



## Drug and Alcohol Programs

### Annual Report 2016

**Summary:** As a provider of publicly funded/subsidized outpatient drug and alcohol services, Community Alternatives must annually report to the public its progress and financial performance. The agency's drug and alcohol revenue grew this year to \$57,212. While costs remained somewhat higher than the revenue, the Board feels the program is moving in the right direction both fiscally and programmatically.

<b>Drug and Alcohol Revenue</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>57,212</b>
Salaries and Wages		42,999
Taxes, Benefits		8600
Occupancy		991
Utilities		100
Supplies		336
Communications		119
Postage and Shipping		34
Equipment		190
Admin Allocation		5499
<b>Total Program Costs</b>		<b>\$58,868</b>
<b>Net Income</b>		<b>\$-1,656</b>



### Clinical Report:

#### 2015 D & A client report:

#### Active clients

55 active clients throughout 2015;

13 CURRENT ACTIVE CLIENTS

Of those **CURRENTLY ACTIVE CLIENTS:**

- 6 - Were referred because they are taking an opiate inhibitor and are required to be in treatment as per their insurance
- 5 - Were referred because they are on probation or parole
- 2 - Were referred because they are involved with CYS
- 3 - Are in their 1<sup>st</sup> attempt at treatment
- 8 - Are in their 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt at treatment
- 2 - Are in their 3<sup>rd</sup> or more attempt at treatment
- 12 have Value Insurance and 1 is SCA funded
- All are at a 1A (individual) level of care; 1 is seen more than 1x per week
- 10 are women; 3 are men
- 5 are between 20-30; 5 are between 30-40; 1 is between 40-50; 2 are between 50-60
- 11 are Caucasian; 2 are Bi-racial

## Discharges

42 discharges in 2015

Of those **DISCHARGES:**

5 – Were successful discharges

Of those SUCCESSFUL discharges : 5 were referred because they were on probation

Of those SUCCESSFUL discharges: 5 were on their 1<sup>st</sup> attempt at treatment

Of those SUCCESSFUL discharges: ALL were in a 1A ( individual) level of service; 2 were women; 3 were men; All 5 were Caucasian

Of those SUCCESSFUL discharges – 1 was between 10-19, 2 were between 20-29, 1 was between 40-49 and 1 was between 50-59

3 - Were **SUCCESSFUL WITH CIRCUMSTANCES** – they completed the program and were administratively discharged but decided to remain in treatment for added stability; of **THESE 3:** 2 never returned to treatment and 1 lost her insurance and couldn't afford the self-pay rate: Of **THESE 3:** 2 were referred by CYS (1 of which was also taking an inhibitor) and the other was referred by probation

Of those discharged **SUCCESSFUL WITH CIRCUMSTANCES** – 2 were between 20-29, 1 was between 30 -39

Of those discharged **SUCCESSFUL WITH CIRCUMSTANCES:** all were in a 1A (individual) level of service; 2 were women; 1 was a man; All 3 were Caucasian

18 - Were **NON-COMPLIANT** discharges by failing to return to treatment and not responding to contact attempts via phone or mail

Of those **NON-COMPLIANT DISCHARGES:** 6 were referred due to taking an opiate inhibitor and 9 were referred by probation; 6 were on their 1<sup>st</sup> treatment attempt; 6 were on their 2<sup>nd</sup> treatment attempt; 3 were on their 3<sup>rd</sup> or more attempt

Of those **NON-COMPLIANT DISCHARGES:** 16 were in a 1A (individual) level of service; 1 was in a 1B (IOP) level of service; 7 were women; 10 were men; 13 were Caucasian, 2 were African American, 3 were Bi-Racial

Of those **NON-COMPLIANT DISCHARGES:** 7 were between 20-29, 8 were between 30-49, 2 were between 40-49 and 1 was between 70-80,

15 - Were **NON –COMPLIANT WITH CIRCUMSTANCES**

Of those discharged **NON-COMPLIANT WITH CIRCUMSTANCES:** 2 discharged after their probation maxed and they were no longer required to be here but didn't complete their goals (1 of these also moved out of state); 3 died while in treatment; 1 was discharged after the agency lost their psychiatrist; 1 had out of county insurance; 5 were jailed; 1 developed a worsening health condition and was no longer required to be here; 1 left after her opiate inhibitor doctor told her to or he would no longer prescribe to her; 1 left to pursue a higher level of care which she had previously resisted

Of those **NON-COMPLIANT WITH CIRCUMSTANCES:** 11 were referred by probation and 2 were referred due to taking an opiate inhibitor; 1 was self-referred and the other was for other reasons

Of those **NON-COMPLIANT WITH CIRCUMSTANCES:** 3 were on their 1<sup>st</sup> treatment attempt, 10 were on their 2<sup>nd</sup> treatment attempt and 2 were on their 3<sup>rd</sup> or more treatment attempt

Of those **NON-COMPLIANT WITH CIRCUMSTANCES:** 13 were in a 1A (individual) level of service; 2 were in a 1B (IOP) level of service; 7 were women; 8 were men;

Of those **NON-COMPLIANT WITH CIRCUMSTANCES:** 9 were Caucasian, 4 were African American, 2 were Bi-Racial

Of those **NON-COMPLIANT WITH CIRCUMSTANCES:** 6 were between 20-29, 2 were between 30-39, 4 were between 40-49, 1 was between 50-59, and 2 were between 60-69

Of those **DISCHARGED CLIENTS:** 26 were Value insurance, 6 were SCA funded, 4 started as SCA funded and then flipped to Value when their insurance kicked in; 2 were self-pay; 1 was self-pay to Value once their insurance kicked in; 2 had UPMC commercial; 1 had Aetna PCO