SAMHSA

Drug and Alcohol Services Information System Series: S-13

Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS): 1999

Data on Substance Abuse Treatment Facilities

Office of Applied Studies

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

OFFICE OF APPLIED STUDIES

Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS): 1999

Data on Substance Abuse Treatment Facilities

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was conducted for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), Office of Applied Studies (OAS), by Synectics for Management Decisions, Inc.(SMDI), Arlington, Virginia, and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR), Princeton, New Jersey, under Contract No. 283-97-9001. Project Directors were Peter Hurley (SMDI) and Geraldine Mooney (MPR). Data collection was performed by MPR's interviewing and quality control staff under the direction of Barbara Rogers and Barbara Holland. This report was prepared by Leigh Henderson and James DeLozier of SMDI, and benefited greatly from review by OAS staff Patricia Royston, Cathie Alderks, Gerri Scott-Pinkney, and Deborah Trunzo (Project Officer), and by SMDI staff editor Elizabeth Walter.

COPIES OF THE PUBLICATION

Copies may be obtained, free of charge, from the National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information (NCADI). The NCADI is a service of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). Write or call NCADI at:

National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information (NCADI)
P.O. Box 2345
Rockville, MD 20847-2345
(301) 468-2600 1-800-729-6686 TDD: 1-800-487-4889

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO PUBLICATION

This publication can be accessed electronically through the Internet World Wide Web connections listed below:

http://www.DrugAbuseStatistics.SAMHSA.gov
http://www.SAMHSA.gov
http://www.health.org

ORIGINATING OFFICE

SAMHSA, Office of Applied Studies
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 16-105
Rockville, Maryland 20857

April 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Click on topic to go to page

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Click on topic to go to page

List of Tables

Click on topic to go to page

List of Tables (continued)

Click on topic to go to page

List of Figures

Click on topic to go to page

HIGHLIGHTS

This report presents results from the 1999 Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, an annual survey of facilities providing substance abuse treatment, conducted by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). UFDS is designed to collect data on the location, characteristics, and use of alcoholism and drug abuse treatment facilities and services throughout the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and other U.S. jurisdictions. Selected findings are given below.

- The number of facilities reporting in 1999 increased by 13 percent over 1998. The turnover in facilities was much greater than indicated by this number—the 13 percent increase was the net result of expanded survey coverage, a response rate increase of 10 percent, facility closings, and normal year-to-year variation in which facilites choose to respond.

- In 1999, private non-profit facilities made up the bulk of the system (60 percent; see Table 2.1), followed by private for-profit (26 percent) and State/local government (11 percent).

- Over half (54 percent) of all facilities had managed care contracts in 1999, as compared to 32 percent in 1995 (Table 2.2). All ownership categories showed an increase in the percentage with managed care contracts.

- Outpatient rehabilitation was the most widely available type of care, offered by 82 percent of all facilities (Table 3.2). Residential rehabilitation was offered by 25 percent of all facilities. Partial hospitalization programs were offered by 19 percent of facilities, and outpatient detoxification by 13 percent. Residential detoxification and hospital inpatient treatment (either detoxification or rehabilitation) were each offered by 5 to 8 percent of all facilities.

- Almost half (45 percent) of all facilities offered special programs for the dually-diagnosed (Table 2.4).

- About one-third (34 percent) of facilities had programs for adolescents (Table 2.4).

- About one in five facilities (22 percent) offered programs for persons with HIV/AIDS or pregnant/postpartum women (Table 2.4).

Chapter 1

Description of the Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) Survey

This report presents tabular information and highlights from the 1999 Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, conducted between October 1999 and April 2000, with a reference date of October 1, 1999. It was the 23rd in a series of national surveys designed to collect data on the location, characteristics, and use of alcohol and drug abuse treatment facilities and services throughout the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and other U.S. jurisdictions.[1] The Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), plans and directs the UFDS survey.

The UFDS survey is designed to collect information from all facilities[2] in the United States, both public and private, that provide substance abuse treatment. UFDS provides the mechanism for quantifying the dynamic character and composition of the United States substance abuse treatment delivery system. The UFDS objectives are:

- to assist SAMHSA and State and local governments in assessing the nature and extent of services provided in State-supported and other treatment facilities, and in forecasting treatment resource requirements;
- to update SAMHSA's Inventory of Substance Abuse Treatment Services (I-SATS) of all known drug and alcohol abuse treatment facilities;
- to analyze general treatment services trends and to conduct comparative analyses for the nation, regions, and States;
- to generate the *National Directory of Drug and Alcohol Abuse Treatment Programs*, a compendium of facilities approved by State substance abuse agencies for the provision of substance abuse treatment; and
- to update the information in SAMHSA's Substance Abuse Treatment Facility Locator, a searchable database of facilities approved by State substance abuse agencies for the provision of substance abuse treatment, available on the Internet at:

  http://findtreatment.samhsa.gov

Survey History

UFDS has evolved from national survey efforts begun in the 1970s by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) to measure the scope and use of drug abuse treatment services in the United States. The sixth of these surveys, conducted in 1976, introduced the data elements and format that have formed the core of subsequent surveys. These include organizational setting, service orientation, services available, clients in treatment by type of care, capacity, and annual revenue sources and amounts. The 1976 survey, called the National Drug Abuse Treatment Utilization Survey, was repeated in 1977 and 1978. In 1979, the National Institute on Alco-

[1] The jurisdictions include the territories of American Samoa and Guam, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands of the United States.

[2] In this report, entities responding to UFDS are referred to as "facilities." This designation is consistent with the title of the survey, although, as discussed later in the report, a "facility" may be a program-level, clinic-level, or multi-site respondent.

hol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) became a cosponsor of the survey, alcoholism treatment facilities were added, and the study was renamed the National Drug and Alcoholism Treatment Utilization Survey. This survey was repeated in 1980 and 1982. In 1984, a one-page version was used (the National Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Program Inventory). In 1987, the full version of the survey was reinstated, and it was renamed the National Drug and Alcoholism Treatment Unit Survey (NDATUS). NDATUS was conducted annually from 1989 to 1993. In 1992, with the creation of SAMHSA, responsibility for conducting the survey shifted to SAMHSA's Office of Applied Studies. The survey was redesigned, and conducted annually as the Uniform Facility Data Set survey from 1995 to 1998. During these years, the survey was conducted by mail with telephone follow-up of non-respondents. The 1999 survey year was a transition year during which the survey was redesigned, and an abbreviated telephone survey of treatment facilities was conducted. In 2000, a redesigned full mail survey will be reinstated. This will be known as the National Survey of Substance Abuse Treatment Services (N-SSATS).

UFDS in the Context of the Drug and Alcohol Services Information System (DASIS)

UFDS is one of the three components of SAMHSA's Drug and Alcohol Services Information System (DASIS). The core of DASIS is the Inventory of Substance Abuse Treatment Services (I-SATS), a continuously-updated, comprehensive listing of all known substance abuse treatment facilities. The other components of DASIS are the UFDS survey and the Treatment Episode Data Set (TEDS), a client-level database of persons admitted to substance abuse treatment. A unique ID number assigned to each facility by I-SATS is used in the collection of facility-level data (UFDS) and client-level data (TEDS) so that the three data sets can be linked. Together, they provide national- and State-level information on the numbers and characteristics of individuals admitted to alcohol and drug treatment programs and describe the facilities that deliver care to those individuals.

The I-SATS is the list frame for UFDS. Facilities in the I-SATS fall into three general categories. These are distinguished by the services provided, the components of DASIS of which they are part, and the relationship of the facility to its State substance abuse agency. These categories are described below.

Treatment facilities approved by State substance abuse agencies and reporting to TEDS

The largest group of facilities (about 8,000 in 1999) includes facilities that are licensed or certified by the State substance abuse agency to provide substance abuse treatment (or are administratively tracked for other reasons), and are required by the State agency to provide TEDS client-level data. State DASIS representatives maintain this segment of the I-SATS by reporting new facilities, closures, and address changes to SAMHSA.

Treatment facilities approved by State substance abuse agencies but not reporting to TEDS

This group (about 4,500 facilities in 1999) includes treatment facilities that are licensed, certified, or otherwise approved by the State substance abuse agency (or are administratively tracked for other reasons), but that are not required by the State agency to provide TEDS client-level data. Some private for-profit facilities fall into this category. This group also includes programs operated by Federal agencies (the Bureau of Prisons (BOP), the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), the Department of Defense, and the Indian Health Service). I-SATS records for Federally-operated facilities are updated annually through lists provided by these agencies.

Treatment facilities not approved by State substance abuse agencies

This group of facilities (about 2,900 in 1999) represents the ongoing SAMHSA effort to make the I-SATS as comprehensive as possible by including treatment facilities that State substance abuse agencies, for a variety of reasons, do not track. Many of these facilities are private for-profit, small group practices, or hospital-based programs. Most of them are identified through periodic screening of alternative source databases (see *Expansion of survey coverage*, below). State substance abuse agencies are given the opportunity to review these facilities and to add them to the State agency-approved list, if appropriate.

Survey Coverage

The use of the I-SATS as the list frame for UFDS imposes certain constraints related to the unit of response and the scope of facilities included. In addition, the expansion of the I-SATS to provide a more complete enumeration of substance abuse treatment facilities means that year-to-year comparisons of the numbers of facilities reporting to UFDS must be interpreted with caution.

Figure 1 is a time line detailing the major changes in survey scope and administration that may have affected the numbers of reporting facilities and clients. Beginning in 1992, SAMHSA introduced expanded efforts to obtain information from non-responding facilities. This resulted in a 25 percent increase in the number of facilities and a 16 percent increase in the number of clients between 1991 and 1992. Beginning in 1995, changes in data collection methods enabled more complete identification of duplicate reporting by networks of facilities, causing a slight reduction in the total number of facilities. In subsequent years, the number of facilities again increased, as efforts were made (detailed below) to expand the survey coverage and to include all sites at which treatment was provided.

Unit of response

UFDS is designed to collect data from each physical location where treatment services are provided. Accordingly, SAMHSA requests that State substance abuse agencies use the point of delivery of service (i.e., physical location) as the defining factor for a facility. It also requests that facilities be included in the I-SATS, UFDS, and TEDS at the same administrative level so that record linkage among the three data sets is valid. Because of the different State administrative systems, however, there are some inconsistencies in implementation. For example, in some States, multiple treatment programs (e.g., detoxification, residential, and outpatient) at the same address and under the same management have separate State licenses. These are treated as separate by the State substance abuse agency, and are given separate I-SATS ID numbers. In other States, multiple sites are included as a single entity under a parent or administrative unit. In many of these cases, individual sites can report services data in the UFDS survey, but client data are available only at a higher administrative level. Beginning in 1995, efforts have been made to identify facility networks and to eliminate duplicate reporting by networks. For most facilities, reporting level remains consistent from year to year. However, beginning in 1998, an emphasis was placed on collecting minimum information from all physical locations, and this has resulted in an increase in the number of facilities.

Expansion of survey coverage

The great majority of treatment facilities in the I-SATS are administratively monitored by State substance abuse agencies. Therefore, the scope of facilities included in the I-SATS is affected by differences in State systems of licensure, certification, accreditation, and the disbursement of public funds. For example, some State substance abuse agencies regulate private facilities and individual practitioners while others do not. In some States,

Figure 1

Numbers of facilities and clients in treatment: UFDS 1992-1999



* BOP = Bureau of Prisons

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Drug and Alcoholism Treatment Unit Survey (NDATUS) 1992-1993; Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey 1995-1999.

hospital-based substance abuse treatment facilities are not licensed through the State substance abuse agency.

To address these differences, SAMHSA conducted a large-scale effort during 1995 and 1996 to identify substance abuse treatment facilities that, for a variety of reasons, were not on the I-SATS. Some 15 source lists were considered, and facilities not on the I-SATS were contacted to ascertain whether they provided substance abuse treatment. As expected, this yielded a number of hospital-based and small private facilities that were not on the I-SATS. (These facilities were surveyed in 1995 and 1996, but they were not included in the published results of the survey until 1997.) Analysis of the results of this effort led to similar but more targeted updates before the 1998 and 1999 UFDS. Potential new facilities were identified using data from the American Business Index (ABI), the annual American Hospital Association survey, and SAMHSA's Inventory of Mental Health Organizations, which were the three source lists from 1995 to 1996 that had yielded the most new facilities. Additional facilities are also identified during the survey itself by survey participants, who are asked to report all of the treatment facilities in their administrative networks. These facilities are initially included as not State agency-approved (see above). State substance abuse agencies are given the opportunity to review these facilities and to add them to the State agency-approved list, if appropriate.

Data collection

Until 1996, State substance abuse agencies distributed and collected the UFDS survey forms. Beginning in 1996, data collection was centralized; SAMHSA has mailed UFDS forms directly to and collected forms directly from the facilities, and has conducted survey or follow-up telephone interviews with the facility director or his/her assignee.

Non-response

Beginning in 1992, SAMHSA expanded efforts to obtain information from non-responding facilities. A representative sample of non-respondents was contacted and administered an abbreviated version of the survey instrument via telephone. In 1993 and later years, this effort was extended to all non-responding facilities. In 1997, a series of measures was introduced to enhance the survey response rate. These included advance notification and improved methods for updating address and contact information. In 1999, use of the abbreviated telephone instrument resulted in a non-response rate of only 5 percent. For 95 percent of facilities in the sample, it was possible either to complete the survey or to determine that the facilities had closed or were otherwise ineligible.

Exclusions

Facilities operated by the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) were excluded from the 1997 and subsequent UFDS because SAMHSA introduced a separate survey of correctional facilities.[3] In 1999, facilities treating incarcerated persons only were identified and excluded. In 1997 only, facilities offering only DUI/DWI programs were excluded.

Changes in Survey Content

Since 1992, SAMHSA has made adjustments each year to the survey design, both to minimize non-response and to include areas of emerging interest such as the role of managed care.

[3] Office of Applied Studies, SAMHSA (2000). *Substance Abuse Treatment in Adult and Juvenile Correctional Facilities: Findings from the Uniform Facility Data Set 1997 Survey of Correctional Facilities*. Drug and Alcohol Services Information System Series: S-9.

Table 1.1
Survey contents: NDATUS/UFDS/N-SSATS 1992-2000

	NDATUS/UFDS/N-SSATS survey year				
Survey contents	*1992-1993*	*1995*	*1996-1998*	*1999*	*2000 (planned)*
Ownership	X	X	X	X	X
Services offered	X	X	X	X	X
No. of clients by age, sex, and race/ethnicity	X	X	X		
No. of clients (total and under age 18)					X
No. of beds	X	X	X		X
Types of payment accepted	X			X	X
Licensure/certification of facility/staff		X		X	X
Sources and amounts of revenue	X	X	X		
Managed care agreements		X	X	X	X

Table 1.1 shows the major content areas for the NDATUS and UFDS surveys before 1999, in 1999, and planned for the 2000 N-SSATS survey. The 1999 UFDS, conducted by telephone, collected less information than in previous years.

Procedures for the 1999 UFDS

Field period and reference date

The field period for the 1999 UFDS was from October 1999 through April 2000, with a reference date of October 1, 1999.

Survey coverage

The sample consisted of all active treatment facilities that were on the I-SATS as of about six weeks before the survey reference date (October 1, 1999). These facilities were contacted by telephone. Facilities added by State substance abuse agencies or discovered during the field interviews were also included in the survey.

Data collection method

In 1999, the UFDS survey was conducted as a computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI; see Appendix).

Content

The 1999 UFDS survey instrument is reproduced in the Appendix. Respondents provided information on treatment services offered on October 1, 1999. Topics included:

- Facility identification information
- Substance abuse services (prevention, intake/assessment/referral, treatment/detoxification, administrative, halfway house, DUI/DWI)
- Ownership
- Hotline operation
- Primary focus (substance abuse, mental health, other)
- Special programs provided (adolescents, dually diagnosed, HIV/AIDS, pregnant/postpartum women, other women's groups, criminal justice clients)

- Types of treatment provided
  - Hospital inpatient (detoxification, rehabilitation, or both)
  - Non-hospital residential (detoxification, rehabilitation, or both)
  - Outpatient (ambulatory detoxification, day treatment/partial hospitalization, intensive outpatient, other outpatient)
- Managed care participation
- Types of payment accepted
- Subsidized care
- Sliding fee scale
- Facility accreditation
- Staff licensure/certification

Responding facilities

The initial sample included 19,435 facilities believed to offer substance abuse treatment. Eighteen percent of the sample (n = 3,461) were determined to be ineligible for the survey. A facility was ineligible if: a) it had closed by October 1, 1999; b) it was not providing substance abuse treatment services on October 1, 1999; or c) it treated incarcerated persons only. Of the remaining 15,974 facilities, five percent (n = 735) could not be contacted or declined to participate. A total of 15,239 facilities (95 percent of eligible facilities) reported that they provided substance abuse treatment and/or detoxification services on October 1, 1999, either alone or in conjunction with other substance abuse services.

Table 1.2. Facilities provided a range of substance abuse treatment/detoxification, prevention, and other services (e.g., intake, assessment, referral, and administration). About two-thirds of facilities (64 percent) engaged in prevention activities. Only one percent of facilities were limited to the provision of treatment/detoxification services.

Table 1.2
Facility function: UFDS 1999

Treatment/ detoxification	*Prevention*	*Other substance abuse services*	*No.*	*%*
X	X	X	9,700	63.7
X		X	5,229	34.3
X			220	1.4
X	X		90	0.6
			15,239	100.0

Quality assurance

Range and consistency checks were built into the CATI system. Calls were monitored periodically.

Further Data Considerations and Limitations

As with any data collection effort, certain procedural considerations and data limitations must be taken into account when interpreting data from the 1999 UFDS. Some of these are outlined above. Some general issues are discussed here; considerations and limitations of specific data items are discussed where the data are presented.

- UFDS attempts to obtain responses from all known treatment facilities, but it is a voluntary survey. There is no adjustment for facility non-response.

- Item non-response was minimal in the CATI survey. There are instances of non-response in most data items, however, and some variables have an explicit *Unknown* response option. If facility ownership was missing, its value was imputed from the facility's 1998 response when possible. For the remaining variables, when a facility did not report complete information, it was excluded from the tabulations for which data were missing. As a result, the number of

treatment facilities on which tables are based varies somewhat from table to table. The number of facilities actually reporting data is generally included in each table.

- Multiple responses were allowed for certain variables (e.g., services provided, facility setting, and specialized programs). Tabulations of these variables include the total number of facilities reporting each response.

Organization of the Report

The balance of this report is organized into four analytic sections. Chapter 2 presents broad trends in facility characteristics for 1992 to 1999 (except 1994, when the UFDS survey was not conducted). Chapter 3 describes key characteristics of facilities and programs. Finally, Chapter 4 presents State-level detail of the tables presented in Chapter 3.

Terminology

Ownership is a term used throughout the report and the tables. Ownership indicates the type of entity owning or responsible for the operation of the facility: private for-profit, private non-profit, or government (Federal, State, local, or tribal).

CHAPTER 2

TRENDS IN FACILITY CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter presents trends in facility characteristics for 1992 to 1999 (the survey was not conducted in 1994). It should be kept in mind, however, that the list frame, methods, and survey instrument have changed during this period. These changes are detailed in Chapter 1.

Number of Facilities and Methadone Facilities

Table 2.1 and Figure 2. The number of facilities reporting in 1999 increased by 13 percent over 1998 (which in turn represented an increase of 24 percent over 1997). The number of facilities reporting in 1999 that they dispensed methadone or LAAM increased by 49 percent over 1998. There were two primary reasons for these increases. First, SAMHSA continued to expand the survey coverage by identifying substance abuse treatment facilities not on the I-SATS. It is important to note that these additions were not necessarily new facilities, but were facilities not previously included in the UFDS survey. Second, the response rate for the 1999 survey was about 10 percentage points higher

Figure 2
Number of facilities and methadone facilities: UFDS 1992-1999



* Survey not conducted in 1994.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Drug and Alcoholism Treatment Unit Survey (NDATUS) 1992-1993; Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey 1995-1999.

than the rate in 1998. This is important because no adjustment for non-response is made in the survey data.

There was significant turnover in facilities responding to the survey. Almost one-third (32 percent) of the 15,239 treatment facilities that responded to the 1999 UFDS did not participate in the 1998 survey. The number of new facilities was partially offset by 3,137 facilities that responded in 1998 but not in 1999. This yielded a net increase of 1,784 facilities.

Facility Ownership

Table 2.1 and Figure 3. Despite substantial increases in the number of facilities reporting—the number of private for-profit facilities reporting increased by 56 percent from 1997 to 1999, and the number of private non-profit facilities increased by 40 percent—the overall structure of the treatment system (as reflected in the UFDS ownership data) remained relatively constant.

In 1999, private non-profit facilities made up the bulk of the system (60 percent), followed by private for-profit (26 percent) and State/local government (11 percent).

Figure 3
Facility ownership: UFDS 1992-1999



* Survey not conducted in 1994.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Drug and Alcoholism Treatment Unit Survey (NDATUS) 1992-1993; Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey 1995-1999.

Managed Care

Table 2.2 and Figure 4. Information on managed care has been collected since 1995, when facilities were first asked whether they had managed care contracts. About 54 percent of facilities had managed care contracts in 1999, as compared to 32 percent in 1995. All ownership categories showed an increase in the percentage with managed care contracts. Privately-owned facilities were more likely to have contracts than were government-owned facilities.

Table 2.3. The proportion of managed care facilities increased in all States between 1995 and 1999.

Figure 4
Facilities with managed care contracts, by ownership: UFDS 1995-1999



SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey 1995-1999.

Programs for Special Groups

Table 2.4 and Figure 5. Facilities may offer treatment programs designed to address the specific needs of certain groups. These groups include the dually diagnosed (persons with a mental illness and co-occurring substance abuse), adolescents, persons with HIV/AIDS, and pregnant or postpartum women. These data were collected in 1995 and from 1997 to 1999. There has been some fluctuation over time in the proportion of facilities offering programs for special groups. However, the differences are small, and probably reflect the changing composition of the sample. The proportion of facilities with programs for the dually-diagnosed ranged from 38 to 48 percent. Thirty-four to 39 percent of facilities had programs for adolescents. About one in five facilities (22 percent) offered programs for persons with HIV/AIDS or pregnant/postpartum women.

Figure 5
Facilities with programs for special groups: UFDS 1995-1999



* Mail respondents only; telephone respondents did not receive this part of the survey.
** Data on special programs were not collected in 1996.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey 1995-1999.

Table 2.1

Substance abuse treatment facilities by ownership and dispensing of methadone/LAAM: 1992-1999[1]
Number and percent distribution

Ownership and dispensing of methadone/LAAM	*Number of facilities*							*Percent distribution*						
	1992	*1993*	*1995*	*1996*	*1997*	*1998*	*1999*	*1992*	*1993*	*1995*	*1996*	*1997*	*1998*	*1999*
Total	11,270	11,496	10,746	10,641	10,860	13,455	15,239	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Ownership														
Private non-profit	6,852	7,020	6,514	6,482	6,498	7,489	9,077	60.8	61.1	60.6	60.9	59.8	55.7	59.6
Private for-profit	2,327	2,384	2,342	2,373	2,550	3,775	3,976	20.6	20.7	21.8	22.3	23.5	28.1	26.1
State/local government	1,536	1,549	1,399	1,323	1,370	1,694	1,689	13.6	13.5	13.0	12.4	12.6	12.6	11.1
Federal government	351	388	339	323	293	317	321	3.1	3.4	3.2	3.0	2.7	2.4	2.1
Tribal government	204	155	152	140	149	180	176	1.8	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.2
	Number of facilities							*Percent of all facilities*						
Facilities dispensing methadone/LAAM	664	690	616	902	768	811	1,206	5.9	6.0	5.7	8.5	7.1	6.0	7.9

[1] Survey reference dates were: Sept. 30, 1992; Oct. 1, 1993; Oct. 2, 1995; Oct. 1, 1996-1999. No survey was conducted in 1994. See Chapter 1 for changes in the survey base, methods, and instruments that affect analysis of trends over time.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Drug and Alcoholism Treatment Unit Survey (NDATUS), 1992-1993; Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, 1995-1999.

Table 2.2

Substance abuse treatment facilities with managed care contracts, by ownership: 1995-1999[1]

Number and percent

	Number of facilities					*Number with managed care contracts*					*Percent with managed care contracts*				
Ownership	*1995*	*1996*	*1997*	*1998*	*1999*	*1995*	*1996*	*1997*	*1998*	*1999*	*1995*	*1996*	*1997*	*1998*	*1999*
Total	10,746	10,641	10,860	13,455	15,239	3,473	4,511	5,040	5,987	8,256	32.3	42.4	46.4	44.5	54.2
Private non-profit	6,514	6,482	6,498	7,489	9,077	2,206	2,862	3,186	3,657	5,169	33.9	44.2	49.0	48.8	56.9
Private for-profit	2,342	2,373	2,550	3,775	3,976	997	1,251	1,390	1,750	2,244	42.6	52.7	54.5	46.4	56.4
Local government	877	868	887	1,105	1,134	193	284	316	388	501	22.0	32.7	35.6	35.1	44.2
State government	522	455	483	589	555	55	60	91	106	228	10.5	13.2	18.8	18.0	41.1
Federal government	339	323	293	317	321	7	32	33	53	77	2.1	9.9	11.3	16.7	24.0
Tribal government	152	140	149	180	176	15	22	24	33	37	9.9	15.7	16.1	18.3	21.0

[1] Survey reference dates were: Oct. 2, 1995; Oct. 1, 1996-1999. See Chapter 1 for a discussion of changes in the survey base, methods, and instruments that affect analysis of trends over time.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, 1995-1999.

Table 2.3

Substance abuse treatment facilities with managed care contracts, by State or jurisdiction: 1995-1999[1]

Number and percent

State or jurisdiction[2]	Number of facilities					Number with managed care contracts					Percent with managed care contracts				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Total	10,746	10,641	10,860	13,455	15,239	3,473	4,511	5,040	5,987	8,256	32.3	42.4	46.4	44.5	54.2
Alabama	70	58	77	110	131	17	18	17	24	54	24.3	31.0	22.1	21.8	41.2
Alaska	73	68	60	73	84	9	13	16	16	17	12.3	19.1	26.7	21.9	20.2
American Samoa	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arizona	98	107	142	212	263	29	53	64	87	132	29.6	49.5	45.1	41.0	50.2
Arkansas	56	54	55	75	66	11	15	17	24	32	19.6	27.8	30.9	32.0	48.5
California	1,264	1,299	1,178	1,462	1,698	155	230	286	340	474	12.3	17.7	24.3	23.3	27.9
Colorado	168	167	143	221	469	44	53	68	91	206	26.2	31.7	47.6	41.2	43.9
Connecticut	189	170	209	253	291	59	81	117	170	218	31.2	47.6	56.0	67.2	74.9
Delaware	50	41	41	46	54	17	18	18	25	36	34.0	43.9	43.9	54.3	66.7
District of Columbia	43	45	40	60	74	7	11	9	16	21	16.3	24.4	22.5	26.7	28.4
Fed. of Micronesia	2	4	1	2	2	--	1	--	--	--	--	25.0	--	--	--
Florida	610	587	526	610	778	147	185	208	222	387	24.1	31.5	39.5	36.4	49.7
Georgia	95	100	152	227	308	20	30	50	63	123	21.1	30.0	32.9	27.8	39.9
Guam	1	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	72	64	69	73	75	24	26	26	30	34	33.3	40.6	37.7	41.1	45.3
Idaho	35	34	39	58	60	7	13	11	18	28	20.0	38.2	28.2	31.0	46.7
Illinois	494	445	467	557	592	183	206	218	260	336	37.0	46.3	46.7	46.7	56.8
Indiana	159	288	251	313	321	57	169	155	187	214	35.8	58.7	61.8	59.7	66.7
Iowa	69	70	78	123	139	39	50	61	94	124	56.5	71.4	78.2	76.4	89.2
Kansas	179	185	145	178	209	38	83	81	89	116	21.2	44.9	55.9	50.0	55.5
Kentucky	257	268	231	259	298	57	97	105	85	146	22.2	36.2	45.5	32.8	49.0
Louisiana	110	127	137	172	183	18	29	31	37	57	16.4	22.8	22.6	21.5	31.1
Maine	98	102	131	162	198	36	42	57	79	113	36.7	41.2	43.5	48.8	57.1
Maryland	318	293	304	346	363	90	84	133	162	206	28.3	28.7	43.8	46.8	56.7
Massachusetts	256	251	310	370	418	143	169	197	220	280	55.9	67.3	63.5	59.5	67.0
Michigan	642	613	597	642	605	307	362	368	391	432	47.8	59.1	61.6	60.9	71.4
Minnesota	251	253	239	283	275	107	152	137	164	195	42.6	60.1	57.3	58.0	70.9
Mississippi	53	59	71	93	124	8	13	16	19	41	15.1	22.0	22.5	20.4	33.1
Missouri	130	138	142	259	319	51	82	78	112	174	39.2	59.4	54.9	43.2	54.5
Montana	36	36	45	58	66	5	7	8	10	24	13.9	19.4	17.8	17.2	36.4

See notes at end of table.

Table 2.3

Substance abuse treatment facilities with managed care contracts, by State or jurisdiction: 1995-1999[1]
Number and percent

State or jurisdiction[2]	Number of facilities					Number with managed care contracts					Percent with managed care contracts				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Nebraska	112	107	97	113	109	52	43	42	51	75	46.4	40.2	43.3	45.1	68.8
Nevada	64	61	71	96	102	21	24	30	29	43	32.8	39.3	42.3	30.2	42.2
New Hampshire	39	52	54	77	75	19	22	33	40	44	48.7	42.3	61.1	51.9	58.7
New Jersey	236	229	237	314	328	81	88	104	142	184	34.3	38.4	43.9	45.2	56.1
New Mexico	69	69	71	124	125	13	13	26	37	64	18.8	18.8	36.6	29.8	51.2
New York	1,042	1,039	1,184	1,235	1,336	509	590	693	705	866	48.8	56.8	58.5	57.1	64.8
North Carolina	111	135	139	271	323	25	53	49	104	171	22.5	39.3	35.3	38.4	52.9
North Dakota	43	44	40	51	44	12	13	16	22	23	27.9	29.5	40.0	43.1	52.3
Ohio	459	476	484	552	578	160	219	207	232	324	34.9	46.0	42.8	42.0	56.1
Oklahoma	118	118	108	161	165	22	44	40	49	61	18.6	37.3	37.0	30.4	37.0
Oregon	159	154	160	194	240	84	98	103	123	178	52.8	63.6	64.4	63.4	74.2
Palau	1	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pennsylvania	498	505	475	544	636	243	321	331	377	509	48.8	63.6	69.7	69.3	80.0
Puerto Rico	146	155	64	132	127	2	1	2	6	27	1.4	0.6	3.1	4.5	21.3
Rhode Island	68	63	59	65	63	34	47	44	46	52	50.0	74.6	74.6	70.8	82.5
South Carolina	80	73	64	79	102	27	34	39	42	56	33.8	46.6	60.9	53.2	54.9
South Dakota	55	56	51	64	66	3	11	10	14	31	5.5	19.6	19.6	21.9	47.0
Tennessee	74	82	132	211	223	29	54	84	145	159	39.2	65.9	63.6	68.7	71.3
Texas	578	419	504	673	756	119	135	154	193	315	20.6	32.2	30.6	28.7	41.7
Utah	98	89	112	137	138	17	20	29	37	63	17.3	22.5	25.9	27.0	45.7
Vermont	19	18	20	46	46	15	15	17	31	38	78.9	83.3	85.0	67.4	82.6
Virgin Islands	3	3	4	3	5	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	20.0
Virginia	122	125	153	209	257	42	61	72	105	155	34.4	48.8	47.1	50.2	60.3
Washington	333	295	298	331	363	146	161	159	166	236	43.8	54.6	53.4	50.2	65.0
West Virginia	51	63	81	81	137	13	29	43	44	88	25.5	46.0	53.1	54.3	64.2
Wisconsin	247	240	269	347	370	94	108	145	192	250	38.1	45.0	53.9	55.3	67.6
Wyoming	42	42	47	46	60	6	15	16	20	23	14.3	35.7	34.0	43.5	38.3

-- Quantity is zero.

[1] Survey reference dates were Oct. 2, 1995; Oct. 1, 1996-1999. See Chapter 1 for changes in the survey base, methods, and instruments that affect analysis of trends over time.

[2] Facilities operated by Federal agencies are included in the States in which the facilities are located.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, 1995-1999.

Table 2.4

Substance abuse treatment facilities offering programs for special groups: 1995-1999[1]

Number and percent

Special group	Number of facilities					Percent of all facilities				
	1995[2]	*1996*[3]	*1997*	*1998*	*1999*	*1995*[2]	*1996*[3]	*1997*	*1998*	*1999*
Total	8,736	10,641	10,860	13,455	15,239					
Dually-diagnosed	3,295	*n/a*	5,255	6,416	6,818	37.7	*n/a*	48.4	47.7	44.7
Adolescents	3,144	*n/a*	4,195	5,163	5,131	36.0	*n/a*	38.6	38.4	33.7
HIV/AIDS	1,497	*n/a*	2,566	2,576	3,368	17.1	*n/a*	23.6	19.1	22.1
Pregnant/postpartum women	1,890	*n/a*	2,200	2,493	3,271	21.6	*n/a*	20.3	18.5	21.5

n/a Data not collected.

[1] Survey reference dates were Oct. 2, 1995; Oct. 1, 1996-1999. See Chapter 1 for changes in the survey base, methods, and instruments that affect analysis of trends over time.

[2] Mail respondents only. Telephone respondents did not receive this part of the survey.

[3] Data on special programs were not collected in 1996.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set survey, 1995-1999.

CHAPTER 3

FACILITY CHARACTERISTICS AND SERVICES

This chapter describes key characteristics of facilities and programs in 1999. Facilities are described in terms of ownership, that is, the type of entity owning or responsible for the operation of the facility: private for-profit, private non-profit, or government (Federal, State, local, or tribal).

Type of Payment Accepted

Table 3.1. Cash/self-payment and private insurance were the most widely accepted forms of payment for substance abuse treatment (accepted by 90 percent and 74 percent of facilities, respectively). Medicaid was accepted by just over half of all facilities (56 percent). Federal military insurance and Medicare were accepted by less than half of all facilities (47 percent and 45 percent, respectively).

The type of payment accepted varied considerably by ownership. Local and State government-owned facilities and private non-profit facilities were more likely to accept Medicaid and Medicare than were private for-profit, Federal, or tribal facilities. Federal military insurance was most likely to be accepted by Federal government-owned facilities in general (65 percent), and by the Dept. of Veterans Affairs (VA) in particular (72 percent).

Sliding Fee Scale Offered

Table 3.1. A sliding fee scale for substance abuse treatment was offered by about two-thirds (68 percent) of all facilities. The sliding fee scale was most likely to be offered in local and State government-owned and private non-profit facilities (81 percent, 73 percent, and 72 percent, respectively).

Type of Care Offered

Table 3.2. Outpatient rehabilitation was the most widely available type of care, offered by 82 percent of all facilities. Residential rehabilitation was offered by 25 percent of all facilities. Partial hospitalization programs were offered by 19 percent of facilities, and outpatient detoxification by 13 percent. Residential detoxification and hospital inpatient treatment (either detoxification or rehabilitation were each offered by 5 to 8 percent of all facilities.

Facilities owned by the Federal government (and in particular by the VA) were most likely to offer each of the different types of care. Ninety-five percent offered outpatient rehabilitation, about 40 percent each offered outpatient detoxification and partial hospitalization, and 28 percent offered residential rehabilitation. While 91 percent of private for-profit facilities offered outpatient rehabilitation, none of the other types of care was offered by more than 16 percent of these facilities.

Methadone/LAAM Dispensed

Table 3.2. Methadone/LAAM was dispensed by 8 percent of all facilities. Facilities most likely to dispense methadone/LAAM were Federal government facilities (14 percent), particularly the facilities operated by the VA (23 percent). Private for-profit facilities were also more likely than average to dispense methadone/LAAM (11 percent).

Substance Abuse Problem Treated

Table 3.3. As recently as 1980, the Federal government surveyed facilities treating alcohol and drug abuse separately. By 1999, however, the vast majority of facilities (96 percent) treated both alcohol

and drug abuse. The Department of Defense had the highest proportion of facilities that treated only one of the two problems (19 percent); all of these facilities treated alcohol abuse only.

Primary Focus

Table 3.4. About two-thirds of facilities (65 percent) reported that treating substance abuse problems was their primary focus of activity. Seventeen percent reported that mental health treatment was their primary focus, and 14 reported that they focused on substance abuse and mental health equally.

Programs for Special Groups

Table 3.5. Facilities may offer treatment programs designed to address the specific needs of certain groups. These groups include the dually diagnosed (persons with a mental illness and co-occurring substance abuse), adolescents, persons with HIV/AIDS, and pregnant or postpartum women. Special programs may also be designed to address women's needs (other than co-occurring pregnancy) or for persons in the criminal justice system (facilities treating incarcerated persons only were excluded from this survey; see Chapter 1.) Many facilities offer treatment for persons arrested while driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs (DUI) or driving while intoxicated (DWI).

Overall, nearly half (45 percent) of all facilities provided programs for the dually diagnosed. These services were most likely to be provided by VA-owned facilities (73 percent). Facilities least likely to have programs for the dually diagnosed were Department of Defense-owned facilities (32 percent).

About 34 percent of facilities offered programs for adolescents. Programs for adolescents were most likely to be offered by the Indian Health Service (59 percent) and tribal government-owned facilities (62 percent). Adolescent programs were least likely to be available in VA-owned or Department of Defense-owned facilities (1 percent and 5 percent, respectively).

About one-fifth (22 percent) of facilities offered programs for persons with HIV/AIDS. These programs were most likely to be available in VA-owned facilities (33 percent), and least likely to be offered by Department of Defense-owned and private for-profit facilities (10 percent and 16 percent, respectively).

Programs for pregnant or postpartum women were offered by 22 percent of facilities. These were most likely to be offered at facilities owned by the Indian health service or tribal governments (32 percent and 29 percent, respectively), and by local or State government-owned facilities (31 percent and 27 percent, respectively). These programs were least likely to be offered by the VA (7 percent), Department of Defense (10 percent), and by private for-profit facilities (14 percent).

Other women's groups were relatively widely available, in 41 percent of all facilities, ranging from 27 percent of Department of Defense-owned facilities to 55 percent of tribal government-owned facilities.

Facilities offering programs for persons in the criminal justice system were relatively widely available, at 47 percent of all facilities.

Special programs for those arrested for DUI/DWI were offered by 38 percent of all facilities. These programs were most likely to be found in private for-profit and Department of Defense facilities (51 percent each).

Table 3.1
Substance abuse treatment facilities by type of payment accepted and sliding fee scale, according to ownership: 1999
Number and percent

Ownership	Number of facilities							Percent of all facilities					
		Type of payment accepted						Type of payment accepted					
	Total	Cash/ self-pay	Private insurance	Medi-care	Medi-caid	Federal military insurance	Offers sliding fee scale	Cash/ self-pay	Private insurance	Medi-care	Medi-caid	Federal military insurance	Offers sliding fee scale
Total	15,239	13,647	11,204	6,789	8,545	7,096	10,353	89.6	73.5	44.6	56.1	46.6	67.9
Private non-profit	9,077	8,111	6,624	4,324	5,766	4,231	6,546	89.4	73.0	47.6	63.5	46.6	72.1
Private for-profit	3,976	3,903	3,052	1,387	1,462	1,663	2,390	98.2	76.8	34.9	36.8	41.8	60.1
Local or county government	1,134	1,014	858	627	823	623	915	89.4	75.7	55.3	72.6	54.9	80.7
State government	555	463	424	327	371	329	404	83.4	76.4	58.9	66.8	59.3	72.8
Federal government	321	98	174	65	54	208	51	30.5	54.2	20.2	16.8	64.8	15.9
Dept. of Veterans Affairs	168	81	130	46	34	121	43	48.2	77.4	27.4	20.2	72.0	25.6
Dept. of Defense	116	6	25	5	4	70	1	5.2	21.6	4.3	3.4	60.3	0.9
Indian Health Service	22	5	13	9	10	10	3	22.7	59.1	40.9	45.5	45.5	13.6
Other	15	6	6	5	6	7	4	40.0	40.0	33.3	40.0	46.7	26.7
Tribal government	176	58	72	59	69	42	47	33.0	40.9	33.5	39.2	23.9	26.7

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 3.2
Substance abuse treatment facilities by type of care offered and dispensing of methadone/LAAM, according to ownership: October 1, 1999
Number and percent

Ownership	Number of facilities									Percent of all facilities							
	Type of care offered									Type of care offered							
		Outpatient		Partial hospital-ization	Residential		Hosp. inpatient		Metha-done/ LAAM	Outpatient		Partial hospital-ization	Residential		Hosp. inpatient		Metha-done/ LAAM
	Total	Detox	Rehab		Detox	Rehab	Detox	Rehab		Detox	Rehab		Detox	Rehab	Detox	Rehab	
Total	15,239	1,973	12,527	2,855	1,237	3,788	1,159	803	1,206	12.9	82.2	18.7	8.1	24.9	7.6	5.3	7.9
Private non-profit	9,077	983	7,075	1,783	845	2,921	654	427	581	10.8	77.9	19.6	9.3	32.2	7.2	4.7	6.4
Private for-profit	3,976	618	3,607	617	192	413	294	230	430	15.5	90.7	15.5	4.8	10.4	7.4	5.8	10.8
Local or county government	1,134	166	979	207	89	172	100	46	100	14.6	86.3	18.3	7.8	15.2	8.8	4.1	8.8
State government	555	65	402	99	67	150	45	59	45	11.7	72.4	17.8	12.1	27.0	8.1	10.6	8.1
Federal government	321	127	305	124	37	91	61	38	46	39.6	95.0	38.6	11.5	28.3	19.0	11.8	14.3
Dept. of Veterans Affairs	168	85	160	86	30	73	49	29	38	50.6	95.2	51.2	17.9	43.5	29.2	17.3	22.6
Dept. of Defense	116	35	115	31	5	10	8	5	3	30.2	99.1	26.7	4.3	8.6	6.9	4.3	2.6
Indian Health Service	22	5	17	4	--	4	2	2	4	22.7	77.3	18.2	--	18.2	9.1	9.1	18.2
Other	15	2	13	3	2	4	2	2	1	13.3	86.7	20.0	13.3	26.7	13.3	13.3	6.7
Tribal government	176	14	159	25	7	41	5	3	4	8.0	90.3	14.2	4.0	23.3	2.8	1.7	2.3

-- Quantity is zero.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 3.3
Substance abuse treatment facilities by substance abuse problem treated, according to ownership: 1999
Number and percent distribution

Ownership	Number of facilities				Percent distribution			
		Problem treated				Problem treated		
	Total	Both alcohol and drug abuse	Drug abuse only	Alcohol abuse only	Total	Both alcohol and drug abuse	Drug abuse only	Alcohol abuse only
Total	15,239	14,686	388	165	100.0	96.4	2.5	1.1
Private non-profit	9,077	8,819	183	75	100.0	97.2	2.0	0.8
Private for-profit	3,976	3,757	168	51	100.0	94.5	4.2	1.3
Local or county government	1,134	1,095	29	10	100.0	96.6	2.6	0.9
State government	555	544	8	3	100.0	98.0	1.4	0.5
Federal government	321	297	--	24	100.0	92.5	--	7.5
Dept. of Veterans Affairs	168	168	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Dept. of Defense	116	94	--	22	100.0	81.0	--	19.0
Indian Health Service	22	22	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Other	15	13	--	2	100.0	86.7	--	13.3
Tribal government	176	174	--	2	100.0	98.9	--	1.1

-- Quantity is zero.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 3.4
Substance abuse treatment facilities by primary focus, according to ownership: 1999
Number and percent distribution

	Number of facilities						*Percent distribution*					
		Primary focus						*Primary focus*				
Ownership	*Total*	*Substance abuse services*	*Mental health services*	*Balance of SA and MH services*	*General health services*	*Other*	*Total*	*Substance abuse services*	*Mental health services*	*Balance of SA and MH services*	*General health services*	*Other*
Total	15,239	9,859	2,573	2,069	171	567	100.0	64.7	16.9	13.6	1.1	3.7
Private non-profit	9,077	6,045	1,394	1,155	104	379	100.0	66.6	15.4	12.7	1.1	4.2
Private for-profit	3,976	2,456	859	542	16	103	100.0	61.8	21.6	13.6	0.4	2.6
Local or county government	1,134	681	173	212	15	53	100.0	60.1	15.3	18.7	1.3	4.7
State government	555	346	112	78	6	13	100.0	62.3	20.2	14.1	1.1	2.3
Federal government	321	206	34	44	25	12	100.0	64.2	10.6	13.7	7.8	3.7
Dept. of Veterans Affairs	168	91	21	27	21	8	100.0	54.2	12.5	16.1	12.5	4.8
Dept. of Defense	116	86	13	13	2	2	100.0	74.1	11.2	11.2	1.7	1.7
Indian Health Service	22	19	--	2	1	--	100.0	86.4	--	9.1	4.5	--
Other	15	10	--	2	1	2	100.0	66.7	--	13.3	6.7	13.3
Tribal government	176	125	1	38	5	7	100.0	71.0	0.6	21.6	2.8	4.0

-- Quantity is zero.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 3.5
Substance abuse treatment facilities offering programs for special groups, according to ownership: 1999
Number and percent

Ownership	Number of facilities								Percent of all facilities						
		Special group							Special group						
	Total	Dually-diag-nosed	Adol-escents	Persons with HIV/ AIDS	Pregnant/ postpartum women	Other women's groups	Criminal justice	DUI/ DWI	Dually-diag-nosed	Adol-escents	Persons with HIV/ AIDS	Pregnant/ postpartum women	Other women's groups	Criminal justice	DUI/ DWI
Total	15,239	6,818	5,131	3,368	3,271	6,222	7,176	5,848	44.7	33.7	22.1	21.5	40.8	47.1	38.4
Private non-profit	9,077	4,030	3,199	2,206	2,146	3,903	4,399	3,004	44.4	35.2	24.3	23.6	43.0	48.5	33.1
Private for-profit	3,976	1,658	1,180	648	537	1,297	1,755	2,041	41.7	29.7	16.3	13.5	32.6	44.1	51.3
Local or county government	1,134	581	433	262	354	571	586	443	51.2	38.2	23.1	31.2	50.4	51.7	39.1
State government	555	289	185	141	149	250	283	171	52.1	33.3	25.4	26.8	45.0	51.0	30.8
Federal government	321	180	25	76	34	104	72	113	56.1	7.8	23.7	10.6	32.4	22.4	35.2
Dept. of Veterans Affairs	168	123	2	56	11	59	38	43	73.2	1.2	33.3	6.5	35.1	22.6	25.6
Dept. of Defense	116	37	6	11	12	31	18	59	31.9	5.2	9.5	10.3	26.7	15.5	50.9
Indian Health Service	22	12	13	6	7	8	10	6	54.5	59.1	27.3	31.8	36.4	45.5	27.3
Other	15	8	4	3	4	6	6	5	53.3	26.7	20.0	26.7	40.0	40.0	33.3
Tribal government	176	80	109	35	51	97	81	76	45.5	61.9	19.9	29.0	55.1	46.0	43.2

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

CHAPTER 4

STATE DATA

This chapter presents facility data by State or jurisdiction. Facilities operated by Federal agencies are included in the States in which the facilities are located, although these facilities may have clients from other States.

These tables are presented for reference only. Care should be taken in drawing any conclusions about differences between States. As discussed in Chapter 1, States differ in their systems of licensure/certification and disbursement of public funds. These factors affect the scope of facilities included in UFDS for each State, and it may create artifactual differences among States. Also, no adjustments were made for survey non-response.

Table 4.1 details the 1999 UFDS survey response rate. Tables 4.2 to 4.7 provide State-level detail on tables presented in earlier chapters and will not be discussed.

Survey Response

Table 4.1. For the United States, the overall response rate was 95 percent, ranging from 86 percent for Hawaii to 100 percent for Iowa and Wyoming. Puerto Rico, the largest of the non-State jurisdictions surveyed, had a response rate of 94 percent.

Table 4.1
Sample accounting and response rate by State or jurisdiction: UFDS 1999

State or jurisdiction [1]	Total sample	Ineligible respondents [2]	Non-respondents	Eligible respondents	Response rate (%) [3]
All facilities	19,435	3,461	735	15,239	95.4
Alabama	157	25	1	131	99.2
Alaska	99	10	5	84	94.4
Arizona	349	54	32	263	89.2
Arkansas	99	30	3	66	95.7
California	2,130	327	105	1,698	94.2
Colorado	677	177	31	469	93.8
Connecticut	362	66	5	291	98.3
Delaware	78	22	2	54	96.4
District of Columbia	104	25	5	74	93.7
Fed. of Micronesia	3	--	1	2	66.7
Florida	1,205	327	100	778	88.6
Georgia	361	44	9	308	97.2
Guam	1	--	--	1	100.0
Hawaii	101	14	12	75	86.2
Idaho	90	26	4	60	93.8
Illinois	785	173	20	592	96.7
Indiana	426	89	16	321	95.3
Iowa	167	28	--	139	100.0
Kansas	260	43	8	209	96.3
Kentucky	365	50	17	298	94.6
Louisiana	214	25	6	183	96.8
Maine	269	63	8	198	96.1
Maryland	439	61	15	363	96.0
Massachusetts	485	58	9	418	97.9
Michigan	708	87	16	605	97.4
Minnesota	339	61	3	275	98.9
Mississippi	151	23	4	124	96.9
Missouri	389	56	14	319	95.8
Montana	75	8	1	66	98.5
Nebraska	137	26	2	109	98.2

See notes at end of table.

Table 4.1
Sample accounting and response rate by State or jurisdiction: UFDS 1999

State or jurisdiction [1]	Total sample	Ineligible respondents [2]	Non-respondents	Eligible respondents	Response rate (%) [3]
Nevada	132	21	9	102	91.9
New Hampshire	97	20	2	75	97.4
New Jersey	413	57	28	328	92.1
New Mexico	163	24	14	125	89.9
New York	1,588	223	29	1,336	97.9
North Carolina	381	48	10	323	97.0
North Dakota	49	4	1	44	97.8
Ohio	791	200	13	578	97.8
Oklahoma	212	42	5	165	97.1
Oregon	293	46	7	240	97.2
Palau	1	--	--	1	100.0
Pennsylvania	787	122	29	636	95.6
Puerto Rico	167	32	8	127	94.1
Rhode Island	80	16	1	63	98.4
South Carolina	116	12	2	102	98.1
South Dakota	82	13	3	66	95.7
Tennessee	273	45	5	223	97.8
Texas	1,100	286	58	756	92.9
Utah	169	24	7	138	95.2
Vermont	66	15	5	46	90.2
Virgin Islands	5	--	--	5	100.0
Virginia	314	44	13	257	95.2
Washington	417	40	14	363	96.3
West Virginia	192	53	2	137	98.6
Wisconsin	458	72	16	370	95.9
Wyoming	64	4	--	60	100.0

-- Quantity is zero.

[1] Facilities operated by Federal agencies are included in the States in which the facilities are located.

[2] A facility was ineligible if: a) it had closed by October 1, 1999; b) it was not providing substance abuse treatment services on October 1, 1999; or c) it treated incarcerated persons only.

[3] Response rate is calculated as 'Eligible respondents' divided by ('Total sample' less 'Ineligible respondents').

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 4.2
Substance abuse treatment facilities by ownership, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent distribution

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities										Percent distribution									
		Ownership										Ownership								
						Federal govt										Federal govt				
	Total	Private non-profit	Private for-profit	Local govt	State govt	VA	DoD	IHS	Other	Tribal govt	Total	Private non-profit	Private for-profit	Local govt	State govt	VA	DoD	IHS	Other	Tribal govt
Total	15,239	9,077	3,976	1,134	555	168	116	22	15	176	100.0	59.6	26.1	7.4	3.6	1.1	0.8	0.1	0.1	1.2
Alabama	131	64	40	12	2	7	4	1	--	1	100.0	48.9	30.5	9.2	1.5	5.3	3.1	0.8	--	0.8
Alaska	84	52	12	6	--	1	3	--	1	9	100.0	61.9	14.3	7.1	--	1.2	3.6	--	1.2	10.7
Arizona	263	154	78	--	2	3	4	5	--	17	100.0	58.6	29.7	--	0.8	1.1	1.5	1.9	--	6.5
Arkansas	66	52	8	--	5	1	--	--	--	--	100.0	78.8	12.1	--	7.6	1.5	--	--	--	--
California	1,698	1,079	381	195	8	9	10	1	2	13	100.0	63.5	22.4	11.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.8
Colorado	469	192	238	18	13	2	4	--	--	2	100.0	40.9	50.7	3.8	2.8	0.4	0.9	--	--	0.4
Connecticut	291	227	42	4	13	2	2	--	--	1	100.0	78.0	14.4	1.4	4.5	0.7	0.7	--	--	0.3
Delaware	54	35	16	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	100.0	64.8	29.6	--	3.7	1.9	--	--	--	--
District of Columbia	74	39	13	10	10	1	1	--	--	--	100.0	52.7	17.6	13.5	13.5	1.4	1.4	--	--	--
Fed. of Micronesia	2	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	100.0	--	--	--	50.0	--	--	--	50.0	--
Florida	778	448	289	23	6	7	5	--	--	--	100.0	57.6	37.1	3.0	0.8	0.9	0.6	--	--	--
Georgia	308	103	69	50	74	3	7	--	2	--	100.0	33.4	22.4	16.2	24.0	1.0	2.3	--	0.6	--
Guam	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	100.0	--	--	--	100.0	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	75	62	6	--	4	--	2	--	1	--	100.0	82.7	8.0	--	5.3	--	2.7	--	1.3	--
Idaho	60	19	28	4	3	1	2	--	--	3	100.0	31.7	46.7	6.7	5.0	1.7	3.3	--	--	5.0
Illinois	592	388	170	19	7	6	2	--	--	--	100.0	65.5	28.7	3.2	1.2	1.0	0.3	--	--	--
Indiana	321	223	80	12	5	1	--	--	--	--	100.0	69.5	24.9	3.7	1.6	0.3	--	--	--	--
Iowa	139	116	8	7	5	2	--	--	--	1	100.0	83.5	5.8	5.0	3.6	1.4	--	--	--	0.7
Kansas	209	111	68	17	7	3	2	1	--	--	100.0	53.1	32.5	8.1	3.3	1.4	1.0	0.5	--	--
Kentucky	298	188	96	7	5	1	1	--	--	--	100.0	63.1	32.2	2.3	1.7	0.3	0.3	--	--	--
Louisiana	183	73	51	9	43	3	2	--	--	2	100.0	39.9	27.9	4.9	23.5	1.6	1.1	--	--	1.1
Maine	198	100	86	3	1	3	1	--	1	3	100.0	50.5	43.4	1.5	0.5	1.5	0.5	--	0.5	1.5
Maryland	363	144	142	27	44	3	3	--	--	--	100.0	39.7	39.1	7.4	12.1	0.8	0.8	--	--	--
Massachusetts	418	309	84	11	6	6	1	1	--	--	100.0	73.9	20.1	2.6	1.4	1.4	0.2	0.2	--	--
Michigan	605	351	186	42	9	5	--	--	--	12	100.0	58.0	30.7	6.9	1.5	0.8	--	--	--	2.0
Minnesota	275	153	84	13	10	2	--	--	--	13	100.0	55.6	30.5	4.7	3.6	0.7	--	--	--	4.7
Mississippi	124	54	14	30	20	2	3	--	1	--	100.0	43.5	11.3	24.2	16.1	1.6	2.4	--	0.8	--
Missouri	319	206	93	4	8	4	3	--	1	--	100.0	64.6	29.2	1.3	2.5	1.3	0.9	--	0.3	--
Montana	66	34	16	4	1	1	1	1	--	8	100.0	51.5	24.2	6.1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	--	12.1

See notes at end of table.

Table 4.2
Substance abuse treatment facilities by ownership, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent distribution

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities										Percent distribution									
	Ownership										Ownership									
						Federal govt										Federal govt				
	Total	Private non-profit	Private for-profit	Local govt	State govt	VA	DoD	IHS	Other	Tribal govt	Total	Private non-profit	Private for-profit	Local govt	State govt	VA	DoD	IHS	Other	Tribal govt
Nebraska	109	74	18	5	3	3	1	1	--	4	100.0	67.9	16.5	4.6	2.8	2.8	0.9	0.9	--	3.7
Nevada	102	45	43	5	2	2	--	1	--	4	100.0	44.1	42.2	4.9	2.0	2.0	--	1.0	--	3.9
New Hampshire	75	48	18	4	4	1	--	--	--	--	100.0	64.0	24.0	5.3	5.3	1.3	--	--	--	--
New Jersey	328	205	97	17	4	1	4	--	--	--	100.0	62.5	29.6	5.2	1.2	0.3	1.2	--	--	--
New Mexico	125	68	29	3	7	2	1	2	1	12	100.0	54.4	23.2	2.4	5.6	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.8	9.6
New York	1,336	917	221	136	46	10	1	--	--	5	100.0	68.6	16.5	10.2	3.4	0.7	0.1	--	--	0.4
North Carolina	323	91	113	80	27	3	5	2	1	1	100.0	28.2	35.0	24.8	8.4	0.9	1.5	0.6	0.3	0.3
North Dakota	44	9	18	1	9	1	1	--	--	5	100.0	20.5	40.9	2.3	20.5	2.3	2.3	--	--	11.4
Ohio	578	488	42	22	6	18	1	--	1	--	100.0	84.4	7.3	3.8	1.0	3.1	0.2	--	0.2	--
Oklahoma	165	98	18	16	12	1	5	3	1	11	100.0	59.4	10.9	9.7	7.3	0.6	3.0	1.8	0.6	6.7
Oregon	240	129	67	35	2	--	--	--	--	7	100.0	53.8	27.9	14.6	0.8	--	--	--	--	2.9
Palau	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pennsylvania	636	450	166	11	2	7	--	--	--	--	100.0	70.8	26.1	1.7	0.3	1.1	--	--	--	--
Puerto Rico	127	103	5	--	18	1	--	--	--	--	100.0	81.1	3.9	--	14.2	0.8	--	--	--	--
Rhode Island	63	50	10	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	100.0	79.4	15.9	--	1.6	1.6	1.6	--	--	--
South Carolina	102	29	25	30	13	1	4	--	--	--	100.0	28.4	24.5	29.4	12.7	1.0	3.9	--	--	--
South Dakota	66	41	8	1	3	3	1	2	--	7	100.0	62.1	12.1	1.5	4.5	4.5	1.5	3.0	--	10.6
Tennessee	223	168	41	7	3	4	--	--	--	--	100.0	75.3	18.4	3.1	1.3	1.8	--	--	--	--
Texas	756	386	270	42	31	10	14	--	1	2	100.0	51.1	35.7	5.6	4.1	1.3	1.9	--	0.1	0.3
Utah	138	61	37	32	3	1	2	1	--	1	100.0	44.2	26.8	23.2	2.2	0.7	1.4	0.7	--	0.7
Vermont	46	39	5	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	100.0	84.8	10.9	2.2	--	2.2	--	--	--	--
Virgin Islands	5	2	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	100.0	40.0	--	20.0	40.0	--	--	--	--	--
Virginia	257	78	57	85	26	3	8	--	--	--	100.0	30.4	22.2	33.1	10.1	1.2	3.1	--	--	--
Washington	363	174	130	26	4	4	4	--	--	21	100.0	47.9	35.8	7.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	--	--	5.8
West Virginia	137	116	10	2	4	5	--	--	--	--	100.0	84.7	7.3	1.5	2.9	3.6	--	--	--	--
Wisconsin	370	194	118	39	6	3	--	--	--	10	100.0	52.4	31.9	10.5	1.6	0.8	--	--	--	2.7
Wyoming	60	38	12	5	2	2	--	--	--	1	100.0	63.3	20.0	8.3	3.3	3.3	--	--	--	1.7

-- Quantity is zero.

[1] Facilities operated by Federal agencies are included in the States in which the facilities are located.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 4.3
Substance abuse treatment facilities by type of payment accepted and sliding fee scale, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities							Percent of all facilities					
		Type of payment accepted						Type of payment accepted					
	Total	Cash/ self-pay	Private insurance	Medi-care	Medi-caid	Federal military insurance	Sliding fee scale offered	Cash/ self-pay	Private insurance	Medi-care	Medi-caid	Federal military insurance	Sliding fee scale offered
Total	15,239	13,647	11,204	6,789	8,545	7,096	10,353	89.6	73.5	44.6	56.1	46.6	67.9
Alabama	131	118	102	51	66	82	76	90.1	77.9	38.9	50.4	62.6	58.0
Alaska	84	62	59	25	42	41	51	73.8	70.2	29.8	50.0	48.8	60.7
Arizona	263	228	156	84	86	91	162	86.7	59.3	31.9	32.7	34.6	61.6
Arkansas	66	65	56	32	31	47	51	98.5	84.8	48.5	47.0	71.2	77.3
California	1,698	1,494	863	406	489	428	1,127	88.0	50.8	23.9	28.8	25.2	66.4
Colorado	469	428	282	122	155	179	339	91.3	60.1	26.0	33.0	38.2	72.3
Connecticut	291	264	231	168	212	129	221	90.7	79.4	57.7	72.9	44.3	75.9
Delaware	54	47	35	21	37	15	35	87.0	64.8	38.9	68.5	27.8	64.8
District of Columbia	74	48	30	24	27	18	30	64.9	40.5	32.4	36.5	24.3	40.5
Fed. of Micronesia	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Florida	778	706	548	280	358	350	563	90.7	70.4	36.0	46.0	45.0	72.4
Georgia	308	282	244	188	198	191	216	91.6	79.2	61.0	64.3	62.0	70.1
Guam	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	75	41	32	16	17	17	17	54.7	42.7	21.3	22.7	22.7	22.7
Idaho	60	53	47	16	21	26	28	88.3	78.3	26.7	35.0	43.3	46.7
Illinois	592	570	494	291	348	272	442	96.3	83.4	49.2	58.8	45.9	74.7
Indiana	321	312	273	221	228	200	217	97.2	85.0	68.8	71.0	62.3	67.6
Iowa	139	131	129	72	125	76	107	94.2	92.8	51.8	89.9	54.7	77.0
Kansas	209	197	173	86	107	122	144	94.3	82.8	41.1	51.2	58.4	68.9
Kentucky	298	290	218	159	151	178	227	97.3	73.2	53.4	50.7	59.7	76.2
Louisiana	183	159	121	72	77	89	111	86.9	66.1	39.3	42.1	48.6	60.7
Maine	198	187	172	103	162	116	162	94.4	86.9	52.0	81.8	58.6	81.8
Maryland	363	334	268	170	202	152	261	92.0	73.8	46.8	55.6	41.9	71.9
Massachusetts	418	374	300	251	279	172	298	89.5	71.8	60.0	66.7	41.1	71.3
Michigan	605	576	518	332	405	318	461	95.2	85.6	54.9	66.9	52.6	76.2
Minnesota	275	260	253	112	128	145	85	94.5	92.0	40.7	46.5	52.7	30.9
Mississippi	124	117	94	66	69	69	81	94.4	75.8	53.2	55.6	55.6	65.3
Missouri	319	287	247	117	163	172	234	90.0	77.4	36.7	51.1	53.9	73.4
Montana	66	58	59	29	42	43	49	87.9	89.4	43.9	63.6	65.2	74.2

See notes at end of table.

Table 4.3
Substance abuse treatment facilities by type of payment accepted and sliding fee scale, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities							Percent of all facilities					
		Type of payment accepted						Type of payment accepted					
	Total	Cash/ self-pay	Private insurance	Medi-care	Medi-caid	Federal military insurance	Sliding fee scale offered	Cash/ self-pay	Private insurance	Medi-care	Medi-caid	Federal military insurance	Sliding fee scale offered
Nebraska	109	94	88	59	73	67	76	86.2	80.7	54.1	67.0	61.5	69.7
Nevada	102	94	77	35	36	48	66	92.2	75.5	34.3	35.3	47.1	64.7
New Hampshire	75	71	55	48	52	42	60	94.7	73.3	64.0	69.3	56.0	80.0
New Jersey	328	291	232	155	185	128	250	88.7	70.7	47.3	56.4	39.0	76.2
New Mexico	125	91	77	49	58	58	70	72.8	61.6	39.2	46.4	46.4	56.0
New York	1,336	1,203	1,091	749	1,086	642	1,087	90.0	81.7	56.1	81.3	48.1	81.4
North Carolina	323	301	248	158	165	157	192	93.2	76.8	48.9	51.1	48.6	59.4
North Dakota	44	38	35	17	18	23	13	86.4	79.5	38.6	40.9	52.3	29.5
Ohio	578	525	484	331	470	346	449	90.8	83.7	57.3	81.3	59.9	77.7
Oklahoma	165	135	114	62	96	81	91	81.8	69.1	37.6	58.2	49.1	55.2
Oregon	240	215	202	89	141	105	171	89.6	84.2	37.1	58.8	43.8	71.3
Palau	1	1	--	--	--	--	1	100.0	--	--	--	--	100.0
Pennsylvania	636	570	475	302	429	251	410	89.6	74.7	47.5	67.5	39.5	64.5
Puerto Rico	127	30	8	5	6	5	18	23.6	6.3	3.9	4.7	3.9	14.2
Rhode Island	63	54	53	25	49	36	50	85.7	84.1	39.7	77.8	57.1	79.4
South Carolina	102	92	81	48	66	59	48	90.2	79.4	47.1	64.7	57.8	47.1
South Dakota	66	51	49	30	36	40	30	77.3	74.2	45.5	54.5	60.6	45.5
Tennessee	223	205	172	115	115	146	142	91.9	77.1	51.6	51.6	65.5	63.7
Texas	756	613	443	239	348	278	442	81.1	58.6	31.6	46.0	36.8	58.5
Utah	138	133	116	78	89	92	96	96.4	84.1	56.5	64.5	66.7	69.6
Vermont	46	43	43	21	39	31	39	93.5	93.5	45.7	84.8	67.4	84.8
Virgin Islands	5	3	3	2	1	1	4	60.0	60.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	80.0
Virginia	257	236	219	135	144	187	158	91.8	85.2	52.5	56.0	72.8	61.5
Washington	363	342	324	138	201	135	246	94.2	89.3	38.0	55.4	37.2	67.8
West Virginia	137	132	130	121	127	117	91	96.4	94.9	88.3	92.7	85.4	66.4
Wisconsin	370	337	323	236	252	236	214	91.1	87.3	63.8	68.1	63.8	57.8
Wyoming	60	57	57	27	37	46	43	95.0	95.0	45.0	61.7	76.7	71.7

-- Quantity is zero.

[1] Facilities operated by Federal agencies are included in the States in which the facilities are located.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 4.4
Substance abuse treatment facilities by type of care offered and dispensing of methadone/LAAM, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities									Percent of all facilities							
	Type of care offered									Type of care offered							
	Total	Outpatient		Partial hospitalization	Residential		Hosp. inpatient		Methadone/ LAAM	Outpatient		Partial hospitalization	Residential		Hosp. inpatient		Methadone/ LAAM
		Detox	Rehab		Detox	Rehab	Detox	Rehab		Detox	Rehab		Detox	Rehab	Detox	Rehab	
Total	15,239	1,973	12,527	2,855	1,237	3,788	1,159	803	1,206	12.9	82.2	18.7	8.1	24.9	7.6	5.3	7.9
Alabama	131	22	111	26	8	32	15	9	17	16.8	84.7	19.8	6.1	24.4	11.5	6.9	13.0
Alaska	84	17	76	18	10	25	6	--	2	20.2	90.5	21.4	11.9	29.8	7.1	--	2.4
Arizona	263	38	221	30	21	67	16	9	39	14.4	84.0	11.4	8.0	25.5	6.1	3.4	14.8
Arkansas	66	13	58	22	17	25	8	4	3	19.7	87.9	33.3	25.8	37.9	12.1	6.1	4.5
California	1,698	271	1,259	345	227	644	76	60	135	16.0	74.1	20.3	13.4	37.9	4.5	3.5	8.0
Colorado	469	23	416	43	20	74	17	11	16	4.9	88.7	9.2	4.3	15.8	3.6	2.3	3.4
Connecticut	291	54	224	70	20	83	22	15	51	18.6	77.0	24.1	6.9	28.5	7.6	5.2	17.5
Delaware	54	9	42	12	3	11	4	2	5	16.7	77.8	22.2	5.6	20.4	7.4	3.7	9.3
District of Columbia	74	17	57	16	4	19	11	8	13	23.0	77.0	21.6	5.4	25.7	14.9	10.8	17.6
Fed. of Micronesia	2	--	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	--	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	50.0
Florida	778	74	648	166	54	200	41	29	45	9.5	83.3	21.3	6.9	25.7	5.3	3.7	5.8
Georgia	308	49	255	107	30	64	37	27	24	15.9	82.8	34.7	9.7	20.8	12.0	8.8	7.8
Guam	1	--	1	1	--	1	--	1	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	100.0	--	100.0	--
Hawaii	75	17	71	18	7	15	5	3	6	22.7	94.7	24.0	9.3	20.0	6.7	4.0	8.0
Idaho	60	6	54	7	7	14	8	7	2	10.0	90.0	11.7	11.7	23.3	13.3	11.7	3.3
Illinois	592	80	542	109	39	102	52	29	65	13.5	91.6	18.4	6.6	17.2	8.8	4.9	11.0
Indiana	321	58	290	83	20	47	53	32	14	18.1	90.3	25.9	6.2	14.6	16.5	10.0	4.4
Iowa	139	10	130	35	9	32	10	7	4	7.2	93.5	25.2	6.5	23.0	7.2	5.0	2.9
Kansas	209	18	203	35	14	36	8	8	6	8.6	97.1	16.7	6.7	17.2	3.8	3.8	2.9
Kentucky	298	24	268	26	18	47	21	15	15	8.1	89.9	8.7	6.0	15.8	7.0	5.0	5.0
Louisiana	183	24	130	44	20	54	26	23	18	13.1	71.0	24.0	10.9	29.5	14.2	12.6	9.8
Maine	198	14	176	18	3	22	10	5	6	7.1	88.9	9.1	1.5	11.1	5.1	2.5	3.0
Maryland	363	63	318	46	26	70	13	8	52	17.4	87.6	12.7	7.2	19.3	3.6	2.2	14.3
Massachusetts	418	63	299	63	25	129	42	34	56	15.1	71.5	15.1	6.0	30.9	10.0	8.1	13.4
Michigan	605	52	540	77	33	98	24	20	34	8.6	89.3	12.7	5.5	16.2	4.0	3.3	5.6
Minnesota	275	27	217	60	34	99	21	21	15	9.8	78.9	21.8	12.4	36.0	7.6	7.6	5.5
Mississippi	124	14	90	27	20	44	20	17	2	11.3	72.6	21.8	16.1	35.5	16.1	13.7	1.6
Missouri	319	48	295	92	41	73	23	17	12	15.0	92.5	28.8	12.9	22.9	7.2	5.3	3.8
Montana	66	3	58	7	4	8	4	4	3	4.5	87.9	10.6	6.1	12.1	6.1	6.1	4.5

See notes at end of table.

Table 4.4
Substance abuse treatment facilities by type of care offered and dispensing of methadone/LAAM, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities									Percent of all facilities							
	Type of care offered									Type of care offered							
		Outpatient		Partial hospital-ization	Residential		Hosp. inpatient		Metha-done/ LAAM	Outpatient		Partial hospital-ization	Residential		Hosp. inpatient		Metha-done/ LAAM
	Total	Detox	Rehab		Detox	Rehab	Detox	Rehab		Detox	Rehab		Detox	Rehab	Detox	Rehab	
Nebraska	109	9	91	14	11	31	5	4	2	8.3	83.5	12.8	10.1	28.4	4.6	3.7	1.8
Nevada	102	13	89	13	5	22	8	6	10	12.7	87.3	12.7	4.9	21.6	7.8	5.9	9.8
New Hampshire	75	9	65	11	9	16	7	3	2	12.0	86.7	14.7	12.0	21.3	9.3	4.0	2.7
New Jersey	328	54	292	77	13	56	23	17	31	16.5	89.0	23.5	4.0	17.1	7.0	5.2	9.5
New Mexico	125	23	109	26	14	27	11	8	8	18.4	87.2	20.8	11.2	21.6	8.8	6.4	6.4
New York	1,336	225	983	206	74	288	118	82	239	16.8	73.6	15.4	5.5	21.6	8.8	6.1	17.9
North Carolina	323	53	275	72	26	56	26	19	18	16.4	85.1	22.3	8.0	17.3	8.0	5.9	5.6
North Dakota	44	8	39	17	5	11	5	4	1	18.2	88.6	38.6	11.4	25.0	11.4	9.1	2.3
Ohio	578	56	525	117	26	135	48	33	19	9.7	90.8	20.2	4.5	23.4	8.3	5.7	3.3
Oklahoma	165	20	133	29	12	45	15	10	4	12.1	80.6	17.6	7.3	27.3	9.1	6.1	2.4
Oregon	240	35	215	34	21	54	8	5	17	14.6	89.6	14.2	8.8	22.5	3.3	2.1	7.1
Palau	1	1	1	1	--	--	1	1	--	100.0	100.0	100.0	--	--	100.0	100.0	--
Pennsylvania	636	41	496	138	50	169	46	28	51	6.4	78.0	21.7	7.9	26.6	7.2	4.4	8.0
Puerto Rico	127	11	22	10	48	109	4	4	7	8.7	17.3	7.9	37.8	85.8	3.1	3.1	5.5
Rhode Island	63	11	52	12	6	16	2	2	11	17.5	82.5	19.0	9.5	25.4	3.2	3.2	17.5
South Carolina	102	8	87	27	6	19	20	18	4	7.8	85.3	26.5	5.9	18.6	19.6	17.6	3.9
South Dakota	66	5	49	8	5	26	5	4	--	7.6	74.2	12.1	7.6	39.4	7.6	6.1	--
Tennessee	223	23	195	54	25	60	21	14	6	10.3	87.4	24.2	11.2	26.9	9.4	6.3	2.7
Texas	756	80	614	132	53	219	67	45	62	10.6	81.2	17.5	7.0	29.0	8.9	6.0	8.2
Utah	138	26	115	36	13	39	8	5	7	18.8	83.3	26.1	9.4	28.3	5.8	3.6	5.1
Vermont	46	7	41	9	4	9	2	2	1	15.2	89.1	19.6	8.7	19.6	4.3	4.3	2.2
Virgin Islands	5	1	4	--	2	2	--	--	--	20.0	80.0	--	40.0	40.0	--	--	--
Virginia	257	35	209	61	24	49	34	15	14	13.6	81.3	23.7	9.3	19.1	13.2	5.8	5.4
Washington	363	43	326	41	20	56	16	14	15	11.8	89.8	11.3	5.5	15.4	4.4	3.9	4.1
West Virginia	137	25	112	22	12	28	13	4	2	18.2	81.8	16.1	8.8	20.4	9.5	2.9	1.5
Wisconsin	370	37	287	77	16	97	44	24	13	10.0	77.6	20.8	4.3	26.2	11.9	6.5	3.5
Wyoming	60	6	51	7	2	13	7	5	1	10.0	85.0	11.7	3.3	21.7	11.7	8.3	1.7

-- Quantity is zero.

[1] Facilities operated by Federal agencies are included in the States in which the facilities are located.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 4.5
Substance abuse treatment facilities by substance abuse problem treated, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent distribution

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities				Percent distribution			
		Problem treated				Problem treated		
	Total	Both alcohol and drug abuse	Drug abuse only	Alcohol abuse only	Total	Both alcohol and drug abuse	Drug abuse only	Alcohol abuse only
Total	15,239	14,686	388	165	100.0	96.4	2.5	1.1
Alabama	131	125	6	--	100.0	95.4	4.6	--
Alaska	84	84	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Arizona	263	245	17	1	100.0	93.2	6.5	0.4
Arkansas	66	62	4	--	100.0	93.9	6.1	--
California	1,698	1,617	58	23	100.0	95.2	3.4	1.4
Colorado	469	454	4	11	100.0	96.8	0.9	2.3
Connecticut	291	279	9	3	100.0	95.9	3.1	1.0
Delaware	54	54	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
District of Columbia	74	69	4	1	100.0	93.2	5.4	1.4
Fed. of Micronesia	2	2	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Florida	778	754	18	6	100.0	96.9	2.3	0.8
Georgia	308	296	9	3	100.0	96.1	2.9	1.0
Guam	1	1	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Hawaii	75	74	--	1	100.0	98.7	--	1.3
Idaho	60	60	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Illinois	592	576	10	6	100.0	97.3	1.7	1.0
Indiana	321	316	5	--	100.0	98.4	1.6	--
Iowa	139	138	1	--	100.0	99.3	0.7	--
Kansas	209	205	4	--	100.0	98.1	1.9	--
Kentucky	298	289	7	2	100.0	97.0	2.3	0.7
Louisiana	183	174	8	1	100.0	95.1	4.4	0.5
Maine	198	195	2	1	100.0	98.5	1.0	0.5
Maryland	363	346	12	5	100.0	95.3	3.3	1.4
Massachusetts	418	410	4	4	100.0	98.1	1.0	1.0
Michigan	605	595	6	4	100.0	98.3	1.0	0.7
Minnesota	275	268	3	4	100.0	97.5	1.1	1.5
Mississippi	124	122	1	1	100.0	98.4	0.8	0.8
Missouri	319	313	4	2	100.0	98.1	1.3	0.6
Montana	66	66	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--

See notes at end of table.

Table 4.5
Substance abuse treatment facilities by substance abuse problem treated, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent distribution

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities				Percent distribution			
		Problem treated				Problem treated		
	Total	Both alcohol and drug abuse	Drug abuse only	Alcohol abuse only	Total	Both alcohol and drug abuse	Drug abuse only	Alcohol abuse only
Nebraska	109	109	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Nevada	102	96	6	--	100.0	94.1	5.9	--
New Hampshire	75	74	1	--	100.0	98.7	1.3	--
New Jersey	328	314	8	6	100.0	95.7	2.4	1.8
New Mexico	125	122	1	2	100.0	97.6	0.8	1.6
New York	1,336	1,170	122	44	100.0	87.6	9.1	3.3
North Carolina	323	316	2	5	100.0	97.8	0.6	1.5
North Dakota	44	44	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Ohio	578	573	1	4	100.0	99.1	0.2	0.7
Oklahoma	165	160	2	3	100.0	97.0	1.2	1.8
Oregon	240	235	3	2	100.0	97.9	1.3	0.8
Palau	1	1	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Pennsylvania	636	632	4	--	100.0	99.4	0.6	--
Puerto Rico	127	118	7	2	100.0	92.9	5.5	1.6
Rhode Island	63	61	1	1	100.0	96.8	1.6	1.6
South Carolina	102	98	1	3	100.0	96.1	1.0	2.9
South Dakota	66	64	1	1	100.0	97.0	1.5	1.5
Tennessee	223	221	2	--	100.0	99.1	0.9	--
Texas	756	724	27	5	100.0	95.8	3.6	0.7
Utah	138	138	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Vermont	46	45	1	--	100.0	97.8	2.2	--
Virgin Islands	5	5	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--
Virginia	257	254	1	2	100.0	98.8	0.4	0.8
Washington	363	360	1	2	100.0	99.2	0.3	0.6
West Virginia	137	136	--	1	100.0	99.3	--	0.7
Wisconsin	370	367	--	3	100.0	99.2	--	0.8
Wyoming	60	60	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--

-- Quantity is zero.

[1] Facilities operated by Federal agencies are included in the States in which the facilities are located.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 4.6
Substance abuse treatment facilities by primary focus, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent distribution

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities						Percent distribution					
		Primary focus						Primary focus				
	Total	Substance abuse services	Mental health services	Balance of SA and MH services	General health services	Other	Total	Substance abuse services	Mental health services	Balance of SA and MH services	General health services	Other
Total	15,239	9,859	2,573	2,069	171	567	100.0	64.7	16.9	13.6	1.1	3.7
Alabama	131	78	27	16	6	4	100.0	59.5	20.6	12.2	4.6	3.1
Alaska	84	64	6	9	2	3	100.0	76.2	7.1	10.7	2.4	3.6
Arizona	263	140	62	45	4	12	100.0	53.2	23.6	17.1	1.5	4.6
Arkansas	66	35	22	8	--	1	100.0	53.0	33.3	12.1	--	1.5
California	1,698	1,299	145	159	16	79	100.0	76.5	8.5	9.4	0.9	4.7
Colorado	469	301	76	64	--	28	100.0	64.2	16.2	13.6	--	6.0
Connecticut	291	194	46	42	4	5	100.0	66.7	15.8	14.4	1.4	1.7
Delaware	54	38	7	8	--	1	100.0	70.4	13.0	14.8	--	1.9
District of Columbia	74	50	8	9	4	3	100.0	67.6	10.8	12.2	5.4	4.1
Fed. of Micronesia	2	2	--	--	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--	--	--
Florida	778	484	137	129	2	26	100.0	62.2	17.6	16.6	0.3	3.3
Georgia	308	134	89	78	2	5	100.0	43.5	28.9	25.3	0.6	1.6
Guam	1	--	--	1	--	--	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	--
Hawaii	75	62	8	3	--	2	100.0	82.7	10.7	4.0	--	2.7
Idaho	60	39	9	8	2	2	100.0	65.0	15.0	13.3	3.3	3.3
Illinois	592	361	100	95	9	27	100.0	61.0	16.9	16.0	1.5	4.6
Indiana	321	123	124	59	4	11	100.0	38.3	38.6	18.4	1.2	3.4
Iowa	139	113	11	8	4	3	100.0	81.3	7.9	5.8	2.9	2.2
Kansas	209	113	59	23	1	13	100.0	54.1	28.2	11.0	0.5	6.2
Kentucky	298	141	84	59	2	12	100.0	47.3	28.2	19.8	0.7	4.0
Louisiana	183	142	27	11	1	2	100.0	77.6	14.8	6.0	0.5	1.1
Maine	198	117	31	39	5	6	100.0	59.1	15.7	19.7	2.5	3.0
Maryland	363	278	36	32	4	13	100.0	76.6	9.9	8.8	1.1	3.6
Massachusetts	418	227	93	67	10	21	100.0	54.3	22.2	16.0	2.4	5.0
Michigan	605	322	168	81	7	27	100.0	53.2	27.8	13.4	1.2	4.5
Minnesota	275	226	18	21	4	6	100.0	82.2	6.5	7.6	1.5	2.2
Mississippi	124	61	42	20	--	1	100.0	49.2	33.9	16.1	--	0.8
Missouri	319	209	60	41	2	7	100.0	65.5	18.8	12.9	0.6	2.2
Montana	66	48	6	9	--	3	100.0	72.7	9.1	13.6	--	4.5
	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
See notes at end of table.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 4.6
Substance abuse treatment facilities by primary focus, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent distribution

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities						Percent distribution					
		Primary focus						Primary focus				
	Total	Substance abuse services	Mental health services	Balance of SA and MH services	General health services	Other	Total	Substance abuse services	Mental health services	Balance of SA and MH services	General health services	Other
Nebraska	109	52	23	29	1	4	100.0	47.7	21.1	26.6	0.9	3.7
Nevada	102	64	17	17	--	4	100.0	62.7	16.7	16.7	--	3.9
New Hampshire	75	30	35	7	--	3	100.0	40.0	46.7	9.3	--	4.0
New Jersey	328	189	72	56	1	10	100.0	57.6	22.0	17.1	0.3	3.0
New Mexico	125	65	24	29	1	6	100.0	52.0	19.2	23.2	0.8	4.8
New York	1,336	1,125	71	93	16	31	100.0	84.2	5.3	7.0	1.2	2.3
North Carolina	323	188	57	65	--	13	100.0	58.2	17.6	20.1	--	4.0
North Dakota	44	30	4	7	1	2	100.0	68.2	9.1	15.9	2.3	4.5
Ohio	578	348	95	93	13	29	100.0	60.2	16.4	16.1	2.2	5.0
Oklahoma	165	105	26	24	2	8	100.0	63.6	15.8	14.5	1.2	4.8
Oregon	240	174	17	41	1	7	100.0	72.5	7.1	17.1	0.4	2.9
Palau	1	1	--	--	--	--	100.0	100.0	--	--	--	--
Pennsylvania	636	441	94	68	10	23	100.0	69.3	14.8	10.7	1.6	3.6
Puerto Rico	127	118	5	3	--	1	100.0	92.9	3.9	2.4	--	0.8
Rhode Island	63	45	12	4	--	2	100.0	71.4	19.0	6.3	--	3.2
South Carolina	102	73	16	9	2	2	100.0	71.6	15.7	8.8	2.0	2.0
South Dakota	66	38	13	9	1	5	100.0	57.6	19.7	13.6	1.5	7.6
Tennessee	223	85	96	35	--	7	100.0	38.1	43.0	15.7	--	3.1
Texas	756	541	107	73	8	27	100.0	71.6	14.2	9.7	1.1	3.6
Utah	138	65	34	25	4	10	100.0	47.1	24.6	18.1	2.9	7.2
Vermont	46	27	11	6	--	2	100.0	58.7	23.9	13.0	--	4.3
Virgin Islands	5	1	--	2	--	2	100.0	20.0	--	40.0	--	40.0
Virginia	257	125	58	62	2	10	100.0	48.6	22.6	24.1	0.8	3.9
Washington	363	298	21	34	2	8	100.0	82.1	5.8	9.4	0.6	2.2
West Virginia	137	47	61	25	1	3	100.0	34.3	44.5	18.2	0.7	2.2
Wisconsin	370	160	85	93	10	22	100.0	43.2	23.0	25.1	2.7	5.9
Wyoming	60	23	18	16	--	3	100.0	38.3	30.0	26.7	--	5.0

-- Quantity is zero.

[1] Facilities operated by Federal agencies are included in the States in which the facilities are located.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

Table 4.7
Substance abuse treatment facilities offering programs for special groups, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities								Percent of all facilities						
		Special group							Special group						
	Total	Dually-diag-nosed	Adoles-cents	Persons with HIV/ AIDS	Pregnant/ postpartum women	Other women's groups	Criminal justice	DUI/ DWI	Dually-diag-nosed	Adoles-cents	Persons with HIV/ AIDS	Pregnant/ postpartum women	Other women's groups	Criminal justice	DUI/ DWI
Total	15,239	6,818	5,131	3,368	3,271	6,222	7,176	5,848	44.7	33.7	22.1	21.5	40.8	47.1	38.4
Alabama	131	43	40	24	26	35	38	33	32.8	30.5	18.3	19.8	26.7	29.0	25.2
Alaska	84	36	32	6	12	30	25	48	42.9	38.1	7.1	14.3	35.7	29.8	57.1
Arizona	263	113	82	54	54	109	144	103	43.0	31.2	20.5	20.5	41.4	54.8	39.2
Arkansas	66	36	18	15	16	18	28	26	54.5	27.3	22.7	24.2	27.3	42.4	39.4
California	1,698	681	442	431	445	652	829	276	40.1	26.0	25.4	26.2	38.4	48.8	16.3
Colorado	469	206	207	72	82	199	282	308	43.9	44.1	15.4	17.5	42.4	60.1	65.7
Connecticut	291	148	75	90	74	152	110	41	50.9	25.8	30.9	25.4	52.2	37.8	14.1
Delaware	54	30	19	13	6	21	22	13	55.6	35.2	24.1	11.1	38.9	40.7	24.1
District of Columbia	74	37	9	34	14	42	36	17	50.0	12.2	45.9	18.9	56.8	48.6	23.0
Fed. of Micronesia	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	100.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Florida	778	352	249	202	141	273	405	351	45.2	32.0	26.0	18.1	35.1	52.1	45.1
Georgia	308	125	88	61	58	83	125	124	40.6	28.6	19.8	18.8	26.9	40.6	40.3
Guam	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	--	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	--
Hawaii	75	31	38	19	27	33	44	14	41.3	50.7	25.3	36.0	44.0	58.7	18.7
Idaho	60	24	27	2	10	19	26	27	40.0	45.0	3.3	16.7	31.7	43.3	45.0
Illinois	592	278	223	134	148	232	275	325	47.0	37.7	22.6	25.0	39.2	46.5	54.9
Indiana	321	144	120	53	52	110	137	147	44.9	37.4	16.5	16.2	34.3	42.7	45.8
Iowa	139	44	70	19	29	49	74	73	31.7	50.4	13.7	20.9	35.3	53.2	52.5
Kansas	209	76	76	23	30	60	95	123	36.4	36.4	11.0	14.4	28.7	45.5	58.9
Kentucky	298	123	81	29	54	87	132	196	41.3	27.2	9.7	18.1	29.2	44.3	65.8
Louisiana	183	86	76	35	31	74	72	57	47.0	41.5	19.1	16.9	40.4	39.3	31.1
Maine	198	90	65	35	37	76	89	134	45.5	32.8	17.7	18.7	38.4	44.9	67.7
Maryland	363	173	121	103	79	173	186	195	47.7	33.3	28.4	21.8	47.7	51.2	53.7
Massachusetts	418	229	103	143	80	202	182	92	54.8	24.6	34.2	19.1	48.3	43.5	22.0
Michigan	605	238	165	81	110	249	262	275	39.3	27.3	13.4	18.2	41.2	43.3	45.5
Minnesota	275	101	80	35	48	96	75	90	36.7	29.1	12.7	17.5	34.9	27.3	32.7
Mississippi	124	81	19	18	13	28	35	63	65.3	15.3	14.5	10.5	22.6	28.2	50.8
Missouri	319	129	93	66	52	83	155	144	40.4	29.2	20.7	16.3	26.0	48.6	45.1
Montana	66	32	41	13	19	34	35	41	48.5	62.1	19.7	28.8	51.5	53.0	62.1

See notes at end of table.

Table 4.7
Substance abuse treatment facilities offering programs for special groups, according to State or jurisdiction: 1999
Number and percent

State or jurisdiction [1]	Number of facilities								Percent of all facilities							
		Special group							Special group							
	Total	Dually-diag-nosed	Adoles-cents	Persons with HIV/ AIDS	Pregnant/ postpartum women	Other women's groups	Criminal justice	DUI/ DWI	Dually-diag-nosed	Adoles-cents	Persons with HIV/ AIDS	Pregnant/ postpartum women	Other women's groups	Criminal justice	DUI/ DWI
Nebraska	109	49	49	9	23	32	32	45	45.0	45.0	8.3	21.1	29.4	29.4	41.3
Nevada	102	39	31	19	23	36	53	38	38.2	30.4	18.6	22.5	35.3	52.0	37.3
New Hampshire	75	37	22	12	11	26	25	18	49.3	29.3	16.0	14.7	34.7	33.3	24.0
New Jersey	328	140	120	88	62	151	136	150	42.7	36.6	26.8	18.9	46.0	41.5	45.7
New Mexico	125	70	54	29	32	52	79	58	56.0	43.2	23.2	25.6	41.6	63.2	46.4
New York	1,336	675	483	483	323	825	720	462	50.5	36.2	36.2	24.2	61.8	53.9	34.6
North Carolina	323	157	105	65	78	123	169	200	48.6	32.5	20.1	24.1	38.1	52.3	61.9
North Dakota	44	22	21	2	10	22	14	24	50.0	47.7	4.5	22.7	50.0	31.8	54.5
Ohio	578	252	210	72	116	226	287	114	43.6	36.3	12.5	20.1	39.1	49.7	19.7
Oklahoma	165	75	65	42	40	70	79	71	45.5	39.4	25.5	24.2	42.4	47.9	43.0
Oregon	240	119	108	39	67	142	131	149	49.6	45.0	16.3	27.9	59.2	54.6	62.1
Palau	1	1	1	--	--	--	1	--	100.0	100.0	--	--	--	100.0	--
Pennsylvania	636	287	221	132	115	257	297	206	45.1	34.7	20.8	18.1	40.4	46.7	32.4
Puerto Rico	127	29	28	47	10	16	37	9	22.8	22.0	37.0	7.9	12.6	29.1	7.1
Rhode Island	63	28	20	21	21	34	25	27	44.4	31.7	33.3	33.3	54.0	39.7	42.9
South Carolina	102	36	45	20	40	50	54	52	35.3	44.1	19.6	39.2	49.0	52.9	51.0
South Dakota	66	24	41	13	15	16	25	32	36.4	62.1	19.7	22.7	24.2	37.9	48.5
Tennessee	223	120	56	44	38	72	90	44	53.8	25.1	19.7	17.0	32.3	40.4	19.7
Texas	756	321	256	192	159	235	388	108	42.5	33.9	25.4	21.0	31.1	51.3	14.3
Utah	138	77	58	28	38	55	79	56	55.8	42.0	20.3	27.5	39.9	57.2	40.6
Vermont	46	27	22	7	7	28	26	21	58.7	47.8	15.2	15.2	60.9	56.5	45.7
Virgin Islands	5	3	--	1	1	1	2	3	60.0	--	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	60.0
Virginia	257	144	89	66	79	130	127	96	56.0	34.6	25.7	30.7	50.6	49.4	37.4
Washington	363	127	138	46	102	171	145	244	35.0	38.0	12.7	28.1	47.1	39.9	67.2
West Virginia	137	70	73	31	45	48	62	57	51.1	53.3	22.6	32.8	35.0	45.3	41.6
Wisconsin	370	175	131	40	59	164	151	189	47.3	35.4	10.8	15.9	44.3	40.8	51.1
Wyoming	60	25	22	8	8	19	22	38	41.7	36.7	13.3	13.3	31.7	36.7	63.3

-- Quantity is zero.

[1] Facilities operated by Federal agencies are included in the States in which the facilities are located.

SOURCE: Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) survey, October 1, 1999.

APPENDIX

UFDS 1999 QUESTIONNAIRE

This Appendix contains the 1999 UFDS questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). The CATI program has been abridged to make it easier to read. Skip patterns noted in this version were part of the CATI program. Unless otherwise noted, skips were made to the next appropriate question.

Uniform Facility Data Set (UFDS) Survey 1999
Computer-Assisted Telephone Interview

>a1a< **Was [*name of facility*] offering substance abuse services on October 1, 1999? This could include treatment, prevention, administrative, or other non-treatment services.**

<1>YES [go to a2]
<0>NO
<d> DON'T KNOW [go to End]
<r> REFUSED [go to End]

>a1b< ***[ONLY IF a1a = NO]*** **When did this facility stop offering substance abuse services?**

<1> January
<2> February
<3> March
<4> April
<5> May
<6> June
<7> July
<8> August
<9> September
<10> October
<11> November
<12> December

<0> Never offered substance abuse services [go to End]

<d> DON'T KNOW [go to End]
<r> REFUSED [go to End]

<____> YEAR

➔ ***PROGRAMMED SKIP: IF a1a = NO, GO TO End.***

>a2< **On October 1, 1999, which of the following substance abuse services were being offered by this facility, <u>at this location</u>? Please answer "Yes" or "No" for each.**

>a2a< **<u>Substance abuse prevention services</u>? (By this we mean activities such as information dissemination or education directed at individuals <u>not</u> identified as needing treatment.)**

<1>YES
<0>NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a2b< **<u>Intake, assessment, or referral services</u> for substance abuse treatment?**

<1>YES
<0>NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a2c< **Either <u>substance abuse treatment or detoxification</u>? (By treatment, we mean services that focus on initiating and maintaining an individual's recovery from substance abuse and averting relapse.)**

<1>YES
<0>NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a2d< **<u>Administrative services</u> such as billing, personnel, and scheduling?**

<1>YES
<0>NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

➔ ***PROGRAMMED SKIP: IF a2c = YES, GO TO a3. OTHERWISE GO TO a7.***

>a3< ***[ONLY IF a2c = YES]*** **Does this facility offer a special program for DUI/DWI or other drunk driver offenders?**

<1> YES
<0> NO [go to a5]
<d> DON'T KNOW [go to a5]
<r> REFUSED [go to a5]

>a4< ***[ONLY IF a3 = YES]*** **Does this facility offer substance abuse treatment services to clients <u>other than</u> DUI/DWI clients?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a5< **Is this facility owned or operated by . . .** ***[CODE ONLY ONE]***

<1> **a private for-profit organization,** [go to a5b]
<2> **a private non-profit organization,** [go to a6]
<3> **the state government,** [go to a6]
<4> **a local, county or community government,** [go to a6]
<5> **a tribal government,** [go to a6]
<6> **or the Federal government?**

<d> DON'T KNOW [go to a6]
<r> REFUSED [go to a6]

>a5a< ***[ONLY IF a5 = 6]*** **Which federal government agency?**

<1> **Department of Veterans Affairs**
<2> **Department of Defense**
<3> **Bureau of Prisons** [go to End]
<4> **Indian Health Service**
<5> **Other** (Specify: _____)

<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a5b< ***[ONLY IF a5 = 1]*** **Is this a solo practice; that is, an office with a single practitioner or therapist?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a6< **Does this facility operate or participate in a substance abuse hotline? (A hotline is a telephone service that provides information and referral and immediate counseling, frequently in a crisis situation. For the purpose of this study, 9-1-1 is not considered a hotline.)**

<1> YES
<0> NO [go to a7]
<d> DON'T KNOW [go to a7]
<r> REFUSED [go to a7]

>a6a< <1> *RECORD HOTLINE TELEPHONE NUMBER:*_____

<d> DON'T KNOW [go to a7]
<r> REFUSED [go to a7]

>a6b< ***[ONLY IF NUMBER REPORTED IN a6a]*** **Does this facility have a second substance abuse hotline?**

<1> YES
<0> NO [go to a7]
<d> DON'T KNOW [go to a7]
<r> REFUSED [go to a7]

>a6c< <1> *RECORD SECOND HOTLINE TELEPHONE NUMBER:*_____

<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a7< **Does this facility operate a halfway house for substance abuse clients at this location?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

➔ ***PROGRAMMED SKIP: IF a2c IS NOT YES, GO TO End.***

>a8< **Is the primary focus of [*name of facility*] to provide substance abuse treatment services, mental health services or something else?**

[PROBE: IF RESPONDENT GIVES MORE THAN ONE RESPONSE, ASK: **Which do you consider the primary focus of this facility?]**

<1> **Substance abuse treatment services** [go to a8a]
<2> **Mental health services** [go to a8a]
<3> **Something else**

<d> DON'T KNOW [go to a8a]
<r> REFUSED [go to a8a]

>a8x< ***[ONLY IF a8 = 3]*** **What is the primary focus of this facility?**

<1> *ENTER FOCUS:*_____
<2> **General health care**
<3> **A balance of services, 50% mental health and 50% substance abuse**

<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a8a< **Is this facility located in, or operated by, a hospital?**

<1> YES
<0> NO [go to a9]
<d> DON'T KNOW [go to a9]
<r> REFUSED [go to a9]

>a8b< ***[ONLY IF a8a = YES]*** **What type of hospital is that . . .**

<1> **A general hospital?**
<2> **A psychiatric hospital, or**
<3> **Another type of specialized hospital (such as alcoholism, maternity, children's, orthopedic)?**
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a9< **Does this facility dispense methadone or LAAM at this location?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a10< **Does this facility offer treatment for alcohol abuse, drug abuse or both?**

<1> **Both alcohol and drug abuse**
<2> **Alcohol abuse only**
<3> **Drug abuse only**
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a11< **Some facilities have specially designed substance abuse treatment programs or groups for particular kinds of clients. Does this facility offer a specially designed substance abuse treatment program or group especially for . . .**

>a11a< **Adolescents?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a11b< **Dually-diagnosed clients (this is, clients with both mental and substance abuse disorders)?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a11c< **Persons with HIV/AIDS?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a11d< **Pregnant or postpartum women?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a11e< **Other women's groups?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a11f< **Criminal justice clients? (NOTE: THIS TREATMENT COULD BE PROVIDED OFF SITE)**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a11g< **Some other type of substance abuse client?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a11h< ***[ONLY IF a11f = YES]*** **Does this facility only treat persons who are currently incarcerated in a prison, jail or detention center?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a12< **On October 1, 1999, which of the following types of substance abuse care were offered by this facility at this location?**

>a12a< **Hospital inpatient?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a12b< **Non-hospital residential?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a12c< **Any kind of outpatient substance abuse care?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a13< ***[ONLY IF a12a = YES]*** **On October 1, 1999, what kind of hospital inpatient substance abuse care was offered—detoxification, rehabilitation or both?** ***[CODE ONLY ONE]***

<1> **Detoxification**
<2> **Rehabilitation**
<3> **Both**
<4> **Neither**
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a14< ***[ONLY IF a12b = YES]*** **On October 1, 1999, what kind of residential substance abuse care was offered at this facility—detoxification, rehabilitation or both?**

<1> **Detoxification**
<2> **Rehabilitation**
<3> **Both**
<4> **Neither**
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a15< ***[ONLY IF a12c = YES]*** **On October 1, 1999, which of the following kinds of outpatient substance abuse care were offered at this facility?**

>a15a< **Ambulatory detoxification? (This means detoxification on an outpatient basis. The client does not stay at the facility 24 hours a day.)**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a15b< **Partial hospitalization or day treatment? (This involves 20 hours or more of outpatient treatment per week.)**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a15c< **Intensive outpatient?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a15d< **Other outpatient treatment?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a15e< ***[ONLY IF a15c = YES]*** **What minimum number of hours per week defines intensive outpatient treatment at this facility?**

<1> *RECORD MINIMUM NUMBER OF HOURS:*_____
<2> No minimum

<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a16< **Which of the following types of payments are accepted by this facility? Please answer "Yes" or "No" for each type of payment.**

Does this facility accept. . .

>a16a< **Cash or self-payment?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a16b< **Medicare payments?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a16c< **Medicaid payments? NOTE: Some states call their medicaid programs by other names; include those programs here.**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a16d< **A state-administered health insurance plan other than Medicaid? (Example: A state-administered health plan for State employees.)**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a16e< **Federal military insurance, such as CHAMPUS, CHAMP-VA or TRICARE?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a16f< **Private health insurance?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a16g< **Indian Health Service contract payments?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a16h< **Does this facility accept other types of payment for treatment?**

<1> YES (Specify: _____)
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a16i< **Does [*name of facility*] receive any [other] public funds such as federal, state, county, or local funds to subsidize substance abuse treatment programs?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a17a< **Does this facility offer fully subsidized care to <u>some</u> or <u>all</u> of its clients?**

<1> **Some**
<2> **All**
<3> **None**
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a17b< **Does this facility use a sliding fee scale?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a18< **On October 1, 1999, did this facility have agreements or contracts with managed care organizations for providing substance abuse treatment services?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a19< ***[ONLY IF FACILITY IS NOT STATE-APPROVED]*** **I'm going to read the names of some of the agencies that license or certify substance abuse facilities. Please tell me if this facility is licensed, certified, accredited, or otherwise approved by any of the following.**

>a19a< **Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations (JCAHO)?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a19b< **Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF)?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a19c< **National Committee on Quality Assurance (NCQA)?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a19d< ***[ONLY IF FACILITY IS NOT STATE-APPROVED]*** **Is this facility licensed or certified by your State substance abuse agency?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a19e< ***[ONLY IF FACILITY IS NOT STATE-APPROVED]*** **Are any staff members at this facility licensed or certified addiction counselors?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a20< **What telephone number should a potential client call to schedule an intake appointment?**

<1> *RECORD INTAKE TELEPHONE NUMBER:* _____
<2> **Initial intake not usually done here**
<3> **No intake, other reason** (Specify: _____)
<4> **Same number you just called**

<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>u1< **At this time I would like to update your facility's address and telephone information.**

>u2< **Is your correct mailing address [*read mailing address*]?**

>u3< **Now I'd like to update [*name of facility*]'s fax number.**

>u3a< ***[ONLY IF FAX NUMBER IS ON CATI]*** **Our records list this facility's fax number as [*read number*]. Is that correct?**

<1> YES [go to u4]
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW [go to u4]
<r> REFUSED [go to u4]

>u3b< ***[ONLY IF FAX NUMBER IS NOT ON CATI OR u3a = NO]*** **What is this facility's fax number?**

<1> *RECORD FAX NUMBER:*_____
<2> DON'T HAVE A FAX

<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>u4< **Does [*name of facility*] have a website?**

<1> YES
<0> NO [go to a22]
<d> DON'T KNOW [go to a22]
<r> REFUSED [go to a22]

>u4a< ***[ONLY IF u4 = YES]*** **What is [*name of facility*]'s URL, or home page address?**

<1> *RECORD HOME PAGE ADDRESS:*_____

<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a22< **[*Note: At this point, the actual interview included a lengthy series of questions to determine whether the facility is administratively linked with other substance abuse treatment facilities, which facilities it is linked to, and the nature of the links. These questions are excluded here because they were for purposes of survey administration only*.]**

>a23< **Facilities participating in this survey that are licensed or approved through their State substance abuse agency will be listed in SAMHSA's *National Directory of Drug Abuse and Alcoholism Treatment Programs*. This Directory will be available on SAMHSA's Internet web site at www.samhsa.gov and in print. Would you like to receive a paper copy of the Directory when it is published?**

<1> YES
<0> NO
<d> DON'T KNOW
<r> REFUSED

>a23a< ***INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT VOLUNTEERS THAT THIS FACILITY DOES NOT WANT TO BE LISTED IN THE DIRECTORY, RECORD HERE.***

<1> DO NOT LIST FACILITY IN DIRECTORY.

>End< **That's all the questions I have. Thank you for your time.**