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Learning Objectives

1. Understand the current Ryan White Care Act provisions and methodology for distributing funding;

2. Review where the Ryan White Program funding is being distributed by each program part and how much each state/territory is receiving per HIV case count;

3. Learn how changes could be made to the Ryan White Program distribution methodologies through administrative or legal means;

4. Discuss perspectives on how funding could be better targeted to areas most in need.
Why This Matters

- Ryan White Program provides some type of services to more than 551,000 people living with HIV
- People in Ryan White Program have a higher viral suppression rate
- The ACA, including Medicaid expansion, is not sufficient
  - Payer of last resort and warps around other programs
  - Medicaid expansion, other coverage and resources vary by state
- Concerted effort to End AIDS in the US
  - Jurisdictions need resources to achieve goals
  - Level needed not the same everywhere
Current Funding Framework

• Formula awards to cities and states based on case counts
• Competitive grants based on demonstrated need
• Other competitive grants:
  • Minority AIDS Initiative, ADAP Emergency Relief, Special Programs of National Significance, other programs
Funding & The Epidemic

- National HIV/AIDS Strategy calls for federal funding to follow the epidemic and be distributed to areas most in need.
- 2016 data shows that the epidemic disproportionately impacted the southern US:
  - Southern states accounted for more than half of all new HIV diagnosis and 46% of all people living with HIV, despite making up 38% of national population.
  - Prevalence rates of people living with diagnosed HIV:
    - overall in the U.S.: 303.5 per 100,000 people
    - by region: 417.8 (Northeast) 359.3 (South) 248.6 (West) 170.6 (Midwest)
An Analysis of Current Ryan White Program Funding
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Purpose

• Examine where current Ryan White Program funding is distributed to determine if it is following the epidemic

• Inform and motivate a discussion about how Ryan White Program funding is being distributed and how it can be better allocated in the future to achieve greater viral suppression across the country
Methodology

- Examined FY 2017 funding awards
  - by program part
  - per HIV/AIDS case count
  - nationwide by states
    - Excluded 6 jurisdictions with low case counts: Guam, Palau, American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, & Marshall Islands
Methodology

• Analyzed the funding:
  1. per case above/below median for Parts A&B (including ADAP)
  2. per case above/below median for Part B ADAP
  3. total Part B & ADAP Supplementals
  4. total Part C & total Part D
  5. per case above/below median for Parts A-D (including ADAP)
  6. per case above/below median for Parts A-D (including ADAP) multiplied by total number of cases
Methodology

• Ranked states 3 ways:
  1. A-D including ADAP funding per case
  2. A-D including ADAP funding per case multiplied by total cases
  3. A&B including ADAP funding per case

• Medicaid Expansion noted

• Data Limitation:
  • Do not have data breaking down Part A awards and Part B Emerging Community awards distributed to multiple states
  • Credited such awards to only one state; so some state funding amounts shown are higher than actually received while others are lower than actual
Parts A & B including ADAP
(Above/Below the Median)

Median Funding per Case: $1,818
Part B ADAP
(Above/Below the Median)

Median Funding per Case: $813

*States that received median funding per case not shown
Part B & ADAP Supplementals

*Excludes states that did not receive Part B supplemental or ADAP supplemental*
Parts C & D
Parts A-D
(Above/Below the Median)

Median Funding per Case: $2,240
Parts A-D Multiplied by Total Cases
(Above/Below the Median)

Median Funding per Case: $2,240
State Funding Rankings
Total Part A-D Funding, Above/Below the Median, Multiplied by Total Cases
## Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>A-D including ADAP per Case Count</th>
<th>A-D including ADAP x Total Cases</th>
<th>A&amp;B including ADAP per Case Count</th>
<th>Medicaid Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Virgin Islands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island +</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia +</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri ++</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi -</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin -</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee +</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia +</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada +</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts +</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>A-D including ADAP per Case Count</th>
<th>A-D including ADAP x Total Cases</th>
<th>A&amp;B including ADAP per Case Count</th>
<th>Medicaid Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania +</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina +</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota +</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky -</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia -</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon +</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia -</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire -</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona -</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware +</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina -</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas -</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio +</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey -</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland -</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas -</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* + State receives Part A and/or Part B funding also distributed to other jurisdictions
* - State receives Part A and/or Part B funding from another jurisdiction

Note: A state may receive more than one funding award that crosses jurisdictions, noted by multiple + and -
Observations

• Part B & ADAP Supplemental awards push states above median
• Important to consider all Part A, B, C and D funding together
• Looking at funding above/below the median multiplied by case count shows the magnitude of funding differentials

Examples:
• Montana’s A-D funding per case was $6,090 above median but $2.6 million in total when multiplied by the number of cases in the state
• New York’s A-D funding per case was only $158 above median but $20.9 million in total
• If states received funding equitably per case, Florida would gain the most ($28.5m)
How Can Funding be Better Aligned with the Need
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Mechanisms that Align Funding with Needs

• Non-Formula Funding
  • Under Current Law
    • Parts A & B Supplemental Funding
    • Parts C & D
  • Requires changes in law
    • ADAP Supplemental & Emergency Relief Funding
How Can Funding Align More with Needs?

- Change Law
  - Distribute Funding based on different factors
    - Case Counts and other factors:
      - Death Rate
      - Viral Suppression Rate
      - Number of Clients using Ryan White Program
      - Insurance Coverage
      - Cost of care
      - Poverty Rate
  - Examine the Part Structure
  - Change proportion of Supplemental Funding and Factors for Distribution
Non-Formula Funding Opportunities

• The AIDS Institute prioritizing opportunities under current law

• Part A Supplemental
  • HRSA examining improvements, but need legislative changes
  • In the meantime, any opportunities?
    • Current law of basing on need and testing and linkage to care is not working as intended
    • Every grant application scores well
Non-Formula Funding Opportunities

- Part B (Non-ADAP) Supplemental
  - Distributed Based on Need
    - Factors Include (Similar to Part A Supplemental):
      - Prevalence
      - Increasing case numbers, including those in emerging populations
      - Cost and complexity of delivering care
      - Uninsured rates
      - Other access limitations
      - Impact of homelessness, co-morbidities and justice involvement
      - Impact of reductions in base awards
Part B Supplemental

• Due to end of hold harmless available funding has grown
  • 2013: $15.4 million
  • 2014: $44.6 million

• Due to unobligated Part B funds (including ADAP) funding has grown even more
  • 2015: $61.4 million
  • 2016: $167 million
  • 2017: $177 million
  • 2018: $170 million

• Not all states apply
• Not all states eligible due to unobligated funds
Part B Supplemental Awards: 2015

- DC, MA, MD, Micronesia & Virgin Islands not eligible in 2015
- 18 states applied for and received funding
  - including 3 that did not receive funding in the previous year (AL, MS, and NE)
- 12 states did not receive funding in 2015 but did in 2014
  - (CO, CT, DE, IL, IN, IA, LA, MI, ND, SD, VA, in addition to MA, which was ineligible)
- Highest awards:
  - NY: $23.8 million or 39 percent of the total
  - CA: $10 million or 16 percent of the total
Part B Supplemental Awards: 2016

- AL, AR, NH, MA, WA, Northern Mariana Islands & American Samoa not eligible
- 20 states applied and all received funding
- Available funding: $167 million; Total awarded: $105 million
- Highest Awards:
  - NY: $29.2m
  - CA: $16.7m
  - PR: $14.3m
  - IA: $6.9m
  - MS: $5.9m
  - DC: $6m
Part B Supplemental Awards: 2017

• OH, MA, the Marshall Islands, and American Samoa were not eligible
• 20 States applied
• $218 million available; $177.8 million awarded
• Highest awards:
  • NY: $35m
  • CA: $35m
  • IN: $26.4m
• Recipients: AL, AK, GA, ID, IA, ME, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NJ, NC, PR, RI, TX, US Virgin Islands, UT, WI
Part B Supplemental Awards: 2018

- DC, OH, OR, Marshall Islands, and Palau not eligible
- $170 million available
  - $40.2m carried over from previous year
- Robust level of applications
- Anticipated award date: September, 2018
Part B Supplement: Questions to Consider

- After grant score, HRSA runs through formula
  - Why? Not in the law
  - Opportunity to reexamine current practices
- Why aren’t all states applying?
- Cap award at $35 million
  - How was that number developed?
- Opportunities for further review
Part C & D Awards

- **Part C Grants**
  - Direct grants to clinics for services to underserved populations
  - Preference for grantees in areas with increased HIV/AIDS burden
  - To be consider in determining awards:
    - Balance in allocations between rural and urban areas
    - Supporting early intervention in rural areas
    - Underserved areas

- **Part D Grants**
  - Direct grants to providers for family-centered health care and supportive services for women, infants, children and youth
  - HRSA has broad discretion in directing Part D funds
Part C Funding Changes

• Recent HRSA changes include new geographic service areas and “right sizing” funding based on clients served
  • 70% of Funding
    • Base Funding: minimum baseline amount per service area augmented by number of clients served
  • 30% of Funding
    • Demographics: a service area’s proportion of populations disproportionately impacted by the HIV epidemic with significant disparities in health outcomes and uninsured populations
    • Presence of RWHAP Part A: Part C service areas outside of Part A jurisdictions receive additional funding
ADAP Supplemental

- 5% of ADAP Base award set-aside for states demonstrating “severe need”
- $42.6 million to 9 states in 2017
  - $41.3m to 15 states in 2015
- Highest Awards in 2017
  - TX: $21.4m
  - GA: $8.9m
- Severe need determined based on one of following:
  - Client population <200% federal poverty level
  - Formulary limitations affecting availability of core ARTs
  - Waiting lists, enrollment caps, expenditure caps
  - Unanticipated increase in eligible individuals
ADAP Emergency Relief Funds

- Pool of money set aside for ADAP through appropriations
- $47 million to 9 states in 2017
- Awards made to eliminate or prevent ADAP waiting lists, and to fund cost-cutting or cost-saving activities
- Funded activities include steps to enroll ADAP clients in insurance plans, as cost-saving measures.
- Highest Awards:
  - CA, TN, PR, VA: each awarded $9 million
- Not included in Ryan White Program law; can be changed through appropriations or incorporated into law
President Trump Budget

• “The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to reauthorize the RWHAP to ensure that Federal funds are allocated to address the changing landscape of HIV across the United States”

• Proposes statutory changes to Parts A & B funding methodologies
  • No specifics provided
  • Allows for a data driven distribution to ensure funds are allocated to populations experiencing high or increasing rates of infections
  • Reduces burden on recipients and allows for better targeting of resources
President Trump Budget

• Increase HHS’s ability to effectively focus resources for HIV care, treatment, and support needs in funded cities and states based on need, geography, data quality, and performance.

• Proposed changes to Ryan White Program authorization
  • To simplify, modernize, and standardized requirements and definitions consistent across the Program Parts
  • Reduces burden on organizations when receiving funding from multiple Parts
The Future

• If we are going to meet the goals of the National HIV/AIDS Strategy & End AIDS need to examine Ryan White Program funding distribution

• Analysis of funding demonstrates current funding is not distributed equitably or on need

• Environment has changed, mostly due to ACA
  • Some disparities have increased

• Difficult to increase overall appropriations
  • Need to look at distributing funding in different ways
  • No one wants to loose funding
The Future

• Most in HIV community seem to support status quo
• Consequences of Legislative Changes
  • Potential Opportunities?
• Continue to encourage HRSA to examine current practices and look towards improvements
• Impact of 340B funding and rebates in general
  • Generic drugs do not provide rebates
• Change eventually needs to occur
  • If we don’t come up with proposals, decisions will be made for us
Thank you!
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Presentation available online at:  
https://bit.ly/2MIup7r

Complete funding analysis available at:  

Twitter @AIDSadvocacy  
Facebook @TheAIDSInstitute