2011-2012 Grant Application Quantification of Need

| | | | | | M1 | | N | 12 | M3 | M4 | N | 45 | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------|-------------|---------------|
| | | GY 2010-11 | % of all | *FY 2010 UDC | **FY 2010 | ***FY 2010 | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | FY 2010 UDC | FY 2010 UDC | UDC Need | FY 2011 UDC | Average of M: |
| | | ARIES | 2010-11 | using % of all & | UDC using | UDC using % | using GR | using GR | adding New | using Avg | % using | Need % | through M5 |
| | | Utilization | Clients per | Aries PLWHA | % of all & | of all & Avg | | | Clients | Utilization | 2005 NA | using 2005 | |
| | Service Category | | SC | | GR PLWHA | PLWHA | | | | | | NA | |
| Core | Service Category | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3 Outpatient & Ambulatory Health Services | 2084 | 72.1% | 2194 | 2142 | 2168 | 2246 | 2421 | 2199 | 1970 | 74.50% | 2266 | 2205 |
| | | 1946 | 67.4% | 2194 | 2142 | 2108 | 2240 | 2421 | 2199 2052 | 1970 | 74.30% | 2200 | 2205 |
| | CD4 Tests | 2005 | | 2048 | 2001 | 2024 | 2097 | 2201 | | 1591 | | | |
| | Viral Load Tests | 2005 | | 2110 | 2061 | 2086 | 2161 | 2329 | | 1591 | | | |
| | Genotype Test | 371 | 12.8% | 391 | 381 | 386 | 400 | 431 | | 1580 | | | |
| | Phenotype Test | 14 | | 15 | 14 | 15 | 400 | 431 | | | | | |
| | Laboratory Service | 496 | | 522 | 510 | 516 | 535 | 576 | | | | | |
| | Medications non-apa | 162 | | 171 | 167 | 169 | 175 | 188 | - | | | | |
| | Miscelaneous Lab Test | 287 | | 302 | 295 | 299 | 309 | 333 | | | | | |
| | Nurse visit | 413 | | 435 | 425 | 430 | 445 | 480 | | | | | |
| | Opthamology | 14 | | 435 | -423 | 430 | 15 | 16 | | | | | |
| | Other Speciality | 4 | 0.1% | 4 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 5 | .54 | | | | |
| | Radiology | 7 | 0.2% | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 34 | | | | |
| | Trofile Test | 1 | 0.0% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| Ę | Medical Case Management Incl. Treatment Adherence | 1480 | | 1558 | 1521 | 1540 | 1595 | 1719 | 1194 | 1522 | 68.80% | 2092 | 1613 |
| | 3 Mental Health Services | 496 | | 522 | 510 | | 535 | 576 | - | - | 37.60% | 1143 | |
| 15 | Substance Abuse Outpatient Services | 215 | 7.4% | 226 | 221 | 224 | 232 | 250 | 157 | 155 | 20.40% | 620 | 281 |
| | Hospice Services | 26 | | 27 | 27 | | 28 | 30 | | | 3.80% | 116 | 46 |
| | 4 Oral Health Care | 1206 | | 1269 | 1240 | 1255 | 1300 | 1401 | 1199 | 1118 | 74.30% | 2259 | 1446 |
| ć | Health Insurance Premium Assistance | 71 | 2.5% | 75 | 73 | | 77 | 82 | 74 | 56 | 58.40% | 2259 | 509 |
| | Medicare/Medicaid Supplement | 39 | 1.3% | 41 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 45 | | | | | |
| 10 | AIDS Pharmaceutical Assistance - Local | 1352 | 46.8% | 1423 | 1390 | 1407 | 1457 | 1571 | 1530 | 1437 | 52.10% | 1584 | 1506 |
| 7 | 7 Medical Nutrition Therapy | 341 | 11.8% | 359 | 351 | 355 | 368 | 396 | 450 | 378 | 73.40% | 2232 | 762 |
| 25 | Early Intervention Services | 985 | 34.1% | 1037 | 1013 | 1025 | 1062 | 1144 | | | 12.10% | 368 | |
| | B Home and Community Based Health Services | 635 | 22.0% | 668 | 653 | 661 | 684 | 738 | | | 12.70% | 386 | |
| 30 | ADAP \$59,174 utilized | | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |

Total Core Medical

| | | | | M1 | | N | 12 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M5 | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----|
| | | % of all | | **FY 2010 | ***FY 2010 | | | | | FY 2010 | FY 2010UDC | |
| | GY 2010-11 | 2008 | *FY 2010 UDC | UDC using | UDC using % | | | FY 2010 UDC | FY 2010 UDC | UDC Need % | Need % | |
| | ARIES | Clients per | using % of all & | % of all & | of all & Avg | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | adding New | using Avg | using 2005 | using 2005 | |
| Service Category | Utilization | SC | Aries PLWHA | GR PLWHA | PLWHA | using GR | using GR | Clients | Utilization | NA | NA | |
| Support | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Case Management Non-Medical | 851 | 29.5% | 896 | 875 | 885 | 917 | 989 | 1124 | 960 | | | |
| 6 Food Bank / Home Delivered Meals | 603 | 20.9% | 635 | 620 | 627 | 650 | 700 | 689 | 608 | 73.40% | 2232 | 971 |
| 11 Outreach Services | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 28% | | |
| 2 Medical Transportation Services | 592 | 20.5% | 623 | 609 | 616 | 638 | 688 | 561 | 549 | 57.30% | 1742 | 831 |
| 12 Referral for Health Care / Supportive Services | 30 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 35 | | | 60.60% | 1843 | |
| 13 Housing Services (RW funded) | 33 | 1.1% | 35 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 38 | | | 42.50% | 1292 | |
| 14 Emergency Financial Assistance | 19 | 0.7% | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 22 | | | 52.10% | 1584 | |
| 17 Non-medical Case Management Tier 2 | 257 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 277 | 299 | | | | | |
| 18 Psychosocial Support | 90 | 3.1% | 95 | 93 | 94 | 97 | 105 | 99 | 110 | 31.40% | 955 | 272 |
| 19 Treatment Adherance Counseling | 53 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 62 | 3 | | 30.20% | 918 | |
| 20 Substance Abuse Residential | 21 | 0.7% | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 4 | 10 | | | |
| Rental Assistance - Housing HOPWA | 336 | | | | | 362 | 390 | | | 54.50% | 1657 | |
| 21 Legal Services | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 29.30% | 891 | |
| 22 Health Education / Risk Reduction | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 26.50% | 806 | |
| 23 Respite Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 7% | 213 | |
| 26 Child Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 4.40% | 134 | |
| 27 Rehabilitation Services | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 13% | 395 | |
| 29 Linguistic Services | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |

Total Support Services

non funded by Part A services

| | | PLWHA | YEAR |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| 2010 Average Growth Rate | 7.78% | 4166 | 2007 |
| UDC 2010-11 All Funding | 2889 | 4293 | 2008 |
| | | 4413 | 2009 |
| 2009 Projected Utilization using GR | 3114 | 4537 | 2010 |
| **2011-12 Projected Utilization using GR | 2970 | 4963 | 2011 |
| | | 5429 | 2012 |
| *2011-12 Projected Utilization per Aries | 3041 | | |
| 2011-12 Variable in Utilization between methods | -71 | | |
| ***2011-12 Average between two methods | 3006 | | |
| 2011-12 Average Variable in Utilization between methods | 250 | | |

How does unmet need factor into our Quantification of need? None of the 5 methods directly include unmet need calculations. However, method 5 includes information from client surveys regarding their need for a service. To what extent this considers unmet need is unclear.

Why are we using the CY 2008 Data versus the FY 2008 data for reporting? (Utilization by Primary Service Category Grant Year and

Calendar Year 2008 Part A Funding and All Funding) Using a mixture makes no sense. We had reports created both ways, so it may have 2 been an oversight to use some calendar year reports. All data changed to grant year since that is what current RW reports are based upon. All data is 03/01/10 to 02/28/11

Why are we using the All Funding data in some cases and the Part A funding cases in others? What is the difference? All funding sources have been used in the past, which makes sense in terms of quantification of "full" TGA need rather than just that portion that Part A

3 funded. All data now using the All Funding numbers. Note that it only impacts some services because Part A is the only RW part funding some services.

How do we justify not funding areas where there is utilization per Aries? Are these non supported by Ryan White or just not added by

council? If utilization is shown that means one of the RW Parts, City Grant or HOPWA is funding. 4

Why don't we use the GR to determine the total number of PLWHA for 2010? The total comes from DSHS Surveliance Report which is not

5 based upon Part A grant year

1

Can we take an average of the ARIES projection to a projection using the GR? 6 The calculation in cell D67 is the average between the ARIES projection and the Growth Rate.

Notes Related to Needs Assessment Data and Calculations

1) All data is taken from ARIES reports. In some situations data for 2002 through 2005 originally came from previous reporting systems (Compis and CareWare). Where data is not entered it is because data was not available. Note that 2005 was a transition year for ARIES and thus that year is excluded from some calculations.

2) The way in which data has been reported in ARIES from year to year is inconsistent, which makes it difficult to record apples to apples data from year to year. For example, in some years OAMC sub-categories Genotype, Phenotype and Other Lab Test were merged into one total and at other times different combinations of sub-categores were merged, such as Lab, Other Lab and Misceleanous Lab. Where data is available for a specific sub-

3) The names applied to service categories has evolved in ARIES acorss time, so it is difficult to be sure that the same service is being tracked. For example, some reports simply list "Housing", while other reports break down various HOPWA services. The name is always distinguishable from Ryan White funded housing service. Because ARIES has changed the names and definition of what is included in a service category over time, some 4) Note that DSHS has not yet released the PLWHA numbers for 2010

5) The methodologies for calculating each of the 5 methods reflected in this worksheet were not well documented. This worksheet was copied from the previous year's calculations, so the formulas for M1 and M2 were simply left in place. The utility of some of the methods is a matter for discussion, especially since some methods result in skewing of the average (see M5). The stratgey is to average all 5 methods. A tab has been created for M2.4 and 5 to chow the data and calculations. The 5 methods are:

<u>Method 1</u> - Use the most recent ARIES utilization data (all funding source) for each service category multiplied by the <u>projected</u> number of clients (see ARIES projection tab for calculations and methodology). Step 1: Take the number of clients utilizing the service multiplied by the total number of clients who utilized (any) RW service to establish the percentage who utilized the service. Step 2: Multiply the number of people projected <u>Method 2</u> - Multiply the number of clients who utilized a service in the most recent ARIES data by the growth <u>Method 3</u> - Add the average number of new clients for the most recent two years of ARIES data to the number of unduplicated clients who used the service three years back.

<u>Method 4</u> - The average number of unduplicated clients utilizing a service for the most recent five years of <u>Method 5</u> - Using the most recent Needs Assessment survey which asked clients if they had a need for a service category, multiply the most recent ARIES utilization data by the percentage of clients indicating a need for the <u>Final Quantification of Need Calculation</u> - calculate the average of all 5 methods