

HAB: Ryan White Part A HIV Emergency Relief Grant Program
Objective Review Committee Final Summary Statement

Score: 94

Application Number: 123396

Application Name: COUNTY OF MARICOPA

State: AZ City: Phoenix

NEED

Criterion 1.1: Jurisdictional Profile

Strength:

The applicant organization clearly substantiated evidence of need by describing in Table 1 the Phoenix Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA) incidence and prevalence of HIV/AIDS for the past 3 calendar years (2011-2013). A detailed narrative comparison of the above period was presented for each of the four categories: HIV incidence, AIDS incidence, HIV prevalence and AIDS prevalence by race/ethnicity, gender, age group of diagnosis, and transmission to support the need.

The applicant organization provides a thorough presentation of HIV/AIDS cases by demographic characteristics in Attachment #3. The applicant organization states that Phoenix reports an increase of men who have sex with men (MSM) with increasing minority cases specifically among newly diagnosed AIDS cases. There is also, an increase among the homeless and formerly-incarcerated individuals living with HIV/AIDS.

Weakness:

The discussion of under-represented populations is not clear and consistent. For example, the application states in the narrative and a table (Table 2) that males are underrepresented in utilization of Ryan White-funded AOMC compared to the percentage of males living with HIV or AIDS in the EMA, but the percentage provided for males utilizing Ryan White-funded AOMC is higher, not lower, than the total percentage of males living with HIV/AIDS in the Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA). The application also stated that females over-utilized AOMC compared to the percentage of females living with HIV/AIDS in the EMA, but the data in the table shows that females actually under-utilized AOMC and the narrative does not discuss this under-utilization by females.

Criterion 1.2: Demonstrated Need

Strength:

Health Resources and Services Administration HRSA-15-003

The applicant organization thoroughly addressed demonstrated need by providing Attachment #4, an updated estimate of Unmet Need in the Phoenix EMA utilizing the HRSA/HAB Unmet Need Framework and calendar year (CY) 2013 data.

The applicant organization discussed in detail the early identification of individuals with HIV/AIDS (EIIHA) in Table 5 and previously diagnosed positive HIV test events for 1/1/2014-6/30/2014 in Table 6.

The application clearly outlines numerous detailed system-level interventions, collaborations and other activities that are specifically designed to successfully achieve the planned outcomes of the EIIHA plan for the identified special populations.

The application clearly identifies specific challenges of working with each of the three chosen EIIHA populations, as well as activities that are specifically geared toward each of the populations named.

The applicant organization presents three detailed planned outcomes for FY 15 which includes viral load suppression and knowing serostatus.

The Planning Council added funds for Housing and counseling, which addresses unmet needs.

The application clearly describes the "Know Your Number Campaign" partnership for decreasing media fear for HIV advertisements.

Weakness:

The application's Figure 2, showing a map of zip codes in the EMA where PLWH/A not in care are located is unclear. There are different shades of color represented but there is no legend which explains the color shade coding.

Criterion 1.3: Impact of Funding

Strength:

The applicant organization clearly addressed the impact of funding by presenting Table 9, Impact of Affordable Care Act-Uninsured and federal poverty level of Ryan White Part A (RWPA) Clients with data on people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWH/A) who are insured/impoverished.

Health Resources and Services Administration

HRSA-15-003

The applicant organization presented a clear overview of the impact of comorbidities on the cost and complexity of providing care in a narrative format and Attachment #5.

Weakness:

None

RESPONSE

Criterion 2.1: Planning and Resource Allocation

Strength:

The applicant organization provided a thorough discussion of the over-all structure of the community input process including a description of the priority setting and allocations process.

The overall structure of the Planning Council is culturally diverse and includes providers, which strengthens the reflection of the EMA.

Weakness:

The Planning Council Letter of Assurance does not clearly and specifically describe how Planning Council member representation is reflective of the PLWH/A demographics in the EMA and does not provide a plan and timeline for addressing the current vacancy for which a Hispanic consumer is being sought.

Criterion 2.2: HIV Care Continuum and FY2015 Implementation Plan

Strength:

The applicant organization presents Figure 4, 2013 Continuum of Care Data for Arizona, Phoenix EMA and Ryan White, which demonstrates that the Planning Council service allocations are making significant strides in increasing access to services as demonstrated through the linkage, retention and antiretroviral therapy columns.

With the aide of National Quality Center the applicant organization developed a set of health outcomes to be measured by monitoring service delivery effectiveness.

The applicant organization has increased funding for health insurance premiums and co-payments, as a result of the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

Weakness:

None

Criterion 2.3: Resolution of Challenges

Strength:

Health Resources and Services Administration

HRSA-15-003

The application clearly identifies challenges that exist in the EMA with regard to differing definitions of the HIV Care Continuum components and no single data repository or method for synchronizing data across multiple systems and identifies strategies that are underway for resolving these challenges.

Weakness:

None

EVALUATIVE MEASURES

Criterion 3.1: Clinical Quality Management

Strength:

The applicant organization clearly addresses Clinical Quality Management (CQM) by providing a detailed description of CQM Program Infrastructure; the applicant organization provides several detailed examples of how process change strategies are utilized to improve outcomes.

Weakness:

None

Criterion 4: RESOURCES/CAPABILITES

Strength:

The applicant organization thoroughly demonstrated the resources and capabilities to implement the grant. The applicant organization has the appropriate staff identified, processes and mechanisms to avoid duplication of services, strong monitoring processes, policies and procedures in place, financial internal controls in place, fiscal oversight, and the process and timeline for corrective actions.

Weakness:

The application does not clearly identify if there were any programmatic or fiscal findings in any of the most recent service provider site visits and, if so, the nature of the findings and the corrective actions taken or planned to address these findings.

Criterion 5: SUPPORT REQUESTED

Strength:

The expenditures for Maintenance of Effort (MOE) are detailed in a table with categories of Primary Medical Care, Outpatient Ambulatory Services, and support services.

Weakness:

None