STATE HEALTH REFORM IMPACT MODELING PROJECT

Alabama

January 2013

Prepared by the Center for Health Law and Policy Innovation of Harvard Law School
and the Treatment Access Expansion Project

BACKGROUND

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) will dramatically change how people living with HIV access healthcare.[1] In states that fully implement the law (including expanding Medicaid), thousands of uninsured people living with HIV—many of whom currently receive care and treatment through Ryan White programs—will have access to healthcare through Medicaid or subsidized private health insurance.

The State Health Reform Impact Modeling Project (the Modeling Project) assesses the impact that healthcare reform will have on people living with HIV by compiling and analyzing Ryan White program and AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) data to predict the shift of uninsured people living with HIV from these discretionary programs to Medicaid or private insurance in all 50 states pursuant to the ACA. In addition, for 21 states and the District of Columbia (DC), the Modeling Project compiles and analyzes detailed budgets and benefit guidelines to assess the services provided by the Ryan White program, ADAP, Medicaid, and plans sold on an exchange, in order to estimate the impact that a transition into Medicaid or private subsidized insurance will have on low-income people living with HIV.[2]

Information on the methodology used to model transitions in each state, as well as the numerical results for each state and DC, are available in Appendix A. See Appendix B for notes on data collection and a summary of the limitations of the modeling process.

In Alabama, the Modeling Project focuses on four state-specific inquiries:

1. What demographic information is available about Ryan White program and ADAP clients?
2. How many ADAP clients will be newly eligible for Medicaid or private insurance subsidies in 2014?
3. What services are currently available to people living with HIV under the Ryan White program versus Medicaid or plans to be sold on an exchange, and what gaps in services currently exist?
4. Given the current Ryan White, Medicaid, and private insurance coverage, what are the likely outcomes of a transition from one program to another in 2014?

ALABAMA

ALABAMIANS LIVING WITH HIV/AIDS

UNMET NEED

As of 2011, approximately 11,342 Alabamians were known to be living with HIV/AIDS (HIV+ aware).[3] An additional 2,000 to 4,000 were estimated to be HIV+ but undiagnosed.[3] HIV+ individuals estimated to have not accessed medical care in the past 12 months stands at 6,307.[3] This proportion of the state's epidemic is not accounted for in the following modeling of the number of individuals who will transition over to Medicaid or subsidized private insurance under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) because they are not currently receiving pharmaceutical treatment through the Ryan White program. Nonetheless, it is likely that nearly all will be newly eligible for either private or public insurance in 2014.

THE RYAN WHITE PROGRAM IN ALABAMA

The Ryan White program is a discretionary, federally funded program providing HIV-related services across the United States to those who do not have other means of accessing treatment and care. In other words, it serves as a critical payer of last resort, filling gaps in healthcare and ancillary support services that are unmet by all other charitable or funded healthcare services. In 2010, Alabama received $27,685,828 of Ryan White funding,[4] and served 10,015 duplicated clients.[5] About 71% of the state's Ryan White funds were Part B grants, assigned based on prevalence of HIV in the state.[4] Of these, 42.4% covered core medical services, 1.2% covered supplemental services, 48.4% went toward the AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP), and 7.4% provided ADAP supplemental funding.[4]

ADAP IN ALABAMA

ADAP is a component of Ryan White (within Part B) that is also funded with matching state appropriations and covers the cost of antiretroviral therapy (ART) for enrollees. To be eligible for ADAP in Alabama, one must be:

- An Alabama resident diagnosed with HIV;
- Living at or below 250% of the federal poverty level (FPL); and
- Lacking access to insurance that pays over 50% of the cost of medications.[6]

In fiscal year 2010, Alabama's ADAP served 1,763 individuals.[7] The state's 2011 ADAP budget was $17,725,286 ($13,116,711 in federal funds).[8] In the previous fiscal year, Alabama spent $21,485,652 on ADAP—approximately 86% of these funds were used to cover the full cost of ART, while about 0.6% of the funds went toward insurance assistance.[9,*]

THE ACA AND ITS IMPACT ON HIV+ ALABAMIANS

THE MEDICAID EXPANSION

Beginning in January 2014, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) expands Medicaid eligibility to most individuals under 65 years of age living below 133% of the federal poverty level (FPL).[10,†] Although the Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) cannot force states to comply with the expansion (by withdrawing existing federal medical funding), the federal government will cover 100% of the cost of newly eligible beneficiaries until 2016, and at least 90% thereafter. Newly eligible enrollees will receive a benchmark benefits package that will include ten categories of essential health benefits (EHB), described in the "Essential Health Benefits" section.[11]

---

* $18,423,430 from Alabama's 2010 ADAP budget went toward covering the full cost of ART, and another $148,644 went toward insurance assistance.

† All undocumented immigrants and lawfully residing immigrant adults who have been in the country 5 years or less will not be eligible for Medicaid coverage. Department of Health & Human Services. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, The Affordable Care Act: Coverage Implications and Issues for Immigrant Families, 7, *available at* http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/11/ImmigrantAccess/Coverage/ib.pdf.

THE BASIC HEALTH PLAN

The ACA provides an option for states to create a Basic Health Plan (BHP) that would be largely federally funded (the state would receive up to 95% of the premium credits an individual would have been entitled to for purchase of a plan on the exchange).[12] A BHP would cover most individuals under 65 years of age living between 133-200% FPL as well as legal residents who do not qualify for Medicaid because of the 5-year residency requirement. BHPs must cover at least the EHB and have the same actuarial value of coverage as a bronze plan the individual might otherwise purchase on an exchange.[13] Cost sharing on BHPs can be subsidized, either for all beneficiaries or for those with specific chronic conditions (eg, HIV/AIDS).[14] In addition to improved affordability, BHPs can minimize "churning" on and off Medicaid as individuals fluctuate around 133% FPL. Because state Medicaid offices can design and manage BHPs, these individuals would more easily transition into a plan with similar provider networks and administrative procedures.

SUBSIDIES FOR PRIVATE INSURANCE PREMIUMS, AND STATE-BASED INSURANCE EXCHANGES

The ACA requires states to establish state-run insurance exchanges, to partner with the federal government to set up a hybrid state-federal exchange, or to default into a federally facilitated exchange.[15] Insurance exchanges will provide individuals and families with a choice of plans, tiered by actuarial value of coverage (bronze, silver, gold, and platinum). Each plan available on an exchange must, at a minimum, adhere to a state-defined and federally approved list of EHB; these benefits are discussed in the following section. All exchanges will be operational January 1, 2014.[16]

Because Alabama has neither enacted legislation to create a state-based exchange nor submitted a benchmark plan to the federal HHS for purposes of defining benefits offered on the exchange, the largest small-group market plan in the state (BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama 320 Plan) has become the default benchmark plan for purposes of defining EHB.[17,18]

For those purchasing coverage on an exchange, the ACA extends insurance premium credits to individuals and families living below 400% FPL, to ensure that premiums do not exceed 2.0-9.8% of household income, and imposes out-of-pocket spending caps to protect healthcare consumers from medical bankruptcy.[19] Eligible individuals and families can employ these credits to purchase a private health insurance plan on a state or federally operated insurance exchange.

ESSENTIAL HEALTH BENEFITS

The ACA requires both Medicaid plans and private health insurance plans sold on state-based insurance exchanges to provide a minimum set of EHB, to be defined by the Secretary of HHS.[20] EHB must include items and services within the following ten benefit categories[21]:

1. Ambulatory patient services;
2. Emergency services;
3. Hospitalization;
4. Maternity and newborn care;
5. Mental health and substance use disorder services, including behavioral health treatment;
6. Prescription drugs;
7. Rehabilitative and habilitative services and devices;
8. Laboratory services;
9. Preventive and wellness services and chronic disease management; and
10. Pediatric services, including oral and vision care.

HHS released a proposed rule that will define the scope of EHB on the private market, and will accept public comments before drafting final guidance.[22] The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has indicated that the HHS rule on EHB will also apply to newly eligible Medicaid beneficiaries, in addition to the protections provided for under the Social Security Act.[23] This means that benefits provided by Medicaid will likely be more robust than on the private market. For example, the Social Security Act requires that a Medicaid benchmark plan cover any US Food and Drug Administration–approved drugs with significant clinically meaningful therapeutic advantage over another.[24]

AN ESTIMATE OF CURRENT RYAN WHITE AND ADAP CLIENTS WHO WILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR MEDICAID OR INSURANCE CREDITS IN 2014

Given the ACA-instituted reforms, a large number of HIV+ individuals in Alabama are expected to become eligible for Medicaid or a BHP in 2014, provided that Alabama expands Medicaid and institutes a BHP. An estimated 84% of the state's Ryan White program clients in 2010 were between 100-200% FPL, making them potentially eligible for either Medicaid or a BHP in 2014.[4] An estimated 75.7% of Alabama's AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) clients will be eligible for Medicaid following its expansion and an additional 16.6% are estimated to be eligible for private insurance subsidies (see Appendix A). Finally, many of the estimated 6,307 HIV+ Alabamians who did not access care in 2011 are likely to become eligible for Medicaid or a BHP in 2014, given the assumption that a significant number of these individuals are living near the FPL.

The percentage of Alabama's ADAP clients who will be newly eligible for Medicaid (75.7%) is considerably higher than the national proportion of newly eligibles (29%). This is primarily because Alabama's ADAP mostly serves individuals with income below 133% FPL (approximately 81% of the state's ADAP clients were below 133% FPL in 2011), but also because the state's ADAP clients are almost entirely uninsured.[‡]

The percentage of Alabama's ADAP clients who are expected to qualify for private insurance subsidies (16.6%) is similar to the national proportion of newly eligibles (15%), probably because Alabama's ADAP serves few individuals with income above 133% FPL (only about 19% of the state's ADAP clients had income above that threshold in 2011).

COMPARING SERVICES PROVIDED BY RYAN WHITE, ADAP, MEDICAID, AND THE EXCHANGE TO HIV+ ALABAMIANS

Since a significant number of HIV+ individuals in Alabama who are currently served by the Ryan White program or AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) are likely to be eligible for Medicaid in 2014, it is important to assess the outcome of transitioning from the former programs to Medicaid. This assessment compares and contrasts the services and treatments that the Ryan White program, ADAP, Medicaid, and Alabama's default benchmark plan currently or will provide to HIV+ Alabamians.

COMPARING RYAN WHITE, MEDICAID, AND THE BENCHMARK PLAN FOR THE EXCHANGE IN ALABAMA

The Ryan White program funds both core medical and support services for patients living with HIV (see Appendix C for a breakdown of core medical services versus support services). Both medical and ancillary services are critical to maintaining the health of low-income individuals who may not have access to many necessities that facilitate effective HIV treatment and care (eg, transportation, child care, nutrition). However, Medicaid and Alabama's benchmark plan, which will largely determine essential health benefits (EHB) for private insurance sold on the state's exchange, do not cover ancillary services (although they cover a broader range of medical services). Accounting for the gaps between the Ryan White program and Medicaid or private insurance sold on the exchange will be critical in transitioning Ryan White beneficiaries onto Medicaid and private insurance while ensuring that health status does not deteriorate (eg, due to lack of proper nutrition, access to transportation to a health clinic, or stable housing).

Table 1 provides a comparison of covered services among Alabama's Ryan White, Medicaid (as of 2010), and the largest small-group market plan in the state (the default benchmark plan used for purposes of determining EHB on an exchange, given that Alabama did not submit its own benchmark plan for review).

[‡] 95% of Alabama's ADAP clients were uninsured in 2011. The remaining 5% were Medicare recipients who had reached the Medicare Part D donut hole, meaning that they depended on ADAP for medication coverage. Alabama Department of Public Health, *available at* http://www.adph.org/aids/assets/MEDCAPGuidance2009.pdf.

Table 1. Ryan White Versus Medicaid and the Benchmark Plan: Covered Services

Benefits applying only to beneficiaries under 21 years of age are not assessed in this report.

Covered Service	Ryan White[25]	Medicaid[26]	BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama 320 Plan[27]
Home Health Care		X	X
Mental Health	X	X	X
Substance Abuse (outpatient)	X	X	X
Substance Abuse (inpatient)		X	X
Medical Case Management	X	X	X
Community-Based Care	X	X	
Ambulatory/Outpatient Care	X	X	X
Oral Health Care	X	X (for children under 21 years of age only)	X (limited to certain diagnostic and preventive care)
Early Intervention Clinic	X		
Intermediate Care Facilities for the Mentally Retarded		X[28]	
Ambulance		X	X
Family Planning		X	
Durable Medical Equipment		X[29]	X
Hospital Services		X	X
Lab and X-ray Services		X	X
Nursing Facility		X	
Midwife/NP Services		X	X
Private Duty Nursing		X	
Physician Services		X	X
Non-Medical Case Management Services	X		
Child Care	X		
Emergency Financial Assistance	X		
Food Bank/Home Delivered Meals	X		
Housing Services	X		
Health Education/Risk Reduction	X		
Legal Services	X		
Linguistics Services	X		
Non-Emergency Medical Transportation	X	X	X
Outreach Services	X		
Psychosocial Support	X		
Referral Agencies	X		
Treatment Adherence Counseling	X		
Chiropractor		X	X
Podiatry		X	
Hospice		X	X
Respiratory Therapy		X	X (cardiac and pulmonary rehabilitation covered)
PT, OT, and Speech Therapy		X	X
Orthotics and Prosthetics		X	X

NP = nurse practitioner; OT = occupational therapy; PT = physical therapy.

As Table 1 indicates, the Ryan White program offers HIV+ individuals a number of ancillary services that Medicaid and Alabama's default benchmark plan do not cover. These ancillary services are crucial for the well being of HIV+ individuals: regardless of age, race, and gender, HIV+ individuals who receive ancillary services are better able to, and more likely to, access medical care.[30] Therefore, individuals who leave the Ryan White program and its ancillary services for Medicaid or for private insurance plans risk having poorer access to medical care if Ryan White wraparound services are unavailable.

Furthermore, Alabama's default benchmark plan—BlueCross BlueShield 320—imposes certain copay requirements that might prove to be prohibitive for low-income HIV+ individuals. At present, individuals on the plan pay up to $350 in deductibles each year, and up to $1,500 in additional out-of-pocket payments. Individuals on the plan must pay between $200-$400 per day for up to 5 days for hospital stays, between $200-$400 copay for emergency department and outpatient services, between $35-$50 for physician consultations, and 20% of the cost of ambulance services, chiropractic services, durable medical equipment, occupational and physical therapy, and speech therapy.[31] These copay requirements, together with the lack of ancillary services, might limit access to medical care for HIV+ individuals who leave the Ryan White program for private insurance plans on the exchange.

The transition from the Ryan White program will affect more than just HIV+ individuals. Some HIV/AIDS providers may also be adversely affected as their patients leave the Ryan White program for Medicaid, since Medicaid reimbursement rates for providers not working at federally qualified health centers may be lower than reimbursement rates under the Ryan White program. Although the Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) has decided, pursuant to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), that Medicaid will reimburse certain healthcare providers at Medicare levels in the years 2013-2014—a move that might ensure that Medicaid reimbursement rates match Ryan White rates in the coming years—Congress must reauthorize this increase in Medicaid reimbursements in 2017.[32] Thus, there is uncertainty regarding the reimbursement that HIV/AIDS healthcare providers can expect in the coming years as their patients transition from the Ryan White program to Medicaid.

COMPARING ADAP, MEDICAID, AND THE BENCHMARK PLAN FOR THE EXCHANGE IN ALABAMA

ADAP provides funding for a robust drug formulary that is necessary to afford low-income individuals access to a combination of drugs to treat HIV. All states participating in ADAP must cover at least one drug in every class of antiretroviral therapy (ART); most cover almost all drugs in each class. Medicaid's drug formulary is defined differently (and its formulary for newly eligible individuals has yet to be defined). Ensuring that Medicaid and plans sold on the exchange provide coverage for a sufficient number of antiretroviral medications will be critical to maintaining the health of Alabamians living with HIV/AIDS.

Table 2 provides a comparison of the antiretroviral drug formularies included in the state's ADAP and Medicaid programs, as well as the largest small-group market plan in the state (the benchmark plan used for purposes of defining EHB for plans sold on an exchange).

Table 2. ADAP Versus Medicaid and the Benchmark Plan: Covered Drugs[33]

Benefits applying only to beneficiaries under 21 years of age are not assessed in this report.

Drugs (ART class indicated in bold; brand name in normal type; generic in italics)	**ADAP[34]**	**Medicaid** (PA required if patient exceeds 10 brand name Rx/month)[35,36]	**BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama 320 Plan[37]**
Multiclass Combination Drugs	**3 Drugs Covered**	**3 Drugs Covered**	**3 Drugs Covered**
Atripla; *efavirenz + emtricitabine + tenofovir DF*	X	X	X
Complera; *emtricitabine + rilpivirine + tenofovir disoproxil fumarate*	X	X	X
Stribild; *elvitegravir + cobicistat + emtricitabine + tenofovir disoproxil fumarate*	X	X	X
Entry Inhibitors - CCR-5 Coreceptor Antagonist	**1 Drug Covered**	**1 Drug Covered**	**1 Drug Covered**
Selzentry; *maraviroc*	X (PA)	X	X
Fusion Inhibitors	**1 Drug Covered**	**1 Drug Covered**	**1 Drug Covered**
Fuzeon; *enfuvirtide*	X (PA)	X	X
HIV Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors	**1 Drug Covered**	**1 Drug Covered**	**1 Drug Covered**
Isentress; *raltegravir*	X	X	X
NNRTIs	**5 Drugs Covered**	**5 Drugs Covered**	**5 Drugs Covered**
Intelence; *etravirine*	X	X	X
Rescriptor; *delavirdine mesylate*	X	X	X
Sustiva; *efavirenz*	X	X	X
Viramune; *nevirapine*	X	X	X
Edurant; *rilpivirine*	X	X	X
NRTIs	**12 Drugs Covered**	**12 Drugs Covered**	**12 Drugs Covered**
Combivir; *zidovudine + lamivudine*	X	X	X
Emtriva; *emtricitabine*	X	X	X
Epivir; *lamivudine*	X	X	X
Epzicom; *abacavir sulfate + lamivudine*	X	X	X
Retrovir; *zidovudine*	X	X	X
Trizivir; *abacavir + zidovudine + lamivudine*	X	X	X
Truvada; *tenofovir DF + emtricitabine*	X	X	X
Videx; *didanosine (buffered versions)*	X	X	X
Videx EC; *didanosine (delayed-release capsules)*	X	X	X
Viread; *tenofovir disoproxil fumarate DF*	X	X	X
Zerit; *stavudine*	X	X	X
Ziagen; *abacavir*	X	X	X

Continued on next page

Table 2. (continued)

Protease Inhibitors	10 Drugs Covered	10 Drugs Covered	9 Drugs Covered
Agenerase; *amprenavir*	X	X	
Aptivus; *tipranavir*	X	X	X
Crixivan; *indinavir sulfate*	X	X	X
Invirase; *saquinavir mesylate*	X	X	X
Kaletra; *lopinavir + ritonavir*	X	X	X
Lexiva; *fosamprenavir*	X	X	X
Norvir; *ritonavir*	X	X	X
Prezista; *darunavir*	X	X	X
Reyataz; *atazanavir sulfate*	X	X	X
Viracept; *nelfinavir sulfate*	X	X	X
"A1" Opportunistic Infection Medications	**29 Drugs Covered**	**29 Drugs Covered**	**25 Drugs Covered**
Ancobon; *flucytosine*	X	X	X
Bactrim DS; *sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim DS*	X	X	X
Biaxin; *clarithromycin*	X	X	X
Cleocin; *clindamycin*	X	X	X
Dapsone	X	X	X
Daraprim; *pyrimethamine*	X	X	X
Deltasone; *prednisone*	X	X	X
Diflucan; *fluconazole*	X	X	X
Famvir; *famciclovir*	X	X	X
Foscavir; *foscarnet*	X	X	
Fungizone; *amphotericin B*	X	X	
INH; *isoniazid*	X	X	X
Megace; *megestrol*	X	X	X
Mepron; *atovaquone*	X	X	X
Myambutol; *ethambutol*	X	X	X
Mycobutin; *rifabutin*	X	X	X
NebuPent; *pentamidine*	X	X	X
Probenecid	X	X	X
Procrit; *epoetin alfa*	X (PA)	X	
Pyrazinamide (PZA)	X	X	X
Sporanox; *itraconazole*	X	X	X
Sulfadiazine – Oral	X	X	X
Valcyte; *valganciclovir*	X	X	X
Valtrex; *valacyclovir*	X	X	X
VFEND; *voriconazole*	X	X	X
Vistide; *cidofovir*	X	X	
Wellcovorin; *leucovorin*	X	X	X
Zithromax; *azithromycin*	X	X	X
Zovirax; *acyclovir*	X	X	X

ADAP = AIDS Drug Assistance Program; ART = antiretroviral therapy; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors; PA = prior authorization; Rx = prescription.

As Table 2 indicates, Medicaid's formulary is limited in that HIV+ individuals are restricted to ten brand-name prescriptions per month, posing a potential problem for people requiring a combination of drugs that are not available in generic form. It is important to note, however, that this analysis uses Alabama's current Medicaid formula, which will not apply to newly eligible beneficiaries under the ACA. (newly eligible beneficiaries will be guaranteed access to any FDA-approved drugs with significant clinically meaningful therapeutic advantage over another).[23]

Alabama's default benchmark plan—BlueCross BlueShield 320—also has a limited drug list compared to the ADAP formulary. HIV+ individuals on this plan do not face the same limits as they would under Medicaid's formulary, but they do not have access to all the drugs that would be covered under ADAP. The proposed federal rule that will define EHB provides that plans sold on exchanges must cover at least the same number of drugs in each category and class as the benchmark plan (or one drug per class if the benchmark plan does not cover any).[22] Thus, assuming the proposed rule is adopted, plans in Alabama must cover at least the number of drugs in each class listed in Table 2 for the BlueCross BlueShield 320 plan (although not necessarily the same drugs). Moreover, Alabama's default benchmark plan imposes certain copay requirements that might hinder access to drugs, especially for HIV+ individuals on the plan who rely on access to a variety of medications. At present, individuals on BlueCross BlueShield 320 must pay $15 per prescription for generic drugs, $40 per prescription for branded drugs that are preferred by the insurance plan, and $60 per prescription for other branded drugs.[38]

If people living with HIV/AIDS are unable to access comprehensive ART through Medicaid or the exchange, either because of a limited formulary or because of onerous copay requirements, Ryan White and ADAP will continue to be necessary as payers of last resort.

CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

This report provides analyses of the Ryan White program, AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP), Medicaid, and the essential health benefits (EHB) under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), enumerating the benefits covered under each, and the implications of transitioning individuals living with HIV/AIDS onto Medicaid or private insurance. This report is intended to assist lawmakers in implementing the ACA in a manner that serves the needs of Alabamians.

While much of the ACA has yet to be implemented, it is certain that a large number of people living with HIV will be newly eligible for Medicaid. Given that a significant proportion of uninsured ADAP clients would transition into Medicaid in Alabama, implementing the ACA's expansion provision is crucial to ensuring access to care and reducing transmission of HIV across the state. In other words, expanding Medicaid is the state's only currently available option to provide access to treatment for the thousands of HIV+ individuals in the state who currently lack access to care.

In that vein, the Medicaid system must be ready and able to handle the needs of low-income people who have HIV/AIDS. Should Alabama elect to expand its Medicaid program, this report provides an initial analysis of the capacity of the program to handle the needs of this influx of individuals living with HIV/AIDS. The Medicaid benefits that will be available to newly eligible beneficiaries, including those living with HIV/AIDS, have not yet been defined. As such, an analysis of the barriers to care that this population is likely to face (based on the existing Medicaid program) is timely, as states prepare for the transition to an expansion of Medicaid. Comparing current Ryan White and ADAP services with existing Medicaid formularies allows for a baseline analysis of the needs of individuals living with HIV/AIDS moving into the Medicaid system. This report identified two challenges:

1. First, a number of services that are currently provided by the Ryan White program are not available under the state's current Medicaid program. HIV+ individuals who shift from the Ryan White program onto Medicaid are therefore likely to have trouble accessing a number of services currently available to them, and Ryan White will continue to be a critical payer of last resort to ensure that all individuals living with HIV/AIDS have access to comprehensive antiretroviral therapy (ART); and
2. Second, limitations on Medicaid recipients' pharmacy benefits may pose challenges for individuals in need of multiple branded prescriptions. Those living with HIV/AIDS are likely to exceed the maximum allowable number of monthly branded prescriptions covered by Medicaid. Final guidance on Medicaid EHB will be crucial in this respect.

It is essential that private insurance plans on the Alabama exchange provide a comprehensive scope of services that is sufficient to meet the needs of Ryan White clients who transition onto these plans. This report identified two challenges with regard to the state's benchmark plan, which will be used to define EHB for private insurance plans:

1. First, a number of services that are currently provided by the Ryan White program are not available under Alabama's default benchmark plan. HIV+ individuals who shift from the Ryan White program to private insurance plans on the exchange are therefore likely to have trouble accessing a number of services currently available to them; and
2. Second, the prescription drug list for HIV+ individuals under Alabama's benchmark plan is not as comprehensive as the state's ADAP formulary. HIV+ individuals shifting from ADAP to private insurance plans may therefore have trouble accessing certain drugs.

There will remain an ongoing demand for Ryan White and ADAP services, to fill the gaps left by Medicaid or private health insurance coverage for low-income people living with HIV/AIDS. Identifying these gaps and structuring these programs is not only fiscally prudent but also necessary to secure the health of Alabamians.

In conclusion, this report makes clear that two factors will be essential in successfully implementing the ACA in a way that reduces the burden of HIV/AIDS on the state:

1. Alabama must adopt the Medicaid expansion, pursuant to the ACA, extending eligibility to all individuals living under 133% of the federal poverty level in order to slow the transmission of HIV and make treatment accessible to thousands of individuals who currently lack care; and
2. Alabama must ensure that Ryan White and ADAP services are available where Medicaid or private insurance coverage gaps exist (eg, transportation, nonmedical case management, food and nutrition) or where cost sharing makes meaningful coverage prohibitive.

Questions may be directed to Katherine Record, krecord@law.harvard.edu.

APPENDIX A

2014 STATE-SPECIFIC ESTIMATES

Medicaid Estimates

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) directs states to extend Medicaid eligibility to all individuals living below 133% of the federal poverty level (FPL), and offers a 100% federal matching rate for these newly eligible individuals (those who are not otherwise eligible for Medicaid but for the new law).

To estimate the number of individuals currently using the AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) who will be eligible for Medicaid in 2014, the following formula was used:

	Total #	ADAP clients being served in fiscal year 2010[39]
–	**est. #**	ADAP clients living above 133% FPL[40,§]
–	**est. #**	ADAP clients living below 133% FPL[**]
–	**est. #**	ADAP clients who are undocumented immigrants living below 133% FPL in June 2011[41]
=	**Total #**	ADAP clients who will be newly eligible for Medicaid in 2014[††]

Alabama's ADAP served 1,763 individuals in 2010. Of those, an estimated 320.87 (18.2%) ADAP clients are living above 133% FPL. Also, there were an estimated 66.87 insured ADAP clients with income below 133% FPL. Approximately 2.1% of Alabamians were undocumented as of 2008 (29.99 undocumented ADAP clients living below 133% FPL). Thus, the calculation for Alabama is:

	1,763	ADAP clients being served in fiscal year 2010
–	**320.87**	ADAP clients living above 133% FPL
–	**66.87**	insured ADAP clients living below 133% FPL
–	**29.99**	undocumented immigrants living below 133% FPL in June 2011
=	**1,345**	ADAP clients who will be newly eligible for Medicaid in 2014; or 75.7% of ADAP clients served in fiscal year 2010

This calculation was done similarly for all 21 states and the District of Columbia (DC). The results of the calculations are shown here:

State	# ADAP Clients Newly Eligible for Medicaid	% ADAP Clients Newly Eligible for Medicaid
Alabama	1,345	76%
Arkansas	299	53%
California	12,274	31%
DC	1,124	41%
Florida	7,321	51%
Georgia	3,075	52%
Illinois	4,374	68%
Kentucky	619	42%
Louisiana	No data available	No data available
Maryland	1,394	22%
Massachusetts	1,400	21%
Mississippi	1,008	68%
New Jersey	2,101	29%
New York	4,233	20%
North Carolina	3,476	62%
Ohio	1,287	37%
Pennsylvania	1,334	22%
South Carolina	1,428	39%
Tennessee	2,505	60%
Texas	8,797	53%
Virginia	2,690	66%
Wisconsin	696	40%
United States	**62,780**	**29%**

Note: Data on the insurance status of ADAP clients in Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, and Kentucky came from the 2011 NASTAD Report instead of the 2012 NASTAD Report.[42] (The 2012 NASTAD Report is missing data for North Carolina and Kentucky and the percentages of insured clients exceeded 100% for Maryland and Ohio.)

§ In order to estimate the number of ADAP clients in any income group, we apply the percentage of clients served in each income group (acquired from Table 13 of the 2012 NASTAD Report) to the number of clients served in fiscal year 2010 (acquired from Table 8 of the same report).
** *See* Methodology for Distribution of Insured ADAP Clients by Income.
†† The final number is an estimate based on figures largely taken from 2010-2011.

The percentages of ADAP clients who will be newly eligible for Medicaid in 2014 vary considerably from state to state. These differences can be explained by the different eligibility standards currently in place for ADAP eligibility within each state, as well as by the differences in estimated percentages of undocumented immigrants in each state. For instance, states with higher-than-average newly eligible Medicaid beneficiaries may currently require that ADAP recipients have no other sources of insurance (eg, Virginia). On the other hand, states with lower-than-average newly eligibles have higher insurance rates all around (eg, Massachusetts) or other public assistance programs that supplement ADAP. In sum, NASTAD's data do not capture all groups of people living with HIV/AIDS who may be eligible for Medicaid in 2014.

Private Insurance Subsidy Estimates

To estimate the number of people currently using ADAP who will be eligible for private insurance subsidies through health insurance exchanges, the following formula was used:

	Total #	ADAP clients being served in fiscal year 2010[39]
–	**est. #**	ADAP clients living below 133% FPL[39,40,‡‡]
–	**est. #**	ADAP clients living above 400% FPL[39,40]
–	**est. #**	Estimated number of insured ADAP clients living between 133-400% FPL[§§]
–	**est. #**	ADAP clients who are undocumented immigrants living between 133-400% FPL[41]
=	**Total #**	ADAP clients who will be newly eligible for subsidized private insurance[***]

Alabama's ADAP served 1,763 individuals in fiscal year 2010. Of those, an estimated 1,429.79 (81.09%) of ADAP clients are living below 133% FPL or above 400% FPL. This leaves about 18.9% (333.24) of ADAP clients living between 133-400% FPL.[†††] Of these, an estimated 21.16 were insured. Approximately 2.1% of Alabamians were undocumented as of 2008 (6.7 undocumented ADAP clients living between 133-400% FPL). Thus, the calculation for Alabama is:

	1,763	ADAP clients being served in June 2011
–	**1,429.79**	ADAP clients living below 133% FPL or above 400% FPL
–	**21.16**	estimated insured ADAP clients living between 133-400% FPL
–	**6.70**	uninsured undocumented immigrants living between 133-400% FPL in June 2011
=	**305**	ADAP clients who will be eligible for insurance subsidies in 2014; or 16.6% of ADAP clients being served in fiscal year 2010

This calculation was done similarly for all 21 states and DC. The results of the calculations are:

State	# ADAP Clients Eligible for Insurance Subsidies	% ADAP Clients Eligible for Insurance Subsidies
Alabama	305	17%
Arkansas	147	26%
California	8,580	22%
DC	829	30%
Florida	4,134	29%
Georgia	1,404	24%
Illinois	1,127	17%
Kentucky	269	18%
Louisiana	No data available	No data available
Maryland	1,726	28%
Massachusetts	932	14%
Mississippi	384	26%
New Jersey	1,879	26%
New York	4,502	21%
North Carolina	621	11%
Ohio	901	26%
Pennsylvania	1,567	26%
South Carolina	1,091	30%
Tennessee	1,531	37%
Texas	4,301	26%
Virginia	896	22%
Wisconsin	401	23%
United States	**37,527**	**15%**

Note: Data on the insurance status of ADAP clients in Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, and Kentucky came from the 2011 NASTAD Report instead of the 2012 NASTAD Report.[42] (The 2012 NASTAD Report is missing data for North Carolina and Kentucky and the percentages of insured clients exceed 100% for Maryland and Ohio.)

‡‡ To estimate the number of ADAP clients in any income group, we apply the percentage of clients served in each income group (acquired from Table 13 of the 2012 NASTAD Report) to the number of clients served in fiscal year 2010 (acquired from Table 8 of the same report).

§§ *See* Methodology for Distribution of Insured ADAP Clients by Income.

*** The final number is an estimate based on figures largely taken from 2010-2011.

††† Note that these calculations mention that 18.9% of Alabama's ADAP clients live between 133-400% FPL, whereas the previous Medicaid calculations conclude that 18.2% of the state's ADAP clients live above 133% FPL. This discrepancy stems from Alabama's incomplete reporting on Table 13 of the 2012 NASTAD Report—taken together, the percentages of ADAP clients in each income group add up to less than 100%. This is not the case for all states. Since we have employed a uniform formula for all states, a slight discrepancy arises in our Alabama calculations.

METHODOLOGY FOR DISTRIBUTION OF INSURED ADAP CLIENTS BY INCOME

Distributing insured ADAP clients by income in each state required several steps:

1. The percentages for adults living below 133% FPL, between 133-400% FPL, and above 400% FPL in each state who are insured were determined using data available at the Kaiser Family Foundation's STATEHEALTHFACTS.ORG website. The website lists insurance statuses for people beginning at 139% FPL instead of 133% FPL, but because of the ACA's 5% income disregard, the Medicaid expansion applies to all individuals living below 138% FPL, making this distinction irrelevant. The website also divides the 133-400% FPL income group into two groups: 133-250% FPL and 251-399% FPL. The number of insured adults and the total number of adults in these two groups were pooled in order to determine the percentage of adults living between 133-400% FPL who are insured.

   In Alabama, 59% of adults living below 133% FPL are insured, 83% of adults living between 133-400% FPL are insured, and 88% living above 400% FPL are insured;

2. Next, we determined the likelihood of an adult in each of the three income groups being insured, relative to the likelihood of being insured in the other income groups. To do this, we gave the figure for the insurance rate for adults living below 133% FPL the baseline number 1, and the insurance rates for the other income groups were calculated to be multiples of this baseline.

   In Alabama, the figure 59% was given the baseline number 1; 80.8% is 1.42 times 59%, and 89.3% is 1.5 times 59%. In other words, an adult in Alabama with income between 133-400% FPL is 1.42 times more likely to be insured than an adult with income below 133% FPL, while an adult with income above 400% FPL is 1.5 times more likely to be insured;

3. We then calculated the number of insured ADAP clients in each state, by referring to Tables 8 and 14 of the 2012 NASTAD National ADAP Monitoring Project Report.[42] Table 8 lists the total number of ADAP clients served in each state in 2010. Using this number, and applying to it the percentage of ADAP clients who are insured in each state (Table 14), we attempted to estimate the number of insured ADAP clients in each state.[‡‡‡]

   In Alabama, we estimated that about 88.15 of the state's 1,763 ADAP clients served in 2010 were insured. The insurance rate for ADAP clients in that state stood at 5% in 2011;

4. In order to proportionately divide the number of insured ADAP clients among the three income groups listed in these steps, the percentage of a state's ADAP clients who fall in each income group was required. Table 13 of the 2012 NASTAD Report shows the percentage of ADAP clients in most states who have incomes below 133% FPL, between 133-400% FPL, and above 400% FPL.

   In Alabama, 81% of ADAP clients are living below 133% FPL, 18% have income between 133-400% FPL, and only about 1% have income above 400% FPL; and finally

5. We then treated the number of insured ADAP clients in each income group as a product of the relative likelihood of being insured (determined previously), and compared it with the relative proportion of clients in that income group among the total clients (based on the percentage of ADAP clients in each income group), along with a weighing factor a.

   We relied on two formulas:

Formula 1:

Number of insured clients in each group

= (relative likelihood of being insured)

x (proportion of income group)

x a

‡‡‡ The NASTAD Report lists the percentage of ADAP clients in each state who were covered by various kinds of insurance (Medicaid, Medicare, private insurance) in 2011. We added the different insurance percentages to estimate the number of ADAP clients in each state who were insured. This leads to an overestimation of the number of insured people in each state: since a single ADAP client may be enrolled in multiple insurance plans (eg, Medicare and private insurance), adding the insurance percentages may often result in double-counting a number of ADAP clients.

Formula 2:

Total number of insured ADAP clients

= (number of insured clients living below 133% FPL)

+ (number of insured clients living between 133-400% FPL)

+ (number of insured clients living above 400% FPL)

Thus, for Alabama:

88.15

= (1 x 0.81 x a)

+ (1.42 x 0.18 x a)

+ (1.50 x 0.001 x a)

Solving for a,

$a = 82.5$

Applying the determined value of a to Formula 1:

The estimated number of insured ADAP clients in Alabama with,

Incomes below 133% FPL = 66.87
Incomes between 133-400% FPL = 21.16
Incomes above 400% FPL = 0.12

These figures were applied to the general calculations estimating the number of ADAP clients who will be eligible for Medicaid or private insurance subsidies.

APPENDIX B

DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

In the interest of consistency among state profiles, and to ensure that data among states are comparable, data sources that provide information for all 21 states and the District of Columbia (DC) were prioritized. More recent or more detailed data available for a particular state have also been included.

Ryan White Program Data

Demographic information about Ryan White program clients was culled from a number of sources. For the sake of continuity, the Federal Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) 2010 State Profiles were used for data about the Ryan White program. Where available, information from state departments of health has also been included. Demographic information for AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) clients is most thoroughly documented by the National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD), and information from that organization has been provided for income and insurance status of ADAP clients. NASTAD's data for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 and June 2011 were used (fiscal year 2010 was necessary for states that did not report data in 2011). Because ADAP data compiled by NASTAD are unduplicated (ie, patients are not double-counted by multiple providers), it is one of the most reliable sources of information about demographic information for people living with HIV/AIDS. Data from June 2011 provide information on how many people living with HIV/AIDS currently enrolled in ADAP live between 100-133% of the federal poverty level (FPL). Since the expansion of Medicaid eligibility to those living under 133% FPL is a new development, there is a relative dearth of data regarding the number of HIV+ individuals currently living between 100-133% FPL. NASTAD provides the only reliable source of these data to date. NASTAD's ADAP information was used for estimates regarding people living with HIV/AIDS who are newly eligible for Medicaid in 2014 at the end of this report. Information available from state departments of health or Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) has also been provided.

Estimates of unmet needs for people living with HIV/AIDS in each state are available in each state's Statewide Coordinated Statement of Need (SCSN). SCSNs must be provided by all states receiving Ryan White program funding, but different states provide SCSNs in different years, so comparability among states is limited. Information about unmet need available from other sources has also been included.

Information on current services covered by the Ryan White program is available from HRSA and the SCSNs, and these data have been included in each state profile. More detailed information was included in the profiles if it was available.

Income thresholds for ADAP eligibility, cost-containment measures in each state, and ADAP formularies are available from a variety of sources. The most common sources for this information are MEDICARE.GOV, Kaiser Family Foundation, and NASTAD's *ADAP Watch* publication. This information has been included for every state and standardized to the extent possible among states.

Ryan White program budget allocations are also available from a number of sources, and information from the Kaiser Family Foundation has been included in every profile for the sake of consistency among states. ADAP budget information is available from NASTAD, including the fiscal year 2011 total budget, and a breakdown of expenditures. This information is provided in each state profile. Kaiser Family Foundation's information on ADAP expenditures has also been included for information on the amount spent by ADAP services on insurance assistance and full prescription coverage.

Medicaid Coverage Data

Services currently covered by Medicaid and their limitations are detailed by state departments of health and state Medicaid manuals. Amounts of information available and levels of detail differ among states, and detailed information is provided in the profiles where available. The focus in each profile is on services most relevant to people living with HIV, as well as limitations that may impede access to needed services.

Benchmark Plan Coverage Data

Because Alabama did not submit a benchmark plan to the Department of Health & Human Resources as a proposed benefits package for purposes of defining essential health benefits for the state's exchange,[43] Alabama's largest small-group market plan is now the default benchmark plan: BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama's 320 Plan.[44] Data were collected from BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama's website, and from the Alabama Department of Insurance analysis of benefits offered by the plan.

NOTES

Data for certain states were incomplete in the 2012 National ADAP Monitoring Project Annual Report; missing data were obtained from alternate sources:

- Data on the insurance status of ADAP clients in Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, and Kentucky came from the 2011 NASTAD Report instead of the 2012 NASTAD Report.[45] (The 2012 NASTAD Report is missing data for North Carolina and Kentucky and the percentages of the insured exceed 100% for Maryland and Ohio.); and
- Data on the number of clients served by Mississippi's ADAP appear to be incorrect in NASTAD's Monitoring Report, as the number of clients served is listed as larger than the number of eligible ADAP clients in the state. The number listed was used in these calculations, and while the specific number of ADAP clients eligible for Medicaid and private insurance subsidies in Mississippi may not be reliable, the proportion of clients eligible for both programs was obtained in the same way as for other states, for interstate comparability reasons.

CAVEATS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The estimates provided require a number of caveats and assumptions:

1. ADAP data (as opposed to Ryan White data) were used to account for insurance status and to avoid double-counting individuals who may be enrolled in multiple Ryan White programs (ie, seeing multiple providers). The estimates presented here, therefore, are only for the proportion of ADAP clients who will be eligible for Medicaid and private insurance subsidies;
2. Data for ADAP clients served were used rather than data for clients enrolled because the number of individuals enrolled may exceed the actual number of clients accessing ADAP services. Potential clients who are currently on ADAP waiting lists in several states are also not included in these calculations. Thus, the numbers provide a conservative estimate of ADAP beneficiaries who will transition onto Medicaid or subsidized private insurance;
3. National data (NASTAD and HRSA) were used in calculations instead of state-specific data to ensure that these estimates could be compared across the states surveyed; and
4. The number of undocumented immigrants on ADAP is a rough estimate extrapolated from estimates of the overall number of undocumented immigrants in the state as a whole as of 2008. It is possible that this estimate either overestimates or underestimates the actual number of undocumented immigrants currently served by ADAP.

With these caveats and assumptions in mind, the figures discussed are our best estimates of the number and percentage of ADAP clients who will be newly eligible for Medicaid in 2014 (assuming full implementation of the ACA) and the number and percentage of ADAP clients who will be eligible for private insurance subsidies.

These estimates are for ADAP recipients only, and are of limited analytical assistance in determining percentages of all people living with HIV/AIDS who will be newly eligible for Medicaid and insurance subsidies in 2014. While the percentages provided could be extrapolated to apply to the broader HIV/AIDS population in states, given the number of caveats and assumptions needed to arrive at this rough estimate, it would be better to obtain additional information about the unmet need within states before attempting to make such calculations.

APPENDIX C

Part A of the Ryan White program funds both medical and support services, allowing states to provide HIV+ individuals with a continuum of care. States are required to spend 75% of Part A awards on core medical services, which include:

- Outpatient and ambulatory care;
- AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) (full coverage of drugs or insurance assistance);
- Oral health;
- Early-intervention services;
- Health insurance premiums and cost-sharing assistance;
- Medical nutrition therapy;
- Hospice services;
- Home- and community-based health services;
- Mental health services;
- Substance abuse outpatient care;
- Home healthcare; and
- Medical case management (including treatment adherence services).

States may spend up to 25% on support (ancillary) services that are linked to medical outcomes (eg, patient outreach, medical transportation, linguistic services, respite care for caregivers of people living with HIV/AIDS, healthcare or other support service referrals, case management, and substance abuse residential services).

REFERENCES

1. Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, 124 Stat. 119 (2010) [hereinafter Affordable Care Act], 26 U.S.C. 36(B) and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396, 18001-18121 (2010).
2. The states assessed include: Alabama, Arkansas, California, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.
3. Alabama Department of Public Health, Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control, HIV Integrated Epidemiological Profile (2011), *available at* http://www.adph.org/aids/assets/HIVEpiProfil2011_Revised.pdf.
4. The Kaiser Family Foundation., Alabama: Ryan White Program, *available at* http://statehealthfacts.org/profileind.jsp?cat=11&sub=126&rgn=2 (*last visited* October 13, 2012).
5. Health Resources and Services Administration, US Department of Health & Human Services, Alabama: Client Characteristics, Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program – 2010 State Profiles, *available at* http://hab.hrsa.gov/stateprofiles/2010/states/al/Client-Characteristics.htm (*last visited* October 13, 2012).
6. Alabama Department of Public Health, ADAP Eligibility Enrollment Guidance—Revised 2012 (2012), 2-3, *available at* http://www.adph.org/aids/assets/ADAPEnrollGuide2012.pdf.
7. National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors, National ADAP Monitoring Project Annual Report, 58, tbl.13 (2012), *available at* http://www.nastad.org/Docs/021503_National%20ADAP%20Monitoring%20Project%20Annual%20Report%20-%20August%202012.pdf.
8. The Kaiser Family Foundation, Alabama: Distribution of AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) Budget by Source, FY2011, *available at* http://www.statehealthfacts.org/profileind.jsp?rgn=2&cat=11&ind=545 (*last visited* October 20, 2012).
9. The Kaiser Family Foundation, Alabama: AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) Expenditures, FY2010, *available at* http://www.statehealthfacts.org/profileind.jsp?rgn=2&cat=11&ind=668 (*last visited* October 20, 2012).
10. Affordable Care Act, tit. II, § 2001(a)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) (2010).
11. Affordable Care Act, tit. II, § 2001(a)(2)(A). 42, U.S.C. § 1396a(k)(1) (2010).
12. Affordable Care Act, tit. I, § 1331(d)(3), as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 18051(d)(3) (2010).
13. Affordable Care Act, tit. I § 1331(e), 42 U.S.C. § 18051(e) (2010).
14. Affordable Care Act, tit. I, § 1331(a)(2)(A)(ii), 42 U.S.C. § 18051(a)(2)(A)(ii) (2010).
15. The Kaiser Family Foundation, Establishing Health Insurance Exchanges: An Overview of State Efforts, August 2012, *available at* http://www.kff.org/healthreform/upload/8213-2.pdf.
16. Affordable Care Act, tit. I, § 1311(b)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 18031(b)(1) (2010).
17. State Progress on Essential Health Benefits, State Reforum, *available at* http://www.statereforum.org/state-progress-on-essential-health-benefits (*last updated* Nov. 9, 2012).
18. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, US Department of Health & Human Services, Frequently Asked Questions on Essential Health Benefits Bulletin, *available at* http://cciio.cms.gov/resources/files/Files2/02172012/ehb-faq-508.pdf (*last visited* October 20, 2012).
19. Chris L. Peterson and Thomas Gabe, Health Insurance Premium Credits in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), Congressional Research Service, 8, *available at* http://www.ncsl.org/documents/health/HlthInsPremCredits.pdf.
20. Affordable Care Act, tit. I, § 1302(a), 42 U.S.C. § 18022(a) (2010).
21. Affordable Care Act, tit. I, § 1302(b), 42 U.S.C. § 18022(b) (2010).
22. 45 C.F.R. pts. 144, 147, 150, et al (proposed Nov. 26, 2012).
23. Letter from Cindy Mann, director, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, to State Medicaid Director (Nov. 20, 2012).
24. Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1927 (2010).
25. Health Research and Services Administration (HRSA), US Department of Health & Human Services, Alabama: Services Utilization, *available at* http://hab.hrsa.gov/stateprofiles/2010/states/al/Services-Utilization.htm (*last visited* Sept. 13, 2012).
26. Alabama Medicaid Agency, Alabama Medicaid Covered Services and Co-Payments (Aug. 2011), *available at* http://www.medicaid.alabama.gov/documents/4.0_Programs/4.2_Covered_Services/4.2_Covered_Services_Summary_8-11.pdf.
27. Alabama Department of Insurance, Benefits Provided by Potential Benchmark Major Medical Plans in Alabama, *available at* http://www.aldoi.gov/PDF/Consumers/AL%20EHBS%204%20Plan%20Comparison%20062512%20v6.pdf.
28. Alabama Medicaid Administrative Code, § 6.7.4.4, (Oct. 2008), *available at* http://medicaid.alabama.gov/documents/6.0_Providers/6.7_Manuals/6.7.4_Provider_Manuals_2008/6.7.4.4_October_2008/6.7.4.4_Admin_Code.pdf.
29. Alabama Medicaid Agency, Durable Medical Equipment, *available at* http://medicaid.alabama.gov/documents/6.0_Providers/6.7_Manuals/6.7.4_Provider_Manuals_2008/6.7.4.4_October_2008/6.7.4.4_Admin_Code.pdf.
30. *See* Dixie Chan, et al., Recipients in need of ancillary services and their receipt of HIV medical care in California, 14 AIDS Care: Psychological and Socio-medical Aspects of AIDS/HIV 73, 81-83 (May 27, 2010).
31. BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama, 320 Plan—Plan Benefits (July 2012), *available at* https://www.bcbsal.org/rapidresponse/pdf/MKT-462.pdf.
32. *See* Department of Health & Human Services, CMS-1589-FC (proposed May 9, 2012), (to be codified at 42 C.F.R. pts. 416, 419, 476, 478, 480, and 495); Department of Health & Human Services, Healthcare law increases payments to doctors for primary care, May 19, 2012, *available at* http://www.hhs.gov/news/press/2012pres/05/20120509b.html.
33. Chart adapted from NASTAD 2012 Report. National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD), National ADAP Monitoring Project Annual Report, 66, tbl.28 (August 2012), *available at* http://www.nastad.org/Docs/021503_National%20ADAP%20Monitoring%20Project%20Annual%20Report%20-%20August%202012.pdf.
34. Alabama Department of Public Health, ADAP Formulary, (September 2012), *available at* http://www.adph.org/aids/assets/ADAPFormulary2012.pdf.
35. Alabama. Medicaid Pharmacist, PDL Update (2011), *available at* http://www.hidinc.com/assets/files/almedicaid/newsletters/Fall%2011%20AL%20Newsletter.pdf.
36. Alabama Medicaid Agency, Four (4) Brand-Name Limit (July 19, 2012), *available at* http://medicaid.alabama.gov/news_detail.aspx?ID=6767.
37. BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama, Prescription Drug Guide – Effective October 1, 2012, *available at* https://www.myprime.com/MyRx/MyRxHealth/forms/AL_Prescription_Drug_Guide.pdf.
38. BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama, 320 Plan—Plan Benefits (July 2012), *available at* https://www.bcbsal.org/rapidresponse/pdf/MKT-462.pdf.
39. National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD), National ADAP Monitoring Project Annual Report, 44-45 tbl.8, 59 tbl.14, August 2012, *available at* http://www.nastad.org/Docs/021503_National%20ADAP%20Monitoring%20Project%20Annual%20Report%20-%20August%202012.pdf.
40. National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD), National ADAP Monitoring Project Annual Report, 58 tbl.13, August 2012, *available at* http://www.nastad.org/Docs/021503_National%20ADAP%20Monitoring%20Project%20Annual%20Report%20-%20August%202012.pdf.
41. The number of undocumented immigrants on ADAP in each state in FY2009 will be extrapolated from the Pew Research Center's report, A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States. *See* A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States, Pew Research Center. (April 14, 2009), *available at* http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/107.pdf. This report provides the estimated number of undocumented immigrants in each state for 2008. This number, divided by the overall population of each state in 2008, provides the percentage that undocumented immigrants make up of the total population in the state. *See* Population Estimates, US Census Bureau, *available at* http://www.census.gov/popest/data/state/totals/2011/index.html (*last visited* October 25, 2012). This percentage is then applied to the number of individuals enrolled in ADAP who have incomes below 133% FPL to estimate how many ADAP beneficiaries will not be newly eligible for Medicaid in 2014 as a result of their immigration status.
42. National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD), National ADAP Monitoring Project Annual Report, tbl.11, May 2011, *available at* http://www.nastad.org/Docs/highlight/2011429_Module%20One%20-%20National%20ADAP%20Monitoring%20Project%20Annual%20Report%20-%20March%202011.pdf.

43. Gov. Robert Bentley Won't Make Decision on 'Essential Health Benefits,' Montgomery Advertiser (October 1, 2012), *available at* http://madvertiserblogs.com/southunionstreet/2012/10/01/gov-robert-bentley-wont-make-decision-on-essential-health-benefits/.

44. Evan Belanger, BlueCross Plan Will Serve as Alabama's Essential Benefits Benchmark, Birmingham Business Journal (October 2, 2012), *available at* http://www.bizjournals.com/birmingham/news/2012/10/02/blue-cross-plan-will-serve-as.html?page=all.

45. National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD), National ADAP Monitoring Project Annual Report, May 2011, *available at* http://www.nastad.org/Docs/highlight/2011429_Module%20One%20-%20National%20ADAP%20Monitoring%20Project%20Annual%20Report%20-%20March%202011.pdf.

This report discusses research that is conducted by the Center for Health Law and Policy Innovation of Harvard Law School, which is funded by Bristol-Myers Squibb with no editorial review or discretion. The content of the report does not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of Bristol-Myers Squibb.

Prepared by the Center for Health Law and Policy Innovation of Harvard Law School and the Treatment Access Expansion Project