimate is only a baseline figure to put prison reduction into financial terms.

In addition, this estimate does not include any of the large potential prison reduction savings if this project were replicated at a larger scale. If a 145-day prison reduction per client effect could be maintained at 200 clients a year for three years, that would ultimately result in a total savings of around 80 beds a year, which would have the potential to result in larger scale savings at the Department of Corrections.

Appendix A

Results of two methodologies of recidivism analysis

	Resentenced		**Effect Size**	**Felony conviction rate**		**Effect Size**	**Days in prison (average)**		**Effect Size**	**Effect size in days**
Observation period	9 Yards	Control		9 Yards	Control		9 Yards	Control		
1 year	27%	38%	29%	6%	21%	71%	71	216	67%	145
3 years	62%	57%	-9%	15%	43%	64%	201	445	55%	244

Appendix B

Results adjusted proportionally for discrepancies in observation periods between experimental and control cohorts.

	Resentenced		**Effect Size**	**Felony convictions**		**Effect Size**	**Days in prison (average)**		**Effect Size**	**Effect size in days**
Observation period	Exp	Control		Exp	Control		Exp	Control		
1 year	27%	38%	29%	6%	21%	71%	71	216	67%	145
3 years	65%	57%	-14%	16%	43%	62%	211	445	52%	234