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Executive Summary

Community health centers care for 16 percent of people living with an HIV diagnosis in the U.S., and 22 percent of all people with HIV who are receiving HIV-related care. The President’s HIV initiative calls for a major expansion of health care: outreach to at-risk populations; services aimed at preventing new infections; and ongoing care and treatment for people living with an HIV diagnosis. All health centers will face challenges in expanding their services, but none more so than those located in the 10 states among those 26 identified as high-burden states or states containing high-burden regions that have not adopted the ACA Medicaid expansion. In these states, thousands of low-income, at-risk people remain exposed to a coverage gap. All health centers will need additional up-front resources to ramp up care capacity still further; those without the Medicaid expansion face the added hurdle of finding funds to sustain expanded services, once added. One key question facing policymakers is how to extend the Community Health Center Fund while adding additional resources for expanded care – and doing so for the 10-year life of the HIV initiative. Another is how to further incentivize adoption of the Medicaid expansion in remaining states. A further key question is whether CMS will modify its § 1115 Medicaid work and eligibility restriction experiments, which threaten to increase coverage interruptions for at-risk, non-exempt populations.

Background

In his 2019 State of the Union address, President Trump called for ending the nation’s HIV epidemic within 10 years. In a special communique published in JAMA immediately following the President’s speech, several senior administration health officials wrote that achieving this goal rests on “4 pillars”:

1. Diagnosing people with HIV as early as possible after infection;
2. Treating HIV infection rapidly and effectively to achieve sustained viral suppression;
3. Preventing at-risk individuals from becoming infected, including use of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP); and
4. Rapid detection and response to emergency HIV clusters to prevent new infection.

The President’s initiative calls for targeting high-burden states, counties, rural areas and cities including 7 states with substantial rural HIV burden, 48 highly-burdened counties in 19 states, Washington, D. C. and San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Notably the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) administrator did not join the JAMA communique even though Medicaid represents the single largest insurer of people with HIV, accounting for 30 percent of all federal spending on HIV-related care. In the 14 states that to date have not expanded Medicaid, thousands of low-income people living with HIV/AIDS risk being uninsured; one estimate is that on average, a state’s decision not to expand Medicaid affects over 2,200 uninsured, low-income people living with HIV who are left without a reliable

---


pathway to coverage.\textsuperscript{6} Based on CDC’s state-level estimates of the lifetime risk of HIV diagnosis,\textsuperscript{7} an estimated 3.3 million people\textsuperscript{8} are at risk of developing HIV during their lifetimes;\textsuperscript{9} 41 percent (over 1.3 million people) live in the 14 non-expansion states.

**Community Health Centers and HIV**

Reaching the President’s goal means significantly expanding outreach, clinical care, and patient support services to at-risk populations and communities. According to the administration, community health centers are expected to play a major role in this effort, given the scope of care they offer and their location in communities experiencing elevated poverty and health risks, and a shortage of affordable and accessible comprehensive primary health care.

In 2017, 1,373 federally funded health centers operating in over 11,000 urban and rural locations served more than 27 million patients. Health centers can be found in all the high-burden states, counties, and localities targeted by the initiative.

Federal data collected annually from health centers show steady growth in their role in fighting HIV/AIDS. In 2017, health centers served nearly 166,000 patients with an HIV diagnosis, a 44 percent increase over 2012 levels (Figure 1).

Health center patients living with an HIV diagnosis represent about 16 percent of people in the U.S. with a known HIV diagnosis in 2015, and 22 percent of people who received some HIV medical care.\textsuperscript{10} In addition, health centers have significantly expanded HIV testing – from 231,000 tests in 2000 to over 1.8 million in 2017\textsuperscript{11} – an increase of 682 percent in the number of patients being tested (Figure 2).

The quality of health center performance also has improved. In 2017, 85 percent of patients diagnosed with HIV by their health center had received follow-up care within 90 days; in 2014 (the first year this quality measure was reported), timely care performance stood at 77 percent.\textsuperscript{12} A government comparison of data from the 2014 Health Center Patient Survey (HCPS) against data from the 2014 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) found that health centers tested their non-elderly adult patients at a rate significantly higher than the testing rate among the general population (66 percent versus 53 percent),\textsuperscript{13} a level of performance consistent with the higher-risk nature of health center patients.
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\textsuperscript{8} Although this is a rough estimate, the number of people at risk is 1% of the 2018 population, in line with the 0.95% lifetime risk reported by Hess, K. L., Hu, X., Lansky, A., Mermin, J., & Hall, H. I. (2017). Lifetime risk of a diagnosis of HIV infection in the United States. Annals of Epidemiology, 27(4), 238-243.

\textsuperscript{9} Based on applying the CDC’s lifetime risk to the 2018 state populations reported by the U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement, 2018. Available at https://www.census.gov/cps/data/cpstablecreator.html


Figure 1. Total Patients and Visits for Health Center Patients with a Diagnosis of Symptomatic/Asymptomatic HIV, 2012-2017

Note: Comparisons to earlier years are not possible because previous years reported only patients and visits with a primary diagnosis of HIV.
Source: 2012-2017 Uniform Data System (UDS) National Reports, Health Resources and Services Administration, HHS.

Figure 2. Number of Health Center Patients Who Received an HIV Test, 2000-2017

682% increase in patients receiving HIV tests from 2000-2017

Source: 2000-2017 Uniform Data System (UDS) National Reports, Health Resources and Services Administration, HHS
Strengthening HIV-Related Care: the Challenges Facing Health Centers

Because health centers are now a significant source of care for people at risk for or living with HIV, the President’s initiative intends to rely on their services in both preventing and treating HIV infection. To meet this challenge — as is true in all efforts to expand medically necessary care in underserved communities — health centers will need to both ramp up service capacity and devise a sustainable means of covering the cost of accessible, affordable care going forward. Ramping up requires expanding outreach, prevention, treatment and management, and patient support activities. Sustaining capacity over time requires reliable funding sources for ongoing activities.

In ACA Medicaid expansion states, Medicaid will cover a large portion of these ongoing costs for low-income adults. Sixteen of the states designated as high-burden, either broadly or as a result of the presence of high-burden counties, as well as the District of Columbia, have implemented Medicaid expansion (Table 1). However, there is no Medicaid expansion in another 10 states considered high-burden or in which are located one or more high-burden counties (Table 1). The sustainability challenge will be far greater for health centers in these states. Many members of the low-income high-risk population in these states lack any reliable pathway to affordable coverage unless they fall into a traditional eligibility category (parents of minor children, pregnant women, or people who qualify for Medicaid on the basis of disability). Furthermore, as shown in Table 2, financial eligibility rules for non-disabled adults are highly restrictive, as illustrated by the financial rules for parents. For the estimated 2.07 million people in these states who fall into a coverage gap — ineligible for Medicaid, but too poor to qualify for subsidized Marketplace plans — the Medicaid financial eligibility limits are daunting; nearly all states exclude even those working full time at minimum wage jobs. Yet among adults with diagnosed HIV who were in care in 2016, 42 percent had incomes at or below the federal poverty level.15
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Table 1. Locations Targeted for Funding Under the Presidential Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Location Type</th>
<th>Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 States</td>
<td><strong>Medicaid Expansion States</strong> (2 States): AR and KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-Expansion States</strong> (5 States): AL, MS, MO, OK, and SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Counties in 19 States</td>
<td><strong>Medicaid Expansion States</strong> (14 States): 30 Counties in AZ, CA, IL, IN, LA, MD, MA, MI, NV, NJ, NY, OH, PA, and WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-Expansion States</strong> (5 States): 18 Counties in FL, GA, NC, TN, and TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Locations</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Juan Municipio, Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sustained grant funding will be essential in all states. Health centers treat significant numbers of uninsured patients (6.2 million, or 23 percent of all patients served in 2017). Added grant funding under the health centers program, as well as grants under the Ryan White Care Act, will be essential, as will access to a ready supply of necessary prescription drugs through the Care Act’s AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP). In 2017, only 13 percent of all health centers (175 grantees) received Care Act grants totaling $77 million, underscoring a need for additional funding through the health center grant program itself.  

Most of these funds (86 percent) went to health centers in the 26 high-burden states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

As important as grants are, unlike Medicaid they are subject to annual aggregate limits. The lack of Medicaid boosts the uninsured numbers in non-expansion states. In Medicaid expansion states, the proportion of uninsured patients (18 percent in 2017) is far lower than in the non-expansion states (36 percent in 2017).  

The President’s initiative further intensifies the focus on expansion in these states.

Even in Medicaid expansion states, however, health centers may face challenges. Currently, of the 37 expansion states, nine either are formally seeking approval to implement Section 1115 Medicaid work demonstrations or have received an approval to move forward.  

Although the CMS conditions approval on exemptions for people receiving active treatment for opioid addiction, the agency has established no similar policy for people with or at risk for HIV. Based on the experience of beneficiaries in Arkansas – the only state that to date has implemented an approved work experiment – mandatory work and reporting requirements, combined with other eligibility restrictions such as premiums and lock-out periods, are likely to cause additional coverage disruptions as a result of people’s inability to consistently pay premiums, fulfill weekly work hour rules, or navigate reporting requirements.

Table 2. Medicaid Income Eligibility Standards as a Percentage of the Federal Poverty Level for Parents and Other Adults in Non-Expansion States Identified as High-Burden in Whole or in Part Under the President’s HIV Initiative (January 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Parents (in a family of three)</th>
<th>Other Adults (for an individual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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16 GW analysis of 2017 UDS data
**Health Center HIV Performance in Expansion Versus Non-Expansion States**

Access to Medicaid among health center patients living with an HIV diagnosis appears to be significantly associated with the quality of performance in high-burden states. As Figure 3 shows, performance on the key HIV linkage-to-care measure used by the federal government to assess the quality of care furnished by health centers was significantly greater among health centers in the group of states and Washington, DC that have been designated as high-burden and that were also Medicaid expansion states in 2017, than for health centers located in high-burden states that had not adopted the expansion. This finding is consistent with previous research showing better performance and stronger health center capacity in states that have more generous Medicaid coverage policies.\(^\text{20}\) Although health insurance alone does not in and of itself ensure better quality care, more generous coverage enables providers including health centers to secure the follow-up care their patients may need, while also providing the operating revenue necessary to strengthen the availability and quality of care. For this reason, both Medicaid expansion and federal grant funding increases have been shown to be associated with increases in patient capacity and the number of patient visits.\(^\text{21}\)

**Looking to the Future**

The feasibility of the administration’s HIV initiative ultimately turns on the availability, accessibility, and quality of health care. More at-risk people must be identified and moved into preventive care. More people will need to be reached with diagnostic and continuing treatment and care management services. In the highest-burden states and communities, the need to ramp up existing efforts can be expected to be substantial, especially given what is already known about the considerable number of people with HIV diagnoses who are not in regular care arrangements.


For this reason, key questions must be answered:

- Will Congress reauthorize the Health Center Fund, which is set to expire at the end of FY2019, and if so, will lawmakers extend the period of authorization beyond the two-year funding cycles previously used? The President’s 10-year initiative rightly assumes that reaching the goal will require 10 years of active efforts to expand access to prevention and treatment services. The same time period could be used for the Health Center Fund, given health centers’ role in HIV treatment and the need for additional resources that will enable expanded HIV care without detracting from other vital services such as treatment of opioid addiction, high-quality maternity and pediatric care, and expanded efforts to reach and treat persons with serious and chronic physical and mental health conditions.

- What steps can Congress take to further incentivize adoption of the Medicaid expansion in remaining states? One option is to restore the highly-enhanced funding levels for newly adopting states that expired at the end of 2016. An additional option would be to provide expansion adoption states with additional and complementary grant resources targeted to health improvement activities for Medicaid beneficiaries facing heightened health and social risks.

- Will CMS, using both its ongoing administrative and innovation authority through the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation (CMMI), promote delivery models and demonstrations aimed at improving the accessibility and quality of HIV preventive and treatment services in the highest-risk communities, and for both Medicaid and Medicare beneficiaries, as well as for people who rely on subsidized Marketplace coverage and live in medically underserved communities?

- How will CMS address the issue of HIV risk and diagnosis in the policies it pursues related to § 1115 demonstrations whose purpose is to restrict eligibility? Will HIV risk or an HIV-positive status be the basis for an exemption from the risk of coverage termination or denial?