

ROSI ADMIN MEASURES– DESCRIPTION OF CHARTS

Data Validity Graph

Valid Data: > 75% response rate from providers

Invalid Data: <75% response rate from providers

QM Panel Graph

"Yes": Indicates County provided complete information on QM panel, as described in "ROSI General Recommendations" document

"No": Indicates County did not provide complete information on QM panel as described in "ROSI General Recommendations" document

Peer Cnsmr Programs Graph

Indicator 1: Independent Peer/Consumer Operated Programs

"Yes": County reports the existence of at least one independent peer/consumer operated program

"No": County reports no independent peer/consumer operated programs

Peer Cnsmr Funding State Line

Indicator 2: % of County program funds allocated for peer/consumer delivered services (statewide view line graph)

Peer Cnsmr Funding Reg Line

Indicator 2: % of County program funds allocated for peer/consumer delivered services (regional views line graphs)

Peer Cnsmr Funding State View

Indicator 2: % of County program funds allocated for peer/consumer delivered services - counties ranked in quintiles (statewide view)

Peer Cnsmr Funding Reg Views

Indicator 2: % of County program funds allocated for peer/consumer delivered services - counties ranked in quintiles (regional views)

Jail Diversion Programs Graph

Indicator 21: County Jail Diversion Programs for Adults

"Yes": County reports the existence of at least one jail diversion program for adults

"No" County reports no jail diversion programs for adults

Affirm Hiring State Line

Indicator 5: % of MH providers with affirmative action hiring policies regarding primary consumers (statewide view line graph)

Affirm Hiring Reg Line

Indicator 5: % of MH providers with affirmative action hiring policies regarding primary consumers (regional views line graphs)

Affirm Hiring State View

Indicator 5: % of MH providers with affirmative action hiring policies regarding primary consumers - counties ranked in quintiles (statewide view)

Affirm Hiring Reg Views

Indicator 5: % of MH provides with affirmative action hiring policies regarding primary consumers - counties ranked in quintiles (regional views)

Mission Statement State Line

Indicator 9: % of MH providers with a mission statement explicitly recovery-oriented (statewide view line graph)

Mission Statement Reg Line

Indicator 9: % of MH providers with a recovery-oriented mission statement (regional views line graphs)

Mission Statement State View

Indicator 9: % of MH providers with a recovery-oriented mission statement - counties ranked in quintiles (statewide view)

Mission Statement Reg Views

Indicator 9: % of MH providers with a recovery-oriented mission statement - counties ranked in quintiles (regional views)

Cnsmr Reps State Line

Indicator 14: % of disclosed primary consumers serving on local governing boards (statewide view line graph)

Cnsmr Reps Reg Line

Indicator 14: % of consumers serving on local governing boards (regional views line graphs)

Cnsmr Reps State View


Indicator 14: % of consumers serving on local governing boards - counties ranked in quintiles (statewide view)

Cnsmr Reps Reg View

Indicator 14: % of consumers serving on local governing boards - counties ranked in quintiles (regional views)

Note: All indicators expressed in percentages were adjusted to the response rates. Example: if the unadjusted % for an indicator was 30% and the provider response rate was 80%, the adjusted indicator would be 80% of 30% = 24%

Data Validity	Counties
Valid Data (>75% response rate)	38
Invalid Data (<75% response rate)	9




Valid Data	
Allegheny	Erie
Arm/Ind	Fayette
Beaver	Frank/Fult
Bed/Som	Greene
Berks	Lack/Susq
Blair	Lancaster
Brad/Sull	Lawrence
Bucks	Luz/Wyom
Butler	Lyc/Clint
Cambria	McKean
Centre	Mercer
Chester	Montgomery
Clarion	Philadelphia
CMP	Schuylkill
CMSU	Tioga
Crawford	Venango
Cumb/Perry	Washington
Dauphin	Wayne
Delaware	Westmoreland

Invalid Data
Cam-Elk
Clear/Jeffe
For/Warr
HMJ
Lebanon
Lehigh
Northampton
Northumberland
Potter

*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010

QM Panel	Counties
Yes (complete information on QM panel provided)	29
No (information not provided on QM panel or incomplete)	18



"Yes"


Allegheny	Fayette
Beaver	Frank/Fult
Berks	Lehigh
Blair	Luz/Wyom
Brad/Sull	Lyc/Clint
Bucks	Mercer
Cam-Elk	Northampton
Chester	Northumberland
CMP	Potter
CMSU	Venango
Crawford	Washington
Cumb/Perry	Wayne
Dauphin	
Delaware	

"No"

Arm/Ind
Bed/Som
Butler
Cambria
Centre
Clarion
Clear/Jeffe
Erie
For/Warr
Greene
HMJ
Lack/Susq
Lawrence
McKean
Montgomery
Philadelphia
Schuylkill
Tioga

*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010

Peer/Consumer Programs		
Yes	23	counties
No	24	counties



"Yes"


Allegheny	Frank/Fult
Arm/Ind	HMJ
Brad/Sull	Lancaster
Bucks	Lawrence
Butler	Lehigh
Centre	McKean
Clarion	Mercer
Clear/Jeffe	Montgomery
Crawford	Northampton
Cumb/Perry	Northumberland
Dauphin	Philadelphia
Erie	

"No"

Beaver	Greene
Bed/Som	Lack/Susq
Berks	Lebanon
Blair	Luz/Wyom
Cambria	Lyc/Clint
Cam-Elk	Potter
Chester	Schuylkill
CMP	Tioga
CMSU	Venango
Delaware	Washington
Fayette	Wayne
For/Warr	Westmoreland



*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010



Statewide Peer/Consumer Funding



*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010


County	2009	2010
Bucks	6.80%	6.06%
Chester	2.18%	2.75%
Delaware	0.96%	2.02%
Montgomery	5.95%	9.71%
Philadelphia	22.55%	28.85%
Allegheny	2.52%	2.48%
Arm/Ind	1.24%	0.78%
Beaver	1.15%	1.04%
Butler	7.77%	7.45%
Cam-Elk	2.91%	5.09%
Clarion	20.94%	3.48%
Clear/Jeffe	5.16%	33.60%
Crawford	24.78%	20.82%
Erie	1.99%	5.00%
Fayette	7.06%	1.48%
For/Warr	0.00%	0.00%
Greene	6.33%	6.51%
Lawrence	11.09%	10.22%
McKean	1.77%	6.98%
Mercer	4.01%	6.00%
Potter	0.00%	0.00%
Venango	6.76%	6.83%
Washington	3.78%	1.53%
Westmoreland	5.46%	5.50%
Bed/Som	0.42%	0.70%
Blair	3.51%	6.58%
Cambria	3.46%	3.92%
Centre	11.40%	0.80%
CMSU	8.35%	10.16%
Cumb/Perry	3.87%	4.46%
Dauphin	0.61%	0.73%
Frank/Fult	7.53%	1.27%
HMJ	5.13%	5.78%
Lancaster	2.45%	2.45%
Lebanon	1.23%	2.53%
Lyc/Clint	0.10%	0.20%
Northumberland	2.43%	2.21%
*York/ Adams	4.37%	N/A
Berks	0.18%	0.78%
Brad/Sull	7.20%	31.68%
CMP	4.65%	5.00%
Lack/Susq	1.57%	0.40%
Lehigh	1.80%	2.06%
Luz/Wyom	1.13%	1.23%
Northampton	4.20%	0.83%
Schuylkill	7.11%	7.07%
Tioga	0.00%	0.00%
Wayne	2.42%	3.97%





*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010





County	2009	2010
Bucks	4	4
Chester	2	3
Delaware	1	2
Montgomery	4	5
Philadelphia	5	5
Allegheny	3	3
Arm/Ind	2	1
Beaver	1	2
Butler	5	5
Cam-Elk	3	4
Clarion	5	3
Clear/Jeffe	4	5
Crawford	5	5
Erie	2	3
Fayette	4	2
For/Warr	1	1
Greene	4	4
Lawrence	5	5
McKean	2	5
Mercer	3	4
Potter	1	1
Venango	4	4
Washington	3	2
Westmoreland	4	4
Bed/Som	1	1
Blair	3	4
Cambria	3	3
Centre	5	1
CMSU	5	5
Cumb/Perry	3	3
Dauphin	1	1
Frank/Fult	5	2
HMJ	4	4
Lancaster	3	3
Lebanon	2	3
Lyc/Clint	1	1
Northumberland	2	2
*York/ Adams	3	
Berks	1	1
Brad/Sull	5	5
CMP	4	3
Lack/Susq	2	1
Lehigh	2	2
Luz/Wyom	1	2
Northampton	2	2
Schuylkill	5	5
Tioga	1	1
Wayne	2	3




This chart is a compilation of self reported peer-consumer funding percentages by county, ranked and divided into fifths (20%). OMHSAS has not independently verified the data. If the county was in the first fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the bottom 20%. If the county was in the 2nd fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the second 20% (above 20% but below 40%). If the county was in the 3rd fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the third 20% (above 40% but below 60%). If the county was in the 4th fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the fourth 20% (above 60% but below 80%). If the county was in the 5th fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell within the top 20%.

*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010.

County	2009	2010
Bucks	4	4
Chester	2	3
Delaware	1	2
Montgomery	4	5
Philadelphia	5	5
Allegheny	3	3
Arm/Ind	2	1
Beaver	1	2
Butler	5	5
Cam-Elk	3	4
Clarion	5	3
Clear/Jeffe	4	5
Crawford	5	5
Erie	2	3
Fayette	4	2
For/Warr	1	1
Greene	4	4
Lawrence	5	5
McKean	2	5
Mercer	3	4
Potter	1	1
Venango	4	4
Washington	3	2
Westmoreland	4	4
Bed/Som	1	1
Blair	3	4
Cambria	3	3
Centre	5	1
CMSU	5	5
Cumb/Perry	3	3
Dauphin	1	1
Frank/Fult	5	2
HMJ	4	4
Lancaster	3	3
Lebanon	2	3
Lyc/Clint	1	1
Northumberland	2	2
*York/ Adams	3	
Berks	1	1
Brad/Sull	5	5
CMP	4	3
Lack/Susq	2	1
Lehigh	2	2
Luz/Wyom	1	2
Northampton	3	2
Schuylkill	5	5
Tioga	1	1
Wayne	2	3



Jail Diversion Programs		
Yes	38	counties
No	9	counties



"Yes"


Allegheny	Frank/Fult
Beaver	HMJ
Berks	Lack/Susq
Blair	Lancaster
Brad/Sull	Lawrence
Bucks	Lebanon
Butler	Lehigh
Cambria	Luz/Wyom
Cam-Elk	Lyc/Clint
Centre	Mercer
Chester	Montgomery
Clear/Jeffe	Northampton
CMSU	Northumberland
Crawford	Philadelphia
Cumb/Perry	Schuylkill
Dauphin	Tioga
Delaware	Venango
Erie	Washington
Fayette	Westmoreland

"No"

Arm/Ind
Bed/Som
CMP
Clarion
For/Warr
Greene
McKean
Potter
Wayne



*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010



Statewide Affirmative Action Hiring Policies



*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010


County	2009	2010
Bucks	27.27%	36.36%
Chester	9.09%	33.33%
Delaware	4.35%	5.56%
Montgomery	14.29%	26.09%
Philadelphia	27.66%	26.42%
Allegheny	4.44%	4.44%
Arm/Ind	36.36%	36.36%
Beaver	0.00%	0.00%
Butler	0.00%	0.00%
Cam-Elk	0.00%	11.11%
Clarion	50.00%	100.00%
Clear/Jeffe	14.29%	6.45%
Crawford	14.29%	28.57%
Erie	14.29%	33.33%
Fayette	0.00%	0.00%
For/Warr	0.00%	22.22%
Greene	61.54%	61.54%
Lawrence	100.00%	100.00%
McKean	20.00%	20.00%
Mercer	0.00%	20.00%
Potter	0.00%	0.00%
Venango	50.00%	28.57%
Washington	0.00%	0.00%
Westmoreland	5.56%	10.53%
Bed/Som	0.00%	0.00%
Blair	28.57%	37.50%
Cambria	45.45%	45.45%
Centre	12.50%	11.11%
CMSU	0.00%	0.00%
Cumb/Perry	0.00%	0.00%
Dauphin	12.90%	13.79%
Frank/Fult	0.00%	0.00%
HMJ	0.00%	7.69%
Lancaster	23.21%	23.21%
Lebanon	23.08%	23.08%
Lyc/Clint	20.00%	0.00%
Northumberland	12.50%	14.29%
*York/ Adams	0.00%	N/A
Berks	0.00%	4.76%
Brad/Sull	0.00%	0.00%
CMP	44.44%	44.44%
Lack/Susq	35.14%	17.39%
Lehigh	5.06%	5.06%
Luz/Wyom	36.36%	47.79%
Northampton	5.06%	5.06%
Schuylkill	14.29%	31.25%
Tioga	25.00%	25.00%
Wayne	40.00%	33.33%





*York/Adams did not submit data for 2010

County	2009	2010
Bucks	4	5
Chester	3	4
Delaware	2	2
Montgomery	3	4
Philadelphia	4	4
Allegheny	2	2
Arm/Ind	5	5
Beaver	1	1
Butler	1	1
Cam-Elk	1	3
Clarion	5	5
Clear/Jeffe	3	2
Crawford	3	4
Erie	3	4
Fayette	1	1
For/Warr	1	3
Greene	5	5
Lawrence	5	5
McKean	4	3
Mercer	1	3
Potter	1	1
Venango	5	4
Washington	1	1
Westmoreland	3	2
Bed/Som	1	1
Blair	4	5
Cambria	5	5
Centre	3	3
CMSU	1	1
Cumb/Perry	1	1
Dauphin	3	3
Frank/Fult	1	1
HMJ	1	2
Lancaster	4	4
Lebanon	4	3
Lyc/Clint	4	1
Northumberland	3	3
*York/ Adams	1	
Berks	1	2
Brad/Sull	1	1
CMP	5	5
Lack/Susq	2	1
Lehigh	2	2
Luz/Wyom	5	5
Northampton	2	2
Schuylkill	3	4
Tioga	4	4
Wayne	5	4







This chart is a compilation of self reported percentages of provider affirmative action hiring policies by county, ranked and divided into fifths (20%). OMHSAS has not independently verified the data. If the county was in the first fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the bottom 20%. If the county was in the 2nd fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the second 20% (above 20% but below 40%). If the county was in the 3rd fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the third 20% (above 40% but below 60%). If the county was in the 4th fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the fourth 20% (above 60% but below 80%). If the county was in the 5th fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell within the top 20%.

*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010


County	2009	2010
Bucks	4	5
Chester	3	4
Delaware	2	2
Montgomery	3	4
Philadelphia	4	4

Allegheny	2	2
Arm/Ind	5	5
Beaver	1	1
Butler	1	1
Cam-Elk	1	3
Clarion	5	5
Clear/Jeffe	3	2
Crawford	3	4
Erie	3	4
Fayette	1	1
For/Warr	1	3
Greene	5	5
Lawrence	5	5
McKean	4	3
Mercer	1	3
Potter	1	1
Venango	5	4
Washington	1	1
Westmoreland	3	2

Bed/Som	1	1
Blair	4	5
Cambria	5	5
Centre	3	3
CMSU	1	1
Cumb/Perry	1	1
Dauphin	3	3
Frank/Fult	1	1
HMJ	1	2
Lancaster	4	4
Lebanon	4	3
Lyc/Clint	4	1
Northumberland	3	3
*York/ Adams	1	





Statewide Recovery-Oriented Mission Statement




*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010


County	2009	2010
Bucks	72.73%	63.64%
Chester	27.27%	28.57%
Delaware	52.17%	72.22%
Montgomery	47.62%	47.83%
Philadelphia	48.94%	39.62%
Allegheny	24.44%	24.44%
Arm/Ind	36.36%	36.36%
Beaver	13.33%	12.50%
Butler	40.00%	40.00%
Cam-Elk	16.67%	44.44%
Clarion	50.00%	50.00%
Clear/Jeffe	14.29%	19.35%
Crawford	42.86%	85.71%
Erie	28.57%	41.67%
Fayette	28.57%	33.33%
For/Warr	0.00%	22.22%
Greene	46.15%	61.54%
Lawrence	100.00%	100.00%
McKean	20.00%	20.00%
Mercer	10.00%	60.00%
Potter	50.00%	25.00%
Venango	50.00%	71.43%
Washington	38.46%	50.00%
Westmoreland	66.67%	68.42%
Bed/Som	50.00%	50.00%
Blair	42.86%	37.50%
Cambria	63.64%	63.64%
Centre	37.50%	33.33%
CMSU	0.00%	0.00%
Cumb/Perry	40.00%	100.00%
Dauphin	25.81%	37.93%
Frank/Fult	55.25%	75.00%
HMJ	33.33%	23.08%
Lancaster	27.86%	27.86%
Lebanon	7.69%	7.69%
Lyc/Clint	40.00%	83.33%
Northumberland	37.50%	28.57%
*York/ Adams	9.17%	
Berks	26.32%	38.10%
Brad/Sull	100.00%	80.00%
CMP	77.78%	77.78%
Lack/Susq	25.68%	21.74%
Lehigh	12.66%	13.92%
Luz/Wyom	36.36%	66.91%
Northampton	12.66%	13.92%
Schuylkill	50.00%	81.25%
Tioga	50.00%	75.00%
Wayne	40.00%	55.56%



Western Recovery-Oriented Mission Statement




Central Region Recovery-Oriented Mission Statement



York/Adams did not provide data for 2010





County	2009	2010
Bucks	5	4
Chester	2	2
Delaware	5	5
Montgomery	4	3
Philadelphia	4	3
Allegheny	2	2
Arm/Ind	3	2
Beaver	1	1
Butler	3	3
Cam-Elk	1	3
Clarion	4	3
Clear/Jeffe	1	1
Crawford	4	5
Erie	2	3
Fayette	2	2
For/Warr	1	1
Greene	4	4
Lawrence	5	5
McKean	2	1
Mercer	1	4
Potter	4	2
Venango	4	4
Washington	3	3
Westmoreland	5	4
Bed/Som	4	3
Blair	4	2
Cambria	5	4
Centre	3	2
CMSU	1	1
Cumb/Perry	3	5
Dauphin	2	3
Frank/Fult	5	5
HMJ	3	1
Lancaster	2	2
Lebanon	1	1
Lyc/Clint	3	5
Northumberland	3	2
*York/ Adams	1	
Berks	2	3
Brad/Sull	5	5
CMP	5	5
Lack/Susq	2	1
Lehigh	1	1
Luz/Wyom	3	4
Northampton	1	1
Schuylkill	4	5
Tioga	4	5
Wayne	3	4




This chart is a compilation of self-reported percentages of provider recovery-oriented mission statements by county, ranked and divided into fifths (20%). OMHSAS has not independently verified the data. If the county was in the first fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the bottom 20%. If the county was in the 2nd fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the second 20% (above 20% but below 40%). If the county was in the 3rd fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the third 20% (above 40% but below 60%). If the county was in the 4th fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the fourth 20% (above 60% but below 80%). If the county was in the 5th fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell within the top 20%.

*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010

County	2009	2010
Bucks	5	4
Chester	2	2
Delaware	5	5
Montgomery	4	3
Philadelphia	4	3
Allegheny	2	2
Arm/Ind	3	2
Beaver	1	1
Butler	3	3
Cam-Elk	1	3
Clarion	4	3
Clear/Jeffe	1	1
Crawford	4	5
Erie	2	3
Fayette	2	2
For/Warr	1	1
Greene	4	4
Lawrence	5	5
McKean	2	1
Mercer	1	4
Potter	4	2
Venango	4	4
Washington	3	3
Westmoreland	5	4
Bed/Som	4	3
Blair	4	2
Cambria	5	4
Centre	3	2
CMSU	1	1
Cumb/Perry	3	5
Dauphin	2	3
Frank/Fult	5	5
HMJ	3	1
Lancaster	2	2
Lebanon	1	1
Lyc/Clint	3	5
Northumberland	3	2
*York/ Adams	1	
Berks	2	3
Brad/Sull	5	5
CMP	5	5
Lack/Susq	2	1
Lehigh	1	1
Luz/Wyom	3	4
Northampton	1	1
Schuylkill	4	5
Tioga	4	5
Wayne	3	4







Statewide Consumer Representation on Boards



*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010


County	2009	2010
Bucks	24.07%	22.68%
Chester	9.19%	5.67%
Delaware	2.39%	4.50%
Montgomery	10.77%	10.71%
Philadelphia	25.53%	50.94%
Allegheny	2.41%	2.41%
Arm/Ind	23.47%	23.47%
Beaver	2.91%	7.48%
Butler	15.31%	15.31%
Cam-Elk	9.62%	8.55%
Clarion	0.00%	0.00%
Clear/Jeffe	0.00%	20.65%
Crawford	17.41%	19.32%
Erie	9.32%	14.12%
Fayette	5.66%	5.66%
For/Warr	0.00%	22.22%
Greene	30.77%	30.77%
Lawrence	6.56%	5.00%
McKean	0.00%	0.00%
Mercer	6.14%	6.85%
Potter	0.00%	0.00%
Venango	3.40%	7.14%
Washington	3.28%	5.47%
Westmoreland	0.43%	0.81%
Bed/Som	0.00%	0.00%
Blair	16.67%	0.00%
Cambria	1.10%	1.10%
Centre	11.76%	20.94%
CMSU	0.00%	0.00%
Cumb/Perry	40.00%	17.54%
Dauphin	4.98%	6.12%
Frank/Fult	7.30%	7.73%
HMJ	16.45%	11.00%
Lancaster	6.40%	6.40%
Lebanon	6.15%	0.00%
Lyc/Clint	6.67%	5.56%
Northumberland	7.68%	12.24%
*York/ Adams	10.61%	
Berks	3.92%	4.72%
Brad/Sull	30.77%	20.74%
CMP	33.33%	11.11%
Lack/Susq	0.00%	3.35%
Lehigh	0.00%	8.86%
Luz/Wyom	0.00%	1.96%
Northampton	1.96%	1.36%
Schuylkill	28.57%	0.00%
Tioga	25.00%	25.00%
Wayne	20.00%	22.22%





*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010

County	2009	2010
Bucks	5	5
Chester	3	3
Delaware	2	2
Montgomery	4	3
Philadelphia	5	4
Allegheny	2	2
Arm/Ind	5	5
Beaver	2	3
Butler	4	4
Cam-Elk	4	3
Clarion	1	1
Clear/Jeffe	1	5
Crawford	4	4
Erie	4	4
Fayette	3	3
For/Warr	1	5
Greene	5	5
Lawrence	3	2
McKean	1	1
Mercer	3	3
Potter	1	1
Venango	2	3
Washington	2	2
Westmoreland	2	1
Bed/Som	1	1
Blair	4	1
Cambria	2	2
Centre	4	5
CMSU	1	1
Cumb/Perry	5	4
Dauphin	3	3
Frank/Fult	3	3
HMJ	4	4
Lancaster	3	3
Lebanon	3	1
Lyc/Clint	3	2
Northumberland	3	4
*York/ Adams	4	
Berks	2	2
Brad/Sull	5	5
CMP	5	4
Lack/Susq	1	2
Lehigh	1	1
Luz/Wyom	1	1
Northampton	2	2
Schuylkill	5	1
Tioga	5	5
Wayne	5	5



This chart is a compilation of self-reported percentages of consumer representation on local boards by county, ranked and divided into fifths (20%). OMHSAS has not independently verified the data. If the county was in the first fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the bottom 20%. If the county was in the 2nd fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the second 20% (above 20% but below 40%). If the county was in the 3rd fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the third 20% (above 40% but below 60%). If the county was in the 4th fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell in the fourth 20% (above 60% but below 80%). If the county was in the 5th fifth, it indicates that their comparative performance fell within the top 20%.

*York/Adams did not provide data for 2010.

County	2009	2010
Bucks	5	5
Chester	3	3
Delaware	2	2
Montgomery	4	3
Philadelphia	5	4
Allegheny	2	2
Arm/Ind	5	5
Beaver	2	3
Butler	4	4
Cam-Elk	4	3
Clarion	1	1
Clear/Jeffe	1	5
Crawford	4	4
Erie	4	4
Fayette	3	3
For/Warr	1	5
Greene	5	5
Lawrence	3	2
McKean	1	1
Mercer	3	3
Potter	1	1
Venango	2	3
Washington	2	2
Westmoreland	2	1
Bed/Som	1	1
Blair	4	1
Cambria	2	2
Centre	4	5
CMSU	1	1
Cumb/Perry	5	4
Dauphin	3	3
Frank/Fult	3	3
HMJ	4	4
Lancaster	3	3
Lebanon	3	1
Lyc/Clint	3	2
Northumberland	3	4
*York/ Adams	4	
Berks	2	2
Brad/Sull	5	5
CMP	5	4
Lack/Susq	1	2
Lehigh	1	1
Luz/Wyom	1	1
Northampton	2	2
Schuylkill	5	1
Tioga	5	5
Wayne	5	5

