

RECOVERY IN CONTEXT

The Neighborhood Characteristics of Sober Living Houses

Amy A. Mericle, PhD 17 October 2019



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- Work on this presentation was completed in collaboration with:
 - Katherine J. Karriker-Jaffe, PhD;
 - Deidre Patterson, MPH;
 - Elizabeth Mahoney, MA;
 - Rachael Korcha, MA;
 - Douglas Polcin, EdD
- Work was supported by funds from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (R01DA042938)
- The authors have no competing or conflicting financial interests to report





ADDICTION & RECOVERY ECOLOGY

Neighborhood disadvantage • Crime & delinquency • Stress & depression • Substance use & relapse White Bison Wellbriety¹ & the "Healing Forest" Sanctuary Healing Wholeness

¹Moore, D. & Coyhis, D. (2010). The Multicultural Wellbriety Peer Recovery Support Program: Two Decades of Community-Based Recovery. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly, 28*(3), 273-292.





CALIFORNIA SOBER LIVING HOUSES (SLHs)

SLHs do not provide treatment or formal services, but residents are either encouraged or required to attend 12-step meetings

Resident in the lease of the second bar of the s

Residents can stay as long as they wish provided may abide by house rules and pay monthly fees

Allowers evidence base but helptofore installing ent







OBJECTIVES

- Describe the neighborhood characteristics of sober living houses in Los Angeles, County in terms of
 - Socio-demographics
 - Alcohol outlets
 - Recovery resources
 - Accessibility
- Examine differences in these characteristics by:
 - Gender served
 - House size
 - Monthly fees charged





SITES AND PARTICIPANTS

- Houses (N=297) were members of Los Angeles County Coalition of the Sober Living Network
- The Sober Living Network is a nonprofit organization that oversees application, quality control, inspection, and house certification procedures within its county-level coalitions
- The Sober Living Network is an affiliate of the National Alliance for Recovery Residences (NARR) and implements housing standards used in recovery residences across the United States





DATA COLLECTION AND MEASURES

- Lists of member houses were provided to researcher staff between 2017-2018
- Houses were geocoded and linked with:
 - US Census/ACS (2012-2016) data to create sociodemographic measures
 - California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) data to create measures of density & proximity to alcohol (on- and off-premises) outlets
 - SAMHSA Treatment Locator and self-help group meetings to create measures of density & proximity to recovery resources
 - Walk Score[®] data to measure the walkability of an address and community-level indicators of geographic access to different amenities





NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

	All Houses	
Neighborhood ¹ Characteristic	М	SD
Socio-demographics (N=285)		
Percent of adults (25 or older) who are not high-school graduates	0.17	0.15
Percent of people unemployed (excludes those out of labor force)	0.06	0.03
Percent people below poverty	0.15	0.11
Percent of population non-White	0.38	0.20
Percent housing units renter occupied	0.53	0.25
Alcohol Outlets (N=273)		
Number of off-premises outlets within .5 miles	3.82	3.60
Number of on-premises outlets within .5 miles	5.03	7.40
Number of off-premises outlets within 1 mile	16.06	11.05
Number of on-premises outlets within 1 mile	21.17	23.86
Treatment and Recovery Resources		
Number of treatment facilities within 10 miles	50.15	26.18
Number of treatment facilities within 15 miles	92.10	44.59
Distance (roadway miles) to nearest treatment program	1.19	0.94
Time (in minutes) to nearest treatment program	2.73	2.11
Number of self-help groups within .5 miles	0.85	1.41
Number of self-help groups within 1 mile	2.79	3.12
Distance (roadway miles) to nearest self-help group	0.84	0.78
Time (in minutes) to nearest self-help program	1.84	1.51
Accessibility		
Number of rail stops within .5 miles (N=297)	0.16	0.51
TransitScore (N=238)	48.71	13.42
WalkScore (N=297)	58.85	27.44
BikeScore (214)	59.05	19.41
ParksScore (N=297)	57.10	
GroceryScore (N=297)	61.55	33.57
Notes. ¹ Neighborhood is defined as census tract.	51.55	55.5

- SLHs were located in neighborhoods that were:
 - Largely renteroccupied
 - In close proximity to on- and offpremise alcohol outlets as well as treatment & selfhelp groups
 - "Somewhat" walkable and had "Some transit"



8

DIFFERENCES BY GENDER SERVED



- Differences in socio-demographics, recovery resources, and accessibility
- Coed houses lowest percent of non-Whites and generally more isolated





9

DIFFERENCES BY RESIDENT CAPACITY



- Larger capacity houses were in neighborhoods with:
 - Higher % of adults without HS degree
 - More liquor stores
 - Shorter distance to treatment and greater walk- & bike-ability.





DIFFERENCES BY MONTHLY FEES (1)



- Monthly fees strongly associated with socio-demographic characteristics
- Houses charging lower fees associated with indicators of neighborhood disadvantage





DIFFERENCES BY MONTHLY FEES (2)



 Houses charging higher fees were more removed from risk & recovery resources





SUMMARY

- Neighborhood factors been found to influence substance use and relapse and could also be critical to helping those in recovery
- SLHs are embedded in a neighborhood context—often with factors that could both positively and negatively affect recovery
- These contextual factors vary by house gender, house capacity, and monthly fees





LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- This study was:
 - Limited to houses in LA County and part of the Sober Living Network
 - Only focused on the association between neighborhood and a limited number of house characteristics
- Future work needed to:
 - Focus on how neighborhood characteristics affect *resident outcomes*
 - Study a wider range of recovery residences and residences in varied geographic regions
 - Develop and investigate interventions to help residents manage neighborhood risk
 - Consider community-level interventions and policy research to empirically investigate principles and components of recovery ecology



THANK YOU!!!





