Why GAO Did This Study

Substance abuse and illicit drug use, including the use of heroin and the misuse of or dependence on alcohol and prescription opioids, is a growing problem in the United States. Individuals with SUD may face challenges in remaining drug- and alcohol-free. Recovery housing can offer safe, supportive, drug- and alcohol-free housing to help these individuals maintain their sobriety and can be an important resource for individuals recovering from SUD. However, the media has reported allegations about potentially fraudulent practices on the part of some recovery homes in some states.

GAO was asked to examine recovery housing in the United States. This report examines (1) what is known about the prevalence and characteristics of recovery housing across the United States; (2) investigations and actions selected states have undertaken to oversee such housing; and (3) SAMHSA funding for recovery housing, and how states have used this or any available state funding. GAO reviewed national and state data, federal funding guidance, and interviewed officials from SAMHSA, national associations, and five states—Florida, Massachusetts, Ohio, Texas, and Utah—selected based on rates of opioid overdose deaths, dependence on or abuse of alcohol and other drugs, and other criteria. State information is intended to be illustrative and is not generalizable to all states.

What GAO Found

Nationwide prevalence of recovery housing—peer-run or peer-managed drug- and alcohol-free supportive housing for individuals in recovery from substance use disorder (SUD)—is unknown, as complete data are not available. National organizations collect data on the prevalence and characteristics of recovery housing but only for a subset of recovery homes. For example, the National Alliance for Recovery Residences, a national nonprofit and recovery community organization that promotes quality standards for recovery housing, collects data only on recovery homes that seek certification by one of its 15 state affiliates that actively certify homes. The number of homes that are not certified by this organization is unknown.

Four of the five states that GAO reviewed—Florida, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Utah—have conducted, or are in the process of conducting, investigations of recovery housing activities in their states, and three of these four states have taken formal steps to enhance oversight. The fifth state, Texas, had not conducted any such investigations at the time of GAO’s review. Fraudulent activities identified by state investigators include schemes in which recovery housing operators recruited individuals with SUD to specific recovery homes and treatment providers, who then billed patients’ insurance for extensive and unnecessary drug testing for the purposes of profit. For example, officials from the Florida state attorney’s office told GAO that SUD treatment providers were paying $300 to $500 or more per week to recovery housing operators for every patient they referred for treatment and were billing patients’ insurance for hundreds of thousands of dollars in unnecessary drug testing over the course of several months. Some of these investigations have resulted in arrests and other actions, such as changes to insurance payment policies. Florida, Massachusetts, and Utah established state certification or licensure programs for recovery housing in 2014 and 2015 to formally increase oversight. The other two states in GAO’s review—Ohio and Texas—had not passed such legislation but were providing training and technical assistance to recovery housing managers.

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), administers two federal health care grants for SUD prevention and treatment that states may use to establish recovery homes and for related activities. First, under its Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment block grant, SAMHSA makes at least $100,000 available annually to each state to provide loans to organizations seeking to establish recovery homes. Second, states have discretion to use SAMHSA funding available under a 2-year grant for 2017 and 2018 primarily for opioid use disorder treatment services, to establish recovery homes or for recovery housing-related activities. Of the five states GAO reviewed, only two, Texas and Ohio, have used any of their SAMHSA grant funds for these purposes. Four of the five states—Florida, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Texas—have also used state general revenue funds to establish additional recovery homes.
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