Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

Preliminary Report on Opioid Service Infrastructures and Geographic Distribution Across New York State Counties

Introduction

This preliminary report draws on a collection of community-based county analyses examining the distribution of opioid-related services across multiple New York State counties. Students were asked to identify and map the types of opioid-related resources available within individual counties, including treatment facilities, medication-assisted treatment (MAT) providers, inpatient and outpatient services, harm reduction organizations, peer recovery programs, emergency supports, housing resources, transportation supports, counseling services, and nonprofit organizations engaged in opioid response.

The reports collectively provide an important preliminary snapshot of how opioid-related infrastructures are distributed unevenly across New York State counties. Although the reports vary in methodological sophistication and depth, several striking regional patterns emerge regarding healthcare density, treatment accessibility, institutional fragmentation, rural vulnerability, and disparities in service concentration.

Most importantly, the reports suggest that opioid response systems are not distributed evenly across geographic regions. Instead, access to treatment and recovery infrastructures appears deeply shaped by county population density, transportation systems, healthcare consolidation, institutional resources, and broader regional inequalities.

The findings also suggest that the availability of services alone does not necessarily correspond to accessibility. Several counties technically possessed treatment resources while simultaneously facing major barriers related to distance, transportation, waitlists, staffing shortages, insurance limitations, and uneven service coordination.

Emerging Patterns in County-Level Service Distribution

One of the clearest findings across the reports was the profound unevenness in opioid-related service infrastructures between counties. Urban-adjacent and institutionally dense counties frequently demonstrated broad networks of overlapping services, while rural counties often relied on small numbers of providers covering large geographic areas.

Several counties demonstrated relatively extensive treatment ecosystems, including:

- multiple outpatient clinics,
- inpatient treatment programs,

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

- methadone and buprenorphine providers,
- emergency stabilization programs,
- peer recovery organizations,
- syringe exchange programs,
- counseling centers,
- and supportive housing services.

In contrast, many rural counties relied on:

- one or two outpatient providers,
- limited MAT availability,
- sparse counseling infrastructure,
- or referrals to neighboring counties.

This unevenness appeared especially visible in counties with large geographic territories but small populations. In these regions, even when services technically existed within county boundaries, residents often faced substantial travel distances and transportation barriers.

The reports repeatedly suggested that the geography of care itself may function as a major determinant of treatment access.

Rural Counties and Infrastructure Scarcity

Several rural counties demonstrated particularly limited opioid response infrastructures.

In counties such as Lewis, Franklin, Yates, Seneca, and portions of Central New York, students frequently identified:

- small numbers of treatment providers,
- limited detoxification capacity,
- minimal inpatient infrastructure,
- reduced behavioral health staffing,
- and heavy reliance on regional referral systems.

In some counties, students noted that residents often traveled to neighboring counties for:

- detoxification,
- inpatient treatment,
- methadone programs,
- or specialized counseling services.

This reliance on regional networks may produce major barriers for individuals lacking:

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

- transportation access,
- stable housing,
- financial resources,
- or family support systems.

The reports collectively suggest that opioid treatment access in many rural counties remains highly dependent on mobility and regional connectivity.

Several students also observed that counties frequently listed services that existed only during limited hours, maintained long waitlists, or lacked sufficient staffing to meet demand consistently.

As a result, formal service availability may overstate practical accessibility.

Institutional Density and Service Concentration

Counties with larger healthcare systems and institutional density generally demonstrated more extensive opioid response infrastructures.

Counties such as Albany, Saratoga, and more urbanized regional centers frequently contained:

- hospitals with addiction services,
- multiple MAT providers,
- nonprofit recovery organizations,
- county public health initiatives,
- peer recovery centers,
- supportive housing programs,
- and specialized behavioral health services.

These counties also appeared more likely to possess:

- integrated referral systems,
- multiple levels of care,
- harm reduction programming,
- and organizational specialization.

Importantly, the reports suggest that these counties may possess stronger institutional capacity not only for treatment provision, but also for:

- grant administration,
- settlement implementation,
- interagency coordination,
- and public health planning.

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

This raises the possibility that counties with denser healthcare ecosystems may be better positioned to operationalize opioid settlement resources and sustain long-term intervention systems.

Types of Services and Emerging Patterns of Distribution

Across the reports, students identified several recurring categories of opioid-related services. Although the quantity and sophistication of services varied substantially across counties, the reports collectively suggest that opioid response systems can be understood as layered infrastructures composed of overlapping but unevenly connected forms of care.

Medication-Assisted Treatment (MAT)

Medication-assisted treatment emerged as one of the most unevenly distributed forms of opioid-related care.

Students repeatedly identified:

- buprenorphine providers,
- methadone clinics,
- office-based opioid treatment programs,
- and integrated MAT services embedded within counseling centers or hospital systems.

However, the geographic distribution of these services was highly uneven.

Methadone treatment appeared especially concentrated within more urbanized regional centers. Several rural counties either lacked methadone clinics entirely or depended on neighboring counties for daily dosing access. This pattern is particularly important because methadone treatment requires frequent and highly structured engagement. Long-distance travel therefore becomes not simply an inconvenience, but a major determinant of treatment retention.

In several counties, students noted that residents traveled between 30 minutes and several hours to access methadone services. These travel requirements may disproportionately affect:

- individuals without reliable transportation,
- individuals experiencing housing instability,
- and individuals attempting to maintain employment while participating in treatment.

Buprenorphine access appeared somewhat more geographically diffuse because office-based prescribing allows services to exist within primary care settings. However, students frequently noted limited numbers of waivered providers in smaller counties.

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

Several reports also suggested that formal provider presence did not necessarily guarantee practical treatment availability. Counties sometimes listed providers who:

- accepted limited insurance plans,
- maintained waitlists,
- offered restricted appointment schedules,
- or lacked capacity for new patients.

The reports collectively suggest that MAT access in rural New York State remains shaped not only by provider numbers, but by transportation systems, workforce stability, and regional healthcare density.

Detoxification and Inpatient Services

Detoxification and inpatient treatment services appeared even more geographically concentrated.

Many smaller counties lacked inpatient facilities entirely and instead relied on regional referral systems connecting residents to urban centers or neighboring counties.

Students repeatedly identified patterns in which:

- detoxification occurred outside county boundaries,
- inpatient stabilization required travel,
- and continuity of care depended on inter-county coordination.

This regional concentration may create significant instability within treatment pathways. Individuals completing inpatient care often returned to counties with far fewer outpatient supports and more limited recovery infrastructures.

Several reports indirectly pointed toward the possibility of a fragmented treatment geography in which:

- acute stabilization occurs in institutionally dense counties,
- while long-term recovery unfolds in more resource-limited rural environments.

This discontinuity may produce major barriers to sustained recovery and treatment retention.

Counseling and Behavioral Health Services

Behavioral health counseling services were more widely distributed than inpatient treatment but remained highly uneven in scope and specialization.

Students identified:

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

- outpatient counseling centers,
- behavioral health clinics,
- hospital-affiliated mental health programs,
- and private counseling providers.

However, many counties appeared to rely on very small behavioral health workforces.

Several reports noted:

- long waitlists,
- shortages of licensed counselors,
- difficulties accessing psychiatric care,
- and limited specialization in substance use treatment.

A recurring pattern across counties involved the overlap between opioid use, mental health instability, housing insecurity, and economic precarity.

Yet the reports suggest that these conditions are frequently addressed through fragmented organizational systems rather than integrated models of care.

Students repeatedly observed that individuals seeking treatment often navigated separate institutions for:

- addiction treatment,
- mental health services,
- housing support,
- medical care,
- and recovery assistance.

The reports therefore point toward a broader issue of systemic fragmentation rather than simple service absence.

Harm Reduction Services

Harm reduction services demonstrated some of the sharpest regional disparities across the reports.

Several urbanized or institutionally dense counties demonstrated:

- naloxone distribution initiatives,
- syringe exchange programs,
- overdose education efforts,
- mobile outreach programs,

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

- and peer-led harm reduction organizations.

In contrast, several rural counties demonstrated little formal harm reduction infrastructure beyond naloxone availability through public health departments or nonprofit organizations.

Students frequently identified peer recovery organizations and nonprofits as central actors in harm reduction work. In counties with otherwise limited healthcare infrastructures, nonprofit organizations often appeared to function as substitute infrastructures of care.

Several reports also suggested ideological differences between counties regarding opioid response models. Some counties appeared to emphasize:

- law enforcement partnerships,
- abstinence-oriented treatment,
- or emergency intervention,
  while others demonstrated broader investment in harm reduction frameworks.

This variation suggests that opioid response systems may also reflect local political cultures, institutional histories, and public health philosophies.

Recovery and Peer Support Services

Peer recovery and recovery support organizations appeared across many counties, though their scale and institutional integration varied significantly.

Students identified:

- peer recovery centers,
- recovery coaching programs,
- recovery community organizations,
- sober support meetings,
- and nonprofit recovery networks.

In several rural counties, peer organizations appeared to occupy disproportionately important positions within otherwise thin treatment ecosystems.

These organizations frequently provided:

- transportation support,
- informal navigation assistance,
- recovery mentoring,
- and linkage to housing or social services.

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

The reports suggest that peer recovery organizations may function as critical bridging institutions connecting fragmented systems of care.

Importantly, these organizations often appeared more flexible and community-embedded than formal healthcare institutions.

This raises important future questions regarding:

- the role of nonprofit infrastructures within rural opioid response systems,
- the relationship between formal healthcare systems and peer-led care,
- and the extent to which counties rely on nonprofit labor to compensate

One of the most significant recurring themes across the reports involved uneven access to medication-assisted treatment.

Several counties demonstrated relatively robust access to:

- buprenorphine providers,
- methadone clinics,
- or integrated MAT services.

However, other counties relied on:

- very small numbers of waivered providers,
- limited methadone access,
- or regional referral systems.

Students frequently identified methadone access as especially geographically concentrated. In several rural regions, individuals seeking methadone treatment reportedly traveled substantial distances to urban centers.

This geographic concentration may create additional burdens related to:

- transportation,
- employment schedules,
- childcare responsibilities,
- and treatment continuity.

The reports therefore suggest that the geography of MAT access may significantly shape treatment retention and overdose vulnerability.

Harm Reduction and Recovery Support Services

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

Another important finding involved uneven access to harm reduction and recovery support services.

Some counties demonstrated growing networks of:

- naloxone distribution programs,
- peer recovery organizations,
- recovery community centers,
- and outreach initiatives.

However, several rural counties demonstrated limited formal harm reduction infrastructures.

In some counties, opioid response systems appeared heavily oriented toward:

- law enforcement partnerships,
- emergency intervention,
- or abstinence-centered treatment models,
  with comparatively limited investment in harm reduction programming.

Several students also noted that peer recovery and nonprofit organizations often played disproportionately important roles in counties with otherwise limited formal healthcare infrastructures.

This suggests that nonprofit and community organizations may function as critical stabilizing institutions within fragile rural treatment systems.

Fragmentation and Coordination Challenges

A recurring theme across the reports involved fragmentation within county opioid response systems.

Even counties with relatively large numbers of services frequently demonstrated:

- poor coordination between organizations,
- fragmented referral pathways,
- limited communication across agencies,
- and uneven continuity of care.

Students repeatedly identified systems in which:

- detoxification,
- outpatient care,
- mental health treatment,

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

- housing support,
- and peer recovery services
  operated through separate organizational structures with varying levels of coordination.

This fragmentation may help explain why counties with relatively large numbers of services do not necessarily demonstrate stronger overdose outcomes.

The reports collectively suggest that service quantity alone may be less important than:

- institutional integration,
- referral continuity,
- transportation accessibility,
- and long-term care coordination.

Chenango County as a Case Study

Chenango County emerged as a particularly important case study because it reflects many of the broader themes identified across the reports.

Students identified a relatively limited but expanding network of opioid-related services within the county, including:

- outpatient treatment programs,
- counseling services,
- recovery support organizations,
- county public health initiatives,
- and nonprofit providers.

However, the county also demonstrated several structural constraints:

- geographic dispersion,
- transportation limitations,
- workforce shortages,
- and reliance on regional systems for certain specialized services.

Several reports suggested that residents often depended on neighboring counties for:

- detoxification,
- inpatient treatment,
- or specialized behavioral health care.

At the same time, students noted evidence of expanding coordination efforts connected to settlement funding and county-level opioid response planning.

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

Chenango County may therefore represent a county attempting to build treatment and recovery infrastructure within conditions of longstanding rural resource limitation.

Contrasting Counties and Emerging Regional Differences

The contrast between Chenango County and counties such as Saratoga or Albany highlights broader regional disparities in opioid response infrastructures.

While institutionally dense counties demonstrated:

- overlapping service networks,
- healthcare specialization,
- multiple treatment levels,
- and broader organizational ecosystems,
  rural counties often relied on small numbers of organizations attempting to cover large geographic territories.

This contrast suggests that opioid response systems may reproduce broader regional inequalities in:

- healthcare access,
- public health infrastructure,
- transportation systems,
- and institutional capacity.

Importantly, the reports suggest that counties entering the settlement era with stronger healthcare ecosystems may possess substantial advantages in:

- implementing new programs,
- hiring staff,
- coordinating services,
- and sustaining intervention systems over time.

Discussion

Collectively, the reports suggest that the opioid crisis cannot be understood solely through overdose mortality statistics. Instead, the reports point toward the importance of examining the underlying infrastructures of care through which treatment, recovery, and intervention become possible.

One of the strongest emerging themes is that treatment availability and treatment accessibility are not equivalent. Counties frequently listed formal resources while simultaneously demonstrating:

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

- transportation barriers,
- staffing shortages,
- fragmented systems,
- waitlists,
- and geographic isolation.

This suggests that future research should examine not simply whether services exist, but:

- how residents navigate them,
- how organizations coordinate,
- how referrals function,
- and how regional inequalities shape practical treatment access.

The reports also suggest that opioid settlement implementation may interact unevenly with existing healthcare infrastructures. Counties with larger provider networks and stronger institutional ecosystems may be better positioned to absorb and operationalize settlement resources.

In contrast, counties with fragile infrastructures may struggle to translate funding into rapidly visible changes.

This raises several broader analytical possibilities:

- opioid response systems may reflect broader forms of regional inequality;
- rural overdose crises may simultaneously be infrastructure crises;
- nonprofit organizations may function as substitute infrastructures where formal healthcare systems remain weak;
- and settlement outcomes may depend heavily on preexisting institutional capacity.

The reports also point toward the importance of examining the geography of opioid treatment itself. Distance, transportation, and regional concentration repeatedly appeared as central barriers to care.

Future work could therefore examine:

- how mobility shapes treatment continuity,
- how counties construct regional referral systems,
- and how individuals navigate fragmented rural care environments.

Preliminary Conclusions and Future Research Directions

This preliminary review suggests that opioid-related service infrastructures remain profoundly uneven across New York State counties.

Milica Milic-Kolarevic
mkolarevic@colgate.edu

While some counties possess relatively dense and overlapping treatment ecosystems, many rural counties continue to rely on fragile networks of limited providers operating across large geographic territories.

The reports collectively suggest that overdose vulnerability may be inseparable from broader regional inequalities involving:

- healthcare access,
- transportation systems,
- workforce capacity,
- institutional coordination,
- and public health infrastructure.

Most importantly, the findings suggest that future opioid research should move beyond mortality trends alone and examine the infrastructures of care themselves.

Potential future research directions include:

1. Comparative mapping of county opioid service ecosystems.
2. Study of transportation barriers and regional treatment access.
3. Examination of how counties operationalize settlement funding.
4. Ethnographic analysis of referral systems and care navigation.
5. Study of nonprofit organizations as substitute infrastructures in rural regions.
6. Analysis of institutional coordination and fragmentation.
7. Examination of medication-assisted treatment deserts.
8. Comparative study of urban and rural treatment ecosystems.
9. Investigation of workforce shortages and provider retention.
10. Longitudinal analysis of how service infrastructures evolve following settlement implementation.
11. Mixed-methods study connecting overdose outcomes to treatment geography.
12. Study of how patients experience fragmented regional treatment systems.
13. Analysis of the relationship between healthcare consolidation and overdose response capacity.
14. Examination of how counties prioritize settlement allocations.
15. Development of county-level typologies of opioid response infrastructures.

Taken together, these reports provide an important preliminary foundation for a larger mixed-methods or ethnographic research project examining the relationship between opioid response infrastructures, settlement implementation, regional inequality, and the geography of care across New York State.