

Ensuring Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Funding Aligns with Needs

Carl Schmid
The AIDS Institute

How Can Funding Align More 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 through Reauthorization Process
 - 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

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
- Not all states apply
- Not all states eligible due to unobligated funds

Part B Supplemental Awards: 2014

- 27 states applied for and received funding in 2014
 - AL did not apply nor did other states in need
- Highest awards:
 - NY: \$12.2 million or 27 percent of the total
 - FL: \$7.6 million or 17 percent of the total
 - TX: \$3.5 million or 8 percent of the total
- Question grant award criteria
 - Community letters to HRSA
 - Is the funding going to where it is needed?

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
- After grant score, HRSA runs through formula
 - Why? Not in the law
 - Opportunity to reexamine current practices

Part B Supplemental Awards: 2016

- AL, AR, NH, MA, WA, Northern Mariana Islands & American Samoa not eligible in 2016
- Concerted effort to encourage states to apply
 - 20 states applied and all received funding
- Available funding: \$167 million
 - Cap award at \$30 million
 - How was that number developed?
- Awards will be announced in September
- Opportunities for further review
 - Funding pool may continue to grow

Part B Supplemental Awards: 2016

- Total Awards: \$105 m (from HRSA Data Warehouse, does not represent full award)
- Highest Awards:
 - NY: \$29.2 m IA: \$6.9 m
 - CA: \$16.7 m DC: \$6 m
 - PR: \$14.3 m MS: \$5.9 m
- Other States: NC, RI, NE, TN, TX, VA, WI, GA, SC, MT, ID, UT, NJ, AK
- Opportunities for further review
 - Funding pool may continue to grow

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
 - HRSA must 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
- Both will be recompeted
 - Opportunity to review distribution of funding

ADAP Supplemental

- 5% set-aside for states demonstrating “severe need”
- \$41.3 million to 16 states in 2015
 - In 2014 it was to 26 states
 - Highest Awards in 2015
 - TX: \$18.2 million
 - GA: \$9.5 million
- 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
 - Prescribed in law

ADAP Emergency Relief Funds

- Pool of money set aside for ADAP through appropriations
- \$75 million to 17 states in 2015
- 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:
 - GA: \$10.3 million
 - VA: \$10.2 million
 - PR: \$9.6 million
- Not included in Ryan White Program law; can be changed through appropriations or incorporated into law

The Future

- If we are going to meet the goals of the National HIV/AIDS Strategy 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 lose funding

The Future

- Most in HIV/AIDS community seem to support status quo
- Need leadership for change
 - Next Administration?
- Continue to encourage HRSA to examine current practices and look towards improvements
- Impact of 340B funding
- Change eventually needs to occur
 - If we don't come up with proposals, decisions will be made for us

Thank you!

Carl Schmid

Deputy Executive Director

The AIDS Institute

cschmid@theaidsinstitute.org