

December 23, 2009

The Honorable Lacey E. Putney, Chairman
House Appropriations Committee
General Assembly Building, Room 947
P.O. Box 406
Richmond, Virginia 23218

Dear Delegate Putney:

I am pleased to forward to you my report in response to Item 282.C of the 2009 *Appropriation Act*. The language in Item 282.C reflected a need to obtain some information about the civil commitment process, particularly related to a possible budget request for additional funds to implement the mental health law reform statutory changes enacted in 2008.

There was an absence of comprehensive, readily available data about that process before the mental health law reform legislation was enacted by the 2008 General Assembly. On my behalf, the Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services collaborated with the Virginia Association of Community Services Boards, and worked with the Office of the Executive Secretary to provide information for this report.

I hope that you and your staff find the information in this report helpful.

Sincerely,

Marilyn B. Tavenner

MBT/jsr

Attachment

cc:

James S. Reinhard, M.D.
Karl R. Hade
Susan E. Massart

Frank L. Tetrick, III
Paul R. Gilding
Ruth Anne Walker

December 23, 2009

The Honorable Charles J. Colgan, Chairman
Senate Finance Committee
General Assembly Building, Room 626
P.O. Box 396
Richmond, Virginia 23218

Dear Senator Colgan:

I am pleased to forward to you my Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 *Appropriation Act*. On my behalf, the Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services collaborated with the Virginia Association of Community Services Boards, and worked with the Office of the Executive Secretary to provide information for this report.

The language in Item 282.C reflected a need to obtain some information about the civil commitment process, particularly related to a possible budget request for additional funds to implement the mental health law reform statutory changes enacted in 2008. There was an absence of comprehensive, readily available data about that process before the mental health law reform legislation was enacted by the 2008 General Assembly.

The reporting requirements in Item 282.C related to the impact of the changes in the civil commitment statutes were established out of a concern that changes in those statutes enacted in 2008 might lead to additional budget requests, and the General Assembly needed information to deal with those requests. Since these changes have been implemented successfully within the additional funds appropriated for this purpose by the 2008 Session and without additional budget requests, it seems that Item 282.C should be removed from the *2010 Appropriation Act*.

I hope that you and your staff find the information in this report helpful.

Sincerely,

Marilyn B. Tavenner

MBT/jsr

cc: James S. Reinhard, M.D.
Karl R. Hade
Joe Flores

Frank L. Tetrick, III
Paul R. Gilding
Ruth Anne Walker

**Report on Information on the Civil Commitment Process
(Item 282.C)**

**To The Governor
and Chairmen of the House Appropriations and
Senate Finance Committees of the General Assembly**

**Presented By
The Honorable Marilyn B. Tavenner
Secretary of Health and Human Resources**

December 15, 2009

Background

Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act states:

“The Secretary of Health and Human Resources, in consultation with the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court, shall develop a reporting system to collect relevant information on emergency custody orders (ECOs), involuntary commitment orders (TDOs), and mental health commitment hearings by fiscal year. The data shall include, but not be limited to, the number of ECOs, TDOs, and commitment hearings that occur each year by locality, and the estimated cost, duration, location, and disposition of each proceeding. The information collected shall comply with all relevant state and federal health privacy laws and shall not include any personal identifiable information. The data collected shall be reported to the Governor, the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees, and the Supreme Court by November 1, 2008, and each year thereafter.”

This report describes the activities of the Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services (Department) on behalf of the Secretary of Health and Human Resources (HHR) and with the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia (OES) in response to this budget item.

While the scarcity of usable data about the civil commitment process has improved somewhat since noted last year in the Department’s *Report Document 216 (2008)*, the lack of systematic data continues to make it difficult to project fiscal impacts for implementing the statutory changes in the involuntary commitment process.¹ As *Report Document 216* noted, along with this lack of usable data, another complication in gathering data about the civil commitment process is the high degree of variability with which it is implemented or administered across the state. For example, while the concept of an emergency custody order (ECO) may appear to be fairly clear and uncomplicated, the manner in which statutory provisions for ECOs are implemented varies considerably across Virginia. In some localities, few if any ECOs are issued by magistrates; instead, law enforcement officials take individuals into custody, as authorized by the statute, but there is no paper order issued by a magistrate. While there is no comprehensive information about the prevalence of this practice, most individuals familiar with the process indicate there could be thousands of ECOs executed by law enforcement officials each year. It would be impossible to obtain information about the estimated cost, duration, location, or disposition of those paperless ECOs. Similarly, the manner in which temporary detention orders are issued and executed varies greatly, particularly regarding duration and location, and the availability of documentation about those TDOs also varies widely across the state. Finally, the location and scheduling of commitment hearings varies considerably across the state.

In the absence of complete and systematic data, this report includes the data that is available. The report also contains a discussion of how more consistent statewide data will be gathered for FY 2010.

¹ *Report on the Allocation of Funds in Item 316.KK of the 2008 Appropriation Act*, September 1, 2008, page 4.

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

As a result of collaborative efforts in FY 2008, the Department, OES, and HHR developed a matrix, contained in the *Report Document 216 (2008)* and attached to this year's report as Appendix A, that describes how the community services boards (CSBs), Department, and OES plan to collect data to address the reporting requirements in Item 282.C. As noted in the *Report Document 216 (2008)*, staff of the Health and Human Resources Subcommittees of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees agreed in August 2008 that the presentation of data would be acceptable in general statements and trends, rather than in large amounts of detailed, specific data, which should reduce data collection and reporting efforts by CSBs. Department and committee staffs agreed to the following approaches for these data elements identified in Item 282.C:

Estimated Cost: A sampling approach based on estimated cost, rather than requiring CSBs to collect extensive data about estimated cost all of the time, is sufficient to respond to this data element. Data can be collected on estimated cost information for one month each quarter, and CSBs already collecting or readily able to gather estimated cost information should be in the sample. Unfortunately, it continues to prove difficult to collect cost data, but given the implementation of the statutory changes within appropriated funds, this data may not be needed.

Location: A sampling method for location also suffices for gathering this data element. Again, CSBs that already collect or could readily gather location information on ECOs and TDOs from their information systems should be in the sample.

Duration: Sampling also appears to be a feasible approach for this data element. There seemed to be some consensus that the important pieces of information being sought are how many ECOs are extended and how many consumers are released at the end of the six hour period due to inability to find a TDO placement, rather than measuring the exact length of each ECO.

Disposition: The intent of this data element is to measure movement through the commitment process. Data is collected on how many people come into the system through ECOs and how many individuals move to the next stage. For example, how many people were released at the expiration of ECOs and how many individuals advanced to a TDO.

The Department and CSBs support collecting meaningful data about the civil commitment process, whenever feasible, through the automated Community Consumer Submission (CCS). The CCS is a software application that extracts individual consumer and service data from local CSB information systems and transmits it each month to the Department. The consumer designation code in the CCS application is an example of this support for integrating data collection about the civil commitment process into the CCS. The consumer designation code enables CSBs and the Department to link specific individuals to particular initiatives or episodes of care. Modifications to the CCS application for FY 2009 established a new consumer designation code (905) to identify individuals who were subject to mandatory outpatient treatment (MOT) orders, pursuant to § 37.2-817 of the *Code of Virginia*. When an individual is admitted to a CSB for mental health services under a MOT order, a consumer designation code is assigned to the person in a type of care record in the CCS. This record includes the date on which services under the MOT order were initiated and will include a date on which those services end. This code enables the CSB and the Department to link demographic, clinical, and service information about the individual to the MOT order.

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

In an effort to collect more data about the civil commitment process through the CCS, the Department worked with the VACSB Data Management Committee and its Executive Directors Forum to modify the CCS for FY 2010 to include service subtype codes that will enable CSBs and the Department to identify subtypes of emergency services related to the civil commitment process. This will produce information in FY 2010 about the numbers of individuals under emergency custody orders or in the emergency custody of a law enforcement officer or under temporary detention orders who were seen by CSB staff, the number of commitment hearings attended and the CSB staff time involved, and the number of mandatory outpatient treatment order review hearings attended and the CSB staff time involved.

FY 2009 CSB Data on the Civil Commitment Process

Individuals Served by CSBs Under Mandatory Outpatient Treatment Orders: Because the 905 consumer designation code for MOT orders was a new feature of the CCS software in FY 2009, not all CSBs may have been able to implement complete data collection in the first year, so reports may have undercounted the number of MOT orders in which CSBs were involved. For FY 2009, eight CSBs reported serving 28 individuals under MOTs and the average length of time these individuals were served under MOT orders was 94.33 days.

Commitment Hearings Attended: Another source of data related to requirements in Item 282.C is one of the performance measures in Exhibit B of the FY 2009 community services performance contract between the Department and CSBs. Performance measure I.B.3 provides some information about the number of civil involuntary adult commitment hearings attended by CSBs. CSBs report the following data for this measure about CSB attendance at commitment hearings for a one month period each quarter:

- Number of commitment hearings for adults attended by the CSB's preadmission screening evaluators in its service area for its own consumers or on behalf of other CSBs,
- Number of commitment hearings for adults attended by the CSB's preadmission screening evaluators outside of its service area for CSB consumers, and
- Number of commitment hearings for adults attended by the CSB's preadmission screening evaluators outside of its service area on behalf of other CSBs.

CSBs reported attending 41,511 commitment hearings in FY 2009. A copy of the applicable part of the reporting form for Exhibit B with the FY 2009 data inserted and a table showing the figures for each CSB are attached to this report as Appendix B.

Emergency Custody and Temporary Detention Orders: A third source of data related to the civil commitment process is a stand-alone report that collects some of the information required by Item 282.C of the *2009 Appropriation Act*. This report was discussed more completely in *Report Document 121 (2008)*. All CSBs submit the short version of this report twice per year, once by the end of January for the first six months of the fiscal year and once after the end of the fiscal year for the entire fiscal year. Two sample CSBs also submitted the longer, more detailed version of this report. While the data from the sample CSBs is interesting in terms of the relative distributions, the sample is too small to draw any statewide inferences. The statewide summary

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

for these two versions of the Item 282.C report and a table displaying the data for each CSB are contained in Appendix C.

Based on the FY 2009 Item 282.C Reports from each CSB, the 40 CSBs saw 11,245 individuals under an ECO, either ECOs issues by magistrates (5,201 individuals) or paperless ECOs executed by law enforcement officers (6,044 individuals). Sixty-two percent of these ECOs resulted in the issuance of TDOs; 28 percent resulted in the release of the individuals in emergency custody; and 10 percent of the ECOs resulted in other dispositions.

FY 2009 Court Data on the Civil Commitment Process

The table below summarizes the court information that is available for this report. Changes to the General District Court case management system (CMS) to capture this information were made in November 2008, so the data is reported from January 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009. Changes to the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court case management system were not made until 2009, so information for these courts is not included; it will be available for the next reporting cycle. Detailed sorts of the data in the table below by locality are available from OES.

General District Court Information: 1/01/2009 - 6/30/2009		
Case Type	Final Disposition	Totals
Emergency Custody Orders	Dismissed	3
	Served	1,566
	Unexecuted	171
	Total	1,740
Mental Health Commitment Orders	Certified	45
	Discharged by Facility (Hearing)	54
	Discharged by Facility (No Hearing)	36
	Dismissed	2,097
	Involuntary Commitment	7,711
	Mandatory Outpatient Treatment	44
	Transfer	4
	Voluntary Commitment	2,893
Total	12,884	
Other Orders	Dismissed	80
	Judicial Authorization Denied	18
	Judicial Authorization Granted	341
	Review Hearing & Approval of MOTs	1
	Total	440
Review, Rescission, or Continuance for Mandatory Outpatient Treatment (MOT)	Continuance for MOT Petition Granted	2
	Continuance for MOT Petition Dismissed	47
	Order for MOT Rescission Granted	5
	Petition for MOT Continued	1
	Petition MOT Rescission	3
	Total	58
Temporary Detention Orders	Dismissed	4
	TDO Served	8,746
	TDO Unexecuted	410
	Total	9,160

Conclusion

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

The language in Item 282.C in the *2008 Appropriation Act*, and continued in the *2009 Appropriation Act*, reflected a need to obtain some information about the civil commitment process, particularly related to a possible budget request for additional funds to implement the mental health law reform statutory changes enacted in 2008. As previously noted, there was an absence of comprehensive, readily available data about that process before the mental health law reform legislation was enacted by the 2008 General Assembly, and this situation continues. The Department, along with CSBs, and OES are taking steps to remedy this situation.

In the short run, the Department and CSBs have had to rely mostly on manual ad-hoc reporting mechanisms developed specifically to address Item 282.C. Over time, reporting requirements that are feasible and meaningful should be incorporated into automated reporting systems whenever possible.

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

Appendix A: 2009 Appropriation Act Item 282 Reporting Requirements

The language in Item 282.C reflects the need to obtain some information about the involuntary civil commitment process, particularly relative to a possible budget request for additional funds to implement mental health law reform statutory changes. As previously noted, there was an absence of systematic, readily available data about that process before the mental health law reform legislation was enacted by the 2008 General Assembly Session, and this situation continues. The Department, along with CSBs, and the OES are taking steps to remedy this situation.

2009 Appropriation Act Item 282 Reporting Requirements ¹				
Data Reported for Each Locality by Fiscal Year ²	Emergency Custody Orders (ECOs)	Temporary Detention Orders (TDOs)	Involuntary Commitment Hearings ³	MOT Review Hearings ⁴
Number	CSBs ⁵	Courts	Courts	Courts
Estimated Cost ⁶	CSBs ⁵	DMAS, CSBs	Courts, OES, CSBs	Courts, OES, CSBs
Duration	Courts ⁵	CSBs ⁸	Courts ⁹	Courts ⁹
Location	CSBs ⁵	CSBs ⁸	Courts ⁹	Courts ⁹
Disposition	CSBs ⁵	NA ¹⁰	Courts	Courts

¹ Courts generate information from the district court case tracking database or Office of the Executive Secretary (OES) billing database. CSBs and the Department of Medical Assistance Services (DMAS) report their information to the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services (Department), which reports this information to the Secretary of Health and Human Resources. Item 282 requires an annual report of collected data to the Governor, the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees, and the Supreme Court by November 1 of each year, starting on November 1, 2008. Since the statutory changes only take effect on July 1, 2008, this first report could not provide annual information for FY 2008. Therefore, the first report should only describe how the information is being collected and will be reported by November 1, 2009 for FY 2008.

² CSBs will report FY 2009 information by emailed Excel spreadsheet reports. To the extent possible, reporting requirements will be incorporated into automated databases and reporting systems in FY 2010 or future years. Locality needs to be clarified; does it mean general district court district, CSB service area, or each city and county within a general district court district or CSB service area?

³ Includes recommitment hearings.

⁴ Although not mentioned specifically in Item 282, mandatory outpatient treatment (MOT) review hearings conducted pursuant to § 37.2-817.2 through § 37.2-817.4 are included because they might constitute a significant impact of the MH reform legislation.

⁵ CSBs can collect this information from preadmission screening forms completed by their staff or from other manual or automated records. The number of ECOs includes the numbers of orders issued and the instances where a law enforcement officer takes a person into emergency custody, reported as separate counts. Location information could be collected

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

from a sample of CSBs periodically during the fiscal year. Disposition means issuance of a TDO or release from custody.

- ⁶ Each organization reports information about estimated costs in its possession. For example, the OES reports its estimated or actual direct costs, including any reimbursed to other individuals or organizations (e.g., independent examiners, attorneys), for commitment and MOT review hearings, the DMAS reports its actual costs associated with TDOs from the Involuntary Commitment Fund, CSBs report their estimated or actual costs associated with all of these activities, and courts report their estimated or actual costs associated with commitment and MOT hearings. Estimated CSB cost data could be collected from a sample of CSBs periodically (e.g., one month per quarter) during the fiscal year.
- ⁷ Duration for ECO means number of ECOs for which magistrates granted a two-hour extension.
- ⁸ Duration means from the time the person is detained to the time a commitment hearing occurs or the person is released. Location is where the person is detained, normally a hospital or crisis stabilization program. These data will be obtained from the records of a sample of CSBs periodically (e.g., one month per quarter) during the fiscal year.
- ⁹ Duration means the actual length of the commitment or MOT review hearing; it does not include other activities associated with the hearing. Location means the place of the hearing. Attempts to obtain these data could be made through use of a survey during the fiscal year.
- ¹⁰ Disposition, except in extremely rare circumstances when a facility director discharges a person, means going to an involuntary commitment hearing. Therefore, this item does not need to be collected; it can be inferred by comparing the numbers of TDOs and commitment hearings.

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

Appendix B: Exhibit B Measure Related to Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

Statewide Summary of FY 2009 Performance Contract Exhibit B Measure Related to Item 282.C of the Appropriation Act			
	Expectation or Goal Measure	Data	Data Reported
I.B.3	Pursuant to subsection B of § 37.2-815 of the <i>Code of Virginia</i> , a preadmission screening evaluator or, through a mutual arrangement, an evaluator from another CSB, shall attend each commitment hearing for adults, original (up to 30 days) or recommitment (up to 180 days), held in the CSB's service area or for a CSB's consumer outside of its service area in person, or if that is not possible, the preadmission screening evaluator shall participate in the hearing through two-way electronic video and audio or telephonic communication systems, as authorized by subsection B of § 37.2-804.1 of the Code of Virginia, for the purposes of presenting preadmission screening reports and recommended treatment plans and facilitating least restrictive dispositions.	33,837	Number of commitment hearings for adults attended by CSB preadmission screening evaluators in their service areas for their own consumers or on behalf of other CSBs; reported for one month each quarter. ¹
		4,179	Number of commitment hearings for adults attended by CSB preadmission screening evaluators outside of their service areas for CSB consumers; reported for one month each quarter. ¹
		3,495	Number of commitment hearings for adults attended by CSB preadmission screening evaluators outside of their service areas on behalf of other CSB; reported for one month each quarter. ¹

¹ Data reported for one month per quarter has been extrapolated for the whole quarter by multiplying reported values by 3 to produce annualized figures; however, this assumes uniform patterns of hearings that may not reflect the actual reality.

The table on the following page provides information about commitment hearing attendance for each CSB. The footnotes on the table, explained below, describe the numbers in each column.

¹ Number of hearings attended by evaluators **in** the CSB's service **area** for its own consumers or on behalf of other CSBs.

² Number of hearings attended by evaluators for its own consumers **out of** the CSB's service **area**.

³ Number of hearings attended by evaluators on behalf of other CSBs **out of** the CSB's service **area**.

The footnote above about extrapolating data for the whole quarter applies to the table on the following page.

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

Commitment Hearings Attended by CSBs in FY 2009				
Community Services Board	In Area¹	Out of Area²	Out of Area³	Total
Alexandria	390	0	0	390
Alleghany Highlands	0	0	0	0
Arlington County	744	0	0	744
Blue Ridge	2,286	0	0	2,286
Central Virginia	1,293	276	219	1,788
Chesapeake	1,086	45	447	1,578
Chesterfield	0	75	0	75
Colonial	345	69	243	657
Crossroads	279	297	96	672
Cumberland Mountain	234	42	0	276
Danville-Pittsylvania	951	9	0	960
Dickenson County	0	15	0	15
District 19	1,977	54	9	2,040
Eastern Shore	93	3	0	96
Fairfax-Falls Church	1,761	0	0	1,761
Goochland-Powhatan	21	3	0	24
Hampton-Newport News	1,251	24	0	1,275
Hanover County	387	69	3	459
Harrisonburg-Rockingham	348	24	78	450
Henrico Area	906	111	3	1,020
Highlands	645	18	0	663
Loudoun County	594	6	0	600
Middle Peninsula-Northern Neck	483	465	318	1,266
Mount Rogers	1,989	12	3	2,004
New River Valley	1,377	24	0	1,401
Norfolk	414	579	0	993
Northwestern	1,071	228	264	1,563
Piedmont	609	0	0	609
Planning District One	0	552	765	1,317
Portsmouth	1,134	27	0	1,161
Prince William County	1,173	30	6	1,209
Rappahannock Area	1,107	66	144	1,317
Rappahannock-Rapidan	150	240	126	516
Region Ten	1,758	225	477	2,460
Richmond Behavioral Health Auth.	2,382	0	0	2,382
Rockbridge Area	30	69	102	201
Southside	210	255	0	465
Valley	750	0	0	750
Virginia Beach	3,288	201	0	3,489
Western Tidewater	321	66	192	579
Statewide Totals	33,837	4,179	3,495	41,511

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

Statewide Summary of FY 2009 Data for Item 282.C		
Data Reported by All CSBs		Data
1.	Numbers of Emergency Custody Orders (ECOs)	
1.a.	Number of Individuals Seen Who Were Under ECOs Issued by Magistrates ¹	5,201
1.b.	Number of Individuals Seen Who Were Under Custody of Law Enforcement Officers Without ECOs (Paperless ECOs)	6,044
2.	Dispositions of Emergency Custody Orders (ECOs)	
2.a.	Number of ECOs Resulting in Temporary Detention Orders (TDOs)	6,696
2.b.	Number of ECOs Resulting in Release of Individuals From Custody	2,962
2.c.	Number of ECOs With Other Dispositions	1,127
Data Reported by Sample CSBs		Data
3.	Location of Emergency Custody Orders (ECOs) ²	
3.a.	Number of ECOs Seen in Non-State Medical Hospital Emergency Departments	0
3.b.	Number of ECOs Seen in Non-State Medical Hospital Psychiatric Units	97
3.c.	Number of ECOs Seen in Other Non-State Medical Hospital Locations	8
3.d.	Number of ECOs Seen in Non-State Psychiatric Hospitals	0
3.e.	Number of ECOs Seen in State Psychiatric Hospitals	4
3.f.	Number of ECOs Seen in Residential Crisis Stabilization Units	0
3.g.	Number of ECOs Seen in Ambulatory (23 hour) Crisis Stabilization Services	144
3.h.	Number of ECOs Seen in Law Enforcement Facilities (Jails or Police Stations)	3
3.i.	Number of ECOs Seen in Homeless Shelters	0
3.j.	Number of ECOs Seen in Other Community Locations	6
4.	Duration of Temporary Detention Orders (TDOs) ³	
4.a.	Number of TDOs With a Duration of up Through 24 Hours	7
4.b.	Number of TDOs With a Duration of More Than 24 up Through 48 Hours	238
4.c.	Number of TDOs With a Duration of More Than 48 up Through 72 Hours	80
4.d.	Number of TDOs With a Duration of More Than 72 up Through 96 Hours	63
4.e.	Number of TDOs With a Duration of More Than 96 Hours	8
5.	Location of Temporary Detention Orders (TDOs)	
5.a.	Number of TDOs Detained in Non-State Med. Hospital Emergency Departments	0
5.b.	Number of TDOs Detained in Non-State Medical Hospital Psychiatric Units	427
5.c.	Number of TDOs Detained in Non-State Psychiatric Hospitals	0
5.d.	Number of TDOs Detained in State Psychiatric Hospitals	4
5.e.	Number of TDOs Detained in Residential Crisis Stabilization Units	0
5.f.	Number of TDOs Detained in Ambulatory Crisis Stabilization Services	0
5.g.	Number of TDOs Detained in Law Enforcement Facilities	3
5.h.	Number of TDOs Detained in Other Community Locations	0

¹ The numbers of ECOs in 1.a may not equal the total numbers of ECOs issued by magistrates because some ECOs are not executed.

² Number of ECOs Seen means number of individuals seen who were under ECOs issued by magistrates or who were under custody of law enforcement officers without written ECOs.

³ Duration means the time between issuance of a TDO and a commitment hearing. The purpose of reporting TDOs by ranges of time is to identify TDOs that are too short (4.a.) or too long (4.e.) to meet the requirements in § 37.2-809 of the *Code of Virginia* and to provide feedback about possible statutory changes in the length of TDOs.

Report on Item 282.C of the 2009 Appropriation Act

Community Services Board	1.a	1.b.	2.a	2.b.	2.c.
Alexandria	66	65	102	19	0
Alleghany Highlands	12	30	29	11	2
Arlington County	21	260	178	103	0
Blue Ridge	395	513	607	266	35
Central Virginia	275	360	363	233	39
Chesapeake	64	0	54	10	0
Chesterfield	115	287	282	103	17
Colonial	45	27	58	14	0
Crossroads	136	62	145	44	9
Cumberland Mountain	155	103	69	80	6
Danville-Pittsylvania	235	0	153	78	4
Dickenson County	28	21	31	17	1
District 19	271	341	427	161	24
Eastern Shore	82	0	67	13	2
Fairfax-Falls Church	2	148	95	42	13
Goochland-Powhatan	7	34	20	20	1
Hampton-Newport News	132	0	98	34	0
Hanover County	114	237	184	42	19
Harrisonburg-Rockingham	23	34	53	43	3
Henrico Area	12	323	257	40	18
Highlands	144	58	84	60	0
Loudoun County	27	346	180	104	88
Middle Peninsula-Northern Neck	148	153	166	121	14
Mount Rogers	243	227	261	158	51
New River Valley	106	183	185	96	8
Norfolk	15	717	338	15	379
Northwestern	135	368	187	204	112
Piedmont	326	8	267	92	4
Planning District One	233	54	136	96	1
Portsmouth	0	112	85	9	18
Prince William County	266	213	326	149	4
Rappahannock Area	205	181	223	112	51
Rappahannock-Rapidan	37	70	49	53	5
Region Ten	97	87	32	65	0
Richmond Behavioral Health Auth.	306	0	203	42	61
Rockbridge Area	30	3	40	17	4
Southside	33	56	71	12	6
Valley	80	79	80	43	36
Virginia Beach	272	146	216	16	70
Western Tidewater	308	138	295	125	22
Statewide Totals	5,201	6,044	6,696	2,962	1,127

¹ Numbered and lettered column headings refer to the top of the table on the previous page.