The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP’s research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine “what works” (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our Technical Documentation.

**Program Description:** Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) for patients in emergency departments is used to identify and address "hazardous" alcohol use (not alcohol dependence). Those screening positive receive a brief intervention, delivered by health care staff or other professional. The intervention includes feedback on the patients’ consumption compared to their peers and a motivational interview to encourage reduction in consumption. Patients typically receive a single intervention lasting 15 minutes to one hour. Some interventions included up to two brief telephone booster calls. Patients meeting diagnostic criteria for abuse or dependence would be referred to chemical dependency treatment in lieu of brief intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxpayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net program cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits minus cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to cost ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits minus costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance the program will produce benefits greater than the costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2018). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our Technical Documentation.
### Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes measured</th>
<th>Treatment age</th>
<th>No. of effect sizes</th>
<th>Treatment N</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem alcohol use</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4591</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis use ^</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illicit drug use ^</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency department visits</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking and driving ^</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries ^</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid drug use ^</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ WSIPP’s benefit-cost model does not monetize this outcome.

**Meta-analysis** is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An **effect size** (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

**Adjusted effect sizes** are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the **first time ES is estimated** and the **second time ES is estimated**. We also report the **unadjusted effect size** to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our **Technical Documentation**.
### Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected outcome:</th>
<th>Resulting benefits:¹</th>
<th>Benefits accrue to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taxpayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem alcohol use</td>
<td>Criminal justice system</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem alcohol use</td>
<td>Labor market earnings associated with problem alcohol use</td>
<td>$490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem alcohol use</td>
<td>Property loss associated with problem alcohol use</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency department visits</td>
<td>Health care associated with emergency department visits</td>
<td>$277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem alcohol use</td>
<td>Mortality associated with problem alcohol</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program cost</td>
<td>Adjustment for deadweight cost of program</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$769</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

²“Others” includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

³“Indirect benefits” includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.

### Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual cost</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program costs</td>
<td>$362</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Present value of net program costs (in 2018 dollars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Cost range (+ or -)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This program consists of a single brief intervention during a visit to the emergency department. According to one multisite US study, of 7,751 patients screened, 1,132 were eligible and consented. (Academic ED SBIRT Research Collaborative. (2007). The impact of screening, brief intervention, and referral for treatment on emergency department patients’ alcohol use. Annals of Emergency Medicine, 50(6), 699-710). In Washington State, cost estimates from 2005 indicate $53 per patient screened based on an analysis by Washington State Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, presented at the 2006 Co-Ocurring Disorders Conference.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our Technical Documentation.
The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in discounted dollars. If the dollars are negative (bars below $0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach $0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above $0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.
The graph above illustrates the breakdown of the estimated cumulative benefits (not including program costs) per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. These cash flows provide a breakdown of the classification of dollars over time into four perspectives: taxpayer, participant, others, and indirect. “Taxpayers” includes expected savings to government and expected increases in tax revenue. “Participants” includes expected increases in earnings and expenditures for items such as health care and college tuition. “Others” includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance. “Indirect benefits” includes estimates of the changes in the value of a statistical life and changes in the deadweight costs of taxation. If a section of the bar is below the $0 line, the program is creating a negative benefit, meaning a loss of value from that perspective.

The graph above focuses on the subset of estimated cumulative benefits that accrue to taxpayers. The cash flows are divided into the source of the value.

**Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis**


