

# **Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance 2004 Supplement**

**Chlamydia Prevalence Monitoring Project  
Annual Report 2004**

**Division of STD Prevention  
December 2005**

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention  
Division of STD Prevention  
Atlanta, Georgia 30333



Centers for Disease Control and  
Prevention.....Julie Louise Gerberding, M.D., M.P.H.  
*Director*

Coordinating Center for Infectious Diseases..... Mitchell L. Cohen, M.D.  
*Director*

National Center for  
HIV, STD, and TB Prevention.....Ronald O. Valdiseri, M.D., M.P.H.  
*Acting Director*

Division of STD Prevention.....John M. Douglas, Jr., M.D.  
*Director*

Epidemiology and Surveillance  
Branch..... Stuart M. Berman, M.D., Sc.M.  
*Chief*

Surveillance and Special Studies  
Team..... Hillard Weinstock, M.D., M.P.H.  
*Lead*

Chlamydia Prevalence  
Monitoring Project..... Hillard Weinstock, M.D., M.P.H.  
*Project Coordinator (Acting)*

Statistics and Data Management  
Branch..... Samuel L. Groseclose, D.V.M., M.P.H.  
*Chief*

Melinda L. Flock, M.S.P.H.  
*Deputy Branch Chief*

Rose Horsley  
*Team Lead*

## Copyright Information

All material contained in this report is in the public domain and may be used and reprinted without special permission; citation to source, however, is appreciated.

## Suggested Citation

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance 2004 Supplement, Chlamydia Prevalence Monitoring Project*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, December 2005.

Copies can be obtained from either the National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, Mailstop E-07, Atlanta, Georgia 30333 or order printed copies through the STD publication ordering system at <http://www.cdc.gov/std>

The report is also available by Internet via the CDC home page at: <http://www.cdc.gov/std/Chlamydia2004/>

## Preface

*Chlamydia Prevalence Monitoring Project Annual Report, 2004* presents statistics and trends for *Chlamydia trachomatis* in the United States through 2004. This annual publication is intended as a reference document for policy makers, program managers, health planners, researchers, and others who are concerned with the public health implications of this disease. The figures and tables in this edition supersede those in earlier publications of these data.

The surveillance information in this report is based on the following sources of data: (1) case reporting from all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; and (2) prevalence data from the Regional Infertility Prevention Projects and the National Job Training Program.

*Chlamydia Prevalence Monitoring Project Annual Report, 2004* consists of four parts. The **National Profile** contains text and figures that provide an overview of chlamydia surveillance in sexually active women and men in the United States. It also includes the sources and limitations of the data used to produce this report. The **Regional Profiles** contain chlamydia trend data in women in all ten HHS regions. The **State Profiles** provide statistical information about chlamydia in women in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The **City Profiles** provide statistical information about chlamydia in women for selected cities.

Any comments and suggestions that would improve the usefulness of future publications are appreciated and should be sent to the Division of STD Prevention at **DSTD@cdc.gov**

## **Acknowledgments**

This report would not have been possible without the contributions of the State and Territorial Health Departments, the STD Programs, the Regional Infertility Prevention Projects, the Office of Population Affairs, the Corrections STD Prevalence Monitoring Project, and the National Job Training Program which provided surveillance data to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

This report was prepared by the following staff members of the Surveillance and Special Studies Team of the Epidemiology and Surveillance Branch and the Statistics and Data Management Branch of the Division of STD Prevention, National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Susan Bradley, Jim Braxton, Sharon Clanton, Darlene Davis, Linda Webster Dicker, LaZetta Grier, Donna Helms, Kathleen Hutchins, Riduan Joesoef, Elvin Magee, Debra Mosure, Rob Nelson, Emmett Swint and Hillard Weinstock.

# Contents

<b>Preface</b> .....	v
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	vi
<b>National Profile</b> .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Sources of Data .....	2
Data Limitations .....	3
Chlamydia Data - 2004.....	4
Notes on State and City Profiles.....	5
References .....	6
<b>Regional Profiles</b> .....	14
<b>State Profiles</b>	
<b>City Profiles</b>	

To view the State and City Profiles, please use the drop down boxes on <http://www.cdc.gov/std/Chlamydia2004/>



# Chlamydia Prevalence Monitoring Project Annual Report – 2004

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Chlamydia Prevalence Monitoring Project is a collaborative effort among the Regional Infertility Prevention Projects, federally-funded STD programs, state epidemiologists, public health laboratory directors, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the Indian Health Service (IHS). The purpose of the project is to monitor the prevalence of genital *Chlamydia trachomatis* infections among women screened for this infection in the United States through publicly-funded programs. The data presented on chlamydial infection in this report complement and supplement data presented in CDC's *Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance, 2004*.<sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

Since 1988, CDC has supported screening programs for *Chlamydia trachomatis* infections and has monitored positivity to evaluate program impact. As documented by chlamydia case reporting (i.e., morbidity) data, case rates following initiation of chlamydia screening and treatment programs have resulted in increases in cases detected and reported. To minimize the impact of variation in chlamydia testing and reporting on the interpretation of surveillance data, CDC, states, and Regional Infertility Prevention Projects use screening positivity data to estimate chlamydia prevalence among selected populations. This report compares data on chlamydia prevalence in selected populations with data reported to CDC through the case reporting system.

# Sources of Data

## Regional Infertility Prevention Projects

Chlamydia screening and prevalence monitoring activities were initiated in Health and Human Services (HHS) Region X in 1988 as a CDC-supported demonstration project. In 1993, as part of the development of the National Infertility Prevention Program, chlamydia screening services for women were initiated in three additional HHS regions (III, VII, VIII) and in 1995 services were implemented in the remaining HHS regions (I, II, IV, V, VI, IX).<sup>2,3</sup> All regional projects, in collaboration with state STD control and family planning programs, report their chlamydia positivity data to CDC. In some of the HHS regions, federally-funded chlamydia screening supplements existing local- and state-funded testing programs. These publicly-funded programs support chlamydia screening primarily in family planning clinics, but also in some STD clinics, prenatal clinics, jails and juvenile detention centers, and other sites.

The ten Health and Human Services (HHS) regions referred to in the text and figures are as follows: Region I = Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont; Region II = New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands; Region III = Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; Region IV = Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee; Region V = Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin; Region VI = Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas; Region VII = Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska; Region VIII = Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming; Region IX = Arizona, California, Hawaii, and Nevada; and Region X = Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

## State and Local Health Departments

As of 2000, all 50 states and the District of Columbia have regulations requiring the reporting of chlamydia cases.

## Corrections Facilities

In 2004, 34 states reported chlamydia screening data from corrections facilities. These data were reported as part of the Corrections STD Prevalence Monitoring Project, the Regional Infertility Prevention Projects, or in response to CDC's request for data.

## National Job Training Program

Since 1990, approximately 20,000 female National Job Training Program entrants have been screened each year for chlamydia, with all tests performed at a central laboratory.<sup>4</sup> Changes in test type for females occurred in mid 1997 from the EIA to the

DNA hybridization probe (GenProbe PACE 2). Beginning in 2000 a small proportion of females have been screened using the strand displacement assay (BDProbeTec ET). Since July 2003, male National Job Training Program entrants have also been screened for chlamydia using the strand displacement assay. The National Job Training Program is primarily a residential job training program for urban and rural economically-disadvantaged youth aged 16 to 24 years at more than 100 sites throughout the country. The chlamydia test results from the National Job Training Program were used to calculate prevalence in this population.

### **Indian Health Service**

In 2004, approximately 8,000 women aged 15 to 44 years were screened at 21 facilities in two of 12 Indian Health Service (IHS) areas. The Indian Health Service provided these data to CDC.

## **Data Limitations**

The interpretation of chlamydia data is complicated by several factors. First, case reports and prevalence data result from the use of several different types of diagnostic tests for chlamydial infection (e.g., direct fluorescent antibody, EIA, DNA probe assay, DNA amplification); these tests vary in their sensitivity and specificity. Second, chlamydia positivity in women attending clinics is an estimate of prevalence; it is not true prevalence. Crude positivity may include those women who are tested two or more times during a single year. Comparisons of positivity with prevalence have shown that in family planning clinics, positivity is generally similar to or slightly higher than prevalence, and in STD clinics, positivity is somewhat lower than prevalence; however, these differences are usually small, with the relative difference <10%.<sup>5</sup> Third, while nearly all family planning clinics perform universal screening of sexually active women <20 years of age, and most clinics do so among women <25 years of age, some selective screening is performed among women 20- to 24-years old and selective screening is frequently performed among women  $\geq 25$  years of age. Fourth, while monitoring prevalence among persons seeking care at clinics provides important information on certain segments of the population, these data cannot be generalized to the population as a whole.

The data from the National Job Training Program are an exception to the first three caveats. Most of the tests are performed using a single test type. Data are limited to entrance exam testing; therefore, no one is included twice. All persons entering the National Job Training Program are required to be tested.

As noted above, various laboratory test methods were used for all data. Except for Figures 4, 5, and 9-18, the figures presented do not include an adjustment of test positivity based on laboratory test type and sensitivity. The chlamydia test results for each test type

were weighted to reflect the sensitivity of the test used.<sup>6</sup> These test-specific sensitivities were defined as estimates from published evaluations of chlamydia screening tests.<sup>7,8</sup> Limitations of this adjustment include unknown dates when laboratories changed tests, missing information on the type of test used, variation of test sensitivity within a technology type and among laboratories, and no adjustment for use of supplemental methods that could increase test sensitivity.

## **Chlamydia Data – 2004**

### **Case reports**

In 2004, 929,462 chlamydial infections were reported to CDC from 50 states and the District of Columbia. The reported number of cases of chlamydial infection was more than two times greater than the reported cases of gonorrhea (330,132 gonorrhea cases were reported in 2004). From 1987 through 2004, the reported rate of chlamydial infection in women increased from 78.5 cases to 485.0 cases per 100,000 population (Figure 1). These increases in the reported national chlamydia rate likely represent increased chlamydia screening, increased use of nucleic acid amplification tests which are more sensitive than other types of screening tests, and improved reporting, as well as the continuing high burden of disease.

In 2004, state- and outlying area-specific chlamydia rates among women ranged from 160.9 per 100,000 to 1,016.6 per 100,000 (Figure 2). This variation in rates reflects both state-specific differences in screening and reporting practices, and in true disease burden.

### **Chlamydia positivity in women in family planning and prenatal clinics**

In 2004, the median state-specific chlamydia test positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women who were screened at selected family planning clinics in all states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands was 6.3% (range, 3.2% to 16.3%) (Figure 3).

The effectiveness of large-scale screening programs in reducing chlamydia prevalence has been documented in areas where this intervention has been in place for several years.<sup>9,10</sup> In 2004, after adjusting estimates in chlamydia positivity to account for changes in laboratory test methods and associated increases in test sensitivity, chlamydia test positivity in women aged 15-24 years screened in family planning clinics decreased in two of 10 HHS regions from 2003 to 2004, increased in six regions and remained the same in two regions (Figure 4). Similar trends in positivity are seen for adolescent women aged 15-19 years screened in family planning clinics (Figure 5)

In 2004, the median state-specific chlamydia test positivity among 15- to 24-year-old women screened in selected prenatal clinics in 25 states, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands was 6.8% (range, 3.1% to 17.6%) (Figure 6).

### **Chlamydia prevalence in National Job Training Program entrants**

In women entering the National Job Training Program in 2004, based on their place of residence before program entry, state-specific chlamydia prevalence ranged from 4.4% to 17.3% in 38 states and Puerto Rico (Figure 7). The median state-specific chlamydia prevalence was 9.7%.

In men entering the program from 46 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico in 2004, the median state-specific chlamydia prevalence was 7.3% (range, 0.8% to 13.0%) (Figure 8).

### **Chlamydia positivity in women and men entering juvenile and adult corrections facilities**

Data on positivity of chlamydial infection in persons entering juvenile or adult corrections facilities were reported to CDC from 34 states (Tables 1 and 2). In adolescent women entering 56 juvenile detention facilities, the median facility positivity for chlamydia was 14.0% (range 2.4% to 26.5%); positivity was greater than 10% in 42 of 56 facilities reporting data. In adult women entering 32 corrections facilities, the median positivity for chlamydia was 7.2% (range 1.2% to 22.7%).

The median chlamydia positivity in adolescent men entering 81 juvenile corrections facilities was 5.8% (range 1.0% to 27.5%). In adult men entering 35 corrections facilities, the median positivity was 10.2% (range 0.7% to 30.0%).

### **Chlamydia positivity in women attending Indian Health Service clinics**

In 2004, chlamydia positivity in 15- to 44-year-old women screened at clinics in two IHS areas was 10.7%.

## **Notes on State and City Profiles**

### **Morbidity Surveillance: Reporting of Chlamydia Cases**

*Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 - 2004.*

Crude incidence rates (new cases/population) were calculated on an annual basis per 100,000 population. In this report, the 2004 rates for all states were calculated by dividing

the number of cases reported from each area in 2004 by the estimated area-specific 2000 population. Rates for 1995-2004 were calculated using postcensal population estimates based on the Bureau of the Census data (U.S. Bureau of the Census; 1991-2000 Estimates of the Population of Counties by Age, Sex and Race/Hispanic Origin: 1990 to 2000; machine-readable data files).

## **Prevalence Monitoring: Reporting of Chlamydia Positivity**

*Figure B. Chlamydia positivity among women 15 to 24 years of age, by testing site, 1993-2004*

*Table 1. Chlamydia positivity among women 15 to 44 years of age, by testing site, 2004*

*Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004*

Chlamydia test positivity was calculated by dividing the number of women testing positive for chlamydia (numerator) by the total number of women tested for chlamydia (denominator includes those with valid test results only and excludes unsatisfactory and indeterminate tests) and was expressed as a percentage. The denominator may contain multiple tests from the same individual if that person was tested more than once during the period for which screening data are reported. Various chlamydia laboratory methods were used and no adjustments of test positivity were made based on laboratory test type and sensitivity. Chlamydia prevalence data on female National Job Training Program entrants are not presented when the number of persons tested from a state was fewer than 100. The number of clinics cited in Table 1 for each state or city represents family planning (FP), sexually transmitted disease (STD), prenatal, Indian Health Service (IHS), and other clinics screening 25 or more women and juvenile and adult corrections facilities screening 100 or more women.

## **References**

<sup>1</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance, 2004*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, September 2005.

<sup>2</sup>Hillis S, Black C, Newhall J, Walsh C, Groseclose SL. New opportunities for chlamydia prevention: applications of science to public health practice. *Sex Transm Dis* 1995;22:70-5.


<sup>3</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Chlamydia trachomatis* genital infections - United States, 1995. *MMWR* 1997;46:193-8.

<sup>4</sup>Mertz KJ, Ransom RL, St. Louis ME, Groseclose SL, et al. Decline in the prevalence of genital chlamydial infection in young women entering a National Job Training Program. *Am J Pub Health* 2001;91(8):1287-90.

- <sup>5</sup>Dicker LW, Mosure DJ, Levine WC. Chlamydia positivity versus prevalence: what's the difference? *Sex Transm Dis* 1998;25:251-3.
- <sup>6</sup>Dicker LW, Mosure DJ, Levine WC, Black CM, Berman SM. Impact of switching laboratory tests on reported trends in *Chlamydia trachomatis* infections. *Am J Epidemiol* 2000;151:430-5.
- <sup>7</sup>Newhall WJ, DeLisle S, Fine D, et al. Head-to-head evaluation of five different non-culture chlamydia tests relative to a quality-assured culture standard. *Sex Transm Dis* 1994;21:s165-6.
- <sup>8</sup>Black CM, Marrazzo J, Johnson RE, et al. Head-to-head multicenter comparison of DNA probe and nucleic acid amplification tests for *Chlamydia trachomatis* infection in women performed with an improved reference standard. *J Clin Micro* 2002;40:3757-3763.
- <sup>9</sup>Addiss DG, Vaugh ML, Ludka D, Pfister J, Davis JP. Decreased prevalence of *Chlamydia trachomatis* infection associated with a selective screening program in family planning clinics in Wisconsin. *Sex Transm Dis* 1993;20:28-35.
- <sup>10</sup>Mertz KJ, Levine WC, Mosure DJ, Berman SM, Dorian KJ. Trends in the prevalence of chlamydial infections: the impact of community-wide testing. *Sex Transm Dis* 1997;24:169-75.




**Figure 3. Chlamydia — Positivity among 15-24 year old women tested in family planning clinics by state: United States and outlying areas, 2004**



Note: Includes states and outlying areas that reported chlamydia positivity data on at least 500 women aged 15-24 years screened during 2004.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 4. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year old women tested in family planning clinics by HHS regions, 1988–2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity. No data on laboratory test method available for Region VII in 1995 and Regions IV and V in 1996.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 5. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 19-year-old women tested in family planning clinics by HHS regions, 1988-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity. No data on laboratory test method available for Region VII in 1995 and Regions IV and V in 1996.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

**Figure 6. Chlamydia — Positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in prenatal clinics by state: United States and outlying areas, 2004**




\*States not reporting chlamydia positivity data in prenatal clinics.

Note: Includes states and outlying areas that reported chlamydia positivity data on at least 100 women aged 15-24 years during 2004.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

**Figure 7. Chlamydia — Prevalence in 16- to 24-year-old women entering the National Job Training Program by state of residence: United States and outlying areas, 2004**




\*Fewer than 100 women residing in these states and entering the National Job Training Program were screened for chlamydia in 2004.

Note: The overall chlamydia prevalence in female students entering the National Job Training Program in 2004 was 10.3%.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Labor

**Figure 8. Chlamydia — Prevalence in 16- to 24-year-old men entering the National Job Training Program by state of residence: United States and outlying areas, 2004**



\*Fewer than 100 men residing in these states and entering the National Job Training Program were screened for chlamydia in 2004.

Note: The overall chlamydia prevalence in male students entering the National Job Training Program in 2004 was 8.3%.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Labor

**Table 1. Chlamydia – Positivity among men and women in juvenile corrections facilities, 2004**

<i>State</i>	<b>Men</b>			<b>Women</b>		
	<i>No. of Sites</i>	<i>No. of Tests</i>	<i>Median % Positivity (Range)</i>	<i>No. of Sites</i>	<i>No. of Tests</i>	<i>Median % Positivity (Range)</i>
Alabama	0	0	0	2	399	19.4 (15.4-23.4)
Arizona	3	4,758	6.5 (6.1-8.3)	4	1,975	15.7 (3.7-21.6)
California*	20	29,815	3.8 (1.2-12.9)	20	12,582	12.8 (6.3-19.9)
Connecticut	1	507	3.2	1	163	11.0
Delaware	1	1,137	5.5	1	290	11.0
Georgia	2	1,751	17.9 (8.3-27.5)	2	5,417	17.6 (8.8-26.5)
Illinois	2	4,752	6.6 (4.5-8.7)	1	662	24.3
Indiana	1	890	6.6	1	292	18.5
Kentucky	4	819	4.6 (1.4-5.8)	2	393	6.1 (2.4-9.9)
Maryland	5	2,375	3.8 (1.0-7.8)	1	450	18.9
Massachusetts	2	944	5.5 (5.2-5.8)	1	310	12.6
Michigan	3	504	6.8 (5.6-12.7)	1	133	24.1
Nebraska	1	970	8.8	1	336	17.3
Nevada	1	120	4.2	0	0	0
New Jersey	2	2,011	8.6 (5.9-11.2)	1	223	25.1
New Mexico	1	551	6.7	0	0	0
New York	8	11,265	6.2 (1.5-10.1)	5	1,059	17.6 (5.2-24.3)
North Dakota	1	175	6.9	0	0	0
Ohio	1	802	13.6	1	231	24.7
Oklahoma	3	536	10.3 (4.3-10.6)	1	148	23.6
Oregon	3	1,883	4.3 (3.0-10.7)	2	323	11.1 (5.9-16.3)
Pennsylvania	2	227	5.3 (4.3-6.3)	0	0	0
South Carolina	1	353	9.6	1	178	11.8
Texas	3	3,937	6.2 (2.4-11.1)	4	1,719	14.3 (5.0-24.2)
Utah	2	794	4.4(4.4-4.4)	1	187	19.3
Virginia	1	632	10.0	0	0	0
Washington	5	1,381	5.9 (1.3-8.1)	2	246	12.4 (7.3-17.5)
Wisconsin	2	746	4.1(3.1-5.1)	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>74,635</b>	<b>5.8 (1.0-27.5)</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>27,716</b>	<b>14.0 (2.4-26.5)</b>

Note: The median positivity is presented from facilities reporting > 100 test results.

\*Includes Los Angeles and San Francisco.

**Table 2. Chlamydia – Positivity among men and women in adult corrections facilities, 2004**


<i>State</i>	<b>Men</b>			<b>Women</b>		
	<i>No. of Sites</i>	<i>No. of Tests</i>	<i>Median % Positivity (Range)</i>	<i>No. of Sites</i>	<i>No. of Tests</i>	<i>Median % Positivity (Range)</i>
Arizona	2	348	16.6 (13.1-20.1)	2	3,460	10.3 (8.7-12.0)
California*	6	4,571	5.3(3.4-6.3)	5	7,518	8.2 (5.7-19.2)
Colorado	2	269	15.5 (14.4-16.7)	1	156	11.5
Delaware	0	0	0	1	564	3.7
Hawaii	0	0	0	2	313	11.5 (7.1-16.0)
Illinois	3	9,008	10.2 (2.8-19.0)	4	13,200	8.7 (5.7-10.4)
Iowa	1	364	14.3	2	635	5.0 (3.0-7.0)
Massachusetts	3	2,724	7.7 (6.5-10.8)	2	1,245	4.8 (4.7-4.9)
Michigan	1	105	15.2	1	109	8.3
Missouri	1	1,422	7.9	2	314	4.9 (4.0-5.7)
Montana	0	0	0	1	162	1.2
Nebraska	4	2,096	9.3 (6.6-16.6)	1	253	13.8
Nevada	1	144	23.6	1	128	22.7
North Dakota	1	592	5.6	0	0	0
Oregon	1	132	15.9	1	179	8.4
Texas	1	426	11.5	2	1,936	6.8 (4.4-9.1)
Utah	1	110	30.0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	1	1,258	5.0
West Virginia	2	988	4.1 (0.7-7.6)	0	0	0
Wisconsin	5	5,661	12.5 (3.2-19.1)	3	1,320	1.9( 1.8-7.2)
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>28,960</b>	<b>10.2 (0.7-30.0)</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>32,750</b>	<b>7.2 (1.2-22.7)</b>

Note: The median positivity is presented from facilities reporting > 100 test results.

\*Includes Los Angeles and San Francisco.

## Regional Profiles


**Figure 9. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region I, 1996-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 10. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region II, 1997-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 11. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region III, 1994-2003**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 12. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region IV, 1997-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 13. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region V, 1997-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 14. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region VI, 1996-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 15. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region VII, 1996-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 16. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region VIII, 1994-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 17. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region IX, 1996-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

**Figure 18. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region X, 1988-2004**




Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

## Regional Profiles


**Figure 9. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region I, 1996-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 10. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region II, 1997-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 11. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region III, 1994-2003**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 12. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region IV, 1997-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 13. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region V, 1997-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 14. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region VI, 1996-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 15. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region VII, 1996-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 16. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region VIII, 1994-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention


**Figure 17. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region IX, 1996-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

**Figure 18. Chlamydia — Trends in positivity in 15- to 24-year-old women tested in family planning clinics: Region X, 1988-2004**



Note: Trends adjusted for changes in laboratory test method and associated increases in test sensitivity.

SOURCE: Regional Infertility Prevention Projects; Office of Population Affairs; Local and State STD Control Programs; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention



**S** **T** **A** **T** **E** **P** **R** **O** **F** **I** **L** **E** **S**



# Alabama – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004


Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	66	38,225	6.0
STD	45	14,633	10.3
Prenatal	5	1,081	6.2
Juvenile Detention	2	308	20.2
Other	11	1,892	6.0

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Alaska – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004



NOTE: No data were reported in 1995.

Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	5	2,511	3.8
STD	NA	NA	NA
Other	18	7,012	8.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Arizona – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	46	22,889	6.0
STD	2	2,188	8.4
Adult Corrections	2	3,015	10.8
Juvenile Detention	4	1,522	16.3
Other	1	137	5.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Arkansas – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004


Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	93	41,330	5.0
STD	46	6,631	9.7
Prenatal	45	6,750	5.8
Other	1	398	1.8

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# California – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004



NOTE: Gender unknown for 32.4% in 1995.

Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004


Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	31	38,596	4.8
STD	14	14,912	11.6
Adult Corrections	5	7,297	8.6
Juvenile Detention	20	10,923	13.3
Other	16	4,495	4.9

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Colorado – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004



Note: Cases were not reported by gender in 1995.

Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	30	17,837	6.1
STD	6	6,441	12.7
Adult Corrections	1	150	12.0
Other	25	10,857	6.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Connecticut – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	12	8,671	4.2
STD	NA	NA	NA
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Delaware – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	12	8,885	5.2
STD	5	2,093	9.7
Adult Corrections	1	519	4.0
Juvenile Detention	1	231	11.7
Other	23	6,493	4.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Florida – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	28	12,635	4.9
STD	24	4,442	9.0
Prenatal	10	2,406	5.3
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Georgia – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	17	18,288	6.2
STD	15	10,963	10.5
Juvenile Detention	2	4,475	18.6
Other	9	3,697	11.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Hawaii – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	20	12,053	7.1
STD	1	1,318	13.7
Adult Corrections	1	127	17.3
Other	5	2,004	4.7

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Idaho – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	39	12,765	4.4
STD	2	195	8.2
Other	2	368	4.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Illinois – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	115	90,658	5.9
STD	35	21,777	11.8
Prenatal	7	4,492	5.8
Adult Corrections	3	11,387	9.7
Juvenile Detention	1	507	24.5
Other	86	30,125	6.8

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Indiana – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	39	33,025	6.7
STD	12	3,869	11.6
Prenatal	2	517	5.2
Juvenile Detention	1	211	20.4
Other	20	8,124	5.6

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Iowa – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	48	42,197	4.5
STD	9	3,176	11.7
Prenatal	1	366	5.2
Adult Corrections	2	552	5.1
Other	7	2,760	4.5

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Kansas – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	73	17,310	5.3
STD	21	6,552	11.2
Prenatal	12	3,590	4.3
Other	14	2,323	6.0

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Kentucky – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	134	44,804	3.7
STD	62	8,890	7.6
Prenatal	32	4,087	4.5
Juvenile Detention	1	286	2.1
Other	26	10,200	4.8

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Louisiana – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	74	56,259	6.4
STD	4	4,171	11.2
Prenatal	26	5,084	9.5
Other	8	3,043	7.6

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Maine – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	22	4,387	3.9
STD	3	497	6.2
Other	2	164	4.3

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Maryland – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	50	38,120	4.4
STD	20	15,268	9.2
Prenatal	4	2,509	2.4
Juvenile Detention	1	356	19.1
Other	17	4,367	8.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Massachusetts – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	23	10,762	4.2
STD	7	1,907	7.6
Adult Corrections	2	1,127	4.7
Juvenile Detention	1	231	12.6
Other	6	664	7.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Michigan – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	120	52,689	6.4
STD	26	14,316	11.3
Juvenile Detention	1	101	23.8
Other	30	6,211	8.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Minnesota – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	17	16,576	6.4
STD	1	942	9.4
Other	12	8,214	8.5

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Mississippi – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	94	36,752	14.2
STD	46	8,164	17.0
Prenatal	33	6,857	12.4
Other	2	519	10.8

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Missouri – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	53	36,347	6.9
STD	6	4,945	18.0
Prenatal	2	362	6.4
Adult Corrections	2	283	5.0
Other	26	7,061	8.9

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Montana – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	21	11,346	5.3
STD	4	597	6.4
Adult Corrections	1	144	1.4
IHS	6	2,913	10.1
Other	37	8,511	6.3

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Nebraska – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	34	16,998	4.7
STD	4	1,423	11.9
Prenatal	5	2,718	5.1
Adult Corrections	1	234	14.5
Juvenile Detention	1	273	17.2
IHS	2	557	9.0
Other	31	3,779	7.5

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Nevada – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	21	6,904	3.4
STD	9	4,068	8.6
Prenatal	1	287	3.1
Adult Corrections	1	120	23.3
Other	2	1,424	7.8

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# New Hampshire – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	16	10,657	3.6
STD	NA	NA	NA
Other	1	258	5.4

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# New Jersey – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	43	48,287	6.4
STD	18	5,966	11.6
Prenatal	2	271	10.7
Juvenile Detention	1	182	25.3
Other	21	8,386	4.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# New Mexico – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004


Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	63	12,335	8.0
STD	33	6,576	13.8
Prenatal	10	857	5.3
Other	2	261	11.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# New York – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004



NOTE: New York's rate for 1995–1999 is based on New York City. New York State case reporting may be incomplete for 2000.

Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	17	48,794	3.9
STD	24	29,147	9.4
Juvenile Detention	3	603	16.9
Other	10	4,114	5.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# North Carolina – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	101	50,541	6.4
STD	85	20,682	10.9
Prenatal	79	26,652	5.7
Other	10	1,210	5.5

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# North Dakota – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	8	6,628	5.6
STD	NA	NA	NA
IHS	5	1,667	10.3
Other	16	5,261	7.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Ohio – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	44	42,092	6.2
STD	24	8,782	10.4
Juvenile Detention	1	161	23.0
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Oklahoma – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	95	34,394	4.8
STD	41	10,720	10.8
Prenatal	16	1,806	4.3
Juvenile Detention	1	122	22.1
Other	5	306	4.9

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Oregon – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	69	34,779	3.9
STD	26	3,891	8.6
Prenatal	8	1,239	2.3
Adult Corrections	1	171	8.8
Juvenile Detention	2	294	9.4
Other	26	6,918	4.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Pennsylvania – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	161	110,940	5.1
STD	64	13,614	10.8
Prenatal	2	389	8.7
Other	13	1,469	6.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Rhode Island – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	7	4,078	4.3
STD	1	548	16.8
Other	2	138	14.5

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# South Carolina – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	66	41,191	11.0
STD	57	19,708	13.4
Prenatal	2	546	9.7
Juvenile Detention	1	158	12.0
Other	2	570	12.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# South Dakota – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	9	3,144	5.4
STD	5	1,006	11.0
IHS	8	3,730	11.7
Other	8	4,996	9.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Tennessee – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	113	41,520	5.1
STD	93	23,282	13.2
Prenatal	11	1,653	5.3
Other	4	609	10.7

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Texas – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	27	24,785	6.9
STD	11	18,787	9.8
Prenatal	8	4,568	5.8
Adult Corrections	2	1,889	6.9
Juvenile Detention	3	1,146	16.4
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Utah – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	12	4,295	7.9
STD	8	1,859	8.0
Juvenile Detention	1	138	20.3
Other	25	3,905	4.7

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Vermont – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	14	9,186	3.3
STD	NA	NA	NA
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Virginia – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	117	45,575	5.4
STD	56	16,747	12.5
Prenatal	54	8,783	6.7
Other	14	4,520	4.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Washington – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	66	57,538	6.6
STD	11	4,313	7.6
Adult Corrections	1	1,123	5.4
Juvenile Detention	1	110	17.3
Other	35	13,799	5.0

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# West Virginia – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	69	23,656	2.7
STD	20	3,126	5.0
Prenatal	2	794	3.0
Other	53	9,200	3.3

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Wisconsin – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	64	28,604	7.5
STD	6	2,631	10.6
Adult Corrections	2	1,102	4.7
Other	14	8,581	5.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Wyoming – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	18	5,339	4.7
STD	3	504	7.5
Other	6	1,618	4.8

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Puerto Rico – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	60	6,398	5.1
STD	3	655	8.7
Prenatal	11	1,556	6.6
Other	66	6,968	3.5

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Virgin Islands – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	3	1,925	11.5
STD	1	371	17.0
Prenatal	2	408	16.9
Other	3	964	11.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



**C**  
**I**  
**T**  
**Y**

**P**  
**R**  
**O**  
**F**  
**I**  
**L**  
**E**  
**S**

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records in a business setting. It highlights how proper record-keeping can help in decision-making, legal compliance, and financial management. The text emphasizes that records should be organized, up-to-date, and easily accessible.

Next, the document addresses the challenges of data management in the digital age. It notes that while digital storage offers convenience, it also introduces risks such as data loss, security breaches, and information overload. Solutions like cloud storage, encryption, and regular backups are suggested to mitigate these risks.

The third section focuses on the role of technology in streamlining business processes. It describes how automation and software solutions can reduce manual errors, save time, and improve overall efficiency. Examples of such technologies include accounting software, CRM systems, and project management tools.

Finally, the document concludes by stressing the importance of employee training and awareness. It suggests that investing in education and skill development can lead to a more productive and knowledgeable workforce, which is essential for long-term business success.

# Atlanta, GA – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	1	363	7.7
STD	2	4,906	9.7
Juvenile Detention	2	4,475	18.6
Other	3	1,611	8.9

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Baltimore, MD – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	4	5,163	6.3
STD	2	6,708	9.9
Juvenile Detention	1	356	19.1
Other	12	3,169	10.0

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Birmingham, AL – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004




Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	NA	NA	NA
STD	1	5,721	10.7
Juvenile Detention	2	308	20.2
Other	1	144	4.9

# Boston, MA – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004


Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	1	1,081	6.9
STD	2	770	4.2
Adult Corrections	1	900	5.0
Other	1	104	4.8

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Buffalo, NY – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004



NOTE: New York's rate for 1995–1999 is based on New York City. Case reporting for New York State, including Buffalo may be incomplete for 2000.

Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004




Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	NA	NA	NA
STD	1	1,183	13.0
Other	2	348	4.0

# Chicago, IL – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	25	27,533	6.5
STD	6	9,328	12.8
Prenatal	3	853	10.0
Adult Corrections	1	10,814	11.2
Juvenile Detention	1	507	24.5
Other	44	20,181	7.4

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Dallas, TX – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	NA	NA	NA
STD	1	3,121	11.5
Other	NA	NA	NA

# Denver, CO – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004



NOTE: No data were reported in 1995.

Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	5	5,370	4.4
STD	1	4,486	12.6
Other	22	10,623	6.1

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Des Moines, IA – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	4	4,467	5.6
STD	1	707	9.5
Other	2	146	2.7

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Detroit, MI – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	8	3,357	8.5
STD	1	3,522	9.2
Other	15	4,300	6.5

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Houston, TX – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	7	6,093	2.7
STD	4	6,028	9.1
Prenatal	7	4,497	5.7
Juvenile Detention	1	444	23.0
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Kansas City, MO – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	2	2,064	8.9
STD	1	1,203	23.3
Other	1	133	3.5

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Los Angeles, CA – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	12	12,601	4.5
STD	8	8,119	15.0
Adult Corrections	1	5,731	13.7
Juvenile Detention	3	3,882	13.8
Other	9	1,924	6.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Louisville, KY – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	4	4,500	4.8
STD	2	2,398	8.5
Other	9	6,297	4.4

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Memphis, TN – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	5	3,809	10.0
STD	1	3,300	18.1
Other	2	450	11.3

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Miami, FL – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004




Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	NA	NA	NA
STD	1	581	9.3
Other	NA	NA	NA

# Nashville, TN – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	4	2,339	5.0
STD	6	2,434	11.8
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# New Orleans, LA – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004


Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	3	6,865	9.2
STD	2	3,480	11.2
Prenatal	3	986	14.3
Other	3	452	15.3

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# New York City, NY – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004



NOTE: New York's rate for 1995 – 1999 is based on New York City. New York State case reporting may be incomplete for 2000.

Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	10	25,097	3.7
STD	10	19,782	9.0
Juvenile Detention	1	207	16.9
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Newark, NJ – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	3	4,900	9.3
STD	1	683	5.9
Juvenile Detention	1	182	25.3
Other	1	369	9.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Omaha, NE – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	8	6,293	5.5
STD	2	768	13.4
Prenatal	1	1,169	5.1
Adult Corrections	1	234	14.5
Juvenile Detention	1	273	17.2
Other	7	1,074	10.2

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Philadelphia, PA – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	44	40,479	6.9
STD	3	5,490	15.1
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Phoenix, AZ – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004


Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	9	9,352	6.4
STD	NA	NA	NA
Adult Corrections	2	3,015	10.8
Juvenile Detention	2	701	19.1
Other	NA	NA	NA

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Portland (Multnomah County), OR – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004



NOTE: Portland represents 78.9% of Multnomah County for case reporting.

Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	10	8,881	4.0
STD	2	1,179	9.8
Prenatal	2	315	2.2
Adult Corrections	1	171	8.8
Juvenile Detention	2	294	9.4
Other	10	2,186	6.6

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Richmond, VA – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004


Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	1	400	15.3
STD	1	1,338	14.8
Prenatal	2	288	4.2
Other	2	231	3.9

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Rochester, NY – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004



NOTE: New York's rate for 1995–1999 is based on New York City. Case reporting for New York State, including Rochester may be incomplete for 2000.

Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004




Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	NA	NA	NA
STD	1	3,414	8.2
Adult Corrections	1	234	5.6
Juvenile Detention	1	162	17.2
Other	2	912	9.2

# San Francisco, CA – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	7	3,060	3.9
STD	1	3,185	4.1
Adult Corrections	3	1,328	7.4
Juvenile Detention	1	345	10.4
Other	5	2,371	3.6

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Seattle (King County), WA – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	20	22,154	5.8
STD	1	2,258	5.5
Other	16	9,555	5.0

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# St Louis, MO – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	2	2,397	7.8
STD	1	1,765	20.0
Adult Corrections	1	129	6.2
Other	6	2,240	7.9

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Washington, DC – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995–2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993–2004





Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	4	3,034	2.6
STD	2	2,352	5.0
Other	8	2,850	2.9

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004



# Wichita, KS – 2004

Figure A. Chlamydia rate per 100,000 women, 1995 – 2004




Figure B. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 24 years by testing site, 1993 – 2004




Table 1. Chlamydia positivity in women 15 to 44 years by testing site, 2004

Testing Site	No. Clinics	No. Tested	Percent Positive
Family Planning	3	3,702	5.6
STD	2	833	12.1
Prenatal	2	1,093	3.0
Other	1	90	5.6

Figure C. Chlamydia positivity by age group in women attending family planning clinics, 2004

