



Department of  
**Mental Health &  
Substance Abuse Services**

# **2016 Tennessee Behavioral Health County and Region Services Data Book**

**July 2016**

**Prepared by:**

**Mario Lehenbauer-Baum, Ph.D. and Rachel L. Jones  
Division of Planning, Research and Forensics  
Office of Research**

**Contact: Karen Edwards, Ph.D., Research Director**

**615-532-3648**

**[Karen.Edwards@tn.gov](mailto:Karen.Edwards@tn.gov)**



## Introduction

The 2016 Tennessee Behavioral Health County and Region Services Data Book covers service and capacity data from the Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (TDMHSAS). Data is provided on a state, regional and (if available) county level; regional data is organized by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Regions (PPR). Please find the map of PPR on the next page. The data book provides information about:

- the general population and population living in poverty in Tennessee (by Planning and Policy Regions and by county)
- admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services and to recovery courts
- admissions to regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS
- Behavioral Health Safety Net enrollees
- children & youth and adult crisis services face-to-face assessments
- TDMHSAS prevention, treatment, recovery and rehabilitation site indicators

To provide information about individuals needing increased access to services, some of the data indicators are also displayed by gender, age groups, race and ethnicity.

### Data notes


 When appropriate, percentages and rates were ranked. The “highest” (Top 25%) values are at least higher than 75% of all values and displayed in red. The “lowest” values (Bottom 25%) are composed of values in the lowest 25% of all values and displayed in blue.

The original data source and year are provided for each indicator. FY refers to the State Fiscal Year (FY) which is July 1 through June 30 (e.g. FY2015 or FY15 refers to the fiscal year 2015 which is July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015). Other indicators include point-in-time counts at a specific day (e.g., February 11, 2016).

Numbers and percentages or rates in data tables are presented with respect to guidelines that protect confidential health information. To ensure adequate precision of summary statistics derived from protected health information (PHI), it is necessary to suppress (omit) rates and other summary statistics based on small numbers of events (or admissions). There should be at least 20 events (or admissions) in the numerator in order to produce a stable rate. When the numerator is less than 20, the rate is unstable, meaning that a small change in the numerator can lead to a large change in the rate or percentage from one year to the other. The following small number guidelines were adapted from the Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services:

- If the number of events (or admissions) for an indicator is less than 5 (<5), the counts are omitted.
- If applicable, zero events (or admissions) are reported.
- If the number of events (or admissions) for an indicator is less than 20, rates or percentages are not reported.

## TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Regions (PPR)



- Region 1:** Carter, Greene, Hancock, Hawkins, Johnson, Sullivan, Unicoi, Washington counties
- Region 2:** Anderson, Blount, Campbell, Claiborne, Cocke, Grainger, Jefferson, Hamblen, Knox, Loudon, Monroe, Morgan, Roane, Scott, Sevier, Union counties
- Region 3:** Bledsoe, Bradley, Clay, Cumberland, DeKalb, Fentress, Grundy, Hamilton, Jackson, Macon, Marion, McMinn, Meigs, Overton, Pickett, Polk, Putnam, Rhea, Sequatchie, Smith, Van Buren, Warren, White counties
- Region 4:** Davidson County
- Region 5:** Bedford, Cannon, Cheatham, Coffee, Dickson, Franklin, Giles, Hickman, Houston, Humphreys, Lawrence, Lewis, Lincoln, Maury, Marshall, Montgomery, Moore, Perry, Robertson, Rutherford, Stewart, Sumner, Trousdale, Wayne, Williamson, Wilson counties
- Region 6:** Benton, Carroll, Chester, Crockett, Decatur, Dyer, Fayette, Gibson, Hardeman, Hardin, Haywood, Henderson, Henry, Lake, Lauderdale, Madison, McNairy, Obion, Tipton, Weakley counties
- Region 7:** Shelby County

## Table of Contents

Page

### Section 1: TENNESSEE POPULATION

#### 1.1. GENERAL POPULATION FACTS

1.1.1	Region and county population estimates	9
1.1.2	Age, gender, race and ethnicity by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	10

#### 1.2. POVERTY IN TENNESSEE

1.2.1.	Regional poverty estimates and poverty map	12
1.2.2.	Age and gender by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	13
1.2.3.	Race and ethnicity by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	14
1.2.4.	County poverty percentages and estimates	15

### Section 2: SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

#### 2.1. TDMHSAS-funded SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES: ENROLLMENT DEMOGRAPHICS

2.1.1.	Levels of care	18
2.1.2.	Levels of care by gender	19
2.1.3.	Admissions to substance abuse treatment services by Planning and Policy Region and by 1,000 population living in poverty	20
2.1.4.	Admissions to substance abuse treatment services by gender	21
2.1.5.	Admissions to substance abuse treatment services by age	22
2.1.6.	Admissions to substance abuse treatment services by race	23
2.1.6.	Admissions to substance abuse treatment services by ethnicity	24

#### 2.2. TDMHSAS-funded SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES: PRIMARY SUBSTANCES OF ABUSE

2.2.1.	Primary substances of abuse	26
2.2.2.	Primary substance of abuse by gender	27
2.2.3.	Primary substance of abuse by age	28
2.2.4.	Primary substance of abuse by race	29
2.2.5.	Primary substance of abuse by ethnicity	30
2.2.6.	Primary substance of abuse by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	31

#### 2.3. TDMHSAS-funded SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES: PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS, ALCOHOL AND MARIJUANA

2.3.1.	Substances of abuse: overview	33
2.3.2.	Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and county map	34
2.3.2.	Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by gender	35
2.3.4.	Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and age	36
2.3.5.	Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and race	37

**2.3. PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS, ALCOHOL AND MARIJUANA (cont.)**

2.3.6. Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and ethnicity	38
2.3.7. Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by county	39
2.3.8. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and county map	40
2.3.9. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by gender	41
2.3.10. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and age	42
2.3.11. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and race	43
2.3.12. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and ethnicity	44
2.3.13. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by county	45
2.3.14. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and county map	46
2.3.15. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by gender	47
2.3.16. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and age	48
2.3.17. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and race	49
2.3.18. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and ethnicity	50
2.3.19. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by county	51

**2.4. OTHER SUBSTANCES OF ABUSE BY COUNTY AND REGION**

2.4.1. Cocaine/Crack	53
2.4.2. Methamphetamines/stimulants	54
2.4.3. Heroin	55
2.4.5. Other prescription drugs	56
2.4.5. Other illicit drugs	57

**2.5. RECOVERY COURTS**

2.5.1. TDMHSAS-funded recovery courts: new admissions in FY2015 and discharge status	59
--	----

**Section 3: TDMHSAS-funded MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

**3.1. REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTES AND PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS**

3.1.1. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to regional mental health institutes (RMHI) and private psychiatric hospitals (PPH)	62
3.1.2. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by region and 1,000 population in poverty	63
3.1.3. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by gender	64
3.1.4. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by age groups	65
3.1.5. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by race	66
3.1.6. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by ethnicity	67
3.1.7. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by county and TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	68
3.1.8. TDMHDAS Regional mental health institutes (RMHI) Regions I - VII	69
3.1.9. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by county and RMHI Region	70

**3.2. BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SAFETY NET**

3.2.1. Number of BHSN enrollees by region and per 1,000 population ages 18+ living in poverty	72
3.2.3. Number of BHSN enrollments per county	73

**3.3. CRISIS SERVICES**

3.3.1. Children and youth crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population	75
3.3.2. Children and youth crisis services face-to-face assessments by county	76
3.3.3. Adult crisis services face-to-face-assessments per 1,000 population	77
3.3.4. Adult crisis services face-to-face assessments by county	78

**Section 4: TDMHSAS PREVENTION, TREATMENT, RECOVERY AND REHABILITATION INDICATORS**

**4.1. SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES**

4.1.1. Alcohol and drug abuse adolescent residential treatment sites	80
4.1.2. Substance abuse adolescent treatment sites	81
4.1.3. Alcohol and drug abuse adult halfway house sites	82
4.1.4. Alcohol and drug abuse adult residential rehabilitation sites	83
4.1.5. Substance abuse addiction recovery program sites	84
4.1.6. Substance abuse prevention coalitions	85
4.1.7. Substance abuse prevention sites	86
4.1.8. Substance abuse co-occurring capable treatment sites	87
4.1.9. Substance abuse co-occurring enhanced treatment sites	88

**4.2. MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

4.2.1. Mental health residential treatment sites for children and adolescents	90
4.2.2. Mental health adult supportive living sites	91
4.2.3. Mental health adult residential treatment sites	92
4.2.4. Mental health adult supportive residential sites	93
4.2.5. Mental health psychosocial rehabilitation program sites	94

# **SECTION 1: TENNESSEE POPULATION DATA**

## **1.1. General population facts**

**Table 1. Population indicators: TDMHSAS Planning and Policy regions (Census 2014 estimates)**

PPR	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7
Census 2010	<b>506,266</b>	1,176,033	941,364	626,681	<b>1,533,111</b>	635,006	927,644
Population estimate 2014	<b>507,724</b>	1,202,594	968,033	668,347	<b>1,632,577</b>	631,274	938,803
<b>Estimated population growth from 2010 - 2014</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>

Top 25% Bottom 25%

**Table 2. Population indicators: Counties in Tennessee (Census 2014 estimates)**

PPR	County	Census 2010	Pop.est. 2014	Est. pop. growth
1	Carter	57,424	56,886	-0.9%
	Greene	68,831	68,335	-0.7%
	Hancock	6,819	6,657	-2.4%
	Hawkins	56,833	56,735	-0.2%
	Johnson	18,244	17,859	-2.1%
	Sullivan	156,823	157,047	0.1%
	Unicoi	18,313	17,963	-1.9%
	Washington	122,979	126,242	2.7%
2	Anderson	75,129	75,528	0.5%
	Blount	123,010	126,339	2.7%
	Campbell	40,716	39,918	-2.0%
	Claiborne	32,213	31,592	-1.9%
	Cocke	35,662	35,374	-0.8%
	Grainger	22,657	22,864	0.9%
	Hamblen	62,544	63,036	0.8%
	Jefferson	51,407	52,677	2.5%
	Knox	432,226	448,644	3.8%
	Loudon	48,556	50,771	4.6%
	Monroe	44,519	45,233	1.6%
	Morgan	21,987	21,660	-1.5%
	Roane	54,181	52,748	-2.6%
	Scott	22,228	21,987	-1.1%
	Sevier	89,889	95,110	5.8%
	Union	19,109	19,113	0.0%
3	Bledsoe	12,876	13,931	8.2%
	Bradley	98,963	102,975	4.1%
	Clay	7,861	7,765	-1.2%
	Cumberland	56,053	57,985	3.4%
	DeKalb	18,723	19,268	2.9%
	Fentress	17,959	17,855	-0.6%
	Grundy	13,703	13,425	-2.0%
	Hamilton	336,463	351,220	4.4%

PPR	County	Census 2010	Pop.est. 2014	Est. pop. growth
3	Jackson	11,638	11,568	-0.6%
	Macon	22,248	23,003	3.4%
	Marion	28,237	28,407	0.6%
	McMinn	52,266	52,626	0.7%
	Meigs	11,753	11,701	-0.4%
	Overton	22,083	22,028	-0.2%
	Pickett	5,077	5,124	0.9%
	Polk	16,825	16,730	-0.6%
	Putnam	72,321	74,165	2.5%
	Rhea	31,809	32,641	2.6%
	Sequatchie	14,112	14,704	4.2%
	Smith	19,166	19,009	-0.8%
	Van Buren	5,548	5,633	1.5%
	Warren	39,839	39,969	0.3%
White	25,841	26,301	1.8%	
4	<b>Davidson</b>	<b>626,681</b>	<b>668,347</b>	<b>6.6%</b>
5	Bedford	45,058	46,627	3.5%
	Cannon	13,801	13,757	-0.3%
	Cheatham	39,105	39,764	1.7%
	Coffee	52,796	53,623	1.6%
	Dickson	49,666	50,575	1.8%
	Franklin	41,052	41,402	0.9%
	Giles	29,485	28,853	-2.1%
	Hickman	24,690	24,384	-1.2%
	Houston	8,426	8,267	-1.9%
	Humphreys	18,538	18,135	-2.2%
	Lawrence	41,869	42,274	1.0%
	Lewis	12,161	11,906	-2.1%
	Lincoln	33,361	33,637	0.8%
Marshall	30,617	31,269	2.1%	
Maury	80,956	85,515	5.6%	
Montgomery	172,331	189,961	10.2%	

PPR	County	Census 2010	Pop.est. 2014	Est. pop. growth
5	Moore	6,362	6,319	-0.7%
	Perry	7,915	7,822	-1.2%
	Robertson	66,283	68,079	2.7%
	Rutherford	262,604	288,906	10.0%
	Stewart	13,324	13,279	-0.3%
	Sumner	160,645	172,706	7.5%
	Trousdale	7,870	8,002	1.7%
	Wayne	17,021	16,913	-0.6%
	Williamson	183,182	205,226	12.0%
	Wilson	113,993	125,376	10.0%
6	Benton	16,489	16,145	-2.1%
	Carroll	28,522	28,370	-0.5%
	Chester	17,131	17,379	1.4%
	Crockett	14,586	14,668	0.6%
	Decatur	11,757	11,666	-0.8%
	Dyer	38,335	37,935	-1.0%
	Fayette	38,413	39,011	1.6%
	Gibson	49,683	49,472	-0.4%
	Hardeman	27,253	25,965	-4.7%
	Hardin	26,026	25,870	-0.6%
	Haywood	18,787	18,185	-3.2%
	Henderson	27,769	28,009	0.9%
	Henry	32,330	32,204	-0.4%
	Lake	7,832	7,631	-2.6%
Lauderdale	27,815	27,382	-1.6%	
Madison	98,294	98,178	-0.1%	
McNairy	26,075	26,267	0.7%	
Obion	31,807	30,941	-2.7%	
Tipton	61,081	61,623	0.9%	
Weakley	35,021	34,373	-1.9%	
7	<b>Shelby</b>	<b>927,644</b>	<b>938,803</b>	<b>1.2%</b>
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>6,346,105</b>	<b>6,549,352</b>	<b>3.2%</b>

Data source: 2010 Census, United States Census Bureau (2014 population estimates).

Data note: Estimated population growth=(2014 population estimate - 2010 Census population)/2010 Census population.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Table 3. Tennessee population indicators: age, gender, race and ethnicity (Census 2014 estimates)**


Top 25% Bottom 25%

Indicator	TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region							TN
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>Regional Population (Census 2014 estimates)</b>								
Population numbers	507,724	1,202,594	968,033	668,347	1,632,577	631,274	938,803	6,549,352
Population as a percentage of the State population	7.8%	18.4%	14.8%	10.2%	24.9%	9.6%	14.3%	
<b>Regional population by age (Census 2014 estimates)</b>								
Individuals under 18 years	100,752	255,782	207,425	144,015	405,260	141,928	239,364	1,494,526
Individuals under 18 years as a percentage of the regional population	19.8%	21.3%	21.4%	21.5%	24.8%	22.5%	25.5%	
Individuals ages 18-64 years	309,019	739,218	588,785	450,293	1,010,289	381,130	590,392	4,069,126
Individuals ages 18-64 years as a percentage of the regional population	60.9%	61.5%	60.8%	67.4%	61.9%	60.4%	62.9%	
Individuals ages 65 years and over	97,953	207,594	171,823	74,039	217,028	108,216	109,047	985,700
Individuals ages 65 years and over as a percentage of the regional population	19.3%	17.3%	17.7%	11.1%	13.3%	17.1%	11.6%	
<b>Regional population by gender (Census 2014 estimates)</b>								
Female individuals	258,896	614,644	494,636	346,406	828,578	322,333	491,679	3,357,172
Female individuals as a percentage of the regional population	51.0%	51.1%	51.1%	51.8%	50.8%	51.1%	52.4%	
Male individuals	248,828	587,950	473,397	321,941	803,999	308,941	447,124	3,192,180
Male individuals as a percentage of the regional population	49.0%	48.9%	48.9%	48.2%	49.2%	48.9%	47.6%	
<b>Regional population by race (Census 2014 estimates)</b>								
Black or African American individuals	13,018	58,457	85,547	187,733	147,782	126,199	500,383	1,119,119
Black or African American individuals as a percentage of the regional population	2.56%	4.86%	8.84%	28.09%	9.05%	19.99%	53.30%	
White individuals	482,029	1,102,237	849,967	438,623	1,410,346	489,127	396,905	5,169,234
White individuals as a percentage of the regional population	94.94%	91.65%	87.80%	65.63%	86.39%	77.48%	42.28%	
Other individuals (American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races)	12,677	41,900	32,519	41,991	74,449	15,948	41,515	260,999
Other individuals (American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races) as a percentage of the regional population	2.50%	3.48%	3.36%	6.28%	4.56%	2.53%	4.42%	
<b>Regional population by ethnicity (Census 2014 estimates)</b>								
Individuals of Hispanic or Latino Origin	11,605	46,739	42,450	66,369	87,843	18,022	55,951	328,979
Individuals of Hispanic or Latino Origin as a percentage of the regional population	2.29%	3.89%	4.39%	9.93%	5.38%	2.85%	5.96%	

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2014).

## 1.2. Poverty in Tennessee


**Figure 1. Poverty in Tennessee by Planning and Policy Region (based on 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)**



**Table 4. Poverty in Tennessee (American Community Survey 2010-2014; Census 2014 estimates)**

Indicator	Tennessee Mental Health Planning and Policy Region							TN
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Percentage of individuals living in poverty.	19.4%	17.4%	19.1%	18.8%	13.6%	19.7%	21.3%	<b>17.8%</b>
Estimated number of individuals living in poverty.	98,711	209,127	185,167	125,649	222,783	124,431	199,965	<b>1,165,833</b>

**Figure 1A. Poverty in Tennessee by county (based on 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)**



Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Data note: Estimated number of individuals living in poverty calculated by applying poverty percentages from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates per county (U.S. Census Bureau). Regional poverty percentages are calculated by adding poverty percentages weighted by the population in each county and region.

## POVERTY: GENDER AND AGE

Chart 1. 18% of individuals in Tennessee live in poverty




Chart 2. 55% of individuals living in poverty are female.




Chart 3. At 25.7%, children/youth have the highest poverty percentage.





Table 5. Poverty in Tennessee (American Community Survey 2010-2014; Census 2014 estimates)

Indicator	Tennessee Mental Health Planning and Policy Region							TN
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Female individuals living in poverty as percentage of regional female population.	20.9%	18.7%	20.6%	20.00%	14.7%	21.1%	22.80%	19.2%
Estimated number of female individuals living in poverty.	54,174	115,025	101,818	69,281	122,097	68,165	112,103	642,662
Male individuals living in poverty as percentage of regional male population.	17.9%	16.0%	17.6%	17.60%	12.5%	18.1%	19.60%	16.4%
Estimated number of male individuals living in poverty.	44,569	94,155	83,221	56,662	100,591	56,059	87,636	522,893
Individuals under 18 years living in poverty as percentage of regional population <18 years.	28.4%	24.4%	27.4%	30.50%	18.6%	27.4%	32.50%	25.8%
Estimated number of individuals under 18 years living in poverty.	28,634	62,372	56,773	43,925	75,571	38,911	77,793	383,979
Individuals aged 18-64 years living in poverty as percentage of regional population 18-64 years.	19.1%	17.1%	18.5%	16.60%	12.6%	18.7%	18.40%	16.6%
Estimated number of individuals aged 18-64 years living in poverty.	58,886	126,067	108,866	74,749	127,460	71,369	108,632	676,028
Individuals aged 65 and over living in poverty as percentage of regional population ages 65 and over.	10.7%	9.3%	10.8%	9.00%	8.5%	12.1%	11.00%	10.0%
Estimated number of individuals aged 65 years and over living in poverty.	10,468	19,284	18,495	6,664	18,422	13,143	11,995	98,472

Data source: 2010 Census, United States Census Bureau (2014 population estimates); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Data note: Estimated number of individuals living in poverty calculated by applying poverty percentages from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates per county (U.S. Census Bureau). Regional poverty percentages are calculated by adding poverty percentages weighted by the population in each county and region.

**Chart 4. Individuals living in poverty in Tennessee: race and ethnicity**



**Table 6. Poverty in Tennessee: race and ethnicity (American Community Survey 2010-2014; Census 2014 estimates)**

Indicator	Tennessee Mental Health Planning and Policy Region							TN
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>Poverty by race (American Community Survey 2010-2014; Census 2014 estimates)</b>								
Percentage of White individuals living in poverty (federal poverty level) as percentage of regional White population.	18.7%	16.4%	17.6%	13.2%	12.2%	16.1%	9.8%	14.9%
Estimated number of White individuals living in poverty.	90,209	180,472	149,568	57,898	172,723	78,753	38,897	768,520
Percentage of Black or African American individuals living in poverty as percentage of regional Black or African American population.	34.9%	32.4%	30.5%	28.2%	22.6%	32.7%	29.7%	29.1%
Estimated number of Black or African American individuals living in poverty.	4,542	18,938	26,067	52,941	33,445	41,326	148,614	325,873
Percentage of individuals with Other races (American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Some Other Race, Two or More Races) living in poverty as percentage of regional population.	33.0%	23.3%	28.3%	27.9%	22.5%	29.6%	25.0%	25.7%
Estimated number of individuals with Other races (American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Some Other Race, Two or More Races) living in poverty.	4,188	9,743	9,193	11,719	16,738	4,717	10,367	67,077
<b>Poverty by ethnicity (American Community Survey 2010-2014; Census 2014 estimates)</b>								
Percentage of Hispanic or Latino individuals living in poverty as percentage of regional Hispanic or Latino population.	42.5%	35.0%	39.7%	33.40%	26.5%	35.6%	37.70%	34.0%
Estimated number of Hispanic or Latino individuals living in poverty.	4,930	16,372	16,846	22,167	23,313	6,409	21,094	111,131

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: 2010 Census, United States Census Bureau (2014 population estimates); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Data note: Estimated region/county numbers of individuals living in poverty calculated by applying poverty percentages from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates per county (U.S. Census Bureau). Estimated Tennessee numbers are calculated by applying statewide poverty percentages from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates in Tennessee (U.S. Census Bureau).

**Table 7. Poverty in Tennessee (American Community Survey 2010-2014; Census 2014 estimates)**

PPR	County name	Pop. est. 2014	% Poverty	# Poverty
1	Carter	56,886	23.5%	13,368
1	Greene	68,335	22.1%	15,102
1	Hancock	6,657	27.8%	1,851
1	Hawkins	56,735	17.0%	9,645
1	Johnson	17,859	23.3%	4,161
1	Sullivan	157,047	18.0%	28,268
1	Unicoi	17,963	20.7%	3,718
1	Washington	126,242	17.9%	22,597
<b>Region 1</b>		<b>507,724</b>	<b>19.4%</b>	<b>98,711</b>
2	Anderson	75,528	17.1%	12,915
2	Blount	126,339	14.4%	18,193
2	Campbell	39,918	22.6%	9,021
2	Claiborne	31,592	24.0%	7,582
2	Cocke	35,374	27.8%	9,834
2	Grainger	22,864	21.2%	4,847
2	Hamblen	63,036	22.0%	13,868
2	Jefferson	52,677	16.6%	8,744
2	Knox	448,644	15.3%	68,643
2	Loudon	50,771	15.7%	7,971
2	Monroe	45,233	19.0%	8,594
2	Morgan	21,660	22.0%	4,765
2	Roane	52,748	17.2%	9,073
2	Scott	21,987	27.7%	6,090
2	Sevier	95,110	15.4%	14,647
2	Union	19,113	22.7%	4,339
<b>Region 2</b>		<b>1,202,594</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>209,127</b>
3	Bledsoe	13,931	21.6%	3,009
3	Bradley	102,975	19.8%	20,389
3	Clay	7,765	21.8%	1,693
3	Cumberland	57,985	16.4%	9,510
3	DeKalb	19,268	19.7%	3,796
3	Fentress	17,855	24.7%	4,410
3	Grundy	13,425	29.1%	3,907
3	Hamilton	351,220	16.0%	56,195

PPR	County name	Pop. est. 2014	% Poverty	# Poverty
3	Jackson	11,568	24.1%	2,788
3	Macon	23,003	21.2%	4,877
3	Marion	28,407	20.3%	5,767
3	McMinn	52,626	18.5%	9,736
3	Meigs	11,701	21.9%	2,563
3	Overton	22,028	22.4%	4,934
3	Pickett	5,124	16.7%	856
3	Polk	16,730	18.9%	3,162
3	Putnam	74,165	25.2%	18,690
3	Rhea	32,641	23.0%	7,507
3	Sequatchie	14,704	18.6%	2,735
3	Smith	19,009	15.9%	3,022
3	Van Buren	5,633	21.6%	1,217
3	Warren	39,969	21.5%	8,593
3	White	26,301	22.1%	5,813
<b>Region 3</b>		<b>968,033</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>185,167</b>
4	Davidson	668,347	18.8%	125,649
5	Bedford	46,627	21.1%	9,838
5	Cannon	13,757	18.1%	2,490
5	Cheatham	39,764	15.1%	6,004
5	Coffee	53,623	21.3%	11,422
5	Dickson	50,575	14.5%	7,333
5	Franklin	41,402	15.9%	6,583
5	Giles	28,853	17.8%	5,136
5	Hickman	24,384	18.8%	4,584
5	Houston	8,267	21.8%	1,802
5	Humphreys	18,135	16.4%	2,974
5	Lawrence	42,274	19.4%	8,201
5	Lewis	11,906	19.8%	2,357
5	Lincoln	33,637	16.3%	5,483
5	Marshall	31,269	15.5%	4,847
5	Mauzy	85,515	16.1%	13,768
5	Montgomery	189,961	16.3%	30,964

Top 25% Bottom 25%

PPR	County name	Pop. est. 2014	% Poverty	# Poverty
5	Moore	6,319	12.3%	777
5	Perry	7,822	23.8%	1,862
5	Robertson	68,079	12.3%	8,374
5	Rutherford	288,906	13.3%	38,424
5	Stewart	13,279	19.1%	2,536
5	Sumner	172,706	10.2%	17,616
5	Trousdale	8,002	15.9%	1,272
5	Wayne	16,913	21.3%	3,602
5	Williamson	205,226	5.6%	11,493
5	Wilson	125,376	10.4%	13,039
<b>Region 5</b>		<b>1,632,577</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>222,783</b>
6	Benton	16,145	21.8%	3,520
6	Carroll	28,370	19.4%	5,504
6	Chester	17,379	20.0%	3,476
6	Crockett	14,668	17.9%	2,626
6	Decatur	11,666	21.8%	2,543
6	Dyer	37,935	16.0%	6,070
6	Fayette	39,011	14.5%	5,657
6	Gibson	49,472	19.3%	9,548
6	Hardeman	25,965	25.9%	6,725
6	Hardin	25,870	22.2%	5,743
6	Haywood	18,185	23.7%	4,310
6	Henderson	28,009	20.7%	5,798
6	Henry	32,204	19.8%	6,376
6	Lake	7,631	29.7%	2,266
6	Lauderdale	27,382	26.3%	7,201
6	Madison	98,178	20.1%	19,734
6	McNairy	26,267	22.7%	5,963
6	Obion	30,941	19.1%	5,910
6	Tipton	61,623	13.1%	8,073
6	Weakley	34,373	21.5%	7,390
<b>Region 6</b>		<b>631,274</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>124,431</b>
7	Shelby	938,803	21.3%	199,965
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>6,549,352</b>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>1,165,785</b>

Data source: 2010 Census, United States Census Bureau (2014 population estimates); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Data note: Estimated number of individuals living in poverty calculated by applying poverty percentages from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates per county (U.S. Census Bureau). Regional poverty percentages are calculated by adding poverty percentages weighted by the population in each county and region.

## **SECTION 2: TDMHSAS-FUNDED SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES**

## **2.1. TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services: enrollment demographics**

Section 2 includes data from admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services. The following table displays the number of treatment admissions for the different levels of care for the last three fiscal years available. All data displayed on the following pages in section 2 (substance abuse **treatment** services) are based on treatment admissions to the levels of care as displayed in the following table. These numbers represent **duplicated** admissions - a single individual might have been admitted more than one time to several level of cares or had several admissions during the fiscal year.

**Table 8. Admissions by level of care**

Level of care	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adolescent day treatment	279	2.0%	473	3.4%	394	2.9%
Adolescent outpatient	236	1.7%	151	1.1%	159	1.2%
Adolescent residential rehab	236	1.7%	208	1.5%	-	-
Ambulatory detoxification services	1,721	12.5%	1,880	13.5%	2,066	15.1%
Ambulatory intensive outpatient services	2,840	20.6%	3,089	22.2%	3,292	24.0%
Free standing residential detoxification services	2,789	20.3%	2,667	19.2%	2,586	18.9%
Halfway house	666	4.8%	827	5.9%	951	6.9%
Hospital inpatient detoxification services	108	0.8%	107	0.8%	114	0.8%
Intensive outpatient services for women	635	4.6%	664	4.8%	487	3.6%
Intensive outpatient services for women who are pregnant	39	0.3%	57	0.4%	38	0.3%
Residential rehabilitation services for women who are pregnant	37	0.3%	44	0.3%	49	0.4%
Residential short-term (<=30 days) services	4,178	30.4%	3,751	27.0%	3,564	26.0%
N/A	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
<b>Total number</b>	<b>13,765</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>13,918</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>13,702</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Chart 5. In FY2015, 64% of substance abuse treatment services admissions were male.




Table 9. Admissions to levels of care by gender

Level of care	FEMALE						MALE					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ambulatory detoxification services	490	28.5%	551	29.3%	729	35.3%	1,231	71.5%	1,329	70.7%	1,337	64.7%
Ambulatory intensive outpatient services	1,043	36.7%	984	31.9%	1,074	32.6%	1,797	63.3%	2,105	68.1%	2,218	67.4%
Free standing residential detoxification services	937	33.6%	842	31.6%	834	32.3%	1,852	66.4%	1,825	68.4%	1,752	67.7%
Hospital inpatient detoxification services	30	27.8%	25	23.4%	31	27.2%	78	72.2%	82	76.6%	83	72.8%
Halfway house	215	32.3%	280	33.9%	373	39.2%	451	67.7%	547	66.1%	578	60.8%
Residential short-term (<=30 days) services	1,316	31.5%	1,222	32.6%	1,206	33.8%	2,862	68.5%	2,529	67.4%	2,358	66.2%
Services for adolescents only (day treatment, outpatient and residential rehab services)	170	22.6%	198	23.8%	127	23.0%	581	77.4%	634	76.2%	426	77.0%
N/A	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
<b>SERVICES FOR FEMALES ONLY</b>												
Intensive outpatient services for women who are pregnant	39	-	57	-	38	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential rehabilitation services for women who are pregnant	37	-	44	-	49	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensive outpatient services for women	635	-	664	-	487	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>4,912</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>4,867</b>	<b>35.0%</b>	<b>4,949</b>	<b>36.1%</b>	<b>8,853</b>	<b>64.3%</b>	<b>9,051</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>8,753</b>	<b>63.9%</b>

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).


# ENROLLMENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 10. Admissions by region

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Tennessee	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7	N/A
<b>FY13</b>	<b>13,765</b>	1,783	2,911	1,690	1,457	1,909	1,617	2,351	47
	<b>100%</b>	<b>12.95%</b>	<b>21.15%</b>	<b>12.28%</b>	<b>10.58%</b>	<b>13.87%</b>	<b>11.75%</b>	<b>17.08%</b>	<b>0.34%</b>
<b>FY14</b>	<b>13,918</b>	1,895	2,804	1,815	1,589	1,866	1,778	2,165	6
	<b>100%</b>	<b>13.62%</b>	<b>20.15%</b>	<b>13.04%</b>	<b>11.42%</b>	<b>13.41%</b>	<b>12.77%</b>	<b>15.56%</b>	<b>0.04%</b>
<b>FY15</b>	<b>13,702</b>	2,036	2,542	1,817	1,831	1,681	1,712	2,075	8
	<b>100%</b>	<b>14.86%</b>	<b>18.55%</b>	<b>13.26%</b>	<b>13.36%</b>	<b>12.27%</b>	<b>12.49%</b>	<b>15.14%</b>	<b>0.06%</b>

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Chart 6. Regional admissions per 1,000 population living in poverty




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

**Table 11. Regional admissions by gender**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	741	41.60%	773	40.80%	927	45.53%	1,042	58.40%	1,122	59.20%	1,109	54.47%
Region 2	1,234	42.40%	1,144	40.80%	1,021	40.17%	1,677	57.60%	1,660	59.20%	1,521	59.83%
Region 3	644	38.10%	691	38.10%	696	38.30%	1,046	61.90%	1,124	61.90%	1,121	61.70%
Region 4	572	39.30%	542	34.10%	696	38.01%	885	60.70%	1,047	65.90%	1,135	61.99%
Region 5	613	32.10%	619	33.20%	546	32.48%	1,296	67.90%	1,247	66.80%	1,135	67.52%
Region 6	508	31.40%	515	29.00%	501	29.26%	1,109	68.60%	1,263	71.00%	1,211	70.74%
Region 7	595	25.30%	580	26.80%	558	26.89%	1,756	74.70%	1,585	73.20%	1,517	73.11%
N/A	5	*	<5	*	<5	*	42	89.36%	<5	*	<5	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>4,912</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>4,867</b>	<b>35.0%</b>	<b>4,949</b>	<b>36.1%</b>	<b>8,853</b>	<b>64.3%</b>	<b>9,048</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>8,753</b>	<b>63.9%</b>

**Chart 7. Regional admissions by gender: FY2015**




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

**Table 12. Regional admissions by age groups**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Region 1</b>	246	40.4%	310	35.3%	295	47.0%	290	13.7%	273	12.8%	242	13.5%	1,247	11.3%	1,312	12.0%	1,499	13.3%
<b>Region 2</b>	90	14.8%	114	13.0%	66	10.5%	522	24.6%	491	23.1%	353	19.7%	2,299	20.8%	2,199	20.2%	2,122	18.8%
<b>Region 3</b>	55	9.0%	59	6.7%	8	*	248	11.7%	301	14.1%	236	13.1%	1,387	12.6%	1,455	13.3%	1,573	14.0%
<b>Region 4</b>	36	5.9%	119	13.6%	109	17.4%	164	7.7%	192	9.0%	224	12.5%	1,257	11.4%	1,277	11.7%	1,493	13.3%
<b>Region 5</b>	59	9.7%	139	15.8%	49	7.8%	346	16.3%	318	14.9%	292	16.3%	1,504	13.6%	1,408	12.9%	1,339	11.9%
<b>Region 6</b>	57	9.4%	99	11.3%	88	14.0%	263	12.4%	262	12.3%	218	12.1%	1,297	11.8%	1,417	13.0%	1,405	12.5%
<b>Region 7</b>	66	10.8%	37	4.2%	<5	*	279	13.1%	291	13.7%	230	12.8%	2,005	18.2%	1,835	16.8%	1,826	16.2%
<b>N/A</b>	0	*	0	*	<5	*	11	*	0	*	0	*	36	76.6%	6	*	8	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	609	100%	877	100%	627	100%	2,123	100%	2,128	100%	1,795	100%	11,032	100%	10,909	100%	11,265	100%

**Chart 8. Regional admissions by age groups: FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).


Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

# ENROLLMENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 13. Regional admissions by race

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	88	4.9%	78	4.1%	86	4.2%	1,662	93.2%	1,778	93.8%	1,917	94.2%
Region 2	162	5.6%	163	5.8%	158	6.2%	2,696	92.6%	2,607	93.0%	2,338	92.0%
Region 3	157	9.3%	191	10.5%	159	8.8%	1,511	89.4%	1,598	88.0%	1,626	89.5%
Region 4	631	43.3%	662	41.7%	800	43.7%	775	53.2%	837	52.7%	951	51.9%
Region 5	228	11.9%	253	13.6%	185	11.0%	1,624	85.1%	1,563	83.8%	1,466	87.2%
Region 6	332	20.5%	465	26.2%	401	23.4%	1,265	78.2%	1,288	72.4%	1,286	75.1%
Region 7	1,480	63.0%	1,253	57.9%	1,147	55.3%	829	35.3%	873	40.3%	901	43.4%
N/A	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	46	82.1%	<5	*	7	*
Tennessee	3,079	22%	3,068	22%	2,937	21.4%	10,408	76%	10,547	76%	10,492	76.6%

Chart 9. Regional admissions by race: FY2015



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

# ENROLLMENT DEMOGRAPHICS


**Table 14. Regional admissions by ethnicity: Hispanic and Latino**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Hispanic or Latino					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	13	0.7%	22	1.2%	25	1.2%
Region 2	40	1.4%	36	1.3%	44	1.7%
Region 3	17	1.0%	23	1.3%	22	1.2%
Region 4	39	2.7%	70	4.4%	41	2.2%
Region 5	43	2.3%	35	1.9%	20	1.2%
Region 6	17	1.1%	23	1.3%	32	1.9%
Region 7	35	1.5%	23	1.1%	27	1.3%
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*
Tennessee	204	1.5%	232	1.7%	211	1.5%

Please note that race and ethnicity are collected separately.

Top 25% Bottom 25%

**Chart 10. Regional admissions by ethnicity: Hispanic and Latino in FY 2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

## 2.2. TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services: primary substances of abuse

Alcohol  
Cocaine/crack  
Heroin  
Marijuana  
Methamphetamines/stimulants  
Prescription opioids  
Other illicit drugs<sup>1</sup>  
Other prescription drugs<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Please note that "Other illicit drugs" include LSD, non-Prescription Methadone, other hallucinogens, aerosols, PCP or PCP combination, solvents, ketamine (Special K), diphenhydramine, nitrites and other over-the-counter drugs, inhalants or unknown drugs.


<sup>2</sup> Please note that "Other prescription drugs" include clonazepam, alprazolam, diazepam, lorazepam, other barbiturate sedatives and tranquilizers, ethchlorvynol, chlordiazepoxide, barbiturates, clorazepate, triazolam, flunitrazepam and other non-barbiturate sedatives and benzodiazepines.

**Table 15. Statewide admissions by primary substance of abuse**

Primary substance of abuse	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Prescription opioids	4,289	31.2%	4,168	29.9%	4,071	29.7%
Alcohol	4,089	29.7%	4,046	29.1%	3,982	29.1%
Marijuana	2,279	16.6%	2,410	17.3%	2,065	15.1%
Cocaine/crack	1,358	9.9%	1,288	9.3%	1,176	8.6%
Methamphetamine/other stimulants	856	6.2%	977	7.0%	1,030	7.5%
Heroin	454	3.3%	560	4.0%	839	6.1%
Other illicit or prescription drugs	375	2.7%	404	2.9%	483	3.5%
N/A	65	0.5%	65	0.5%	56	0.4%
<b>Total number of admissions</b>	<b>13,765</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13,918</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13,702</b>	<b>100%</b>

Top 25% Bottom 25%

**Chart 11. Since FY13, prescription opioids, alcohol and marijuana were identified as main substances of abuse for 75.8% (average).**




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

# PRIMARY SUBSTANCES OF ABUSE

Table 16. Regional percentages of admissions by primary substances of abuse

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Prescription opioids			Alcohol			Marijuana			Cocaine/crack			Methamphetamine/other stimulants			Heroin			Other illicit or prescription drugs		
	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY13	FY14	FY15
Region 1	37%	34%	38%	28%	29%	25%	21%	21%	18%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	6%	1%	1%	1%	5%	6%	6%
Region 2	59%	57%	54%	20%	19%	21%	8%	10%	10%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	3%
Region 3	38%	39%	36%	26%	26%	27%	11%	12%	9%	6%	5%	4%	14%	13%	16%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%
Region 4	16%	15%	15%	35%	33%	31%	18%	22%	22%	23%	20%	19%	1%	2%	3%	5%	5%	7%	2%	3%	4%
Region 5	26%	28%	32%	34%	31%	31%	18%	18%	14%	9%	9%	7%	7%	7%	8%	2%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%
Region 6	21%	18%	18%	34%	33%	32%	17%	20%	16%	9%	9%	9%	13%	15%	15%	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%	3%
Region 7	7%	7%	8%	37%	37%	38%	26%	22%	19%	17%	17%	14%	3%	3%	2%	8%	12%	17%	1%	1%	1%
Tennessee	31%	30%	30%	30%	29%	29%	17%	17%	15%	10%	9%	9%	6%	7%	8%	3%	4%	6%	3%	3%	4%

Chart 12. Percentages of primary substances of abuse by region: FY2015




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

# PRIMARY SUBSTANCES OF ABUSE

Table 17. Primary substance of abuse by gender

Primary substance of abuse	FEMALE						MALE					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Alcohol	1,092	26.7%	1,068	26.4%	1,059	26.6%	2,997	73.3%	2,978	73.6%	2,923	73.4%
Cocaine/crack	581	42.8%	485	37.7%	479	40.7%	777	57.2%	803	62.3%	697	59.3%
Heroin	146	32.2%	198	35.4%	315	37.5%	308	67.8%	362	64.6%	524	62.5%
Marijuana	553	24.3%	612	25.4%	495	24.0%	1,726	75.7%	1,798	74.6%	1,570	76.0%
Methamphetamines/stimulants	368	43.0%	427	43.7%	462	44.9%	488	57.0%	550	56.3%	568	55.1%
Prescription opioids	1,951	45.5%	1,873	44.9%	1,889	46.4%	2,338	54.5%	2,295	55.1%	2,182	53.6%
Other illicit or prescription drugs	188	50.1%	184	45.5%	236	48.9%	187	49.9%	220	54.5%	247	51.1%
N/A	33	50.8%	20	30.8%	14	*	32	49.2%	45	69.2%	42	75.0%
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>4,912</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>4,867</b>	<b>35.0%</b>	<b>4,949</b>	<b>36.1%</b>	<b>8,853</b>	<b>64.3%</b>	<b>9,051</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>8,753</b>	<b>63.9%</b>

Chart 13. Primary substances of abuse by gender: FY2015




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

**Table 18. Primary substance of abuse by age group**

Primary substance of abuse	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Alcohol	45	7.4%	87	9.9%	62	9.9%	283	13.3%	270	12.7%	270	15.0%	3,761	34.0%	3,687	33.8%	3,642	32.3%
Cocaine/crack	<5	0.5%	10	1.1%	<5	0.2%	70	3.3%	77	3.6%	65	3.6%	1,284	12.0%	1,201	11.0%	1,109	9.8%
Heroin	<5	0.2%	<5	0.2%	<5	0.2%	90	4.2%	104	4.9%	127	7.1%	363	3.0%	453	4.2%	711	6.3%
Marijuana	506	83.1%	679	77.4%	451	71.9%	635	29.9%	609	28.6%	463	25.8%	1,138	10.0%	1,122	10.3%	1,148	10.2%
Methamphetamines stimulants	5	0.8%	17	1.9%	10	1.6%	140	6.6%	185	8.7%	169	9.4%	711	6.0%	775	7.1%	850	7.5%
Prescription opioids	33	5.4%	31	3.5%	17	2.7%	819	38.6%	811	38.1%	639	35.6%	3,437	31.0%	3,325	30.5%	3,413	30.3%
Other illicit or prescription drugs	16	2.6%	47	5.4%	48	7.7%	72	3.4%	64	3.0%	60	3.3%	287	2.6%	293	2.7%	375	3.3%
N/A	0	*	<5	*	37	63.8%	14	*	8	*	<5	*	51	78%	53	81.54%	17	*
<b>Total admissions</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>877</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,123</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,128</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,795</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11,032</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10,909</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11,265</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Chart 14. Primary substances of abuse by age groups: FY2015**




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

**Table 19. Primary substance of abuse by race**

Primary substance of abuse	Black or African American						White					
	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Alcohol	926	30.1%	997	32.5%	953	32.4%	3,054	29.3%	2,962	28.1%	2,936	28.0%
Cocaine/crack	862	28.0%	790	25.7%	730	24.9%	478	4.6%	476	4.5%	433	4.1%
Heroin	40	1.3%	63	2.1%	74	2.5%	402	3.9%	491	4.7%	751	7.2%
Marijuana	1,067	34.7%	1,019	33.2%	930	31.7%	1,137	10.9%	1,271	12.1%	1,054	10.0%
Methamphetamines/stimulants	9	*	11	*	14	*	837	8.0%	956	9.1%	1,000	9.5%
Prescription opioids	141	4.6%	121	3.9%	140	4.8%	4,107	39.5%	4,001	37.9%	3,885	37.0%
Other illicit or prescription drugs	22	0.7%	47	0.9%	62	1.5%	345	1.2%	346	1.3%	412	1.5%
Not available	12	*	20	*	34	2.2%	48	2.6%	44	2.3%	21	2.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,079</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,068</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,937</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10,408</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10,547</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10,492</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Chart 15. Primary substances of abuse by race: FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).


Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

**Table 20. Primary substance of abuse by ethnicity**

Primary substance of abuse	Hispanic or Latino					
	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Alcohol	78	38.2%	73	31.5%	71	33.6%
Cocaine/crack	10	4.9%	14	6.0%	12	5.7%
Heroin	7	3.4%	7	3.0%	14	6.6%
Marijuana	62	30.4%	77	33.2%	41	19.4%
Methamphetamines/stimulants	10	4.9%	13	5.6%	17	8.1%
Prescription opioids	32	15.7%	43	18.5%	45	21.3%
Other illicit or prescription drugs	4	2.0%	4	1.7%	11	5.2%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

**Chart 16. Primary substance of abuse by ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

## **2.3. TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services: prescription opioids, alcohol and marijuana**

## SUBSTANCES OF ABUSE

**Chart 21. Statewide admissions by substance of abuse**


Substance of abuse	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Prescription opioids	5,973	5,919	5,924
Alcohol	6,489	6,421	6,142
Marijuana	5,525	5,537	5,342
Cocaine/crack	2,942	2,780	2,737
Methamphetamine/other stimulants	1,623	1,880	2,093
Heroin	606	752	1,088
Other illicit or prescription drugs	2,887	2,661	2,694

Top 25% Bottom 25%

*These numbers reflect duplicated admissions with substances identified as either primary, secondary or tertiary substance of abuse.*

**Table 17. Statewide admissions by substance of abuse: FY2015**

**Alcohol, prescription opioids and marijuana were the top three substances of abuse in FY2015**




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).



**Table 22. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS identified as a substance of abuse: gender**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	453	46.7%	441	47.1%	589	54.2%	517	53.3%	496	52.9%	498	45.8%
Region 2	957	46.3%	863	44.4%	747	43.0%	1,112	53.7%	1,082	55.6%	992	57.0%
Region 3	379	43.1%	437	45.5%	417	45.0%	500	56.9%	523	54.5%	510	55.0%
Region 4	186	49.6%	194	48.5%	234	51.8%	189	50.4%	206	51.5%	218	48.2%
Region 5	301	39.7%	322	42.9%	309	38.9%	457	60.3%	428	57.1%	485	61.1%
Region 6	214	38.4%	202	36.6%	216	39.2%	343	61.6%	350	63.4%	335	60.8%
Region 7	127	37.4%	130	34.7%	139	37.6%	213	62.6%	245	65.3%	231	62.4%
N/A	<5	*	0	*	<5	*	23	*	0	*	<5	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>2,619</b>	<b>43.8%</b>	<b>2,589</b>	<b>43.7%</b>	<b>2,653</b>	<b>44.8%</b>	<b>3,354</b>	<b>56.2%</b>	<b>3,330</b>	<b>56.3%</b>	<b>3,271</b>	<b>55.2%</b>

**Chart 19. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS as a substance of abuse: Regional gender percentages in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions

Table 23. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS identified as a substance of abuse: age groups

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	56	5.8%	47	5.0%	43	4.0%	176	18.1%	186	19.9%	165	15.2%	738	76.1%	704	75.1%	879	80.9%
Region 2	22	1.1%	19	*	7	*	411	19.9%	375	19.3%	265	15.2%	1,636	79.1%	1,551	79.7%	1,466	84.3%
Region 3	18	*	21	2.2%	4	*	158	18.0%	191	19.9%	141	15.2%	703	80.0%	748	77.9%	782	84.4%
Region 4	1	*	2	*	6	*	52	13.9%	70	17.5%	69	15.3%	322	85.9%	327	81.8%	377	83.4%
Region 5	10	*	6	*	0	*	164	21.6%	149	19.9%	146	18.4%	584	77.0%	595	79.3%	648	81.6%
Region 6	8	*	11	*	3	*	86	15.4%	83	15.0%	58	10.5%	463	83.1%	458	83.0%	490	88.9%
Region 7	3	*	6	*	0	*	48	14.1%	54	14.4%	45	12.2%	289	85.0%	315	84.0%	322	87.0%
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*	6	*	0	*	0	*	19	*	0	*	<5	*
Tennessee	118	2.0%	112	1.9%	63	1.1%	1,101	18.4%	1,108	18.7%	889	15.0%	4,754	79.6%	4,698	79.4%	4,968	83.9%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Chart 20. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS as a substance of abuse: Regional age group percentages in FY2015




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).  
 Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

**Table 24. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS identified as a substance of abuse: race**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	23	2.4%	16	*	13	*	938	96.7%	904	96.5%	1,064	97.9%
Region 2	45	2.2%	47	2.4%	44	2.5%	2,004	96.9%	1,884	96.9%	1,674	96.3%
Region 3	12	*	11	*	20	2.2%	857	97.5%	938	97.7%	892	96.2%
Region 4	48	12.8%	37	9.3%	49	10.8%	317	84.5%	347	86.8%	391	86.5%
Region 5	20	2.6%	29	3.9%	23	2.9%	724	95.5%	713	95.1%	765	96.3%
Region 6	25	4.5%	38	6.9%	24	4.4%	530	95.2%	509	92.2%	525	95.3%
Region 7	100	29.4%	112	29.9%	112	30.3%	236	69.4%	259	69.1%	251	67.8%
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*	25	*	0	*	<5	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>5,631</b>	<b>94.3%</b>	<b>5,554</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>5,566</b>	<b>94.0%</b>

**Chart 21. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS as a substance of abuse: Regional race percentages in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.


## PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS AS A SUBSTANCE OF ABUSE

**Table 25. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS identified as a substance of abuse: Hispanic or Latino**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Hispanic or Latino					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	5	*	10	*	11	*
Region 2	14	*	17	*	30	1.7%
Region 3	6	*	13	*	10	*
Region 4	4	*	11	*	5	*
Region 5	16	*	9	*	7	*
Region 6	2	*	3	*	9	*
Region 7	1	*	2	*	3	*
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>1.3%</b>

*Please note that race and ethnicity are collected separately.*

**Chart 22. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS as a substance of abuse: Regional Hispanic or Latino percentages in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

**Table 26. Number and percentages of admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS as a substance of abuse**

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		
		#	%	#	%	#	%	
1	Carter	61	64.9%	52	50.5%	77	62.6%	
	Greene	176	66.2%	147	59.3%	128	54.9%	
	Hancock	14	*	17	*	14	*	
	Hawkins	101	72.7%	98	72.1%	135	72.2%	
	Johnson	30	40.5%	19	*	16	*	
	Sullivan	316	51.4%	318	45.6%	356	51.2%	
	Unicoi	28	65.1%	16	*	16	*	
	Washington	244	45.9%	270	44.6%	345	48.2%	
	Region 1	970	54.4%	937	49.4%	1,087	53.4%	
2	Anderson	141	72.3%	129	72.1%	101	63.9%	
	Blount	290	76.5%	244	73.3%	214	63.9%	
	Campbell	114	85.7%	100	90.1%	100	82.0%	
	Claiborne	51	87.9%	49	89.1%	58	93.5%	
	Cocke	71	81.6%	33	66.0%	48	71.6%	
	Grainger	41	78.8%	36	75.0%	39	81.3%	
	Hamblen	140	69.7%	173	67.1%	121	68.4%	
	Jefferson	47	69.1%	57	75.0%	43	71.7%	
	Knox	788	65.4%	792	65.3%	702	64.5%	
	Loudon	46	80.7%	39	69.6%	30	71.4%	
	Monroe	49	64.5%	39	51.3%	23	56.1%	
	Morgan	38	88.4%	30	83.3%	38	80.9%	
	Roane	64	82.1%	46	71.9%	47	73.4%	
	Scott	20	74.1%	24	80.0%	28	93.3%	
	Sevier	127	61.4%	118	67.4%	118	73.3%	
	Union	42	91.3%	36	80.0%	29	74.4%	
	Region 2	2,069	71.1%	1,945	69.4%	1,739	68.4%	
3	Bledsoe	5	*	7	*	5	*	
	Bradley	31	38.8%	23	31.1%	45	42.5%	
	Clay	11	*	21	53.8%	21	56.8%	
	Cumberland	62	62.6%	72	74.2%	54	70.1%	
	DeKalb	55	76.4%	55	75.3%	67	65.7%	
	Fentress	50	84.7%	49	81.7%	34	89.5%	
	Grundy	27	81.8%	23	67.6%	30	81.1%	
	Hamilton	250	35.6%	272	36.2%	299	38.5%	
	Region 3	2,069	71.1%	1,945	69.4%	1,739	68.4%	
3	Jackson	18	*	17	*	20	76.9%	
	Macon	16	*	19	*	12	*	
	Marion	19	55.9%	22	50.0%	24	58.5%	
	McMinn	36	51.4%	46	68.7%	50	66.7%	
	Meigs	10	*	5	*	8	*	
	Overton	21	67.7%	24	77.4%	10	*	
	Pickett	<5	*	6	*	<5	*	
	Polk	8	*	6	*	<5	*	
	Putnam	120	69.8%	126	70.8%	95	59.0%	
	Rhea	19	55.9%	24	66.7%	30	66.7%	
	Sequatchie	6	*	<5	*	5	*	
	Smith	22	75.9%	16	*	16	*	
	Van Buren	<5	*	10	*	9	*	
	Warren	39	50.0%	49	55.1%	48	50.5%	
	White	50	68.5%	64	76.2%	41	62.1%	
	Region 3	879	52.0%	960	52.9%	927	51.0%	
	Region 4 (Davidson)	375	25.7%	400	25.2%	452	24.7%	
5	Bedford	19	29.7%	13	*	13	*	
	Cannon	19	51.4%	14	*	11	*	
	Cheatham	23	45.1%	23	52.3%	23	74.2%	
	Coffee	53	33.3%	43	24.0%	60	36.8%	
	Dickson	51	57.3%	30	50.0%	27	46.6%	
	Franklin	27	43.5%	30	44.1%	24	47.1%	
	Giles	13	*	13	*	11	*	
	Hickman	14	*	16	*	21	58.3%	
	Houston	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	
	Humphreys	10	*	6	*	12	*	
	Lawrence	41	62.1%	37	55.2%	33	70.2%	
	Lewis	15	*	20	51.3%	20	57.1%	
	Lincoln	11	*	7	*	10	*	
	Marshall	11	*	7	*	12	*	
	Maury	39	29.1%	55	31.8%	41	38.0%	
	Montgomery	57	34.3%	72	47.7%	70	50.7%	
	Moore	0	*	0	*	<5	*	
Region 5	758	39.7%	750	40.2%	794	47.2%		
5	Perry	10	*	8	*	7	*	
	Robertson	29	48.3%	29	59.2%	36	52.2%	
	Rutherford	120	36.1%	136	38.0%	141	40.5%	
	Stewart	8	*	5	*	10	*	
	Sumner	100	41.5%	82	44.8%	84	44.0%	
	Trousdale	<5	*	0	*	8	*	
	Wayne	9	*	8	*	9	*	
	Williamson	28	28.3%	32	34.4%	46	49.5%	
	Wilson	45	47.9%	62	51.7%	61	53.5%	
	Region 5	758	39.7%	750	40.2%	794	47.2%	
	6	Benton	18	*	19	*	15	*
		Carroll	31	49.2%	28	45.2%	21	36.2%
		Chester	18	*	17	*	23	37.1%
		Crockett	11	*	14	*	15	*
		Decatur	8	*	7	*	7	*
		Dyer	32	31.1%	30	24.6%	32	31.4%
		Fayette	14	*	18	*	17	*
Gibson		47	29.2%	49	24.7%	57	24.8%	
Hardeman		25	46.3%	8	*	21	41.2%	
Hardin		37	55.2%	46	60.5%	41	60.3%	
Haywood		<5	*	11	*	6	*	
Henderson		46	46.5%	33	40.7%	42	46.2%	
Henry		34	47.9%	24	31.6%	25	51.0%	
Lake		11	*	13	*	10	*	
Lauderdale		18	*	30	30.3%	19	*	
Madison		95	26.0%	93	19.8%	94	21.3%	
McNairy		35	68.6%	38	62.3%	33	73.3%	
Obion	33	31.4%	29	32.6%	29	37.7%		
Tipton	23	30.7%	16	*	20	26.0%		
Weakley	18	*	29	52.7%	24	58.5%		
Region 6	557	34.4%	552	31.0%	551	32.2%		
Region 7 (Shelby)	340	14.5%	375	17.3%	370	17.8%		
County unknown	25	53.2%	0	*	<5	*		
Tennessee	5,973	43.4%	5,919	42.5%	5,924	43.2%		


**Top 25%** **Bottom 25%**

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).


Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Chart 23. Admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse**

*\*significant increase or decrease compared to previous fiscal year.*



**Figure 3. Admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: FY2015**




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Rates for counties not reported for events <20. Significance calculated by using z-score test for two population proportions.

**Table 27. Admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: gender**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	278	34.3%	289	34.7%	268	33.4%	532	65.7%	545	65.3%	534	66.6%
Region 2	287	29.3%	282	29.7%	292	32.1%	692	70.7%	667	70.3%	618	67.9%
Region 3	195	28.5%	201	27.1%	190	27.0%	489	71.5%	540	72.9%	515	73.0%
Region 4	288	34.2%	246	30.8%	297	32.9%	555	65.8%	552	69.2%	607	67.1%
Region 5	258	25.5%	240	25.6%	213	25.9%	755	74.5%	697	74.4%	609	74.1%
Region 6	231	25.5%	209	21.7%	192	21.7%	675	74.5%	756	78.3%	693	78.3%
Region 7	325	26.6%	303	25.4%	264	23.8%	899	73.4%	892	74.6%	845	76.2%
N/A	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	28	*	0	*	<5	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>1,864</b>	<b>28.7%</b>	<b>1,772</b>	<b>27.6%</b>	<b>1,718</b>	<b>28.0%</b>	<b>4,625</b>	<b>71.3%</b>	<b>4,649</b>	<b>72.4%</b>	<b>4,424</b>	<b>72.0%</b>

**Chart 24. Admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: Regional gender percentages in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

# ALCOHOL AS A SUBSTANCE OF ABUSE

**Table 28. Admissions with ALCOHOL identified as a substance of abuse: age groups**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	101	12.5%	144	17.3%	137	17.1%	89	11.0%	64	7.7%	67	8.4%	620	76.5%	626	75.1%	598	74.6%
Region 2	52	5.3%	73	7.7%	28	3.1%	113	11.5%	111	11.7%	96	10.5%	814	83.1%	765	80.6%	786	86.4%
Region 3	21	3.1%	20	2.7%	<5	*	58	8.5%	74	10.0%	54	7.6%	605	88.5%	647	87.3%	648	91.8%
Region 4	<5	*	28	3.5%	34	3.8%	51	6.0%	36	4.5%	59	6.5%	788	93.5%	733	92.0%	809	89.7%
Region 5	25	2.5%	78	8.3%	14	1.7%	126	12.4%	119	12.7%	120	14.6%	862	85.1%	739	79.0%	687	83.7%
Region 6	33	3.6%	53	5.5%	31	3.5%	129	14.2%	109	11.3%	99	11.2%	744	82.1%	803	83.2%	754	85.3%
Region 7	<5	*	18	1.5%	6	0.5%	103	8.4%	108	9.1%	92	8.3%	1,115	91.2%	1,067	89.4%	1,005	91.1%
N/A	0	*	0	*	<5	*	8	*	0	*	0	*	22	*	<5	*	5	*
Tennessee	241	3.7%	414	6.5%	253	4.1%	677	10.4%	621	9.7%	587	9.6%	5,570	85.9%	5,382	83.9%	5,292	86.3%

**Chart 25. Admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: Regional age group percentages in FY2015**

Top 25% Bottom 25%




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

**Table 29. Admissions with ALCOHOL identified as a substance of abuse: race**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Region 1</b>	42	5.2%	46	5.5%	48	6.0%	751	92.7%	774	92.8%	740	92.3%
<b>Region 2</b>	85	8.7%	78	8.2%	85	9.3%	870	88.9%	852	89.8%	808	88.8%
<b>Region 3</b>	65	9.5%	110	14.8%	73	10.4%	605	88.5%	623	84.1%	619	87.8%
<b>Region 4</b>	352	41.8%	315	39.5%	381	42.1%	459	54.4%	447	56.0%	483	53.4%
<b>Region 5</b>	135	13.3%	134	14.3%	109	13.3%	847	83.6%	771	82.3%	693	84.3%
<b>Region 6</b>	226	24.9%	280	29.0%	242	27.3%	664	73.3%	668	69.2%	625	70.6%
<b>Region 7</b>	710	58.0%	696	58.2%	618	55.7%	487	39.8%	472	39.5%	475	42.8%
<b>N/A</b>	<5	*	0	*	<5	20.0%	29	*	<5	*	<5	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>1,616</b>	<b>24.9%</b>	<b>1,659</b>	<b>25.8%</b>	<b>1,557</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>4,712</b>	<b>72.6%</b>	<b>4,609</b>	<b>71.8%</b>	<b>4,447</b>	<b>72.4%</b>

**Chart 26. Admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: Regional race percentages in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.


## ALCOHOL AS A SUBSTANCE OF ABUSE

**Table 30. Admissions with ALCOHOL identified as a substance of abuse: Hispanic or Latino**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Hispanic or Latino					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	8	*	6	*	10	*
Region 2	14	*	17	*	16	*
Region 3	13	*	9	*	7	*
Region 4	19	*	31	*	23	*
Region 5	20	*	22	*	17	*
Region 6	12	*	15	*	20	*
Region 7	19	*	17	*	12	*
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*
Tennessee	105	1.6%	117	1.8%	105	1.3%

*Please note that race and ethnicity are collected separately.*

**Chart 27. Admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: Regional Hispanic or Latino percentages in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 31. Number and percentages of admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse

PPR	County	FY13		FY14		FY15		PPR	County	FY13		FY14		FY15		PPR	County	FY13		FY14		FY15	
		#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	43	45.7%	44	42.7%	46	37.4%	3	Jackson	9	*	15	*	<5	*	5	Perry	7	*	6	*	7	*
	Greene	89	33.5%	94	37.9%	85	36.5%		Macon	9	*	15	*	10	*		Robertson	33	55.0%	24	49.0%	31	44.9%
	Hancock	5	*	8	*	<5	*		Marion	9	*	15	*	16	*		Rutherford	161	48.5%	188	52.5%	199	57.2%
	Hawkins	37	26.6%	31	22.8%	46	24.6%		McMinn	26	37.1%	21	31.3%	18	*		Stewart	<5	*	6	*	6	*
	Johnson	24	32.4%	18	*	12	*		Meigs	5	*	5	*	<5	*		Sumner	143	59.3%	100	54.6%	83	43.5%
	Sullivan	311	50.6%	316	45.3%	277	39.9%		Overton	13	*	13	*	10	*		Trousdale	5	*	<5	*	5	*
	Unicoi	19	*	13	*	14	*		Pickett	0	*	<5	*	<5	*		Wayne	8	*	5	*	6	*
	Washington	282	53.0%	310	51.2%	320	44.7%		Polk	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Williamson	63	63.6%	47	50.5%	49	52.7%
Region 1	810	45.4%	834	44.0%	802	39.4%	Putnam	64	37.2%	64	36.0%	74	46.0%	Wilson	50	53.2%	48	40.0%	48	42.1%			
2	Anderson	65	33.3%	55	30.7%	52	32.9%	Rhea	9	*	10	*	18	*	Region 5	1,013	53.1%	937	50.2%	822	48.9%		
	Blount	131	34.6%	119	35.7%	127	37.9%	Sequatchie	5	*	10	*	7	*	Benton	8	*	8	*	10	*		
	Campbell	15	*	9	*	19	*	Smith	5	*	6	*	8	*	Carroll	24	38.1%	27	43.5%	29	50.0%		
	Claiborne	9	*	7	*	9	*	Van Buren	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Chester	17	*	20	55.6%	32	51.6%		
	Cocke	22	25.3%	13	*	30	44.8%	Warren	22	28.2%	24	27.0%	29	30.5%	Crockett	32	65.3%	47	74.6%	27	58.7%		
	Grainger	12	*	7	*	17	*	White	28	38.4%	23	27.4%	28	42.4%	Decatur	25	67.6%	20	74.1%	19	*		
	Hamblen	65	32.3%	80	31.0%	85	48.0%	Region 3	684	40.5%	741	40.8%	705	38.8%	Dyer	58	56.3%	77	63.1%	59	57.8%		
	Jefferson	23	33.8%	18	*	26	43.3%	Region 4 (Davidson)	843	57.9%	798	50.2%	904	49.4%	Fayette	32	60.4%	24	49.0%	33	58.9%		
	Knox	469	39.0%	486	40.1%	418	38.4%	Bedford	31	48.4%	38	48.7%	17	*	Gibson	106	65.8%	123	62.1%	122	53.0%		
	Loudon	18	*	19	*	17	*	Cannon	14	*	17	*	9	*	Hardeman	36	66.7%	25	59.5%	30	58.8%		
	Monroe	25	32.9%	25	32.9%	8	*	Cheatham	35	68.6%	21	47.7%	14	*	Hardin	30	44.8%	31	40.8%	27	39.7%		
	Morgan	<5	*	5	*	7	*	Coffee	77	48.4%	108	60.3%	81	49.7%	Haywood	35	70.0%	36	70.6%	28	68.3%		
	Roane	18	*	18	*	19	*	Dickson	50	56.2%	31	51.7%	29	50.0%	Henderson	58	58.6%	42	51.9%	42	46.2%		
	Scott	10	*	8	*	9	*	Franklin	23	37.1%	34	50.0%	23	45.1%	Henry	37	52.1%	22	28.9%	21	42.9%		
Sevier	86	41.5%	68	38.9%	56	34.8%	Giles	17	*	15	*	9	*	Lake	13	*	8	*	<5	*			
Union	8	*	12	*	11	*	Hickman	17	*	13	*	14	*	Lauderdale	39	52.0%	52	52.5%	57	55.9%			
Region 2	979	33.6%	949	33.8%	910	35.8%	Houston	7	*	<5	*	<5	*	Madison	202	55.3%	266	56.6%	241	54.5%			
3	Bledsoe	0	*	5	*	<5	*	Humphreys	11	*	10	*	10	*	McNairy	22	43.1%	33	54.1%	19	*		
	Bradley	40	50.0%	44	59.5%	48	45.3%	Lawrence	29	43.9%	19	*	12	*	Obion	60	57.1%	43	48.3%	38	49.4%		
	Clay	8	*	17	*	19	*	Lewis	22	62.9%	13	*	12	*	Tipton	48	64.0%	34	55.7%	33	42.9%		
	Cumberland	41	41.4%	33	34.0%	27	35.1%	Lincoln	13	*	11	*	13	*	Weakley	24	53.3%	27	49.1%	14	*		
	DeKalb	17	*	22	30.1%	23	22.5%	Marshall	18	*	16	*	12	*	Region 6	906	56.0%	965	54.3%	885	51.7%		
	Fentress	14	*	18	*	9	*	Maury	70	52.2%	73	42.2%	55	50.9%	Region 7 (Shelby)	1,224	52.1%	1,195	55.2%	1,109	53.4%		
	Grundy	9	*	5	*	9	*	Montgomery	103	62.0%	88	58.3%	75	54.3%	County unknown	30	63.8%	<5	*	5	*		
	Hamilton	347	49.4%	367	48.9%	335	43.1%	Moore	<5	*	0	*	<5	*	Tennessee	6,489	47.1%	6,421	46.1%	6,142	44.8%		


Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).


Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Chart 28. Admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse**

*\*significant increase or decrease compared to previous fiscal year.*



**Figure 4. Admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: FY2015**




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Rates for counties not reported for events <20. Significance calculated by using z-score test for two population proportions.

**Table 32. Admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: gender**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Region 1</b>	309	<b>38.8%</b>	326	<b>40.8%</b>	310	<b>37.8%</b>	487	<b>61.2%</b>	473	<b>59.2%</b>	511	<b>62.2%</b>
<b>Region 2</b>	352	36.6%	319	34.3%	303	35.7%	611	63.4%	611	65.7%	545	64.3%
<b>Region 3</b>	168	28.5%	200	30.9%	205	34.5%	421	71.5%	447	69.1%	390	65.5%
<b>Region 4</b>	228	36.5%	207	30.0%	243	29.8%	396	63.5%	482	70.0%	572	70.2%
<b>Region 5</b>	207	25.4%	201	25.9%	167	23.9%	609	74.6%	574	74.1%	533	76.1%
<b>Region 6</b>	177	26.6%	195	24.7%	162	22.8%	488	73.4%	595	75.3%	550	77.2%
<b>Region 7</b>	216	<b>20.5%</b>	202	<b>22.4%</b>	187	<b>22.1%</b>	837	<b>79.5%</b>	701	<b>77.6%</b>	660	<b>77.9%</b>
<b>N/A</b>	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	18	*	<5	*	<5	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>1,658</b>	<b>30.0%</b>	<b>1,651</b>	<b>29.8%</b>	<b>1,579</b>	<b>29.6%</b>	<b>3,867</b>	<b>70.0%</b>	<b>3,886</b>	<b>70.2%</b>	<b>3,763</b>	<b>70.4%</b>

**Chart 29. Admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: Regional gender percentages in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).


Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 33. Admissions with MARIJUANA identified as a substance of abuse: age groups

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	229	28.8%	272	34.0%	253	30.8%	182	22.9%	131	16.4%	111	13.5%	385	48.4%	396	49.6%	457	55.7%
Region 2	86	8.9%	110	11.8%	66	7.8%	259	26.9%	238	25.6%	187	22.1%	618	64.2%	582	62.6%	595	70.2%
Region 3	50	8.5%	52	8.0%	<5	0.7%	137	23.3%	155	24.0%	113	19.0%	402	68.3%	440	68.0%	479	80.4%
Region 4	36	5.8%	117	17.0%	107	13.2%	108	17.3%	115	16.7%	139	17.1%	480	76.9%	457	66.3%	566	69.7%
Region 5	54	6.6%	111	14.3%	38	5.4%	224	27.5%	198	25.6%	168	24.0%	538	65.9%	465	60.1%	494	70.6%
Region 6	53	8.0%	89	11.3%	42	5.9%	170	25.6%	169	21.4%	141	19.8%	442	66.5%	532	67.3%	529	74.3%
Region 7	66	6.3%	34	3.8%	12	1.4%	207	19.7%	201	22.3%	146	17.3%	780	74.1%	668	74.0%	687	81.3%
N/A	0	*	0	*	<5	*	5	*	0	*	0	*	14	*	<5	*	<5	*
Tennessee	574	10.4%	785	14.2%	521	9.8%	1,292	23.4%	1,207	21.8%	1,005	18.8%	3,659	66.2%	3,544	64.0%	3,811	71.4%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Chart 30. Admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: Regional age group percentages in FY2015




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).  
 Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

**Table 34. Admissions with MARIJUANA identified as a substance of abuse: race**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Region 1</b>	59	7.4%	42	5.3%	46	5.6%	719	90.3%	729	91.2%	755	92.0%
<b>Region 2</b>	95	9.9%	92	9.9%	103	12.1%	842	87.4%	821	88.3%	723	85.3%
<b>Region 3</b>	94	16.0%	121	18.7%	101	17.0%	489	83.0%	510	78.8%	482	81.0%
<b>Region 4</b>	352	56.4%	376	54.6%	452	55.5%	251	40.2%	256	37.2%	313	38.4%
<b>Region 5</b>	150	18.4%	152	19.6%	129	18.4%	630	77.2%	592	76.4%	558	79.7%
<b>Region 6</b>	174	26.2%	274	34.7%	222	31.2%	483	72.6%	502	63.5%	480	67.4%
<b>Region 7</b>	820	77.9%	642	71.1%	592	69.9%	218	20.7%	248	27.5%	244	28.8%
<b>N/A</b>	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	19	*	<5	*	<5	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>1,744</b>	<b>31.6%</b>	<b>1,699</b>	<b>30.7%</b>	<b>1,645</b>	<b>30.8%</b>	<b>3,651</b>	<b>66.1%</b>	<b>3,658</b>	<b>66.1%</b>	<b>3,555</b>	<b>66.6%</b>

**Chart 31. Admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: Regional race percentages in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.


## MARIJUANA AS A SUBSTANCE OF ABUSE

**Table 35. Admissions with MARIJUANA identified as a substance of abuse: Hispanic or Latino**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Hispanic or Latino					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	7	*	12	*	12	*
Region 2	21	*	17	*	13	*
Region 3	6	*	11	*	7	*
Region 4	20	*	43	*	18	*
Region 5	32	*	20	*	12	*
Region 6	7	*	10	*	13	*
Region 7	20	*	7	*	11	*
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*
Tennessee	113	2.0%	120	2.2%	86	1.6%

*Please note that race and ethnicity are collected separately.*

**Chart 32. Admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: Regional Hispanic or Latino percentages in FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

**Table 36. Number and percentages of admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse**

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	41	43.6%	40	38.8%	43	35.0%	3	Jackson	7	*	7	*	9	*	5	Perry	8	*	<5	*	5	*
	Greene	125	47.0%	103	41.5%	103	44.2%		Macon	10	*	15	*	7	*		Robertson	15	*	17	*	25	36.2%
	Hancock	5	*	7	*	<5	*		Marion	13	*	21	47.7%	11	*		Rutherford	161	48.5%	149	41.6%	165	47.4%
	Hawkins	54	38.8%	31	22.8%	65	34.8%		McMinn	26	37.1%	20	29.9%	25	33.3%		Stewart	<5	*	<5	*	5	*
	Johnson	32	43.2%	29	54.7%	17	*		Meigs	5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Sumner	90	37.3%	59	32.2%	70	36.6%
	Sullivan	291	47.3%	304	43.6%	289	41.6%		Overton	6	*	11	*	<5	*		Trousdale	5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Unicoi	16	*	7	*	16	*		Pickett	<5	*	<5	*	0	*		Wayne	9	*	8	*	6	*
	Washington	232	43.6%	278	45.9%	287	40.1%		Polk	<5	*	<5	*	6	*		Williamson	37	37.4%	24	25.8%	28	30.1%
Region 1	796	44.6%	799	42.2%	821	40.3%	Putnam	43	25.0%	46	25.8%	25	15.5%	Wilson	33	35.1%	37	30.8%	32	28.1%			
2	Anderson	55	28.2%	44	24.6%	44	27.8%	Rhea	11	*	10	*	14	*	Region 5	816	42.7%	775	41.5%	700	41.6%		
	Blount	119	31.4%	93	27.9%	126	37.6%	Sequatchie	<5	*	5	*	<5	*	Benton	12	*	13	*	11	*		
	Campbell	39	29.3%	28	25.2%	43	35.2%	Smith	12	*	12	*	6	*	Carroll	20	31.7%	35	56.5%	21	36.2%		
	Claiborne	15	*	12	*	23	37.1%	Van Buren	<5	*	6	*	<5	*	Chester	18	*	12	*	21	33.9%		
	Cocke	39	44.8%	16	*	25	37.3%	Warren	32	41.0%	30	33.7%	43	45.3%	Crockett	30	61.2%	36	57.1%	20	43.5%		
	Grainger	11	*	16	*	15	*	White	22	30.1%	24	28.6%	17	*	Decatur	25	67.6%	15	*	18	*		
	Hamblen	73	36.3%	101	39.1%	75	42.4%	Region 3	589	34.9%	647	35.6%	595	32.7%	Dyer	51	49.5%	63	51.6%	47	46.1%		
	Jefferson	29	42.6%	18	*	21	35.0%	Region 4 (Davidson)	624	42.8%	689	43.4%	815	44.5%	Fayette	21	39.6%	15	*	19	*		
	Knox	409	34.0%	432	35.6%	375	34.4%	Bedford	42	65.6%	48	61.5%	14	*	Gibson	68	42.2%	81	40.9%	91	39.6%		
	Loudon	22	38.6%	18	*	8	*	Cannon	13	*	14	*	<5	*	Hardeman	20	37.0%	23	54.8%	25	49.0%		
	Monroe	27	35.5%	37	48.7%	10	*	Cheatham	22	43.1%	15	*	9	*	Hardin	18	*	24	31.6%	24	35.3%		
	Morgan	12	*	9	*	10	*	Coffee	95	59.7%	102	57.0%	83	50.9%	Haywood	25	50.0%	20	39.2%	17	*		
	Roane	20	25.6%	20	31.3%	10	*	Dickson	25	28.1%	17	*	19	*	Henderson	29	29.3%	31	38.3%	32	35.2%		
	Scott	7	*	8	*	<5	*	Franklin	29	46.8%	31	45.6%	25	49.0%	Henry	34	47.9%	42	55.3%	19	*		
Sevier	68	32.9%	62	35.4%	46	28.6%	Giles	19	*	10	*	14	*	Lake	10	*	15	*	10	*			
Union	18	*	16	*	14	*	Hickman	<5	*	8	*	14	*	Lauderdale	37	49.3%	55	55.6%	63	61.8%			
Region 2	963	33.1%	930	33.2%	848	33.4%	Houston	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	Madison	130	35.6%	211	44.9%	176	39.8%			
3	Bledsoe	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Humphreys	7	*	5	*	10	*	McNairy	16	*	16	*	14	*		
	Bradley	33	41.3%	36	48.6%	42	39.6%	Lawrence	23	34.8%	31	46.3%	20	42.6%	Obion	57	54.3%	46	51.7%	45	58.4%		
	Clay	<5	*	15	*	12	*	Lewis	7	*	11	*	10	*	Tipton	22	29.3%	17	*	28	36.4%		
	Cumberland	40	40.4%	26	26.8%	12	*	Lincoln	23	71.9%	9	*	11	*	Weakley	22	48.9%	20	36.4%	11	*		
	DeKalb	31	43.1%	27	37.0%	32	31.4%	Marshall	8	*	12	*	9	*	Region 6	665	41.1%	790	44.4%	712	41.6%		
	Fentress	19	*	11	*	7	*	Mauzy	65	48.5%	97	56.1%	45	41.7%	Region 7 (Shelby)	1,053	44.8%	903	41.7%	847	40.8%		
	Grundy	7	*	10	*	9	*	Montgomery	74	44.6%	63	41.7%	73	52.9%	County unknown	19	40.4%	<5	*	<5	*		
	Hamilton	256	36.4%	304	40.5%	303	39.0%	Moore	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	Tennessee	5,525	40.1%	5,537	39.8%	5,342	39.0%		

**Top 25%** **Bottom 25%**

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

## **2.4. TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services: other substances of abuse by county and region**

**Cocaine/Crack**  
**Methamphetamine/stimulants**  
**Heroin**  
**Other illicit drugs<sup>1</sup>**  
**Other prescription drugs<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Please note that "Other illicit drugs" include LSD, non-Prescription Methadone, other hallucinogens, aerosols, PCP or PCP combination, solvents, ketamine (Special K), diphenhydramine, nitrites and other over-the-counter drugs, inhalants or unknown drugs.

<sup>2</sup> Please note that "Other prescription drugs" include clonazepam, alprazolam, diazepam, lorazepam, other barbiturate sedatives and tranquilizers, ethchlorvynol, chlordiazepoxide, barbiturates, clorazepate, triazolam, flunitrazepam and other non-barbiturate sedatives and benzodiazepines.

**Table 37. Number and percentages of admissions with COCAINE or CRACK as a substance of abuse**

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	8	*	<5	*	9	*	3	Jackson	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	5	Perry	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Greene	37	13.9%	19	*	19	*		Macon	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Robertson	22	36.7%	9	*	24	34.8%
	Hancock	0	*	<5	*	<5	*		Marion	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Rutherford	77	23.2%	90	25.1%	73	21.0%
	Hawkins	9	*	9	*	18	*		McMinn	<5	*	5	*	<5	*		Stewart	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Johnson	5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Meigs	<5	*	0	*	0	*		Sumner	39	16.2%	38	20.8%	38	19.9%
	Sullivan	72	11.7%	73	10.5%	70	10.1%		Overton	<5	*	<5	*	0	*		Trousdale	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Unicoi	6	*	<5	*	<5	*		Pickett	0	*	<5	*	0	*		Wayne	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Washington	105	19.7%	93	15.3%	112	15.6%		Polk	0	*	<5	*	<5	*		Williamson	16	*	20	21.5%	17	*
	Region 1	242	13.6%	206	10.9%	234	11.5%		Putnam	16	*	20	11.2%	11	*		Wilson	23	24.5%	39	32.5%	29	25.4%
2	Anderson	21	10.8%	20	11.2%	19	*	Rhea	5	*	<5	*	0	*	Region 5	381	20.0%	361	19.3%	301	17.9%		
	Blount	52	13.7%	46	13.8%	30	9.0%	Sequatchie	<5	*	0	*	0	*	Benton	5	*	<5	*	<5	*		
	Campbell	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Smith	5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Carroll	6	*	8	*	8	*		
	Claiborne	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Van Buren	0	*	0	*	0	*	Chester	6	*	10	*	14	*		
	Cocke	6	*	<5	*	10	*	Warren	5	*	7	*	<5	*	Crockett	15	*	28	44.4%	20	43.5%		
	Grainger	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	White	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Decatur	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*		
	Hamblen	12	*	15	*	13	*	Region 3	241	14.3%	219	12.1%	201	11.1%	Dyer	20	19.4%	25	20.5%	18	*		
	Jefferson	6	*	<5	*	6	*	Region 4 (Davidson)	593	40.7%	574	36.1%	679	37.1%	Fayette	10	*	13	*	14	*		
	Knox	233	19.4%	201	16.6%	187	17.2%	Bedford	5	*	7	*	<5	*	Gibson	31	19.3%	33	16.7%	33	14.3%		
	Loudon	<5	*	7	*	<5	*	Cannon	5	*	<5	*	0	*	Hardeman	20	37.0%	13	*	13	*		
	Monroe	8	*	<5	*	<5	*	Cheatham	9	*	10	*	7	*	Hardin	13	*	15	*	12	*		
	Morgan	5	*	<5	*	0	*	Coffee	17	*	13	*	6	*	Haywood	23	46.0%	17	*	13	*		
	Roane	7	*	6	*	7	*	Dickson	27	30.3%	14	*	11	*	Henderson	12	*	10	*	14	*		
	Scott	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Franklin	10	*	6	*	5	*	Henry	15	*	11	*	8	*		
Sevier	22	10.6%	18	*	10	*	Giles	10	*	<5	*	<5	*	Lake	5	*	<5	*	<5	*			
Union	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Hickman	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Lauderdale	20	26.7%	14	*	25	24.5%			
Region 2	387	13.3%	333	11.9%	299	11.8%	Houston	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Madison	83	22.7%	117	24.9%	116	26.2%			
3	Bledsoe	0	*	0	*	0	*	Humphreys	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	McNairy	<5	*	11	*	<5	*		
	Bradley	9	*	<5	*	7	*	Lawrence	10	*	8	*	<5	*	Obion	20	19.0%	17	*	12	*		
	Clay	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	Lewis	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Tipton	22	29.3%	7	*	13	*		
	Cumberland	7	*	<5	*	<5	*	Lincoln	8	*	<5	*	<5	*	Weakley	8	*	9	*	<5	*		
	DeKalb	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Marshall	5	*	5	*	6	*	Region 6	341	21.1%	367	20.6%	343	20.0%		
	Fentress	0	*	<5	*	0	*	Maury	30	22.4%	35	20.2%	23	21.3%	Region 7 (Shelby)	749	31.9%	718	33.2%	678	32.7%		
	Grundy	<5	*	0	*	<5	*	Montgomery	55	33.1%	41	27.2%	38	27.5%	County unknown	8	*	<5	*	<5	*		
	Hamilton	172	24.5%	157	20.9%	157	20.2%	Moore	0	*	<5	*	0	*	Tennessee	2,942	21.4%	2,780	20.0%	2,737	20.0%		

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Table 38. Number and percentages of admissions with METHAMPHETAMINES and STIMULANTS as a substance of abuse

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	6	*	14	*	19	*	3	Jackson	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	5	Perry	<5	*	<5	*	5	*
	Greene	26	9.8%	34	13.7%	42	18.0%		Macon	10	*	12	*	5	*		Robertson	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Hancock	<5	*	<5	*	6	*		Marion	10	*	15	*	13	*		Rutherford	18	*	22	6.1%	18	*
	Hawkins	13	*	22	16.2%	25	13.4%		McMinn	20	28.6%	18	*	32	42.7%		Stewart	<5	*	<5	*	6	*
	Johnson	31	41.9%	19	*	6	*		Meigs	8	*	10	*	6	*		Sumner	14	*	15	*	18	*
	Sullivan	49	8.0%	57	8.2%	102	14.7%		Overton	8	*	<5	*	5	*		Trousdale	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Unicoi	11	*	6	*	<5	*		Pickett	<5	*	<5	*	0	*		Wayne	11	*	12	*	10	*
	Washington	32	6.0%	53	8.7%	90	12.6%		Polk	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Williamson	5	*	7	*	13	*
	Region 1	170	9.5%	208	11.0%	294	14.4%		Putnam	37	21.5%	36	20.2%	39	24.2%		Wilson	9	*	10	*	16	*
2	Anderson	36	18.5%	29	16.2%	30	19.0%	Rhea	11	*	19	*	15	*	Region 5	266	13.9%	242	13.0%	299	17.8%		
	Blount	26	6.9%	21	6.3%	19	*	Sequatchie	<5	*	6	*	8	*	Benton	12	*	20	58.8%	9	*		
	Campbell	41	30.8%	26	23.4%	33	27.0%	Smith	6	*	5	*	5	*	Carroll	24	38.1%	20	32.3%	19	*		
	Claiborne	10	*	19	*	11	*	Van Buren	<5	*	5	*	5	*	Chester	<5	*	<5	*	6	*		
	Cocke	5	*	<5	*	5	*	Warren	35	44.9%	42	47.2%	49	51.6%	Crockett	9	*	8	*	9	*		
	Grainger	9	*	10	*	15	*	White	23	31.5%	31	36.9%	24	36.4%	Decatur	9	*	9	*	<5	*		
	Hamblen	12	*	39	15.1%	35	19.8%	Region 3	419	24.8%	493	27.2%	572	31.5%	Dyer	29	28.2%	32	26.2%	25	24.5%		
	Jefferson	5	*	7	*	7	*	Region 4 (Davidson)	51	3.5%	70	4.4%	114	6.2%	Fayette	7	*	8	*	10	*		
	Knox	57	4.7%	88	7.3%	71	6.5%	Bedford	10	*	8	*	9	*	Gibson	37	23.0%	53	26.8%	43	18.7%		
	Loudon	<5	*	9	*	<5	*	Cannon	17	*	10	*	<5	*	Hardeman	7	*	12	*	9	*		
	Monroe	26	34.2%	37	48.7%	18	*	Cheatham	6	*	<5	*	5	*	Hardin	32	47.8%	35	46.1%	29	42.6%		
	Morgan	13	*	7	*	19	*	Coffee	34	21.4%	30	16.8%	48	29.4%	Haywood	<5	*	10	*	5	*		
	Roane	7	*	15	*	11	*	Dickson	14	*	9	*	11	*	Henderson	21	21.2%	23	28.4%	29	31.9%		
	Scott	<5	*	8	*	<5	*	Franklin	19	*	11	*	11	*	Henry	8	*	24	31.6%	17	*		
Sevier	12	*	20	11.4%	15	*	Giles	7	*	<5	*	8	*	Lake	7	*	<5	*	5	*			
Union	<5	*	<5	*	6	*	Hickman	9	*	<5	*	7	*	Lauderdale	19	*	34	34.3%	32	31.4%			
Region 2	267	9.2%	341	12.2%	303	11.9%	Houston	<5	*	0	*	0	*	Madison	41	11.2%	47	10.0%	65	14.7%			
3	Bledsoe	<5	*	5	*	6	*	Humphreys	7	*	<5	*	10	*	McNairy	16	*	17	*	18	*		
	Bradley	25	31.3%	24	32.4%	40	37.7%	Lawrence	26	39.4%	28	41.8%	16	*	Obion	31	29.5%	41	46.1%	28	36.4%		
	Clay	<5	*	<5	*	7	*	Lewis	11	*	22	56.4%	23	65.7%	Tipton	6	*	13	*	19	*		
	Cumberland	24	24.2%	32	33.0%	21	27.3%	Lincoln	<5	*	5	*	<5	*	Weakley	14	*	22	40.0%	16	*		
	DeKalb	22	30.6%	17	*	31	30.4%	Marshall	0	*	<5	*	5	*	Region 6	335	20.7%	436	24.5%	396	23.1%		
	Fentress	16	*	23	38.3%	16	*	Maury	19	*	16	*	25	23.1%	Region 7 (Shelby)	108	4.6%	90	4.2%	114	5.5%		
	Grundy	6	*	13	*	15	*	Montgomery	14	*	18	*	23	16.7%	County unknown	7	14.9%	0	*	<5	*		
	Hamilton	139	19.8%	166	22.1%	226	29.1%	Moore	<5	*	<5	*	0	*	Tennessee	1,623	11.8%	1,880	13.5%	2,093	15.3%		

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Table 39. Number and percentages of admissions with HEROIN as a substance of abuse**

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Greene	8	*	8	*	5	*
	Hancock	0	*	0	*	<5	*
	Hawkins	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Johnson	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Sullivan	13	*	13	*	15	*
	Unicoi	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Washington	5	*	6	*	22	3.1%
	<b>Region 1</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
2	Anderson	<5	*	<5	*	8	*
	Blount	18	*	10	*	9	*
	Campbell	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Claiborne	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Cocke	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Grainger	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Hamblen	0	*	6	*	<5	*
	Jefferson	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Knox	47	3.9%	65	5.4%	107	9.8%
	Loudon	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Monroe	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Morgan	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Roane	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Scott	0	*	0	*	<5	*
	Sevier	<5	*	5	*	<5	*
Union	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	
<b>Region 2</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	
3	Bledsoe	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Bradley	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Clay	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Cumberland	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	DeKalb	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Fentress	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Grundy	0	*	0	*	<5	*
	Hamilton	33	4.7%	48	6.4%	88	11.3%
	<b>Region 3</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>5.7%</b>
<b>Region 4 (Davidson)</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>9.6%</b>	
5	Bedford	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Cannon	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Cheatham	<5	*	5	*	5	*
	Coffee	0	*	0	*	<5	*
	Dickson	7	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Franklin	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Giles	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Hickman	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Houston	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Humphreys	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Lawrence	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Lewis	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Lincoln	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Marshall	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Maury	<5	*	6	*	5	*
	Montgomery	5	*	5	*	5	*
	Moore	0	*	<5	*	0	*
<b>Region 5</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	
6	Benton	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Carroll	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Chester	0	*	<5	*	9	*
	Crockett	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Decatur	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Dyer	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Fayette	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Gibson	<5	*	<5	*	6	*
	Hardeman	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Hardin	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Haywood	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Henderson	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Henry	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Lake	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Lauderdale	5	*	6	*	<5	*
	Madison	25	6.8%	28	6.0%	39	8.8%
	McNairy	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
Obion	<5	*	0	*	0	*	
Tipton	5	*	<5	*	17	*	
Weakley	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	
<b>Region 6</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	
<b>Region 7 (Shelby)</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>19.4%</b>	
<b>County unknown</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>&lt;5</b>	<b>*</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>752</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>1,088</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	

**Top 25%** **Bottom 25%**

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**OTHER PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AS A SUBSTANCE OF ABUSE**

**Table 40. Number and percentages of admissions with OTHER PRESCRIPTION DRUGS as a substance of abuse**

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	29	30.9%	22	21.4%	32	26.0%
	Greene	59	22.2%	44	17.7%	48	20.6%
	Hancock	5	*	10	*	8	*
	Hawkins	48	34.5%	28	20.6%	51	27.3%
	Johnson	18	*	11	*	9	*
	Sullivan	116	18.9%	130	18.6%	135	19.4%
	Unicoi	11	*	9	*	8	*
	Washington	120	22.6%	119	19.6%	138	19.3%
	<b>Region 1</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>22.8%</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>21.1%</b>
2	Anderson	48	24.6%	47	26.3%	41	25.9%
	Blount	103	27.2%	85	25.5%	46	13.7%
	Campbell	40	30.1%	31	27.9%	41	33.6%
	Claiborne	20	34.5%	21	38.2%	26	41.9%
	Cocke	33	37.9%	17	*	16	*
	Grainger	18	*	14	*	14	*
	Hamblen	64	31.8%	61	23.6%	36	20.3%
	Jefferson	8	*	20	26.3%	10	*
	Knox	347	28.8%	299	24.7%	259	23.8%
	Loudon	24	42.1%	15	*	14	*
	Monroe	25	32.9%	8	*	13	*
	Morgan	19	*	13	*	16	*
	Roane	26	33.3%	15	*	24	37.5%
	Scott	8	*	8	*	7	*
	Sevier	45	21.7%	30	17.1%	23	14.3%
Union	14	*	17	*	16	*	
<b>Region 2</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>28.9%</b>	<b>701</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	
3	Bledsoe	<5	*	5	*	5	*
	Bradley	20	25.0%	13	*	21	19.8%
	Clay	5	*	12	*	<5	*
	Cumberland	34	34.3%	27	27.8%	22	28.6%
	DeKalb	18	*	22	30.1%	25	24.5%
	Fentress	20	33.9%	13	*	13	*
	Grundy	19	*	16	*	20	54.1%
	Hamilton	132	18.8%	109	14.5%	127	16.3%
	<b>Region 3</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>23.8%</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>21.4%</b>
	<b>Region 4 (Davidson)</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>9.2%</b>
5	Bedford	5	*	<5	*	7	*
	Cannon	<5	*	<5	*	8	*
	Cheatham	10	*	14	*	5	*
	Coffee	27	17.0%	19	*	20	12.3%
	Dickson	14	*	12	*	9	*
	Franklin	11	*	17	*	12	*
	Giles	8	*	7	*	<5	*
	Hickman	5	*	<5	*	8	*
	Houston	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Humphreys	<5	*	<5	*	6	*
	Lawrence	15	*	11	*	14	*
	Lewis	10	*	12	*	7	*
	Lincoln	6	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Marshall	8	*	7	*	6	*
	Maury	26	19.4%	32	18.5%	21	19.4%
	Montgomery	24	14.5%	15	*	16	*
	Moore	0	*	0	*	<5	*
<b>Region 5</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	
6	Benton	6	*	8	*	6	*
	Carroll	21	33.3%	5	*	11	*
	Chester	12	*	11	*	12	*
	Crockett	5	*	9	*	9	*
	Decatur	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Dyer	25	24.3%	22	18.0%	19	*
	Fayette	7	*	8	*	10	*
	Gibson	34	21.1%	29	14.6%	30	13.0%
	Hardeman	5	*	5	*	7	*
	Hardin	18	*	20	26.3%	14	*
	Haywood	<5	*	7	*	<5	*
	Henderson	17	*	20	24.7%	20	22.0%
	Henry	8	*	8	*	8	*
	Lake	<5	*	6	*	7	*
	Lauderdale	5	*	15	*	15	*
	Madison	45	12.3%	33	7.0%	36	8.1%
	McNairy	9	*	24	39.3%	12	*
Obion	18	*	11	*	16	*	
Tipton	11	*	8	*	7	*	
Weakley	10	*	7	*	11	*	
<b>Region 6</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>14.4%</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	
<b>Region 7 (Shelby)</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	
<b>County unknown</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>&lt;5</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>&lt;5</b>	<b>*</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>2,503</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>2,247</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>2,296</b>	<b>16.8%</b>	

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Table 41. Number and percentages of admissions with OTHER ILLICIT DRUGS as a substance of abuse**

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	8	*	8	*	<5	*
	Greene	19	*	21	8.5%	9	*
	Hancock	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Hawkins	7	*	6	*	8	*
	Johnson	<5	*	5	*	<5	*
	Sullivan	53	8.6%	74	10.6%	73	10.5%
	Unicoi	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Washington	26	4.9%	28	4.6%	35	4.9%
	<b>Region 1</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>6.5%</b>
2	Anderson	11	*	<5	*	6	*
	Blount	11	*	8	*	6	*
	Campbell	5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Claiborne	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Cocke	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Grainger	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Hamblen	9	*	10	*	7	*
	Jefferson	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Knox	43	3.6%	38	3.1%	27	2.5%
	Loudon	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Monroe	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Morgan	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Roane	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Scott	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
Sevier	<5	*	5	*	<5	*	
Union	<5	*	0	*	<5	*	
<b>Region 2</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	
3	Bledsoe	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Bradley	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Clay	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Cumberland	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	DeKalb	<5	*	0	*	7	*
	Fentress	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Grundy	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Hamilton	23	3.3%	23	3.1%	37	4.8%

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
3	Jackson	0	*	6	*	<5	*
	Macon	0	*	0	*	<5	*
	Marion	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	McMinn	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Meigs	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Overton	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Pickett	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Polk	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Putnam	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Rhea	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Sequatchie	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Smith	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Van Buren	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Warren	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
White	<5	*	<5	*	0	*	
<b>Region 3</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	
<b>Region 4 (Davidson)</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	
5	Bedford	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Cannon	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Cheatham	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Coffee	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Dickson	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Franklin	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Giles	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Hickman	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Houston	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Humphreys	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Lawrence	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Lewis	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Lincoln	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Marshall	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Maury	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Montgomery	5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Moore	0	*	0	*	0	*

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
5	Perry	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Robertson	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Rutherford	10	*	9	*	6	*
	Stewart	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Sumner	5	*	<5	*	6	*
	Trousdale	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Wayne	0	*	<5	*	0	*
	Williamson	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Wilson	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	<b>Region 5</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
6	Benton	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Carroll	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Chester	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Crockett	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Decatur	0	*	0	*	<5	*
	Dyer	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Fayette	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Gibson	5	*	5	*	<5	*
	Hardeman	0	*	0	*	0	*
	Hardin	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Haywood	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
	Henderson	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Henry	5	*	10	*	<5	*
	Lake	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Lauderdale	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Madison	6	*	5	*	9	*
	McNairy	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
Obion	5	*	<5	*	<5	*	
Tipton	<5	*	0	*	<5	*	
Weakley	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	
<b>Region 6</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	
<b>Region 7 (Shelby)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>*</b>	
<b>County unknown</b>	<b>&lt;5</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>*</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	

**Top 25%** **Bottom 25%**

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region


## 2.5. Recovery courts

**Table 42. TDMHSAS-funded recovery courts: new admissions in FY2015\***

TDMHSAS Region	Number of new admissions in FY2015
Region 1	23
Region 2	119
Region 3	81
Region 4	160
Region 5	87
Region 6	82
Region 7	176
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>728</b>

*New admissions to recovery courts in FY2015 (from 07/01/2014 to 06/30/2015) do not represent the total number of individuals served.*

**Chart 33. New admissions to recovery courts\* per 100,000 population: FY2015**



Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

\*Please note that the number of admissions includes all recovery courts (adult and juvenile recovery courts)

## **SECTION 3: TDMHSAS-funded MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**


### **3.1. Regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS**

**REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTES AND  
PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS**

**Table 43. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to psychiatric hospitals**

	FY2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Regional mental health institutes	9,561	8,115	9,218	9,737
Private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS	1,836	2,912	3,097	3,134
Statewide number of admissions	11,397	11,027	12,315	12,871

**Chart 34. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS**



Data source: TDMHSAS Division of Hospital Services.


Please note that Lakeshore Mental Health Institute closed with the end of FY2012; TDMHSAS started contracting private psychiatric hospitals in FY2012.

## REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTES AND PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS

**Table 44. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS**

TDMHSAS Region	Tennessee	PPR 1	PPR 2	PPR 3	PPR 4	PPR 5	PPR 6	PPR 7	N/A*
<b>FY13</b>	11,027	1,286	1,771	2,030	1,371	1,811	866	1,192	700
	100%	11.66%	16.06%	18.41%	12.43%	16.42%	7.85%	10.81%	6.35%
<b>FY14</b>	12,315	1,345	2,072	1,939	1,773	2,086	806	1,517	777
	100%	10.92%	16.83%	15.75%	14.40%	16.94%	6.54%	12.32%	6.31%
<b>FY15</b>	12,871	1,440	2,191	2,203	1,716	2,183	862	1,469	807
	100%	11.19%	17.02%	17.12%	13.33%	16.96%	6.70%	11.41%	6.27%

**Chart 35. TDMHSAS funded admissions to regional mental health institutes/private psychiatric hospitals per 1,000 population 18+ years**



Data source: TDMHSAS Division of Hospital Services.


\*Data note: N/A includes admission from out of state as well as admissions with missing county of residence; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region.

## REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTES AND PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS

Table 45. Admissions by region and gender

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Region 1</b>	445	<b>34.6%</b>	472	<b>35.1%</b>	479	<b>33.3%</b>	841	<b>65.4%</b>	873	<b>64.9%</b>	961	<b>66.7%</b>
<b>Region 2</b>	676	<b>38.2%</b>	787	<b>38.0%</b>	744	<b>34.0%</b>	1,095	<b>61.8%</b>	1,285	<b>62.0%</b>	1,447	<b>66.0%</b>
<b>Region 3</b>	809	<b>39.9%</b>	746	<b>38.5%</b>	837	<b>38.0%</b>	1,221	<b>60.1%</b>	1,193	<b>61.5%</b>	1,366	<b>62.0%</b>
<b>Region 4</b>	488	<b>35.6%</b>	589	<b>33.2%</b>	532	<b>31.0%</b>	883	<b>64.4%</b>	1,184	<b>66.8%</b>	1,184	<b>69.0%</b>
<b>Region 5</b>	678	<b>37.4%</b>	825	<b>39.5%</b>	813	<b>37.2%</b>	1,133	<b>62.6%</b>	1,261	<b>60.5%</b>	1,370	<b>62.8%</b>
<b>Region 6</b>	319	<b>36.8%</b>	270	<b>33.5%</b>	313	<b>36.3%</b>	547	<b>63.2%</b>	536	<b>66.5%</b>	549	<b>63.7%</b>
<b>Region 7</b>	391	<b>32.8%</b>	529	<b>34.9%</b>	476	<b>32.4%</b>	801	<b>67.2%</b>	988	<b>65.1%</b>	993	<b>67.6%</b>
<b>N/A</b>	241	<b>40.9%</b>	231	<b>40.8%</b>	253	<b>40.0%</b>	348	<b>59.1%</b>	335	<b>59.2%</b>	380	<b>60.0%</b>
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>4,047</b>	<b>37.1%</b>	<b>4,449</b>	<b>36.8%</b>	<b>4,447</b>	<b>35.0%</b>	<b>6,869</b>	<b>62.9%</b>	<b>7,655</b>	<b>63.2%</b>	<b>8,250</b>	<b>65.0%</b>

Chart 36. Gender percentages among admissions by region: FY2015



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.

Data note: Data excludes admissions with missing gender (n=111 for FY13, n=211 for FY14 and n=174 for FY15).

**REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTES AND  
PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS**

**Table 46. Admissions by region and age group**

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy	Age 18-25						Age 26+					
	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Region 1</b>	215	17.0%	248	18.0%	256	18.0%	1,057	82.0%	1,067	79.0%	1,150	80.0%
<b>Region 2</b>	265	15.0%	325	16.0%	303	14.0%	1,490	84.0%	1,729	83.0%	1,866	85.0%
<b>Region 3</b>	341	17.0%	343	18.0%	369	17.0%	1,680	83.0%	1,583	82.0%	1,823	83.0%
<b>Region 4</b>	272	20.0%	323	18.0%	284	17.0%	1,087	79.0%	1,443	81.0%	1,429	83.0%
<b>Region 5</b>	389	21.0%	422	20.0%	432	20.0%	1,410	78.0%	1,656	79.0%	1,746	80.0%
<b>Region 6</b>	173	20.0%	145	18.0%	145	17.0%	690	80.0%	659	82.0%	716	83.0%
<b>Region 7</b>	234	20.0%	327	22.0%	306	21.0%	955	80.0%	1,188	78.0%	1,163	79.0%
<b>N/A</b>	105	18.0%	97	17.0%	132	21.0%	467	79.0%	461	81.0%	490	77.0%
<b>Tennessee</b>	1,994	18.0%	2,230	18.0%	2,227	18.0%	8,836	81.0%	9,786	81.0%	10,383	82.0%

**Chart 37. Age group percentages among admissions by region: FY2015**

Top 25% Bottom 25%



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.


Data note: Data excludes admissions from individuals under 18 years (n=83 for FY13, n=85 for FY14 and n=82 for FY15) as well as admissions with unknown age (n=114 for FY13, n=214 for FY14 and n=179 for FY15).

## REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTES AND PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS

Table 47. Admissions by region and race

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	41	3.2%	24	1.8%	20	1.4%	1,241	96.5%	1,314	97.7%	1,417	98.3%
Region 2	115	6.5%	161	7.8%	168	7.7%	1,645	92.9%	1,900	91.7%	2,002	91.4%
Region 3	454	22.4%	395	20.4%	400	18.1%	1,556	76.6%	1,511	77.9%	1,756	79.7%
Region 4	432	31.5%	611	34.5%	594	34.6%	871	63.5%	1,082	61.0%	1,029	60.0%
Region 5	225	12.4%	269	12.9%	336	15.4%	1,537	84.9%	1,740	83.4%	1,778	81.4%
Region 6	306	35.3%	265	32.8%	291	33.6%	543	62.6%	526	65.3%	556	64.7%
Region 7	915	76.8%	1,106	72.9%	1,055	71.8%	243	20.4%	368	24.3%	334	22.7%
N/A	81	15.9%	87	14.6%	109	14.3%	493	84.1%	459	85.4%	508	85.7%
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>2,569</b>	<b>23.5%</b>	<b>2,918</b>	<b>24.1%</b>	<b>2,973</b>	<b>23.4%</b>	<b>8,129</b>	<b>74.5%</b>	<b>8,900</b>	<b>73.5%</b>	<b>9,380</b>	<b>73.9%</b>

Chart 38. Race percentages among admissions by region: FY2015



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.

Data note: Table excludes admission for individuals with "Other" race (n=216 for FY13, n=281 for FY14, n=309 for FY15). Data excludes admissions with unknown race (n=113 for FY13, n=216 for FY14 and n=209 for FY15).


## REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTES AND PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS

**Table 48. Admissions by region and ethnicity**


TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Hispanic or Latino					
	FY 2013		FY 2014		FY 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Region 1</b>	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
<b>Region 2</b>	8	*	<5	*	8	*
<b>Region 3</b>	18	*	29	1.6%	27	1.3%
<b>Region 4</b>	32	2.4%	33	1.9%	50	3.0%
<b>Region 5</b>	29	1.6%	62	3.0%	41	1.9%
<b>Region 6</b>	16	*	<5	*	<5	*
<b>Region 7</b>	22	1.9%	28	1.9%	36	2.5%
<b>N/A</b>	14	*	13	*	7	*
<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>1.6%</b>

*Please note that race and ethnicity are collected separately.*

**Chart 39: Percentage of Hispanic and Latino individuals living in poverty in Tennessee (American Community Survey, 2015)**



**Chart 40: Percentage of Hispanic and Latino individuals served in RMHI and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

**PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS**

**Table 49. Number of admissions and rate per 1,000 population 18+ years by Planning and Policy Regions and counties**

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate
1	Carter	118	2.6	141	3.1	129	2.8	3	Jackson	10	*	15	*	16	*	5	Perry	8	*	15	*	10	*
	Greene	127	2.3	124	2.3	154	2.8		Macon	31	1.8	29	1.7	32	1.8		Robertson	55	1.1	75	1.5	60	1.2
	Hancock	23	4.4	13	*	17	*		Marion	51	2.3	74	3.3	56	2.5		Rutherford	338	1.6	354	1.6	392	1.8
	Hawkins	86	1.9	97	2.2	128	2.9		McMinn	93	2.3	99	2.4	134	3.3		Stewart	8	*	16	*	13	*
	Johnson	42	2.9	47	3.2	39	2.6		Meigs	22	2.4	30	3.2	30	3.2		Sumner	171	1.3	238	1.8	222	1.7
	Sullivan	388	3.1	374	3.0	404	3.2		Overton	12	*	13	*	20	1.2		Trousdale	15	*	22	*	14	*
	Unicoi	39	2.7	52	3.6	52	3.6		Pickett	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Wayne	18	*	23	1.7	25	1.8
	Washington	463	4.6	506	5.0	526	5.2		Polk	36	2.7	47	3.5	51	3.8		Williamson	114	0.8	110	0.7	110	0.7
Region 1	1,286	3.2	1,354	3.3	1,449	3.6	Putnam		72	1.2	101	1.7	135	2.3	Wilson		131	1.4	129	1.4	160	1.7	
2	Anderson	189	3.2	203	3.4	218	3.7		Rhea	104	4.1	91	3.6	101	4.0		Region 5	1,811	1.5	2,087	1.7	2,183	1.8
	Blount	118	1.2	194	1.9	174	1.7		Sequatchie	21	1.8	15	1.3	35	3.0	Benton	33	2.5	33	2.5	48	3.7	
	Campbell	106	3.4	94	3.0	121	3.8		Smith	19	*	15	1.0	23	1.6	Carroll	39	1.8	42	1.9	45	2.0	
	Claiborne	25	1.0	49	1.9	58	2.3		Van Buren	11	*	13	2.9	14	*	Chester	13	*	10	*	22	1.6	
	Cocke	48	1.7	43	1.5	60	2.1		Warren	73	2.4	63	2.1	91	3.0	Crockett	18	*	13	*	10	*	
	Grainger	22	1.2	35	1.9	28	1.6		White	31	1.5	21	1.0	29	1.4	Decatur	18	*	13	*	26	2.8	
	Hamblen	82	1.7	70	1.4	94	1.9		Region 3	2,031	2.7	1,941	2.6	2,207	2.9	Dyer	60	2.1	51	1.8	56	1.9	
	Jefferson	70	1.7	61	1.5	59	1.4	Region 4 (Davidson)	1,371	2.6	1,773	3.4	1,716	3.3	Fayette	18	*	26	0.8	27	0.9		
	Knox	657	1.9	831	2.4	871	2.5	Bedford	55	1.6	72	2.1	92	2.7	Gibson	73	1.9	48	1.3	52	1.4		
	Loudon	61	1.5	70	1.7	56	1.4	Cannon	24	2.2	36	3.3	16	*	Hardeman	122	5.9	97	4.7	108	5.2		
	Monroe	49	1.4	68	1.9	77	2.2	Cheatham	25	0.8	39	1.3	50	1.6	Hardin	26	1.3	29	1.4	38	1.9		
	Morgan	35	2.0	50	2.9	50	2.9	Coffee	129	3.2	125	3.1	115	2.8	Haywood	24	1.7	25	1.8	18	1.3		
	Roane	148	3.5	132	3.1	153	3.6	Dickson	59	1.5	82	2.1	87	2.2	Henderson	38	1.8	38	1.8	35	1.6		
	Scott	37	2.2	37	2.2	40	2.4	Franklin	49	1.5	77	2.4	72	2.2	Henry	20	0.8	27	1.1	33	1.3		
Sevier	104	1.4	117	1.6	115	1.5	Giles	38	1.7	70	3.1	52	2.3	Lake	5	*	8	*	<5	*			
Union	20	1.4	21	1.4	17	1.2	Hickman	41	2.2	41	2.2	70	3.7	Lauderdale	38	1.8	32	1.5	40	1.9			
Region 2	1,771	1.9	2,075	2.2	2,191	2.3	Houston	12	*	6	*	8	*	Madison	154	2.0	147	1.9	147	1.9			
3	Bledsoe	24	2.1	27	2.3	23	2.0	Humphreys	32	2.3	32	2.3	27	1.9	McNairy	45	2.2	54	2.7	41	2.0		
	Bradley	204	2.6	193	2.4	225	2.8	Lawrence	52	1.6	70	2.2	69	2.2	Obion	39	1.6	26	1.1	28	1.2		
	Clay	7	*	7	*	15	*	Lewis	33	3.6	26	2.8	36	3.9	Tipton	47	1.0	40	0.9	48	1.0		
	Cumberland	43	0.9	51	1.1	55	1.2	Lincoln	33	1.3	24	0.9	39	1.5	Weakley	38	1.4	49	1.8	41	1.5		
	DeKalb	31	2.1	38	2.5	44	2.9	Marshall	49	2.1	43	1.8	50	2.1	Region 6	868	1.8	808	1.7	866	1.8		
	Fentress	26	1.9	16	*	30	2.2	Maury	158	2.4	174	2.7	181	2.8	Region 7 (Shelby)	1,192	1.7	1,517	2.2	1,469	2.1		
	Grundy	46	4.4	33	3.1	47	4.5	Montgomery	160	1.2	187	1.4	210	1.5	N/A	697	-	760	-	790	-		
	Hamilton	1,061	3.8	950	3.4	999	3.6	Moore	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Tennessee	11,027	2.2	12,315	2.4	12,871	2.5		

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.

N/A includes admissions from individuals "out of state" or where the county of residence was unknown or not collected.

**Top 25%** **Bottom 25%**


Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region.

In addition to presenting data for counties and regions by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy regions, the next page displays county and regional data by regional mental health institute (RMHI) regions. Note that allocations of counties in RMHI regions vary compared to TDMHSAS Planning and Policy regions!

**Table 50. RMHI Regions and psychiatric hospitals operated by or under contract with TDMHSAS**

Number on map	Psychiatric hospital	RMHI Region served							Counties served:
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
①	Woodridge	✓							Carter, Greene, Hancock, Hawkins, Johnson, Sullivan, Unicoi, Washington.
②	Peninsula		✓						Anderson, Blount, Campbell, Claiborne, Cocke, Grainger, Jefferson, Hamblen, Knox, Loudon, Monroe, Morgan, Roane, Scott, Sevier, Union.
③	Ridgeview		✓						
④	Moccasin Bend Mental Health Institute	✓	✓	✓					Anderson, Bedford, Bledsoe, Blount, Bradley, Carter, Campbell, Claiborne, Clay, Cocke, Coffee, Cumberland, DeKalb, Fentress, Franklin, Grainger, Greene, Grundy, Hamblen, Hamilton, Hancock, Hawkins, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Lincoln, Loudon, Macon, Marion, McMinn, Meigs, Moore, Monroe, Morgan, Overton, Pickett, Polk, Putnam, Rhea, Roane, Scott, Sesquatchie, Sevier, Sullivan, Smith, Unicoi, Union, VanBuren, Washington, Warren, White
⑤	Middle Tennessee Mental Health Institute				✓	✓			Cannon, Cheatham, Davidson, Dickson, Giles, Hickman, Houston, Humphreys, Maury, Marshall, Montgomery, Roberston, Rutherford, Stewart, Sumner, Trousdale, Williamson, Wilson.
⑥	Western Mental Health Institute						✓		Benton, Carroll, Chester, Crockett, Decatur, Dyer, Fayette, Gibson, Hardeman, Hardin, Haywood, Henderson, Henry, Lake, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Lewis, Madison, McNairy, Obion, Perry, Tipton, Wayne, Weakley.
⑦	Memphis Mental Health Institute							✓	Shelby

**Figure 5. Location of hospitals by RMHI regions 1 - 7**



Data source: TDMHSAS Division of Hospital Services.

## REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTES AND PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS

Top 25% Bottom 25%

**Table 50A. Number of admissions and rate per 1,000 population 18+ years by RMHI Regions and counties**

RMHI Region	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		RMHI Region	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		RMHI Region	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate
1	Carter	118	2.6	141	3.1	129	2.8	3	Franklin	49	1.5	77	2.4	72	2.2	5	Stewart	8	*	16	*	13	*
	Greene	127	2.3	124	2.3	154	2.8		Grundy	46	4.4	33	3.1	47	4.5		Sumner	171	1.3	238	1.8	222	1.7
	Hancock	23	4.4	13	*	17	*		Hamilton	1,061	3.8	950	3.4	999	3.6		Trousdale	15	*	22	3.6	14	*
	Hawkins	86	1.9	97	2.2	128	2.9		Jackson	10	*	15	*	16	*		Williamson	114	0.8	110	0.7	110	0.7
	Johnson	42	2.9	47	3.2	39	2.6		Lincoln	33	1.3	24	0.9	39	1.5		Wilson	131	1.4	129	1.4	160	1.7
	Sullivan	388	3.1	374	3.0	404	3.2		Macon	31	1.8	29	1.7	32	1.8		RMHI Region 5		1,430	1.4	1,654	1.6	1,722
	Unicoi	39	2.7	52	3.6	52	3.6		Marion	51	2.3	74	3.3	56	2.5	Benton	33	2.5	33	2.5	48	3.7	
	Washington	463	4.6	506	5.0	526	5.2		McMinn	93	2.3	99	2.4	134	3.3	Carroll	39	1.8	42	1.9	45	2.0	
RMHI Region 1		1,286	3.2	1,354	3.3	1,449	3.6	Meigs	22	2.4	30	3.2	30	3.2	Chester	13	*	10	*	22	1.6		
2	Anderson	189	3.2	203	3.4	218	3.7	Moore	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Crockett	18	*	13	*	10	*		
	Blount	118	1.2	194	1.9	174	1.7	Overton	12	*	13	*	20	1.2	Decatur	18	*	13	*	26	*		
	Campbell	106	3.4	94	3.0	121	3.8	Pickett	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Dyer	60	2.1	51	1.8	56	1.9		
	Claiborne	25	1.0	49	1.9	58	2.3	Polk	36	2.7	47	3.5	51	3.8	Fayette	18	*	26	0.8	27	0.9		
	Cocke	48	1.7	43	1.5	60	2.1	Putnam	72	1.2	101	1.7	135	2.3	Gibson	73	1.9	48	1.3	52	1.4		
	Grainger	22	1.2	35	1.9	28	1.6	Rhea	104	4.1	91	3.6	101	4.0	Hardeman	122	5.9	97	4.7	108	5.2		
	Hamblen	82	1.7	70	1.4	94	1.9	Sequatchie	21	1.8	15	1.3	35	3.0	Hardin	26	1.3	29	1.4	38	1.9		
	Jefferson	70	1.7	61	1.5	59	1.4	Smith	19	*	15	1.0	23	1.6	Haywood	24	1.7	25	1.8	18	1.3		
	Knox	657	1.9	831	2.4	871	2.5	Van Buren	11	*	13	2.9	14	*	Henderson	38	1.8	38	1.8	35	1.6		
	Loudon	61	1.5	70	1.7	56	1.4	Warren	73	2.4	63	2.1	91	3.0	Henry	20	0.8	27	1.1	33	1.3		
	Monroe	49	1.4	68	1.9	77	2.2	White	31	1.5	21	1.0	29	1.4	Lake	5	*	8	*	3	*		
	Morgan	35	2.0	50	2.9	50	2.9	RMHI Region 3		2,301	2.6	2,240	2.5	2,528	2.8	Lauderdale	38	1.8	32	1.5	40	1.9	
	Roane	148	3.5	132	3.1	153	3.6	Region 4 (Davidson)		1,371	2.6	1,773	3.4	1,716	3.3	Lawrence	52	1.6	70	2.2	69	2.2	
	Scott	37	2.2	37	2.2	40	2.4	Cannon	24	2.2	36	3.3	16	*	Lewis	33	3.6	26	2.8	36	3.9		
Sevier	104	1.4	117	1.6	115	1.5	Cheatham	25	0.8	39	1.3	50	1.6	Madison	154	2.0	147	1.9	147	1.9			
Union	20	1.4	21	1.4	17	1.2	Dickson	59	1.5	82	2.1	87	2.2	McNairy	45	2.2	54	2.7	41	2.0			
RMHI Region 2		1,771	1.9	2,075	2.2	2,191	2.3	Giles	38	1.7	70	3.1	52	2.3	Obion	39	1.6	26	1.1	28	1.2		
3	Bedford	55	1.6	72	2.1	92	2.7	Hickman	41	2.2	41	2.2	70	3.7	Perry	8	*	15	*	10	*		
	Bledsoe	24	2.1	27	2.3	23	2.0	Houston	12	*	6	*	8	*	Tipton	47	1.0	40	0.9	48	1.0		
	Bradley	204	2.6	193	2.4	225	2.8	Humphreys	32	2.3	32	2.3	27	1.9	Wayne	18	*	23	1.7	25	1.8		
	Clay	7	*	7	*	15	*	Marshall	49	2.1	43	1.8	50	2.1	Weakley	38	1.4	49	1.8	41	1.5		
	Coffee	129	3.2	125	3.1	115	2.8	Mauzy	158	2.4	174	2.7	181	2.8	RMHI Region 6		979	1.8	942	1.7	1,006	1.8	
	Cumberland	43	0.9	51	1.1	55	1.2	Montgomery	160	1.2	187	1.4	210	1.5	Region 7 (Shelby)		1,192	1.7	1,517	2.2	1,469	2.1	
	DeKalb	31	2.1	38	2.5	44	2.9	Robertson	55	1.1	75	1.5	60	1.2	N/A		697	-	760	-	790	-	
	Fentress	26	1.9	16	*	30	2.2	Rutherford	338	1.6	354	1.6	392	1.8	Tennessee		11,027	2.2	12,315	2.4	12,871	2.5	

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.

N/A includes admissions from individuals "out of state" or where the county of residence was unknown or not collected.

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region.


### **3.1. Behavioral Health Safety Net enrollees**

**Table 51. Behavioral Health Safety Net enrollees**

TDMHSAS Region	Tennessee	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7
FY2013	34,092	3,287	8,458	4,688	3,105	6,960	4,242	3,352
	100%	9.64%	24.81%	13.75%	9.11%	20.42%	12.44%	9.83%
FY2014	34,668	3,321	9,014	4,567	3,378	7,115	4,142	3,131
	100%	9.58%	26.00%	13.17%	9.74%	20.52%	11.95%	9.03%
FY2015	32,410*	3,067	8,277	4,295	3,296	6,612	3,729	3,133
	100%	9.46%	25.54%	13.25%	10.17%	20.40%	11.51%	9.67%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

**Chart 41. Rate of Behavioral Health Safety Net enrollees per 1,000 population living in poverty<sup>1</sup>**



Data source: TDMHSAS Behavioral Health Safety Net (BHSN) Database; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (population 18+ living in poverty).

\*Data note: Includes one out-of-state enrollee in FY2015.

<sup>1</sup>Please note that Behavioral Health Safety Net eligibility criteria exclude individuals under 19 years of age. To calculate the 1,000 population rate, only numbers for individuals living in poverty ages 18 and above were available.

**Table 52. Number of Behavioral Health Safety Net (BHSN) enrollments as a percentage of individuals living in poverty (18+)**

PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2013		FY2014		FY2015	
		#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	311	3.3%	342	3.7%	277	3.0%	3	Jackson	68	3.6%	62	3.2%	57	3.0%	5	Moore	16	*	10	*	5	*
	Greene	764	7.5%	754	7.4%	667	6.5%		Macon	122	3.7%	101	3.0%	88	2.6%		Perry	37	3.0%	25	2.0%	19	1.5%
	Hancock	72	5.4%	79	5.9%	59	4.4%		Marion	150	4.0%	149	3.9%	139	3.7%		Robertson	312	5.8%	298	5.6%	279	5.2%
	Hawkins	344	5.2%	366	5.5%	318	4.8%		McMinn	339	5.1%	303	4.6%	288	4.3%		Rutherford	844	3.2%	890	3.4%	840	3.2%
	Johnson	85	2.6%	89	2.8%	80	2.5%		Meigs	82	4.3%	70	3.7%	74	3.9%		Stewart	19	*	22	1.2%	22	1.2%
	Sullivan	934	4.9%	963	5.0%	916	4.8%		Overton	88	2.6%	95	2.9%	89	2.7%		Sumner	787	6.9%	759	6.7%	587	5.2%
	Unicoi	82	3.1%	82	3.1%	76	2.9%		Pickett	11	*	10	*	9	*		Trousdale	46	5.1%	56	6.2%	47	5.2%
	Washington	695	4.2%	646	3.9%	674	4.0%		Polk	44	2.0%	45	2.0%	47	2.1%		Wayne	103	4.1%	83	3.3%	54	2.1%
2	Anderson	442	5.3%	406	4.9%	330	4.0%	Putnam	412	3.1%	450	3.4%	420	3.1%	Williamson	169	2.3%	164	2.2%	143	1.9%		
	Blount	783	6.1%	880	6.9%	768	6.0%	Rhea	286	5.8%	280	5.7%	232	4.7%	Wilson	424	5.0%	379	4.4%	341	4.0%		
	Campbell	242	3.7%	228	3.5%	214	3.3%	Sequatchie	58	3.0%	70	3.6%	72	3.7%	Benton	127	5.0%	124	4.9%	115	4.5%		
	Claiborne	268	4.9%	336	6.1%	294	5.4%	Smith	71	3.4%	60	2.8%	60	2.8%	Carroll	187	4.6%	179	4.4%	165	4.0%		
	Cocke	456	6.8%	487	7.3%	430	6.4%	Van Buren	25	2.9%	28	3.3%	22	2.6%	Chester	69	2.6%	92	3.5%	95	3.6%		
	Grainger	150	4.4%	183	5.3%	165	4.8%	Warren	266	4.6%	240	4.2%	238	4.1%	Crockett	51	3.1%	70	4.3%	65	4.0%		
	Hamblen	545	6.2%	551	6.3%	522	5.9%	White	162	4.0%	146	3.6%	124	3.0%	Decatur	100	5.5%	96	5.3%	80	4.4%		
	Jefferson	295	4.7%	334	5.3%	322	5.1%	4 Davidson	3,105	3.8%	3,378	4.1%	3,296	4.0%	Dyer	329	8.0%	349	8.5%	307	7.5%		
	Knox	3,636	7.3%	3,879	7.8%	3,728	7.5%	Bedford	223	3.8%	207	3.5%	217	3.7%	Fayette	106	2.8%	107	2.8%	90	2.4%		
	Loudon	247	5.2%	284	6.0%	255	5.4%	Cannon	44	2.6%	47	2.8%	49	2.9%	Gibson	407	6.7%	370	6.1%	356	5.9%		
	Monroe	257	4.5%	271	4.8%	241	4.2%	Cheatham	118	3.1%	124	3.2%	116	3.0%	Hardeman	167	3.6%	146	3.1%	109	2.3%		
	Morgan	42	1.2%	37	1.1%	32	0.9%	Coffee	322	4.3%	366	4.9%	329	4.4%	Hardin	140	3.5%	150	3.7%	117	2.9%		
	Roane	206	3.3%	199	3.2%	181	2.9%	Dickson	347	7.2%	364	7.5%	326	6.7%	Haywood	104	3.6%	118	4.1%	113	3.9%		
	Scott	119	2.8%	135	3.2%	82	2.0%	Franklin	168	3.5%	189	3.9%	189	3.9%	Henderson	358	9.7%	311	8.4%	285	7.7%		
Sevier	523	5.1%	557	5.4%	477	4.6%	Giles	195	5.1%	233	6.1%	214	5.6%	Henry	251	5.8%	271	6.2%	268	6.2%			
Union	247	8.7%	247	8.7%	236	8.3%	Hickman	160	5.0%	152	4.8%	139	4.4%	Lake	13	*	12	*	16	*			
3	Bledsoe	60	2.5%	49	2.1%	41	1.7%	5 Houston	25	2.1%	26	2.2%	24	2.0%	Lauderdale	222	4.5%	181	3.7%	163	3.3%		
	Bradley	308	2.3%	305	2.3%	313	2.3%	Humphreys	100	5.0%	109	5.4%	96	4.8%	Madison	601	4.8%	615	4.9%	546	4.4%		
	Clay	20	1.5%	32	2.5%	24	1.8%	Lawrence	257	4.9%	260	4.9%	245	4.7%	McNairy	155	3.6%	143	3.3%	155	3.6%		
	Cumberland	247	3.6%	223	3.2%	239	3.4%	Lewis	103	5.8%	93	5.3%	66	3.7%	Obion	291	7.5%	285	7.3%	303	7.8%		
	DeKalb	90	3.3%	93	3.4%	85	3.1%	Lincoln	209	5.7%	200	5.4%	174	4.7%	Tipton	376	7.0%	359	6.7%	275	5.1%		
	Fentress	77	2.6%	71	2.4%	70	2.4%	Marshall	306	10.0%	310	10.2%	262	8.6%	Weakley	188	3.4%	164	3.0%	106	1.9%		
	Grundy	44	1.6%	50	1.9%	61	2.3%	Maury	587	6.7%	598	6.8%	588	6.7%	7 Shelby	3,352	2.8%	3,131	2.6%	3,133	2.6%		
	Hamilton	1,658	4.4%	1,635	4.3%	1503	4.0%	Montgomery	1,039	5.5%	1,151	6.1%	1,241	6.6%	Out of State	-	-	-	-	1	*		
										Top 25%		Bottom 25%											
		Tennessee		34,092		4.4%		34,668		4.5%		32,410		4.2%									


Data source: TDMHSAS Behavioral Health Safety Net (BHSN) Database; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Data note: PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region; percentages computed using the number of enrollments and the estimated number of people over 18 living in poverty in each county. Please note that BHSN eligibility criteria exclude individuals under 19 years of age; however, only numbers for individuals living in poverty ages 18 and above were available to calculate the 1,000 population rate.


<5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

### **3.3. Crisis services**

**Chart 42. Rate of children and youth crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population 0-17 years**



**Figure 5. Rate of children and youth crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population 0-17 years: FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS Office of Crisis Services and Suicide Prevention (numbers include walk-in center and mobile crisis face-to-face assessments); U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2014).

Data note: Rates per county calculated by: number of crisis services in county/population 0-17 years in county\*1,000.

**CRISIS SERVICES: FACE-TO-FACE ASSESSMENTS  
CHILDREN AND YOUTH**

**Table 53. TDMHSAS-funded crisis services face-to-face assessments: number and rate per 1,000 population 0-17 years**


PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015	
		#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate
1	Carter	50	4.61	85	7.83	3	Jackson	6	*	16	*	5	Perry	9	*	14	*
	Greene	151	11.04	208	15.21		Macon	20	3.54	30	5.31		Robertson	114	6.66	152	8.88
	Hancock	9	*	<5	*		Marion	32	5.29	28	4.63		Rutherford	276	3.82	479	6.62
	Hawkins	75	6.27	101	8.44		McMinn	73	6.39	92	8.06		Stewart	5	*	15	*
	Johnson	39	12.49	35	11.21		Meigs	9	*	12	*		Sumner	160	3.80	272	6.47
	Sullivan	348	11.13	363	11.61		Overton	29	5.90	18	*		Trousdale	5	*	9	*
	Unicoi	8	*	29	8.33		Pickett	<5	*	<5	*		Wayne	12	*	22	7.04
	Washington	284	11.37	322	12.90		Polk	9	*	11	*		Williamson	108	1.88	150	2.61
	Region 1	964	9.57	1,147	11.38		Putnam	141	8.94	150	9.51		Wilson	86	2.83	179	5.89
2	Anderson	305	19.19	185	11.64	Rhea	29	3.85	45	5.97	Region 5	1,743	4.30	2,517	6.21		
	Blount	143	5.37	228	8.56	Sequatchie	9	*	8	*	Benton	118	36.99	30	9.40		
	Campbell	123	14.65	50	5.95	Smith	15	*	31	6.97	Carroll	168	27.39	34	5.54		
	Claiborne	24	3.87	28	4.52	Van Buren	<5	*	<5	*	Chester	26	6.83	28	7.36		
	Cocke	41	5.55	74	10.02	Warren	41	4.35	56	5.94	Crockett	28	7.80	14	*		
	Grainger	12	*	21	4.35	White	37	6.40	44	7.62	Decatur	10	*	7	*		
	Hamblen	72	4.88	101	6.85	Region 3	1,114	5.37	1,386	6.68	Dyer	49	5.37	57	6.24		
	Jefferson	61	5.58	99	9.06	Region 4 (Davidson)	951	6.60	1,068	7.42	Fayette	19	*	22	2.70		
	Knox	703	7.30	798	8.29	Bedford	79	6.46	83	6.79	Gibson	221	18.40	81	6.74		
	Loudon	65	6.46	87	8.64	Cannon	11	*	15	*	Hardeman	22	4.24	29	5.60		
	Monroe	32	3.28	50	5.12	Cheatham	43	4.58	79	8.42	Hardin	44	8.19	53	9.86		
	Morgan	34	7.96	20	4.68	Coffee	82	6.39	79	6.16	Haywood	15	*	<5	*		
	Roane	149	14.27	125	11.97	Dickson	54	4.57	102	8.63	Henderson	45	6.88	30	4.59		
	Scott	30	5.57	27	5.01	Franklin	56	6.45	53	6.11	Henry	174	25.77	41	6.07		
Sevier	85	4.23	160	7.96	Giles	33	5.45	41	6.77	Lake	<5	*	<5	*			
Union	8	*	28	6.28	Hickman	14	*	41	7.70	Lauderdale	42	6.63	26	4.10			
Region 2	1,887	7.38	2,081	8.14	Houston	6	*	7	*	Madison	249	11.01	288	12.73			
3	Bledsoe	5	*	22	9.09	Humphreys	15	*	24	6.01	McNairy	41	6.88	40	6.71		
	Bradley	110	4.77	167	7.24	Lawrence	35	3.32	38	3.60	Obion	32	4.66	35	5.10		
	Clay	6	*	6	*	Lewis	8	*	7	*	Tipton	88	5.57	98	6.21		
	Cumberland	45	4.24	51	4.81	Lincoln	39	5.16	29	3.84	Weakley	52	7.80	22	3.30		
	DeKalb	24	5.52	26	5.98	Marshall	24	3.23	52	7.00	Region 6	1,445	10.18	943	6.64		
	Fentress	23	5.89	24	6.15	Mauzy	160	7.94	196	9.72	Region 7 (Shelby)	1,015	4.24	1,232	5.15		
	Grundy	7	*	<5	*	Montgomery	307	5.94	378	7.31	County unknown	1,385	-	68	-		
	Hamilton	440	5.92	541	7.28	Moore	<5	*	<5	*	Tennessee	10,504	7.03	10,442	6.99		

Top 25% Bottom 25%


Data source: TDMHSAS Office of Crisis Services and Suicide Prevention (numbers include walk-in center and mobile crisis face-to-face assessments); U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2014).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Chart 43. Rate of adult crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population 18+ years**



**Figure 6. Rate of adult crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population 18+ years: FY2015**



Data source: TDMHSAS Office of Crisis Services and Suicide Prevention (numbers include walk-in center and mobile crisis face-to-face assessments); U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2014).

Data note: Rates per county calculated by: number of crisis services in county/population 0-17 years in county\*1,000.

**CRISIS SERVICES: FACE-TO-FACE ASSESSMENTS  
ADULTS**

**Table 54. TDMHSAS-funded crisis services face-to-face assessments: number and rate per 1,000 population 18+ years**

PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015	
		#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate
1	Carter	378	8.21	288	6.26	3	Jackson	142	15.17	103	11.01	5	Perry	37	6.03	33	5.38
	Greene	421	7.70	576	10.54		Macon	121	6.97	126	7.26		Robertson	359	7.04	329	6.45
	Hancock	17	*	66	12.58		Marion	201	8.99	210	9.39		Rutherford	958	4.42	1,199	5.54
	Hawkins	293	6.55	535	11.95		McMinn	441	10.70	456	11.07		Stewart	70	6.72	64	6.14
	Johnson	76	5.16	82	5.56		Meigs	63	6.77	76	8.17		Sumner	831	6.36	725	5.55
	Sullivan	1,666	13.25	1,856	14.76		Overton	166	9.70	185	10.81		Trousdale	68	11.01	58	9.39
	Unicoi	136	9.39	108	7.46		Pickett	27	6.47	34	8.15		Wayne	111	8.05	123	8.92
	Washington	1,260	12.44	1,382	13.65		Polk	126	9.48	148	11.14		Williamson	257	1.74	248	1.68
Region 1	4,247	10.44	4,893	12.02	Putnam	971	16.63	955	16.35	Wilson	549	5.78	504	5.31			
2	Anderson	792	13.28	905	15.18	Rhea	309	12.31	286	11.39	Region 5	8,059	6.57	8,468	6.90		
	Blount	695	6.97	636	6.38	Sequatchie	85	7.39	115	10.00	Benton	126	9.73	267	20.61		
	Campbell	335	10.63	533	16.91	Smith	104	7.14	108	7.42	Carroll	213	9.58	348	15.65		
	Claiborne	271	10.67	344	13.55	Van Buren	45	9.87	46	10.09	Chester	179	13.19	173	12.75		
	Cocke	333	11.90	439	15.69	Warren	421	13.78	408	13.36	Crockett	143	12.91	126	11.37		
	Grainger	164	9.09	146	8.09	White	309	15.06	296	14.42	Decatur	134	14.35	126	13.49		
	Hamblen	746	15.45	1,056	21.87	Region 3	9,154	12.04	8,982	11.81	Dyer	438	15.21	409	14.20		
	Jefferson	379	9.08	426	10.20	Region 4 (Davidson)	5,455	10.40	6,291	12.00	Fayette	163	5.28	206	6.67		
	Knox	3,819	10.84	3,649	10.36	Bedford	305	8.87	356	10.35	Gibson	406	10.84	545	14.55		
	Loudon	254	6.24	217	5.33	Cannon	90	8.30	80	7.38	Hardeman	302	14.53	222	10.68		
	Monroe	276	7.78	232	6.54	Cheatham	112	3.69	129	4.25	Hardin	420	20.49	386	18.83		
	Morgan	147	8.45	171	9.83	Coffee	423	10.37	514	12.60	Haywood	111	8.00	112	8.07		
	Roane	411	9.71	475	11.23	Dickson	373	9.63	357	9.21	Henderson	253	11.78	233	10.85		
	Scott	123	7.41	187	11.27	Franklin	286	8.74	312	9.53	Henry	174	6.84	288	11.32		
Sevier	537	7.16	509	6.79	Giles	243	10.66	236	10.35	Lake	32	4.97	45	6.99			
Union	104	7.10	104	7.10	Hickman	153	8.03	217	11.38	Lauderdale	215	10.22	280	13.31			
Region 2	9,386	9.91	10,029	10.59	Houston	38	5.88	53	8.20	Madison	1,496	19.80	1,261	16.69			
3	Bledsoe	105	9.12	103	8.95	Humphreys	128	9.05	108	7.64	McNairy	279	13.74	290	14.28		
	Bradley	767	9.60	813	10.18	Lawrence	355	11.19	377	11.88	Obion	190	7.89	236	9.80		
	Clay	85	13.77	76	12.31	Lewis	98	10.58	98	10.58	Tipton	562	12.26	612	13.35		
	Cumberland	409	8.63	441	9.31	Lincoln	150	5.75	180	6.90	Weakley	283	10.21	262	9.46		
	DeKalb	235	15.75	192	12.87	Marshall	218	9.14	326	13.67	Region 6	6,119	12.50	6,427	13.13		
	Fentress	147	10.54	178	12.76	Maury	800	12.24	807	12.35	Region 7 (Shelby)	15,111	21.60	14,616	20.90		
	Grundy	143	13.58	148	14.06	Montgomery	1,031	7.46	1,023	7.40	County unknown	1,942	-	1,012	-		
	Hamilton	3,732	13.48	3,479	12.56	Moore	16	*	*	2.38	Tennessee	59,473	11.77	62,142	12.29		

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: TDMHSAS Office of Crisis Services and Suicide Prevention (numbers include walk-in center and mobile crisis face-to-face assessments); U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2014).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; \*Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

## **Section 4: TDMHSAS prevention, treatment, recovery and rehabilitation indicators**

### **4.1. Substance abuse services**

## ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE ADOLESCENT RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT SITES

TDMHSAS prevention, treatment,  
recovery and rehabilitation indicators

**Figure 7. Alcohol and drug abuse adolescent residential treatment sites as of 2/11/2016**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*

**Table 55. Bed capacity of alcohol and drug abuse adolescent residential treatment sites for children and youth**


PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16
1	Johnson	0	25	25
1	Sullivan	12	12	12
2	Blount	56	56	56
2	Hamblen	2	2	2
2	Knox	24	24	24
3	Hamilton	40	40	36
4	Davidson	36	24	36
5	Cheatham	0	8	8
6	Dyer	13	13	13
6	Madison	52	52	56
7	Shelby	99	75	75
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>334</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>343</b>

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region



**Figure 9. Alcohol and drug abuse adult halfway house sites as of 2/11/2016**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*

**Table 57. Bed capacity of alcohol and drug abuse adult halfway house sites**

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16
2	Anderson	23	15	15
2	Knox	141	141	117
3	Bradley	10	10	10
3	Hamilton	60	60	40
4	Davidson	93	115	105
5	Bedford	30	30	30
5	Lewis	0	38	38
5	Marshall	0	7	7
5	Maury	32	32	15
5	Montgomery	0	10	10
5	Rutherford	40	40	40
5	Trousdale	0	15	7
6	Crockett	8	8	0
6	Hardin	24	24	24
7	Shelby	79	79	89
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>540</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>547</b>

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Figure 10. Alcohol and drug abuse adult residential rehabilitation sites as of 2/11/2016**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*

**Table 58. Bed capacity of alcohol and drug abuse adult residential rehabilitation sites**


PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of	As of	As of
1	Sullivan	39	39	39
1	Washington	22	22	22
2	Blount	75	75	82
2	Knox	40	40	46
2	Sevier	36	42	42
3	Hamilton	82	68	72
3	Putnam	18	18	23
4	Davidson	148	187	186
5	Bedford	10	10	10
5	Cheatham	8	0	0
5	Dickson	88	102	98
5	Hickman	4	9	21
5	Lewis	69	50	50
5	Lincoln	0	0	11
5	Marshall	13	6	6
5	Maury	32	32	15
5	Montgomery	5	0	0
5	Rutherford	0	8	16
5	Trousdale	25	18	26
6	Gibson	12	0	0
6	Madison	52	55	60
7	Shelby	265	265	255
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>1,043</b>	<b>1,046</b>	<b>1,080</b>

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

## SUBSTANCE ABUSE ADULT ADDICTIONS RECOVERY PROGRAM SITES

**Figure 11. Substance abuse addictions recovery program sites in FY2015**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*


**Table 59. Substance abuse addictions recovery program sites**

PPR	County	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
1	Carter	0	0	1
1	Hawkins	1	0	0
1	Sullivan	1	1	0
1	Washington	1	1	2
2	Anderson	2	1	1
2	Campbell	0	0	1
2	Hamblen	1	0	0
2	Jefferson	1	0	0
2	Knox	4	4	5
2	Monroe	1	1	0
2	Morgan	0	1	0
2	Sevier	0	0	1
3	Bradley	1	1	0
3	Hamilton	1	1	1
3	Jackson	0	0	1
3	Macon	0	0	0
3	McMinn	1	1	0
3	Putnam	2	2	0
4	Davidson	31	33	24
5	Bedford	2	2	1
5	Coffee	0	0	0
5	Humphreys	1	1	1
5	Lewis	1	1	1
5	Marshall	1	1	0
5	Maury	2	2	1
5	Montgomery	0	0	0
5	Robertson	2	2	1
5	Rutherford	2	1	1
5	Wilson	1	2	2
6	Crockett	0	0	1
6	Dyer	2	2	2
6	Hardin	3	2	2
6	Madison	2	3	2
7	Shelby	25	24	25
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>77</b>

Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Figure 12. Substance abuse prevention coalitions in FY2015**



**Table 60. Substance abuse prevention coalitions**

PPR	County	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
1	Johnson	1	1	1
1	Sullivan	1	1	1
1	Washington	1	1	1
2	Anderson	1	1	1
2	Blount	1	1	1
2	Hamblen	1	1	1
2	Jefferson	1	1	1
2	Knox	1	1	1
2	Roane	1	1	1
2	Scott	1	1	1
2	Union	1	1	1
3	Clay	1	1	1
3	Fentress	1	1	0
3	Grundy	1	1	1
3	Hamilton	1	1	1
3	Jackson	1	1	1
3	McMinn	1	1	1
3	Overton	1	1	1
3	Putnam	1	1	1

PPR	County	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
3	Smith	1	1	1
4	Davidson	1	1	5
5	Coffee	1	1	1
5	Dickson	1	1	1
5	Franklin	1	1	1
5	Rutherford	1	1	1
5	Stewart	1	1	1
5	Sumner	1	1	1
5	Williamson	1	1	1
6	Dyer	1	1	1
6	Henry	1	1	1
6	Lauderdale	1	1	1
6	Madison	1	0	1
6	Obion	1	1	0
6	Tipton	1	1	1
6	Weakley	1	1	1
7	Shelby	1	1	1
	<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>38</b>

Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Figure 13. Substance abuse prevention sites in FY2015 (for individuals ages 12-25 years)**




**Table 61. Substance abuse prevention sites (for individuals ages 12-25 years)**

PPR	County	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
1	Hancock	1	1	1
1	Hawkins	2	2	1
1	Sullivan	6	5	5
2	Anderson	5	3	3
2	Blount	2	1	1
2	Campbell	1	0	1
2	Cocke	6	6	6
2	Grainger	2	2	2
2	Hamblen	5	5	5
2	Jefferson	3	3	3
2	Knox	4	6	13
2	Loudon	1	1	1
2	Morgan	2	1	1
2	Roane	2	1	1
2	Scott	5	3	3
2	Union	1	1	1
3	Bradley	1	1	1
3	Clay	1	1	1
3	Cumberland	2	2	2
3	DeKalb	0	0	1
3	Fentress	2	1	1
3	Grundy	0	2	0
3	Hamilton	10	0	5
3	Macon	1	8	1
3	McMinn	2	2	4
3	Overton	1	2	2
3	Polk	1	1	1
3	Rhea	2	2	4
3	Van Buren	2	1	1
3	Warren	2	3	2
3	White	1	1	1
4	Davidson	17	15	15
5	Dickson	2	2	2
5	Franklin	1	1	1
5	Hickman	1	1	1
5	Humphreys	1	1	1
5	Maury	4	3	5
5	Montgomery	1	0	0
5	Robertson	1	0	1
5	Rutherford	4	2	2
5	Sumner	7	4	4
5	Trousdale	1	2	1
5	Williamson	1	0	0
5	Wilson	5	2	2
6	Carroll	0	0	1
6	Chester	3	2	2
6	Dyer	2	3	3
6	Fayette	5	6	7
6	Gibson	0	2	0
6	Hardeman	1	1	1
6	Henderson	5	7	6
6	Lake	1	1	1
6	Lauderdale	3	2	1
6	Madison	1	1	1
6	Obion	4	4	5
6	Tipton	5	4	5
6	Weakley	5	4	4
7	Shelby	9	13	15
	<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>162</b>

Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Figure 14. Substance abuse co-occurring capable treatment sites in FY2015**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*

**Table 62. Substance abuse co-occurring capable treatment sites**


PPR	County	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
1	Greene	2	3	0
1	Hawkins	3	0	0
1	Sullivan	8	7	8
2	Anderson	4	4	3
2	Cocke	9	0	0
2	Hamblen	2	1	0
2	Jefferson	3	0	0
2	Knox	15	27	5
2	Morgan	1	0	0
3	Hamilton	14	14	7
3	McMinn	2	0	0
4	Davidson	51	37	28
5	Bedford	5	4	3
5	Coffee	1	0	0
5	Dickson	2	0	0
5	Lewis	14	16	7

PPR	County	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
5	Marshall	12	12	0
5	Maury	5	3	3
5	Montgomery	1	1	0
5	Rutherford	3	1	0
5	Sumner	1	1	0
5	Wilson	4	6	0
6	Decatur	1	0	0
6	Dyer	2	0	0
6	Gibson	1	0	0
6	Hardeman	0	0	1
6	Hardin	1	0	0
6	Henry	1	0	1
6	Madison	12	10	9
7	Shelby	45	52	43
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>225</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>118</b>

Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Figure 15. Substance abuse co-occurring enhanced treatment sites in FY2015**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*

**Table 63. Substance abuse co-occurring enhanced treatment sites**

PPR	County	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
1	Carter	2	2	0
1	Greene	1	0	0
1	Hancock	3	4	0
1	Hawkins	3	4	0
1	Johnson	4	3	0
1	Sullivan	13	13	0
1	Unicoi	4	3	0
1	Washington	16	17	11
2	Anderson	0	1	0
2	Hamblen	1	0	0
2	Knox	12	0	14

PPR	County	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
2	Morgan	0	3	0
3	Hamilton	0	1	10
3	McMinn	6	5	0
3	Putnam	10	10	0
4	Davidson	3	3	3
5	Rutherford	4	2	0
5	Sumner	0	1	0
5	Wilson	2	2	0
6	Gibson	1	1	0
6	Madison	7	12	5
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>43</b>


Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

## **Section 4: TDMHSAS prevention, treatment, recovery and rehabilitation indicators**

### **4.1. Mental health services**

**Figure 16. Mental health residential treatment sites for children and youth as of 2/11/2016**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*

**Table 64. Bed capacity of mental health residential treatment sites for children and youth**

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16
1	Carter	0	0	16
1	Johnson	68	47	47
1	Washington	25	32	33
2	Anderson	29	36	39
2	Blount	128	113	113
2	Hamblen	13	13	14
2	Knox	35	25	25
2	Roane	52	52	116
3	Bradley	0	16	16
3	Hamilton	24	24	24
4	Davidson	124	112	124

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16
5	Cheatham	82	82	82
5	Humphreys	93	93	93
5	Maury	20	20	20
5	Perry	42	42	42
5	Rutherford	36	36	36
5	Sumner	24	24	24
5	Wilson	31	31	31
6	Dyer	15	15	15
6	Madison	53	53	61
7	Shelby	543	505	506
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>1,437</b>	<b>1,371</b>	<b>1,477</b>

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Figure 17. Mental health adult supportive living sites in FY2015**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*


**Table 65. Bed capacity of mental health adult supportive living sites**

PPR	County	# beds			PPR	County	# beds			PPR	County	# beds		
		As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16			As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16			As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16
1	Carter	3	3	0	3	Marion	10	10	10	5	Lincoln	15	15	0
1	Greene	18	18	10	3	McMinn	7	0	3	5	Maury	5	5	20
1	Hawkins	8	8	0	3	Overton	16	16	16	5	Montgomery	8	8	0
1	Sullivan	30	30	30	3	Putnam	18	13	13	5	Rutherford	118	127	105
1	Washington	21	21	18	3	Rhea	0	8	8	5	Sumner	0	8	8
2	Anderson	30	30	30	3	Warren	90	90	89	5	Williamson	8	16	0
2	Blount	16	16	16	3	White	8	8	8	5	Wilson	162	152	155
2	Claiborne	11	0	0	4	Davidson	331	393	366	6	Benton	34	34	37
2	Hamblen	11	0	0	5	Bedford	49	36	46	6	Carroll	15	35	0
2	Jefferson	32	32	34	5	Cannon	22	28	16	6	Dyer	19	28	32
2	Knox	128	100	92	5	Coffee	24	24	0	6	Gibson	10	10	10
2	Monroe	25	25	25	5	Dickson	5	5	5	6	Hardeman	79	79	79
3	Bledsoe	10	10	10	5	Franklin	10	10	10	6	Henry	22	22	22
3	Bradley	16	16	16	5	Hickman	40	49	28	6	Madison	35	35	35
3	Clay	15	15	15	5	Houston	15	15	16	7	Shelby	377	441	446
3	Hamilton	150	155	176	5	Humphreys	14	14	14		<b>Tennessee</b>	<b>2,109</b>	<b>2,229</b>	<b>2,085</b>

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Figure 18. Mental health adult residential treatment sites in FY2015**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*

**Table 66. Bed capacity of mental health adult residential treatment sites**


PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16
2	Anderson	2	2	2
2	Blount	37	37	24
2	Sevier	29	36	42
3	Hamilton	12	12	12
3	Rhea	0	16	16
3	Warren	24	24	24
4	Davidson	16	16	16
5	Dickson	0	26	26

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16
5	Hickman	4	5	18
5	Humphreys	0	24	24
5	Sumner	20	25	25
5	Williamson	0	0	16
6	Obion	8	8	8
6	Madison	0	10	0
6	Weakley	8	8	8
7	Shelby	54	62	64
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>214</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>325</b>

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Figure 19. Mental health adult supportive residential sites in FY2015**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*

**Table 67. Bed capacity of mental health adult supportive residential sites**

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds	PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds	
		As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16			As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	
1	Washington	16	20	20	5	Maury	16	8	8	
2	Knox	15	15	15	5	Montgomery	8	8	8	
2	Sevier	0	7	19	5	Rutherford	10	10	0	
3	Grundy	10	10	10	5	Sumner	10	20	20	
3	Hamilton	52	42	32	5	Wilson	44	54	54	
3	Macon	8	8	8	6	Carroll	16	48	48	
3	McMinn	8	8	8	6	Dyer	4	4	0	
3	Putnam	20	20	20	6	Fayette	8	8	8	
3	Rhea	0	8	8	6	Lauderdale	6	6	6	
3	Warren	16	24	41	6	Obion	18	18	18	
4	Davidson	165	143	135	6	Weakley	16	16	16	
5	Bedford	15	15	15	7	Shelby	27	25	14	
5	Coffee	8	8	61	<b>Tennessee</b>			<b>520</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>611</b>
5	Hickman	4	4	19						

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

**Figure 20. Licensed mental health psychosocial rehabilitation program sites in FY2015**



*Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.*

**Table 68. Bed capacity of licensed mental health psychosocial rehabilitation program sites**

PPR	County	#			PPR	County	#		
		As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16			As of 7/1/13	As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16
1	Greene	1	1	1	5	Dickson	1	1	1
1	Sullivan	2	2	2	5	Maury	3	3	3
1	Washington	1	1	1	5	Montgomery	1	1	1
2	Anderson	1	1	1	5	Rutherford	1	1	1
2	Campbell	1	1	1	5	Wilson	1	1	1
2	Knox	4	3	3	6	Benton	0	1	1
2	Roane	1	1	1	6	Carroll	0	1	1
2	Scott	1	1	1	6	Gibson	0	1	1
3	Hamilton	1	1	1	6	Henry	1	1	1
3	Warren	1	1	1	6	Madison	1	1	1
4	Davidson	7	6	6	6	Obion	0	1	1
5	Bedford	1	1	1	6	Weakley	1	0	0
5	Coffee	1	1	1	7	Shelby	5	5	5
<b>Tennessee</b>		<b>38</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>39</b>					

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region