THE DOMESTIC EPIDEMIC IS WORSE THAN WE

THOUGHT: A WAKE-UP CALL FOR HIV PREVENTION

Tuesday, September 16, 2008

House of Representatives,

Committee on Oversight and

Government Reform,

Washington, D.C.

"This is a preliminary transcript of a Committee Hearing. It has not yet been subject to a review process to ensure that the statements within are appropriately attributed to the witness or member of Congress who made them, to determine whether there are any inconsistencies between the statements within and what was actually said at the proceeding, or to make any other corrections to ensure the accuracy of the record."

## **Committee Hearings**

of the

## U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



```
1 RPTS JURA
```

- 2 DCMN HERZFELD
- 3 | THE DOMESTIC EPIDEMIC IS WORSE THAN WE
- 4 THOUGHT: A WAKE-UP CALL FOR HIV PREVENTION
- 5 Tuesday, September 16, 2008
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 Committee on Oversight and
- 8 Government Reform,
- 9 Washington, D.C.

- The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:08 a.m., in
- 11 Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Henry A.
- 12 | Waxman [chairman of the committee] presiding.
- Present: Representatives Waxman, Kucinich, Tierney,
- 14 Watson, McCollum, Sarbanes, Speier, Davis of Virginia, Shays
- 15 and Turner.
- 16 Also Present: Representative Waters.
- 17 Staff Present: Caren Auchman, Press Assistant; Jen
- 18 Berenholz, Deputy Clerk; Zhongrui "JR" Deng, Chief
- 19 Information Officer; Miriam Edelman, Special Assistant;
- 20 Earley Green, Chief Clerk; Ella Hoffman, Press Assistant;

Karen Lightfoot, Communications Director and Senior Policy 21 Advisor; Karen Nelson, Health Policy Director; Leneal Scott, 22 23 Information Systems Manager; Naomi Seiler, Counsel; Mitch Smiley, Special Assistant; Tim Westmoreland, Counsel: 24 Lawrence Halloran, Minority Staff Director; Jennifer 25 Safavian, Minority Chief Counsel for Oversight and 26 Investigations; Ellen Brown, Minority Legislative Director 27 and Senior Policy Counsel; Jill Schmalz, Minority Counsel; 28 29 Molly Boyl, Minority Professional Staff Member; Adam Fromm, Minority Professional Staff Member; and Brian McNicoll, 30 31 Minority Communications Director.

32 l

Chairman WAXMAN. The committee will come to order.

We are here today to discuss some alarming developments in the fight against HIV and AIDS in the United States.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recently announced that the HIV epidemic in the United States is growing at a rate far greater than was previously thought.

The new figures are a stark reminder that the HIV epidemic is far from over, and that we must take new and urgent steps to strengthen our national HIV prevention efforts.

The first cases of what later came to be identified as AIDS were reported in Los Angeles in 1981. Over the next 2 years, the case reports accumulated, and we learned that a distinct syndrome was being diagnosed in different populations all across the country. By the mid-1980s, there were an estimated 130,000 new infections every year in the United States.

As infections increased, so did our investment in HIV prevention efforts. Even before the virus called HIV was identified as the cause of AIDS, CDC experts had figured out the transmission routes and issued early recommendations for the prevention of infection. The Federal Government started investing significant amounts of funding in prevention and education efforts nationwide.

These investments paid off, and the infection rate dropped dramatically, but this is a job that is never done.

This was recently demonstrated in dramatic fashion when CDC reported that the real infection rate is much higher than we thought. Over the past 10 years, CDC's official estimate for annual new infections have been about 40,000, but last month CDC announced that, in fact, there were over 56,000 new HIV infections in 2006. The higher figure was due to improved counting methods, not to an actual jump in infections, but it tells us that the epidemic in the United States is and has been growing faster than we had thought.

The message these new findings send is clear: We are not doing enough to limit the spread of this deadly disease.

What is more, we are still seeing severe disparities in HIV's impact on different populations. Men who have sex with men constitute 57 percent of new infections. Blacks, who make up about 12 percent of the total population, account for 45 percent of new HIV infections. Hispanics are also disproportionately affected.

Part of the problem is that the Federal Government has not been doing enough for HIV prevention in the United States. In adjusted dollars, the CDC's HIV prevention budget has dropped more than 20 percent since 2002. This year the administration actually asked for a \$1 million decrease in HIV funds. This didn't make sense to me, so I asked the Centers for Disease Control to prepare a budget that reflects not what the White House wanted, but rather the agency's

professional scientific judgment of what it would take to fully implement effective HIV prevention in the United States.

As we will hear today, the administration asked for less than half of what CDC's scientific professionals estimate is necessary for effective HIV prevention. Instead of listening to its own experts, the administration requested that Congress fund HIV prevention programs at far lower levels.

What is even more senseless is that by underfunding prevention, the Nation will incur greater treatment costs down the road. It is indisputable that evidence-based HIV prevention saves money in addition to saving lives by avoiding the high cost of medical care and lost productivity. But on this issue the administration apparently prefers to be penny wise and pound foolish.

We are here today to learn from some of our Nation's top HIV prevention experts what a truly robust national HIV prevention program would look like. We will hear from leaders at CDC and NIH about how they are attempting to roll out effective programs and research potential new ones. We will discuss barriers to evidence-based HIV prevention, like the Federal needle exchange ban and this administration's stubborn and irrational focus on abstinence-only programs. And because HIV infections don't occur in a vacuum, we will hear recommendations from all of our witnesses on how the

Federal HIV prevention response should address the societal factors that contribute to risk, including poverty, homelessness, racial and gender inequality, homophobia, and stigma related to HIV status.

I look forward to a constructive discussion of these questions today, but one point should be clear from the outset: The status quo simply isn't acceptable. We undermine public health, and betray some of America's most vulnerable citizens, and allow the further spread of a deadly and still incurable disease by failing to invest in proven prevention methods. We aren't doing everything we can and should, and I hope this hearing will be the first step in returning the necessary spotlight, resources, and political will to HIV prevention efforts in the United States.

[Prepared statement of Chairman Waxman follows:]

122 \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1-1 \*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman WAXMAN. Before recognizing our very distinguished panel of witnesses, I want to recognize the gentleman from Ohio Mr. Turner for an opening statement.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for holding this hearing to examine new data on the incidence of HIV infection on the United States. We appreciate your longstanding dedication to public health issues and your abiding commitment to meet the many challenges posed by the AIDS epidemic.

Using a more sensitive surveillance tool, the Centers for Disease Control found 56,300 new HIV infections in 2006. That is a 40 percent higher incidence than previous estimates. The upward adjustment does not reflect an acceleration of the epidemic, but a more precise capability to establish between recent and longer-term infections. So it still appears the epidemic has, in fact, plateaued in terms of new infections per year over the last decade, but at a markedly higher rate than we thought.

With this new knowledge about the path and the scope of the epidemic, public health officials can better target efforts to prevent the spread of the virus that causes AIDS. How to bring those prevention tools to at-risk groups has always been a challenge at every level. This more accurate data should inject a renewed sense of urgency into the Federal, State, local, and private-sector partnerships

working to stop the spread of HIV. But behind the figures lurks one deadly fact: No prevention strategy works on a person who doesn't know he or she is infected.

At any given time, it is estimated fully 25 percent of Americans carrying HIV have not been diagnosed. They are far more likely to engage in high-risk behaviors that expose still others to the silent infection. Breaking that silence, research has proven, the power of information is a barrier against the virus.

Once diagnosed and properly counseled, HIV-infected individuals are significantly less likely to engage in behaviors that put others at risk. That leaves public health officials to confront the hard questions: Who should be offered testing? How often? And who pays for any broader HIV screening that might detect latent or unknown infections?

HIV/AIDS is not curable, but it is treatable. With the tools at our disposal, we need not consign thousands of our fellow citizens each year to the devastation of preventable HIV infection.

Since its outbreak, the United States has played a leading role in research and treatment of HIV and AIDS. One of the witnesses today, Anthony Fauci, is a recognized leader in unlocking the lethal mechanisms by which the virus attacks the immune system.

This is an important hearing about the implications of

173	this new CDC data for public health officials and public
174	policymakers. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your attention to
175	this issue.
176	Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Turner.
177	[The information follows:]
178	****** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

Chairman WAXMAN. For our first panel, we are pleased to have Dr. Julie Gerberding, who has been the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention since 2002. In this role she has led the CDC in its mission of health promotion and disease prevention in the U.S. and abroad.

Dr. Gerberding has contributed to more numerous peer-reviewed publications and textbook chapters, and to guidelines and policies on a range of health issues, including HIV prevention. She has served on Federal and non-Federal advisory councils, including the CDC's HIV Advisory Committee, and teaches infectious disease medicine at both Emory University and the University of California at San Francisco.

We want to welcome you back to the committee, Dr.

Gerberding, and we are pleased that you are here, coming

right from Texas where you have been trying to deal with the

tragic consequences of the hurricane.

Dr. Gerberding is accompanied by Dr. Kevin Fenton, who, since 2005, has served as the Director of CDC's National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD and TB Prevention. He leads the U.S. Government's HIV surveillance and prevention efforts, interacting with State and local agencies, community organizations and researchers nationwide. Dr. Fenton has worked in HIV research, epidemiology and prevention since 1995, including as Director of HIV and

204 Sexually Transmitted Infections Department at the United Kingdom's Health Protection Agency.

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

Dr. Anthony S. Fauci has served as the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health since 1984. He oversees a broad range of research on the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of infectious diseases, including HIV/AIDS. continues to conduct his own research on immune, mediated and infectious disease, and has contributed to over 1,000 scientific publications.

Dr. Fauci served as one of the key advisors to the White House and the Department of Health and Human Services on AIDS issues, and is a member of The National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences Institute of Medicine; and Dr. Fauci has testified on numerous occasions before this committee and other committees that I even chaired in the Congress since the early 1980s.

And we are happy to have you here as well.

Dr. Fauci is accompanied by Dr. Thomas Insel, the Director of the National Institute for Mental Health at NIH. In that role Dr. Insel oversees the agency's research on behavioral prevention methods for HIV.

We are pleased that all of you are here today. the practice of this committee that all witnesses who testify before us do so under oath. So if you would please rise and

229 raise your right hand.

[witnesses sworn.]

Chairman WAXMAN. Your prepared statements will be in the record in full. We would like to ask each of you to make your oral presentation in around 5 minutes. We will have a clock that will allow you to see when the 5 minutes is up. It will be green for 4 minutes, yellow for 1 minute, red when the 5 minutes has passed. And we won't be strict on it, but we would like that to be a guide, so that when you see the red light, since we have many witnesses yet to come, we would like to ask you to try to reach your conclusion so that we can ask questions and hear from the other witnesses as well.

Dr. Gerberding, we are pleased to have you.

242 STATEMENTS OF JULIE GERBERDING, DIRECTOR, CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION, ACCOMPANIED BY KEVIN FENTON, 243 244 DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CENTER FOR HIV/AIDS, VIRAL HEPATITIS, STD 245 AND TB PREVENTION, CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND 246 PREVENTION; AND ANTHONY S. FAUCI, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL 247 INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASE, NATIONAL 248 INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS INSEL, DIRECTOR, 249 NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR MENTAL HEALTH, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF 250 HEALTH

## STATEMENT OF JULIE GERBERDING

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

Dr. GERBERDING. Thank you very much.

I would like to start with my first slide, which is a reflection on Ike striking in Galveston. I did visit the hurricane territory yesterday, and for the record I would like to acknowledge the tremendous effort of State health commissioner Dr. Lehi and the whole pantheon of experts in public health across the State that are performing miracles.

I think we all recognize that hurricanes represent urgent public health threats, and when people recognize an urgent threat, they hold nothing back in responding to it.

Unfortunately, on the next slide we have another urgency, and

263 l

that is the urgent reality of HIV/AIDS in America. Last month I spent 2 weeks at San Francisco General Hospital taking care of patients, and on my service I had two undiagnosed AIDS patients die; I had several individuals come in with the opportunistic infections that we started seeing in 1981 when I was an intern. And in that community, we learned that there is an epicenter of HIV transmission among men who have sex with men, and particularly among African Americans.

Similarly, I visited Oakland earlier this year, and found to my astonishment--and found an even grimmer situation in terms of HIV transmission in that community.

On my next graphic I tried to represent the progress that we have made despite these current situations. And we are currently proposing federally a \$24.1 billion HIV budget for all AIDS-related activities at the Federal level. Of that, 4 percent is reflected in CDC's prevention budget. And I think over time we have had some good news. We are definitely seeing people live longer with HIV, and many are thriving despite the complications of the drug treatment and everything else that having a chronic illness represents.

In addition, we have made tremendous progress in perinatal AIDS, in reducing the incidence among injection drug users and among heterosexuals at high risk.

We have also seen the rate of transmission decline over

time. That means for every 100 HIV-infected individuals, the number of new people that they infect has continued to drop precipitously since the early phases of the epidemic.

And, finally, I think studies do show that prevention interventions can work. We have evidence of efficacy in at least 49 behavioral interventions, and several others are on the docket for coming forward.

Let me just quickly show you the pictures of what these statistics look like. The red line here is the number of people in America living with HIV, and the blue line are the number of new cases that were reported that precipitated this hearing. And you can see that although the number of people with HIV in our country continues to increase, the number of new infections is holding steady over the past several years and declining as the large picture in the United States; meaning that our interventions are successful, or we would see that blue line go up commensurate with the red line.

On the next graphic, you can see the picture of perinatal transmission, again, evidence that prevention can work.

On the next graphic, the picture of what is happening recently among people at high-risk heterosexual contact. And I could repeat that for injection drug users and others.

But on the next graphic we have the sobering statistic that is my frame for the urgent reality that we are facing,

and this is the incidence rates going up among men who have sex with men in the United States.

On the next graphic I show some statistics that were released last week which really reflect a detailed understanding of the epidemiology of this risk, showing that while overall the majority of men who have sex with men and get HIV infection are white, there is disproportionate representation of African Americans, and particularly young African Americans and Hispanics. They are represented here way out of proportion to their prevalence in society.

And on the next graphic we have the rates of HIV infection which use as the denominator the number of people in our society in those categories. So you can see that African Americans have an infection rates that is about seven times that of whites, and Hispanics have a rate that is about three times that of whites across America.

So this is very serious information, and it tells us where we need to target our prevention interventions.

So let me conclude by telling you what I think are the priorities for those prevention interventions. We have submitted a long professional judgment. We have tried to put everything in there we could think of. We understand the reality of the budget, but we wanted you to know what the universe of possibility might be. So on the first slide, I am trying to summarize some of those interventions that

relate to finding the leading edge of the epidemic.

The information we just published is the first time we have ever been able to say in real terms, where is the infection now, and how bad is it going, and who is getting it? So we need to expand our ability to do that so that we have that information at the community level and can target those interventions that do work for those individuals.

We also need to integrate services. It is great that we have representatives from mental health, substance abuse, and a broad continuum, because there is a syndemic of these factors that come together in the concept of social justice and in social determinants of health that we have to address if we are going to be successful here. And we need to conduct not just individual interventions, but social marketing campaigns.

On the next graphic I am emphasizing the importance of finding the people who are infected. This is Epidemiology 101, but it is something that we still haven't been able to do successfully in this disease. Twenty-five percent of infected people still don't know they have the virus. So we need to expand access to rapid testing. And, in particular, our Federal facilities need to move to support the CDC guidelines and allow screening for HIV, using the protocols that we have recommended for the routine screening. We also need to have better tests, and we need to focus those tests

on finding people early, hopefully as they are seroconverting, because that is the time when they pose the biggest transmission risk, and we are missing them, and they are highly infectious, and they account for a disproportionate part of the epidemic.

Now, my last graphic, I mentioned those aspects that relate to the need for new tools. We don't have all the answers here. I wish we did. We have been working on it, but our research budget hasn't really allowed us to update and modernize our toolkit.

One area in particular, given the difficulties we are having with the vaccine, are the preexposure treatment trials to determine whether or not taking HIV drugs before you are exposed could result in an overall health benefit and a reduced risk of infection. CDC is conducting three of those studies and are collaborating on a fourth, and I know NIH is doing one, too, as well. So we are hoping that that could put a new biomedical toolkit or two in our toolbox while we are working on some of these other measures that we think are important.

I just want to make one final point here. AIDS is a social disease as much as it is a viral disease, and part of bringing people to accept prevention is to create that expectation in an environment of hope. Many of the people who are getting this infection now are functioning in a

388 society that offers them very little hope for education, 389 economic, or social attainment, and if we don't address the 390 underpinnings of the problem, we are never going to be able 391 to get where we need to be as a Nation. 392 So thank you for allowing me to explode with a lot of 393 information in a very short period of time. But we are very, 394 very passionate about this and very committed to this issue. 395 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you. It is very helpful 396 information. 397 [Prepared statement of Dr. Gerberding follows:]

398

\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1-2 \*\*\*\*\*\*

399	Chairman WAXMAN.	Dr. Fenton, you are just hear to
400	answer questions?	
401	Dr. FENTON. That	is right.
402	Chairman WAXMAN.	Well, we will have questions for you.
403	Dr. Fauci.	

## 404 STATEMENT OF ANTHONY S. FAUCI

Dr. FAUCI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify before you here today on the role of the NIH research endeavor in HIV prevention, the subject of this hearing. I guess the slides don't work, so we will go with the--are they up? Okay. There they are.

Okay. On the first slide shown on the board there, I want to just emphasize that since the very early days of HIV that you described in your opening statement, in the summer of 1981, there have been some spectacular advances in AIDS research ranging from the initial discovery of the virus to the delineation of the pathogenesis, natural history, but, importantly, treatment.

Now, treatment has been one of the more spectacular successes in the development of now over 25 drugs that have transformed the lives of HIV-infected individuals. The results of this have been quite impressive.

On the next slide is a review paper showing the results of the first decade of HIV written up in the Journal of Infectious Diseases that there is a conservative estimate of about 3 million lives--years of life have been saved in the United States alone from 1996 through 2005 on the basis of

the accessibility of treatment, particularly the combinations of therapies. This has been repeated and verified in Europe, Australia, and Canada.

Now, that is the very good news. But the subject of the hearing is what is still going on? So on the next slide, just to reiterate what Dr. Gerberding had said, we still have a major ongoing problem globally and even here in the United States with over one-half million deaths, 1.1 million people infected with HIV, and, as underscored by Dr. Gerberding, 25 percent of them are unaware that they are infected. And we know the majority of infections come from an individual who does not know that he or she is infected, transmitted to another individual.

And an example is something that is very close to home. We make rounds three times a week at our clinic, up at the clinical center at the NIH, and just last week a patient was presented to me, a resident of the District of Columbia, 38 years old, who presented for the first time with advanced tuberculosis, central nervous system lymphoma, and CB4 count of 3, which is about as low as you can get in a viral load. That person clearly was infected for many years, has now compromised his own ability to be treated because he is so advanced, and who knows how many people that that person exposed, mainly because he did not know that he was infected.

Now, on the next slide, what about prevention? The NIH

and its multiple institutes, particularly our institute, NIAID, NIMH, NIDA, Child Health, and others, have been heavily involved in prevention research. And when I say prevention research, it's to try and get some of the scientific facts that would help inform some of the activities that are implemented so well by the CDC.

On this slide we show that if you include vaccine, behavioral change, and microbicides, about 38 percent of the NIH budget is devoted to prevention activities. And I just want to spend a minute to underscore some of the proven strategies as well as those that are still investigational and for which we have remaining challenges on the next slide.

Proven HIV prevention strategies again underscores what Dr. Gerberding mentioned, that prevention does work when it is applied and implemented. For example, preventing sexually transmitted disease, cognitive behavior interventions when applied have been shown to work. Behavioral changes regarding sexual transmission are paramount in its prevention. Condom promotion. In a study, a group of studies that were sponsored by the NIH just a year and a half ago on adult male circumcision in an international basis, predominantly in sub-Saharan Africa, showed anywhere from a 55 to 65 percent prevention in males who were circumcised that lasted for 3 to 4 years of follow-up and likely much more.

The prevention of blood-borne transmission. Clearly needle exchange programs work. There is no doubt about that. Drug treatment programs, methadone and related programs have been shown in a number of studies by the CDC and by NIDA and NIH to work.

And probably the most dramatic success story is the prevention of mother-to-child transmission, by treating the mother during pregnancy and the baby soon after delivery, and most recent studies, weeks to months of breast feeding have been truly a great success story.

The next slide.

There are also some investigational prevention strategies, some of which are in the process of being proven, others that are still challenging. The first is the prevention and treatment of coinfections, such as tuberculosis, malaria, and other sexually transmitted diseases. Not all STDs, or sexually transmitted diseases, when you treat them result in a decrease in HIV transmission, but some do. And we are now continuing our studies to try and delineate that a little bit more clearly.

We have been challenged by topical microbicide studies. The initial studies over the past several years have proven not to be effective. They were the first generation of studies that did not incorporate specific anti-HIV drugs; they were merely chemicals that would block transmission, but

not in a specific anti-HIV manner. The products that are currently in the pipeline we are cautiously optimistic about.

The last two I want to close on is antiretrovirals as prevention and vaccines. By an antiretroviral as prevention, we mean that if you treat people who are infected, you could theoretically and in reality decrease their ability to transmit to others. You can talk about population studies; if you treat enough people in a population, you will get the mean viral load in the population low enough that you might decrease the incidence; but even more potentially exciting is what we call PrEP, and Dr. Gerberding mentioned that on one of her slides, or preexposure prophylaxis. There is a large study conducted by the CDC, several other studies, some of which are conducted by the NIH, looking at a large number of individuals to see if, in fact, this treatment prior to infection would significantly block transmission.

And then there is vaccines, which in the history of viral diseases are generally the Holy Grail of how you stop the transmission of a viral infection. We have not been successful thus far. As shown on this slide, at the last meeting this summer in Mexico City of the International AIDS Society, we discussed some of the remaining challenges and the reality that we will not have an HIV vaccine at least for several years at best. I am cautiously optimistic that we will, but up until the time that we do, we are going to be

527 left with the prevention measures that were discussed by Dr. 528 Gerberding and myself and in your own opening statement, Mr. 529 Chairman. 530 So in the last slide, I want to emphasize that point; 531 that when we talk about prevention, it is not unidimensional, 532 and it is not one-size-fits-all. We refer to it as a comprehensive prevention toolbox, of which a vaccine would be 533 a major contribution. But even if we get a vaccine that is 534 effective, we would still have to rely very heavily on the 535 536 other prevention measures that have been discussed in our 537 various statements. So I will close here, Mr. Chairman, and be happy to 538 539 answer any questions. 540 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Fauci. 541 [Prepared statement of Dr. Fauci follows:] 542 \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1-3 \*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman WAXMAN. Dr. Insel, do you have a statement?
Dr. INSEL. No statement, just to go on to questions.

Chairman WAXMAN. Okay. I want to start off the questions for you, Dr. Gerberding. I want to ask about CDC's HIV prevention goals and its budget.

In January of 2001, and I understand this was before your tenure as Director, CDC released a document called HIV Prevention Strategic Plan Through 2005. At the time, the working estimate of annual new infections per year in the U.S. was 40,000. The agency called this number relatively stable, but unacceptably high, and stated that a new strategic plan for HIV prevention was essential.

In this 2001 document, what was CDC's target for reducing annual new HIV infections?

Dr. GERBERDING. I would want to let you know that although I was not the CDC Director during this period of time, I was on an advisory committee before I went to the Center, before I went to CDC, so I participated in the earliest phases of that development. And the expectation optimistically at that time was a 50 percent reduction in the number of new infections, to be able to drive the infection rate down to 20,000. At that time we didn't have a lot of evidence to model or base those figures on, but we believed that if we did everything we knew how to do, we could strive for that. It made sense to create a stretch goal, and

568 obviously we didn't make it.

Chairman WAXMAN. Because if we look at 2005, fast forward 5 years later, CDC's estimate of annual new infections at that point was still 40,000 a year, and the figure hasn't budged. Why do you think that nothing changed? Was it--what is your assessment?

Dr. GERBERDING. I think it is complicated, but there are two factors that probably play a pretty big role. One is the fact that our earlier estimates were made before we recognized the benefits of drug treatment. And so what happened was we suddenly had a larger and larger and larger number of people in our country with HIV who presented a transmission risk to other people because they were surviving instead of dying from the disease. So it was a positive factor, but it clearly made our earlier estimates fairly irrelevant.

The second thing is that I don't think we adequately controlled for the generational effect. So as new young people come into the risk environment, they don't behave--kids are not little adults. They don't behave the way we would expect more mature people who have lived through their friends dying to behave. And so we saw increased infection rates, as we are still seeing today, among the youngest people. So our estimates did not adequately adjust for the generational problem of new cohorts at risk.

Chairman WAXMAN. When we look at the CDC budget in 2001, there was a steady growth in the prevention part. And by that time, in 2007, CDC's HIV prevention budget actually dropped in adjusted dollars just by 20 percent. So while we didn't see the decrease we had hoped for, we saw, in fact, a steady level, which would be that—a failure of the prevention efforts to succeed.

At that point, CDC put a document forward extending its HIV prevention through 2010. And what was the goal in that document, if you can tell us?

Dr. GERBERDING. I would have to go back and review that particular estimate.

Kevin, maybe you can answer that question.

Dr. FENTON. Thank you very much for that question.

In the 2007 revision of the HIV prevention strategy, what we were attempting to do is to identify shorter-term goals for HIV prevention as well as looking at goals which were achievable within the resources that we had at CDC. One of the experiences we had from 2001 to 2007, as you mentioned, was the fact that our budget remained relatively flat over that time, so it was crucially important that we looked at what was achievable in the next 3 years. In the meantime--

Chairman WAXMAN. And the numbers that you found that you thought was achievable was, rather than 50 percent, down

618	to 10 percent; Is that right?	
619	Dr. FENTON. That is correct.	
620	Chairman WAXMAN. And was that 10 percent goal modeled	
621	on the fact that you saw a decrease in the prevention side of	
622	the HIV budget?	
623	Dr. FENTON. It was modeled on the realities of the	
624	existing prevention budget as well as the availability of	
625	better information, better surveillance information, better	
626	data on incidence which we knew were forthcoming in the next	
627	few years.	
628	Chairman WAXMAN. And how much did the administration	
629	request for HIV prevention for this next fiscal year, 2009?	
630	Dr. GERBERDING. The request in the proposed budget is	
631	less than the request from last year by a percent or so. So	
632	it is a reduction.	
633	Chairman WAXMAN. As I understand, that is \$752.6	
634	million?	
635	Dr. GERBERDING. I believe that is correct.	
636	Chairman WAXMAN. Now, according to your professional	
637	judgment budget, the funding that CDC needs to conduct	
638	appropriately scaled-up domestic HIV prevention programs and	
639	research for 2009, I understand, is \$1.63 billion; is that	
640	right?	
641	Dr. GERBERDING. If we were able to walk out the door	
642	today and do absolutely everything that we knew how to do to	
ı		

full scale, it would be expensive, and those numbers reflect that kind of best-case scenario. I think we also recognize we couldn't go from where we are to where we would like to be as fast as we probably reflected in our budget estimates, but we wanted to give you the flavor that the scale here is one challenge. The "what to do" is the other challenge.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, and just to look at where we are and where you would like us to be and where do you think the money could wisely be spent, the administration is proposing half of what CDC's experts say is necessary. And, in fact, that is an actual decrease of \$1 million from fiscal year 2008. So the proportion, it appears to us, for domestic HIV funding for prevention would be around 5 percent.

Dr. GERBERDING. I think the figure for the large request for domestic HIV, the \$24.1 billion overall that has been requested includes about a 4 percent prevention budget, at least according to the analysis that we have been able to review from Kaiser. So it is a very small piece of the overall budget. And I think the concept of a dime of prevention is worth a dollar of cure is what we need to relook at, especially now that we have these new incidence data. In addition, we know that it is cost-saving to prevent HIV because it is so expensive to treat.

Chairman WAXMAN. You are telling us that information. Did you tell the President? Did you tell the Secretary of

HHS? Did anyone in the administration ever come and ask you over the last 6 years what you and your expert colleagues believed and what you would need in order to turn the domestic epidemic around?

Dr. GERBERDING. We have had a lot of briefings on this subject. And I think one of the challenges that I face at CDC is my own expert judgment, that it isn't going to be enough to just do more of the same. We have got to really step back and say, you know what? If you keep doing the same thing over and over again, it doesn't matter how big you do it, you are not really going to solve the problem.

So not only do we need to expand what we know can work, we have got to find new things. And so I really want to emphasize that the research for new tools is also a very, very big part of this. And I am sure that Dr. Fauci would agree with that, that there is more we need to know and not just more that we need to do.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, just to conclude my questioning here, you can't do more of the same with less money, even if some of the same things you were doing were successful.

Dr. GERBERDING. Unless you are a magician.

Chairman WAXMAN. And if you could get new tools, that would be great. But you may not be able to even do the new tools if your prevention budget is decreasing and the population of people being infected is even more than we

693 expected.

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

694 Dr. GERBERDING. What I am really also--and what I have 695 asked Dr. Fenton to do is to look at whatever the pie is, 696 whatever the investment that we have, and make absolutely 697 sure that whatever we are doing with it, we are getting the 698 absolute maximum out of it that we can. We may need to 699 rebalance. We would like to have more, but we may need to 700 also rebalance what we are doing to make sure that it is 701 making the biggest difference.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Of course, Congress appropriates the money, not the administration. So this Congress has the authority to move those numbers up or down appropriately, don't they?

Dr. GERBERDING. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay. And are we spending more internationally on AIDS prevention and treatment than we are nationally now?

Dr. GERBERDING. We are spending more internationally for the President's emergency program as well as the global fund.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. So basically we have seen more funding for AIDS and HIV prevention and treatment, but it is going internationally instead of--

718 Dr. GERBERDING. May I just qualify that for a 719 statement? 720 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Please. 721 Dr. GERBERDING. Because as I said, our total Federal 722 budget for HIV is 24-some billion dollars a year because of 723 the mass investment that we make in treatment naturally. 724 we are not spending \$24 billion internationally a year. 725 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Now, a full 25 percent of 726 individuals with HIV, I think, are unaware of their 727 infection, and these individuals account for about 50 percent 728 of new infections? 729 Dr. GERBERDING. It is about--it is probably close to 50 730 percent. We know that once people find out what -- I think it 731 is actually 58 percent. The undiagnosed people are 732 accounting for about 60 percent of the infections that we are 733 seeing. But we are also learning more recently that probably 734 early infection is a special subset of that group. And so people who are newly infected don't recognize it, aren't 735 736 getting tested as they develop the systems of the conversion 737 illness, are highly infectious with great--738 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. How long does it take after the 739 contact that you're infected and can pass it on? Is it a 740 matter of hours? Days? 741 Dr. GERBERDING. It is not hours, but it happens faster 742 than we realize now that we have more and more sensitive

tests. So although the antibody test may not become positive for many days, the virus is replicating very early on after exposure. And that is why people can transmit even though they don't know they have it.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I recently spent about 10 days in Africa touring some of our facilities that were there on AIDS prevention. One of the problems there is the people that have it now are getting medical care, they are keeping mothers from passing it to their kids, they are able to live seminormal lives. But over there, the men are just not as likely to go in and turn themselves in, and there is still a lot of denial in Africa. Is there anything similar in the United States?

Dr. GERBERDING. There are many comparable social issues. One of them is shame; the people are ashamed to have the infection. The other is stigma; they are punished if someone else finds out they have it. And then the third is ignorance. There are still many people in this country and around the world who don't recognize the risk and don't understand that their behavior puts them at risk.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Now, I understand that 38 percent of the individuals, roughly, with newly diagnosed HIV are now developing full-blown AIDS within a year of diagnosis. For these individuals, prevention, testing, and treatment strategies don't seem to have worked. What do you

see? Is there a granular understanding of this population,
what leads to this outcome in people who are being diagnosed
and then moving quickly to AIDS?

Dr. GERBERDING. Well, the HIV diagnosis is happening perhaps years after the infection has occurred at the time people are beginning to develop symptoms. So it is a failure to diagnose, a failure to reach out and get yourself tested, or a failure for health professionals or people you encounter in--

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. But that is a diagnosis question and waiting so long?

Dr. GERBERDING. So, D, the diagnosis of the prevention paradigm, has got to be a strong emphasize.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Now, as the epidemic has progressed, the perception of HIV/AIDS has changed. The success of effective treatments may have the downside of creating a sense of complacency about HIV/AIDS impact. What are the Federal efforts that are under way in order to address complacency and correct some of these misconceptions? Anything that we can do?

Dr. GERBERDING. We need to do so much more than we are doing right now. We need to get AIDS back on the radar screen. We need to highlight the fact that this isn't just something that happens underground; this is something that is still posing a threat to college students and to young men

793 and women across our Nation's fabric. We need to engage 794 community leaders. We need to engage popular opinion 795 leaders. We need to make it clear that it is not a problem "over there," it is a problem at home. And all you have to 796 797 do is look at the statistics in the metropolitan D.C. Area to 798 see a picture that would suggest we have nothing to be 799 complacent about. 800 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. It's remarkable, the medical progress that has been made in this area over the last 10 801 802 years. I was very surprised. I mean, people who were 803 diagnosed, now it is no longer a death sentence if you take your medication regularly. We are being able to stop it from 804 805 being passed on to kids and the like. I mean, getting 806 treatment now, if you are HIV-positive, going and getting 807 treatment is literally a lifesaver, Isn't it? 808 Dr. GERBERDING. Treatment is lifesaving. And this is 809 hard to say, but as much as we want people with HIV 810 infections to live and thrive and survive, it is not good to 811 have HIV. These drugs are hard to take. They are wrought 812 with complications and side effects. It is not easy to have 813 HIV and take these drug treatments for a lifetime. 814 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. And it is expensive. 815 Dr. GERBERDING. And it is expensive. And it isn't a 816 disease that anyone should want to have, and it is certainly

not a disease that we should accept as just part of our

817

818 advanced society. We still need to prevent this disease.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. For the uninsured who are diagnosed HIV-positive, obviously having to take the medication is, what, \$1,000 a month. What would it be?

Dr. GERBERDING. It depends very much on which regimen you are taking. And there are, fortunately, right now so many good choices that there are a variety of options and a variety of cost factors. But it is not inexpensive. It is one of the most expensive chronic diseases to treat and manage.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis.

830 Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all for your testimony here. You have testified about the importance of implementing evidence-based prevention programs, so I want to ask a few questions tying it in on the evidence behind some of our policies that affect the prevention programming.

The new CDC incidence numbers show that injection drug use directly accounts for about 12 percent of the new infections. The sexual partners, the children of injection drug users are also indirectly at risk.

There is scientific consensus that needle exchange programs reduce the transmission of HIV and other infectious

diseases without increasing the rate of drug use. Needle exchange programs also connect people to important health and social services, including drug treatment. These are conclusions that have been reached, as far as I understand it, based on evidence of at least 18 groups of experts and the most prominent professional and public health societies in the world, including the CDC and NIH. Just recently, when the CDC published its August data, the authors noted that infections among injection drug users dropped 80 percent, and they stated that, among other factors, one reason was that drug users, and I quote, have reduced needle sharing by using sterile syringes available through needle exchange programs or pharmacies.

So despite this overwhelming mountain of evidence, every year the Labor-HHS Department appropriations bill includes provisions banning the use of Federal funds for the needle exchange programs. So it looks like other programs around the country and communities and States are doing all that they can do, private people, but they are not really being supported by the Federal Government.

So, Dr. Fauci, let me start with you, if I could. In your professional scientific judgment, does the public health evidence support the Federal ban on funding needle exchange programs?

Dr. FAUCI. No, it doesn't. Actually, I was part of a

group that I helped cochair years and years ago to look in a somewhat meta-analysis way of all the data that you referred to asking the two questions, A, does needle exchange help promote illicit drug use; and, B, does it impede or block in many respects the transmission of HIV? And the answer to both of those questions were: It doesn't increase the injection drug use, and it does prevent HIV infection.

So the scientific data are really rather firm and totally convincing that injection drug use and the transmission of HIV through injection drug use can be decreased significantly by needle exchange programs.

Mr. TIERNEY. Dr. Gerberding and Dr. Fenton, in your professional scientific judgment, do you agree with Dr. Fauci?

Dr. GERBERDING. I agree. And I also ran a bridge program to needle exchange in San Francisco, from San Francisco General Hospital, so I had a chance to see first-hand.

I want to emphasize the word you used, though,
"program," because it isn't just the needle, it is the
surrounding education, the reduction in partners and sharing
and so forth. So it has to be done in the context of the
overall program. And my understanding is that there is
actually for CDC a congressional prohibition on using any of
our appropriated dollars for needle exchange. So we need to

893 work on this.

894 Mr. TIERNEY. That was the dilemma that I was pointing 895 out.

Dr. Fenton, do you also agree?

Dr. FENTON. I concur.

Mr. TIERNEY. Okay. So let me move on now and ask a question about programs for youth. The new CDC data shows that almost a third of the new infections occur with people under the age of 30. There's been a number of comprehensive sex education programs that appear to show a reduction of HIV or HIV risk behaviors among young people. But aside from a small amount of money in CDC's Department of Adolescent School Health, there doesn't appear to be any Federal funds dedicated to comprehensive sex education. In the meantime, we spend about \$1.5 billion on abstinence-only-until-marriage programs.

I am aware that no evidence that this kind of narrow program decreases HIV risk. In fact, a longitudinal, independent, congressionally mandated study that came out last year found that the programs had no impact at all on teen behavior compared to the control group. In April, we heard from the American Public Health Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and others that these programs are not supported by evidence.

So, I want to ask each of you individually, in your

professional scientific judgment, do you believe that evidence at this time supports abstinence-only-until-marriage programs as an effective intervention to reduce HIV risk among youth? Dr. Gerberding?

Dr. GERBERDING. Let me say that I have spent a great deal of time in preparation for this hearing reviewing those data, and I agree with the conclusions that there is no evidence of benefit from the 10 abstinence-only programs that have been evaluated. And in looking at the comprehensive curricula programs, there is more evidence of benefit, at least in terms of benefit, in knowledge. And hopefully STDs in the long term--although we have never studied an impact on HIV.

But I also want to emphasize that there are many in the STD world of science who believe that delaying the entree to sexual behavior is a good and very important part of a comprehensive program. So, abstinence is not a dirty word, but programs that deal with youths' sexual health need to bring to them the entire compendium of tools that we know they may need in their efforts to protect themselves.

Mr. TIERNEY. Dr. Fenton.

Dr. FENTON. I agree with the statements of Dr.

Gerberding. I know of no evidence supporting the

effectiveness of abstinence-only-until-marriage programs in

preventing STDs or HIV incidence among young people. And I

also support and concur with Dr. Gerberding's statement regarding the role of comprehensive sex education programs as an effective tool or as part of an effective program toward better sexual health among our youth.

Mr. TIERNEY. Dr. Fauci.

Dr. FAUCI. Yes, I agree also. It is pretty clear that if you look at abstinence only in a vacuum, that there is no data to indicate that that decreases transmission of HIV or other sexually transmitted diseases.

But, again, to underscore what Dr. Gerberding says, as part of a comprehensive program where you try to delay the sexual debut, but you also inform people of what you need to do if you do not practice abstinence has to go along with that; otherwise, alone in a vacuum, it doesn't work.

Mr. TIERNEY. Let me, if I can, conclude by asking, has Health and Human Services ever asked any of you for your opinion on these two subjects?

Dr. GERBERDING. We have had many briefings on this subject, and say that as the data have come forward, it has only been recently that we have had evaluation studies pulled together to really ask the question. From a CDC standpoint, our total investment in abstinence every year is about \$2.2 million, and I actually wish 15 years ago we had made a much bigger investment because we would know the answers to the questions that we are finally now being able to surface. So

968 we erred, perhaps, in retrospect, in not going into this with an open mind and doing those kinds of programmatic, innovative evaluation programs in the first place.

Mr. TIERNEY. I would be comforted if the budget reflected the error and changed around and moved some of that money to a more effective place. But it's a little late for that one, I think. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Shays.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

A number of years ago, I chaired the committee that oversaw HHS, and we had Donna Shalala come before us because HHS had failed for a year to get the committee together that was to begin to describe how we -- and determine how we could protect the blood supply. We had 25,000 hemophiliacs who died. And I never saw it as my purpose to go after the Clinton administration, nor do I think it is my purpose here to go after the Bush administration. But I am really puzzled that this would in any way be a political issue.

I would like to know from both our key witnesses have you found in any way that the administration has been unresponsive in trying to deal with this AIDS epidemic?

Dr. GERBERDING. I would like to say that my intersection with both Secretaries that I've worked for as individuals, as well as staff from the White House that I have encountered on the issue of domestic and international

993 AIDS, has come to me to ask for science, they have come to me to ask for the data. I don't personally feel that I've come 994 995 under any pressure to comply with a particular policy. 996 Have you found them unresponsive? Mr. SHAYS. 997 Dr. GERBERDING. No, I haven't. That has not been my 998 experience. 999 Mr. SHAYS. Dr. Fauci, have you found them unresponsive? 1000 Dr. FAUCI. No, I have not. They've listened, several 1001 administrations, the current administration, the Clinton 1002 administration, and the--1003 I mean, it seems like it's the one area Mr. SHAYS. 1004 where politics has kind of not been part of it, so I would 1005 hate to introduce it now. What you have basically said to us is the upward 1006 1007 adjustment does not reflect an acceleration of the epidemic, but a more precise capability to distinguish between recent 1008 and long-term infections. So isn't it clear that we have new 1009 1010 information, and when there is new information, we need to 1011 respond to it? Dr. Fauci? Dr. FAUCI. Yes. As we get new information, we 1012 1013 certainly do need to respond to it, and that is the reason for the intensification. 1014 1015 Mr. SHAYS. Isn't this new information that we are 1016 learning? I mean, we are learning that with the epidemic 1017 hasn't gone up, it is just that our statistics were not as

accurate as they could be, correct?

Dr. FAUCI. Yes. As Dr. Gerberding has mentioned, and I
will obviously leave for her to comment on that, the new,
more sophisticated and accurate counting measures indicate

1023 higher than we had thought it was. But it has been stable

that the incidence or number of new infections per year is

1024 since the '90s, so it has not gone up. It is just higher

1025 numbers because of better counting.

1022

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

Dr. GERBERDING. The new information is based primarily on new testing activities in the States as well as new tests.

What it tells us is that there is no room for complacency;

55,600--

Mr. SHAYS. Absolutely, there is no room for complacency. The issue is that we have new information, and from this new information we can better act on it, correct?

Dr. GERBERDING. That is exactly why--

Mr. SHAYS. Now, do either of you appear before the-Chairman WAXMAN. If you will forgive me. I know it is
your 5 minutes, but it seems to me you haven't let a witness
complete a sentence yet. And I know you only have a limited
time, but I would be glad to yield.

Mr. SHAYS. I am sorry, I just have a number of questions, but I am delighted to have you continue.

Dr. GERBERDING. I think the important message here is that we need to be able to have this kind of information at

1043 the community level, because it tells us right where we need This data tells us nationally we need to go to men 1044 1045 who have sex with men, African Americans and Hispanic people, and do a lot more than we are doing right now in those 1046 1047 targeted populations. But in communities there will be even 1048 more specific information that can tell us how to use the 1049 resources we have to get the most benefit from it. 1050 So you are absolutely right. This information has 1051 to--it tells me that we need to reframe what we are doing. 1052 And I have asked Dr. Fenton to bring in experts and really 1053 look at our portfolio as it exists in light of this new 1054 information, and say where are we and where should we be. 1055 Mr. SHAYS. And I congratulate the both Chairman and 1056 Ranking Member, because I know they worked together in having 1057 this hearing. This is a huge piece of information. 1058 really isn't political information, it is new knowledge, based on new science, and we need to respond to it. 1059 1060 I would like to make sure, do you either, any of the 1061 four of you, make presentations before the Congress on 1062 funding requests? 1063 Dr. FAUCI. Yes. We defend the budget every year at our 1064 appropriations hearing in front of the House and the Senate. And you are never required to say something 1065 Mr. SHAYS. that is not true before those hearings, correct? 1066 1067 Dr. FAUCI. Correct.

1068 Mr. SHAYS. So in other words, if a committee member 1069 asked you a question about your funding needs, you would be 1070 very candid with them; is that not correct? 1071 Dr. FAUCI. Yes. 1072 Mr. SHAYS. Is that correct? 1073 Dr. GERBERDING. Yes. Mr. SHAYS. So if someone on the committee said, is this 1074 1075 enough money to do your job, and you said--you didn't think 1076 it was, you would tell them, well, we think we need more; and 1077 if we had more, we would put it to this use. 1078 correct? 10.79 Dr. GERBERDING. Well, Mr. Shays, there is the reality 1080 as an agency head, and I know Dr. Fauci feels this as an 1081 institute head, we can always think of good ways to spend 1082 money to do more than we are doing. But we also have to 1083 respond to the realities of the budget proposals that are put 1084 in front of us. But when you ask me for my professional judgment, I give you my very best answer, unconstrained by 1085 1086 any other realities. Mr. SHAYS. So any member on that committee who says, do 1087 1088 you need more money in these areas, and how you would use it, 1089 you would let them know? 1090 Dr. GERBERDING. I tell the truth. 1091 Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. 1092 Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, if I may, as an

1093 appropriator on that committee.

1094 Mr. SHAYS. Sure.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I think what Dr. Gerberding said was honest, but I think it honestly needs to be said that she comes in and she does her job as an utmost professional. She is very, very honest, as everyone is from CDC, NIH. But they all defend--they all defend the President's priorities and the President's choices.

1101 Mr. SHAYS. Right. And then you, as a member of the 1102 committee, feel very inclined to ask very candid questions.

And I know that, based on the testimony, that they would give 1104 you a candid response in return.

1105 Ms. MCCOLLUM. And then if we do anything, it is called 1106 an earmark by the President.

Mr. SHAYS. So I will just conclude by saying, in the end this was a budget agreed to by a Democratic Congress, suggested by a Republican President. It is a bipartisan budget. And in the end, we have to work together to come up with the best conclusions.

1112 Thank you very much.

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1113 Chairman WAXMAN. Without objection, the Chair would
1114 like to recognize himself for an additional minute. Hearing
1115 no objection.

Dr. Fauci and Dr. Gerberding, as I understand it, when you come before the Congress, you are defending the budget

1118 submitted by the administration; isn't that correct? 1119 Dr. FAUCI. Correct. 1120 Dr. GERBERDING. Correct. 1121 Chairman WAXMAN. Now, unless you are asked what your 1122 professional judgment might be, you are there to represent 1123 the administration. 1124 Dr. Gerberding, when I asked you questions earlier, you 1125 indicated that you thought that you should have had more 1126 money in the prevention efforts going all the way back to the beginning of your time. And I asked you about whether you 1127 1128 heard from people in the administration, the President, 1129 Secretary, and others, whether they asked you what you really 1130 needed. You said you had lots of meetings held with superiors who discussed these needs. 1131 I would like to ask you for the record to submit 1132 1133 documents and any other further information about the 1134 meetings you had to tell them what you thought you needed to 1135 prevent the epidemic from increasing in scope. 1136 Dr. GERBERDING. I will do my best to resurrect that. 1137 [The information follows:]

\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*

1138

1139 I must also say that HIV isn't the only Dr. GERBERDING. place that we have gone to say we are concerned about. 1140 1141 Mr. SHAYS. Would the gentleman yield for a slight 1142 intervention? 1143 Chairman WAXMAN. Certainly. Mr. SHAYS. 1144 Thank you. 1145 I just want to make sure for the record, was this new 1146 data available -- and I don't know what the answer is. But was 1147 this new data that is available today available when the 1148 President and Congress were presenting their--doing their 1149 last budget?

1150	RPTS DEAN
1151	DCMN SECKMAN
1152	[11:04 a.m.]
1153	Dr. GERBERDING. The new data were published in August,
1154	at the beginning of August of this year.
1155	Mr. SHAYS. This year. So it was not available either
1156	to the President or to Congress?
1157	Dr. GERBERDING. That's correct.
1158	Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.
1159	Chairman WAXMAN. In your developing your CDC budget do
1160	you start from scratch from what you believe is needed or do
1161	you receive a preset total from HHS or the Office of
1162	Management and Budget into which you must fit your goals.
1163	Dr. GERBERDING. I think, like every agency, we're given
1164	parameters. They vary from year to year. When I started, we
1165	were given parameters for increases. Recently, we have been
1166	given parameters to have scenarios for a modest increase, a
1167	flat line or a reduction. And we go forward with different
1168	versions of our request based on what parameters are finally
1169	selected by the administration to present the final budget to
1170	Congress. I also present our request to the formal budget
1171	council in the Department, and that is a factor that the
1172	Secretary weighs when he looks at all of the agency budgets
1173	in aggregate, because he had to finally bring the budget
1	

1174 forward.

Chairman WAXMAN. Now, when all is said and done, your 1175 1176 budget now for domestic HIV prevention is around 5 percent, 1177 and that's a drop in the percentage you've had in previous 1178 years, isn't that correct? 1179 Dr. GERBERDING. I'm not sure of the 5 percent figure, 1180 but most of our domestic HIV money is for prevention, but the 1181 amount of money that our government is spending on prevention 1182 is still hovering at about 4 percent of the total. 1183 Chairman WAXMAN. Okay, thanks. 1184 Ms. Speier. 1185 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. SPEIER. 1186 I had the opportunity recently to spend some time at 1187 Gilead which is a company in my district. And I'm going to 1188 preface my questions based on that fact, because they 1189 provided me with information that I thought was pretty 1190 astonishing. One is that, of the 50,000 new HIV individuals 1191 in America, the vast percentage of them are African American 1192 women. Now that seems to be different from what you provided 1193 today. But their concern to me was that African American 1194 women are the highest increase in those contracting HIV. that not the case? 1195 1196 Dr. FENTON. No, that's incorrect. The majority of new 1197 HIV infections are occurring among men, and the majority of 1198 those are among men who have sex with men. 1199 Ms. SPEIER. So the women, then, the African American

1200 women are an increasing number?

Dr. FENTON. What you may have heard is that the largest proportion of women who are newly infected with HIV are African American women. So they account for nearly a substantial proportion, more than half, or just about half of the new infections which are occurring in women in the United States. And then you have smaller proportions of infections occurring among Hispanics and white women; that may have been the statistic they were referring to.

Ms. SPEIER. What was most amazing to me was the regime now for drugs has been reduced, at least with Gilead's work, to one pill a day, as opposed to 9 or 10 pills in which patients oftentimes will not take one of the pills because it is upsetting physically to them. And by being able to just take one pill, you're getting greater compliance.

What they impressed upon me was the importance of testing, because as I think one of my colleagues earlier said, it is not a death sentence anymore. In fact, being diagnosed with HIV means that you can in fact have a full life, a full life expectancy. It is just being tested early, being diagnosed early and getting the drugs and following the regime that is offered; is that not the case?

Dr. GERBERDING. That is the case. The one pill has many drugs in it.

1224 Ms. SPEIER. Correct.

1225 Dr. GERBERDING. But they are able to combine them into 1226 a single tablet. 1227 Ms. SPEIER. So listening to them and listening to you 1228 it seems to me that we need to do two things, one is augment 1229 the testing that goes on in this country everywhere. Two, we 1230 require all other countries to come up with National HIV AIDS 1231 plans if they are participating in PEPFAR, but we don't have 1232 a national plan; is that true? 1233 Dr. GERBERDING. We have a national strategy, and we are 1234 committed to updating it in light of the new incidence 1235 information that we are receiving. 1236 We also in, I think in December, Kevin, will be 1237 publishing a new update on interventions that work that we 1238 can incorporate into the national strategy. 1239 Ms. SPEIER. So testing, what do we do to augment 1240 testing in this country? 1241 Dr. GERBERDING. There are some things we are doing right now. One of the biggest advances is the rapid test, 1242 1243 that allows people to be tested in non-medical environments. 1244 We are really pushing hard to make testing a routine part of 1245 medical care so that when you come in, you get tested. I was 1246 so pleased to see this in action at San Francisco General, it 1247 is night and day compared to even 5 years ago, but that's not 1248 happening everywhere. It is particularly not happening in VA hospitals and Federal facilities yet because they have 1249

1250 regulations that have to be changed in order for that to 1251 happen. But we need to make testing universally accepted and 1252 acceptable in all kinds of nontraditional environments. 1253 Ms. SPEIER. Would it make sense to make Medicaid 1254 funding contingent on participating in a program where 1255 testing done uniformly? Dr. GERBERDING. Well, I would like to see us work with 1256 1257 CMS around support for screening, because ultimately screening will be cost effective for CMS and HERSA and the 1258 1259 other Federally funded health programs, so I think that is an 1260 important lever that we want to pull. And we are working on 1261 how to get those regs changed. 1262 Ms. SPEIER. Finally, in terms of microbicides, that was 1263 heralded some years ago as being an outstanding opportunity for us to address the issue, particularly in places around 1264 1265 the world, Africa in particular. It appears in your 1266 testimony that I just read that there has been some disappointing results in the clinical trials. Could you 1267 1268 expand on that please and tell us where you are going with 1269 microbicides? 1270 Dr. GERBERDING. The clinical trial so far with the 1271 available compounds have been disappointing. They have 1272 failed to predict and in some cases may have actually 1273 enhanced transmission because of irritation in the mucosal tissues in contact with the microbicide, but that doesn't 1274

1275 mean that we won't find compounds that work. And there are 1276 studies ongoing right now in animal models and early clinical 1277 studies looking at both vaginal as well as rectal 1278 microbicides. So this is a very important area for 1279 investment. It is one of those new tools that I'm trying to 1280 make a plea for working collaboratively within NIH, of 1281 course, as well as FDA. 1282 Dr. FAUCI. Most of those studies, Ms. Speier, were done 1283 with microbicides that don't have a specific anti-HIV drug in 1284 The second generations are those that are now 1285 incorporating drugs that specifically block the virus, so the 1286 issue that Dr. Gerberding mentioned is one we still haven't 1287 overcome, is the propensity towards vaginal irritation which 1288 can sometimes paradoxically make things worse, but also there has not been potent anti-HIV drugs in the compounds, which 1289 1290 now the second and third generations ones that we feel a little bit more optimistic about now are ones that do contain 1291 1292 those compounds. 1293 And my last question, Mr. Chairman, to both Ms. SPEIER. 1294 of you, if you were being asked today how much money.we 1295 should be spending in the United States on HIV and AIDS, how 1296 much would that budget be? 1297 Dr. GERBERDING. We have submitted that for the record, our professional judgment without constraint. And as Kevin 1298 1299 and I sat down and walked through that budget, I think we

recognize that this isn't just a CDC question, it has to include the NIH, it has to include SAMSA for mental health because we can't solve this problem without doing more for mental health and substance use. And we need to address the correctional facilities, because a disproportionate part of the population at risk is in correctional environments. So we only have a piece, and we probably need to sit down together as a collaboration and really think through a true national strategy, and that's what we are proposing to do as these new data become available.

Ms. SPEIER. Give us a number nonetheless.

Dr. FAUCI. I can give you an NIH number. Our budget, as you know, has been essentially flat for the last 4 or 5 years. So we have \$29-plus billion in research that we've--that we spend, which is a substantial amount of money. The difficulty is if you have no increases for several years in a row, you're really looking at a 3.2 percent decrease per year in actual real money in the sense of inflationary index. So you are looking at a minus 12, 13 or plus percent decrease over a period of 5 years. So when people ask us, in our professional judgment, which I will give you now, that if you're looking at what we could use and spend quite well, the NIH budget is \$2.9 billion for AIDS on a budget that's \$29 billion for all of NIH, so it is a little more than 10 percent. With a \$2.9 billion budget for the NIH for AIDS, we

1325 could spend about \$3.35 billion.

1326 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. Speier, your time has 1327 expired.

1328 Ms. McCollum.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

People are dying every day in this country because of AIDS, and the numbers continue to increase despite the fact that AIDS prevention works. And I know this all too well, because I recently lost a friend from AIDS. It was a story that could go with maybe not being tested quick enough. It is a story this you could talk about fear and discrimination, but it also includes the Federal Government and the State of Minnesota not doing what it could do to support people who are on anti-retro viral treatment and the stress that these individuals go through when their treatment is threatened or cut off and then they find themselves scrambling for treatment.

We're here today because we need to get our energy back into the need for HIV prevention and education efforts, and I appreciate sincerely the testimony of the panel. We know that there are populations now that are more at risk than other populations. We're here today because the CDC's report found out this that there were 60, excuse me, 56,000 new HIV infections last year focused in racial and ethnic minorities; that's 70 percent of new cases. This is also true of

1350 Minnesota, and I wish Mr. Shays was still here. Maybe he'll 1351 come back.

Minnesota has recorded the highest number of HIV cases seen in the last 10 years in 2007. With 325 new cases, gay, bisexual men are the highest group impacted with 77 percent of all cases. Minnesota also is facing higher increases among young men and among Latina women. We know that the HIV rate in African American men and in the immigrant population is 20 times higher than the statewide average.

Mr. Chair, I would--I'll submit some issues for the record, but one thing that was brought up in a question was, well, this is new because we're testing better. Well Minnesota's been testing since 1985, so it is going up in Minnesota. I'm--I--I want to ask you, again, do you think the only reason why you're seeing rates increase in the populations that I have mentioned and across this country, the only reason is because testing is more effective, knowing that States submit records to you on a regular basis?

Dr. GERBERDING. I regret if I implied that we thought the reason for the number that this was related to testing. This number is a new number because we have a new diagnostic test that allows us to tell when somebody was infected, so we can distinguish very old infections from recent infections, so that's the test element of the number. But the number that we are reporting today and the back calculations that we

1375 did using the new methodology of extrapolation over time 1376 allows us to recognize that we've been misunderstanding the true incidence for a long period of time. In part it is 1377 1378 complicated and I would be happy to sit down an walk through 1379 some of the science of it. But is not that we are doing more 1380 testing, and you're right Minnesota was one of the first to 1381 have HIV reporting and the first to take an aggressive 1382 perspective on that. But, nevertheless, even in Minnesota, 1383 there are undiagnosed people and there is ongoing transmission. 1384 1385

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you.

1386

1387

1388

1389

1390

1391

1392

1393

1394

1395

1396

1397

1398

1399

One of the people who took it to the street, took it to public officials was a wonderful person, our State epidemiologist, Dr. Michael Osterholm, who made sure that we kept track of records. And some people called him an alarmist for going out and talking about it at the time. think the alarm needs to go off again, and so I thank you again for your report.

Mr. Chairman, the Minnesota Department of Health Federal CDC HIV prevention grant has been reduced by 8 percent in the past 5 years. Federal CDC STD prevention grants, which is also a precursor that's been used, has been reduced 4 percent since 2003. That's despite the number of STD cases has risen 14 percent since 2003.

Mr. Chair, I'm going to submit some information into the

1400 record from the State of Minnesota and the profile of HIV 1401 epidemic. I will be around if there's an opportunity for more questions. I originally wasn't going to spend my time 1402 1403 so much talking about Minnesota, but I wanted to, for the 1404 public, clear up any misunderstanding that might have been 1405 what these statistics are really indicating to us, and that's 1406 to wake up and to start getting correct information, and to 1407 let today's youth know that treatment is not a cure; it is 1408 not a cure. 1409

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1410

1411

1412

1413

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Ms. McCollum.

We will be, without objection, we will be pleased to receive the information for the record that you would like to submit.

1414 [The information follows:]

1415 \*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*

1416 Chairman WAXMAN. Ms. Watson.

Ms. WATSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to clarify something that was said, and I'll direct this towards you, Dr. Fenton, as I understood, HIV is spreading more quickly among African American women than any other group. Is that correct or not correct?

Dr. FENTON. HIV infection is spreading at the greatest rate among gay and bisexual men. In fact the data shows that they are the only group where we have seen consistent and sustained increases in HIV incidence since the early 1990s.

Ms. WATSON. Then, let me go back, because after the virus was spread--I mean, identified around 1980, 1981, it was believed to be among white males having sex with males. It seemed that there was attention given to that segment of society, and things improved, and that's where the funding was going. Maybe 10 years later, there was data showing that it was moving quicker among African American women, coming from partners who injected themselves.

As I understand that, there is a disproportionate toll on African Americans, males, females at this time, and they account for 12 percent of the population but 45 percent of the new infections in the year 2006. Is that true?

Dr. FENTON. That's true.

Ms. WATSON. Okay, I might have missed this part of your testimony, so let me just refer back to it. But can you tell

1441 us more about what CDC is doing in terms of the Heightened National Response to address HIV and AIDS in the African 1442 1443 American community? Dr. FENTON. Thank you. I would be delighted to tell 1444 1445 you about that. The Heightened National Response is an 1446 initiative which was started in 2006, and it brings together 1447 CDC or Federal partners and our partners and leaders in the 1448 African American community to focus on the epidemic among African Americans and to accelerate our prevention efforts. 1449 1450 And the Heightened National Response is built on four 1451 key pillars. The first is to expand HIV testing within the African American community. The second is to expand the 1452 1453 reach of our prevention services; in other words, to scale up 1454 effective prevention interventions with African Americans so 1455 we know it will have an impact on the epidemic. The third is 1456 to mobilize the African American community. And we have been 1457 really working with a range of amazing African American 1458 leaders to focus and to bring the conversation back to HIV 1459 and the importance of community leadership on HIV/AIDS. the fourth pillar is on research, to ensure that we are 1460 1461 investing in research for and by African Americans, so that 1462 we're looking at culturally competent prevention 1463 interventions moving forward. 1464 Ms. WATSON. Now, the main points that you are describing to us, did you get new funding to be able to 1465

1466	implement?
------	------------

Dr. FENTON. No, this is a great example of what Dr.

Gerberding said of looking at our existing prevention

portfolio and having to make tough decisions to realign our

existing prevention dollars into what we believe are urgent

threats or urgent realities and to deal with the matters at

hand. And so this is part of the activities that we have to

do in the current environment.

Ms. WATSON. Well, going back and looking at the history because I chaired the health and human services in the California Senate for 17 years. I was there when we identified the virus, and I was there when money flowed in to address white males having sex with white males. I was there, too, when we discovered that it was moving among the African American female community. And I never saw the funding keep pace with the spread. So I will expect, in trying to reach your goals to reduce the rate of infection, that you have not been able to reach those goals of reducing the rate of infection among that population.

Dr. FENTON. Well, actually, we do know that the transmission rate of HIV has been declining in the United States. There are more people living with HIV, but--

Ms. WATSON. But what about African Americans? I really want to see zero in, because this was a great concern. I carried the needle exchange program for years. I was called

on the carpet by, particularly, the ministerial community. I had to go to San Francisco and sit in the hot seat. And it was very, very difficult to have an understanding that if we do a needle exchange, at least we take a dirty needle out. And at that time, as Dr. Gerberding has said, that we're able then to give information about treatment and at the point of exchange. And that program only was adopted after Willie Brown took over, and I was gone at that point. 

But I'm still concerned as to what is happening in that community. And I'm still concerned about resources. And I would like to know the status of mobilizing the community--I know we are working through a lost our churches now. Could you just add to that, please?

Dr. FENTON. Sure. It has been an amazing couple of years in which we've brought leaders from all walks of life into the African American community to dialogue with us and to plan with us. Leaders from the African American faith communities, from the academic sector, from the business sector, from grassroots organizations who have come to Atlanta to talk about their activities and their plans and look at ways is in which CDC can accelerate efforts towards prevention. This has been a new way for us to work as an agency. It is an important way for us to work as an agency moving forward.

Ms. WATSON. If I might take just another minute, Mr.

- 1516 Chairman.
- 1517 Chairman WAXMAN. Without objection, the gentlelady is
- 1518 yielded another minute.
- 1519 Ms. WATSON. In the African American community, our
- 1520 churches are the place where people come together. And that
- 1521 is a route that I think should be more focused on. And if we
- 1522 had the necessary budget items, and this is something I have
- 1523 in mind, to impact those who are appropriators, we really
- 1524 need to--and I understand also that HIV/AIDS is spreading
- 1525 among Hispanic Americans now, where it wasn't as heightened
- 1526 as, 10 years ago, as it appears to be now. So I think that
- 1527 we need a special program expanded to deal particularly in
- 1528 the African American community with our churches and other
- 1529 community programs.
- 1530 With that, I will say thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 1531 And thank you, Dr. Fenton.
- 1532 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. Watson.
- 1533 Mr. Sarbanes.
- 1534 Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 1535 Thanks to the panel.
- 1536 I would imagine that just about any condition can be
- 1537 treated or involves sort of two prongs at least in your
- 1538 strategy combat it. One is sort of behavioral modification.
- 1539 The other is treatment. So--but, obviously, there are
- 1540 certain kinds of conditions, diseases and so forth where that

1541 interplay is more relevant and elastic.

And--so I had a couple of questions. Is there any evidence, or can you describe how progress on the treatment front may have contributed to some backsliding on sort of the behavioral practice or modifying behaviors up front? And if that has happened, you know, how do you address that? What are the strategies for--to maintain the intensity and focus on both strands without having them sort of contribute to going in the opposite direction with the other? And along those lines, and this is my only question, so then I ask you all to just jump in, are there conditions or diseases that have been good reference points for you to look at where the analogy is strong enough, in terms of what we are dealing with HIV and AIDS, of what's happened in terms of how we've managed those is instructive in terms of the strategies that we're trying to employ with respect to HIV and AIDS?

Dr. GERBERDING. I'll start. I think that the risk period for people, all other things being considered, for the highest chance of transmitting to others is very early after infection and then again very late in infection when the viral load is very high. But you can transmit at any time. So if treatment is successful in suppressing viral load, it stands to reason that people would be less infectious to others during that period of time. They also tend to change their behavior when they know they are infected and protect

1566 other people as a consequence of their disease.

But we are experiencing anecdotal and I think more systematically a cohort of people who have falsely been reassured that their lives are going to be unaffected by this treatment, and so there is some complacency and some recidivism and increase in risk behavior. And we see that by indicators such as the incidence of rectal syphilis going up in some populations where there has been an increase in unsafe sexual practices, so that is a phenomenon.

There is—it is very difficult to find a good analogy to HIV in the context that you're asking the question. To some extent, TB is like that. You have to treat it for a long time, and people become less infectious when they are in treatment. They can be falsely reassured by the therapy early on and be less conscientious about infecting the people in their households, but AIDS is a pretty unique infectious disease, a chronic infectious disease for which we have a chronic infectious disease treatment. And so we're kind of learning as we go with this one.

Dr. FAUCI. Just to underscore what you said about the perceptions. The perception of something not being as bad as we decades ago thought it was, if you look at the environment that we're in, we used to have hospices and 20 to 40 percent of the hospital beds in some cities were occupied by people with HIV infection. It is mostly an outpatient disease right

1591 now.

1610

1611

1612

1613

1614

1615

1592 The public perceptions that put on the face of someone 1593 with HIV, if you look at some of the advertisements for some of the drugs, you open up medical journals and you page 1594 1595 through the first 10 pages and they have these 1596 extraordinarily healthy looking people rock climbing saying, 1597 I'm doing very well on my Atripla or on my, whatever drug 1598 combination they are on, and it really creates a false 1599 impression that we've been trying to underscore here, and Dr. 1600 Gerberding mentioned it actually formally in her 1601 presentation, is the issue that it is a bad thing to get HIV 1602 infected. Even though with all the very, very effective 1603 drugs we have, it is not a good thing. It's difficult to 1604 take the medications. It is a lifelong disease. 1605 stop, we have shown as others have, that the virus bounces 1606 right back, and at this point, we have not been able to cure 1607 it. 1608 Mr. SARBANES. Would you attribute any of the increase 1609 that has been talked about here today to this sort of

Mr. SARBANES. Would you attribute any of the increase that has been talked about here today to this sort of misperception, or is it--I'm sure it is hard to draw a straight line.

Dr. FAUCI. No, I think there is no question in our mind that when people practice risk behavior, if you question them and talk about it with them, a significant amount, I can't give you a number, is due to the feeling that it isn't as bad

1616 as it was back in the early 1980s. Of course, there was an 1617 incredible amount of fear. If you were in New York City or 1618 San Francisco or Los Angeles or some of the other cities, the 1619 fear among the community, particularly among the gay 1620 community, was palpable. There is much less of that now because of the perception that we can treat it very well. 1621 1622 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sarbanes. 1623 Without objection, Representative Maxine Waters, who is not a member of our committee, will be allowed to sit with us 1624 1625 and enter a statement in the record and to ask questions. 1626 Without objection, that will be the order. 1627 Ms. WATERS. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. 1628 so pleased that you are holding this hearing and I would like 1629 to thank you and Ranking Member Tom Davis for this hearing 1630 today. 1631 I'd just like to give a little bit of background and ask 1632 a few questions. 1633 Many people in the black community have long suspected 1634 that the epidemic was worse than our Nation's leaders thought 1635 it was, even before the CDC's new estimates were released. 1636 We knew that African Americans accounted for about half of 1637 all of the new AIDS cases, and we knew that HIV/AIDS was 1638 having a profound impact on African Americans. 1639 In 1998, we sounded the alarm in the halls of Congress on April 24th, 1998, while I was the Chair of the 1640

Congressional Black Caucus, the CBC held a brain trust which was sponsored by Congressman Louis Stokes. During that brain trust, those same members were shocked by the presentation of Bennie Primm, the executive director of the Addiction, Research and Treatment Corporation. Dr. Primm's presentation described the state of HIV/AIDS crisis in minority communities, particularly the black community. On May 11, 1998, the CBC held a meeting that brought together many public health workers, AIDS activists and

together many public health workers, AIDS activists and representatives from all over the country to tell us about the impact of the HIV/AIDS in minority communities. That same day, the CBC called for President Bill Clinton to declare a public health emergency to combat the crisis in minority communities.

In the fall of 1998, Lou Stokes, Donna Christensen and I met with Donna Shalala, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to discuss the crisis. We agreed that what we really needed was not a declaration of a public health emergency but rather money for programs to address the crisis.

On October 28th, 1998, the CBC held an event to roll out the Minority Aids Initiative. The event featured the participation of President Clinton, Secretary Shalala and representatives of HIV/AIDS organizations from around the country.

1666 At the 1998 roll out, we announced that the Minority 1667 Aids Initiative would receive an initial appropriation of \$156 million in fiscal year 1999. The minority AIDS 1668 initiative grew significantly over the next 5 years, but 1669 1670 since then, funding has remained stagnant at about \$400 1671 million per year since fiscal year 2003, and at some points, 1672 it dropped below the 400 million. 1673 Having said that, African Americans again have been 1674 seriously and disproportionately affected by HIV/AIDS. 1675 are more than one half million African Americans living with HIV/AIDS today. African Americans account of about half of 1676 1677 all the new AIDS cases, although only 12 percent of the 1678 population is black. African American women represent 1679 somewhere between 66 and 75 percent of all the new AIDS cases 1680 among women. And African American teenagers represent 69 1681 percent of all the new AIDS cases among teenagers. 1682 go on and on with this. 1683 Are you shocked about this crisis? Are you bothered 1684 about this crisis? 1685 Let me start with Dr. Julie Gerberding. Does this 1686 information shock you? Dr. GERBERDING. I, as I said before you were here, I 1687 1688 believe this is an urgent situation. Am I shocked by it? 1689 I'm certainly not happy about it. Ms. WATERS. Do you think it's a crisis? 1690

1691 Dr. GERBERDING. I think it is a crisis. 1692 Ms. WATERS. Mr. Fenton, are you shocked? Do you think 1693 this is a crisis? 1694 Dr. FENTON. I'm saddened, and CBC has portrayed this as an severe and ongoing crisis among the community. 1695 1696 Ms. WATERS. Do you do think it is a crisis? 1697 Dr. FENTON. I do. 1698 Dr. Anthony Fauci, do you think it is a Ms. WATERS. 1699 crisis? Dr. FAUCI. Yes, I do, Ms. Waters. 1700 1701 Ms. WATERS. Okay, given we all believe this is a crisis 1702 and these statistics and this information is shocking, what 1703 do you recommend? 1704 Dr. GERBERDING. I would be happy to share the 1705 professional judgment budget that we have presented to this 1706 committee with you, which I think reflects three major focal 1707 areas. One is to know not just who got it then or who is 1708 getting it now, but who is going to do get it if we don't act 1709 and invest in the systems that tell us what to do about that. 1710 Second is to get everybody diagnosed who's had it, so they 1711 can benefit from treatment. And the third is to put a 1712 significant effort into new research--1713 How long have you been at CDC? Ms. WATERS. 1714 Dr. GERBERDING. Six years. 1715 Ms. WATERS. Six years? You heard my background on how

1716 I created the Minority Aids Initiative. I created that 1717 because we needed to focus on building capacity and getting communities that had little or no resources involved in RFP 1718 1719 processes. We've been working very hard, and I come here, 1720 and I hear you, Mr. Fenton, talk about all this great work 1721 you're doing with minority leaders and minorities 1722 communities. I don't know about it. I've been involved in this issue for a long time, having created this and watching 1723 the incidence of HIV/AIDS grow in African American 1724 1725 communities across the country. 1726 And I want to know, because I don't get a sense that you 1727 really feel this is a crisis. And when you tell me that, 1728 well, I submitted a budget, take a look at the budget, how 1729 have you sounded the alarm? What have you done to deal with 1730 this growing crisis? Do you see what I just said about 1731 African American teenagers from 13- to 19-years old representing 69 percent of all the new AIDS cases among 1732 1733 teenagers? Doesn't that bother you? 1734 Dr. GERBERDING. Mrs. Waters, we will be briefing the 1735 Black Caucus this afternoon, but if you would be able to 1736 participate in our enhanced initiative, we would love to have 1737 your voice because we need to get leaders involved in helping 1738 us--1739 Ms. WATERS. No, no, no, no, no. 1740 Dr. GERBERDING. We need your help.

1741 Ms. WATERS. No.

1751

1752

1753

1754

1755

1756

1757

1758

1759

1760

1761

1762

1763

1742 Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

leadership from you.

1743 I am involved and I have been involved. And the Black Caucus has been screaming to the top of its voice for help. 1744 1745 We just got one portion of this reauthorized with Ryan White. 1746 The other portions of the funding that we struggle with are 1747 not even official in the budget. What are you going to do 1748 about just getting CDC portion authorized? It is spread out 1749 among several of these agencies, including CDC and NIH and And I don't see any leadership from--I don't see any 1750

Now, I know that you think I'm being a little bit harsh, and I am. I happen to be an African American woman. I don't want gays and lesbian and African American men and women fighting about who is worse off. We are all worse off. And I don't like it when I go out into the communities and I see all of these little groups struggling and fighting, and the way you deal with the discretionary money. We need some leadership.

And I'm so pleased that I am able to be here today, Mr. Waxman, and I thank you for indulging me in my frustration.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

The gentlelady's time has expired.

Dr. Fenton and Dr. Gerberding, one--once CDC identifies
effective programs, the next step is to disseminate them to

1766 the States.

How does CDC identify effective programs.

Dr. GERBERDING. I would like to ask Dr. Fenton to take on this in detail, but just to tell you that there is a two-step process. One is to review the evidence of efficacy by expert scientists who are in a position to make those judgments, and we respect that and to get that up in the compendium, which will be updated again. But in addition, there is a process of diffusion where we work with an organization that trains and helps disseminate people. Right now, there is a bottleneck in the training, so that's one of the issues we addressed in our professional judgement budget.

Chairman WAXMAN. So you have a research time that applies a methodological review of studies of existing programs. They identify the ones that are found to work. You put it up on the compendium. Isn't that right?

Dr. GERBERDING. Yes. And we expect the grantees who receive our dollars when they are developing programs to use those programs that are proven to be effective. But in order for them to successfully implement them, they often need training and support, and that's one of the areas that we are not able to keep up with right now.

Chairman WAXMAN. When the compendium was first released in 1999, CDC said it would update it annually as effective new programs were identified, and CDC's experts did identify

1791	a number of additional programs that work, but as I
1792	understand it, you said there is a bottleneck. CDC did not
1793	issue annual updates to the compendium; is that right?
1794	Dr. GERBERDING. I can't go back to 1999, but we have
1795	done two updates since I have been the director of the CDC.
1796	It is a little hard to do it annually because the data from
1797	these programs doesn't come forward that fast, but I think we
1798	are accelerating our ability to do that.
1799	Chairman WAXMAN. When did CDC last issue an update on
1800	the compendium?
1801	Dr. GERBERDING. 2007.
1802	Chairman WAXMAN. Did CDC attempt to get HHS approval to
1803	release an updated compendium prior to that time?
1804	Dr. GERBERDING. I believe we did.
1805	Chairman WAXMAN. And what was the response from HHS?
1806	Dr. GERBERDING. I would have to ask Kevin, who wasn't
1807	the director at the time, to go into the details of this,
1808	because I don't know all the steps involved. We can provide
1809	that paper trail for you. But to suffice to say that it was
1810	not a sped did I process.
1811	Chairman WAXMAN. Okay. Well, I'd like the answer to
1812	that question for the record. I'd also like to know why
1813	didn't HHS approve any updates of the compendium until 2007?
1814	Dr. GERBERDING. I can't answer that.
1815	Chairman WAXMAN. Okay.

1816 Dr. GERBERDING. But I can say, in the recent years, 1817 we've had I think a much more accelerated process, and I'm 1818 satisfied that we are able do it in a timely way now. 1819 we will have the update for 2008 before the end of this 1820 calendar year. Well, it took 8 years to update the 1821 Chairman WAXMAN. 1822 list with crucial information about programs that have been 1823 shown to save lives. And I'm concerned that instead of 1824 encouraging effective HIV prevention, HHS seems to have been 1825 standing in the way. In fact, the committee asked CDC for a 1826 list of dates for which the compendium and other important 1827 HIV prevention documents were submitted to HHS for clearance 1828 and when they were actually released. And my understanding 1829 is that the committee hasn't gotten a response because CDC's 1830 response is still in clearance at HHS. 1831 Does CDC provide training or technical assistance for implementing the programs it identifies? 1832 1833 Dr. GERBERDING. Yes, we do. 1834 Chairman WAXMAN. And how many organizations are 1835 currently on the waiting list? 1836 Dr. GERBERDING. About 2,000. Chairman WAXMAN. So 2,000 organizations out there want 1837 1838 to provide identify effective HIV prevention programs, but 1839 they are still on a waiting list. I think that's 1840 unconscionable given the statistics we've been hearing about

1841 today, and I think we need to address it.

1842

1843

1844

1845

1846

1847

1848

1849

1850

1851

1852

1853

1854

1855

1856

1857

1858

1859

1860

1861

1862

1863

1864

1865

Dr. Gerberding, just a clarification of your testimony, you suggested earlier that one of the reasons that you lowered your prevention goals is that there are more people with HIV living because of treatment, but the data for 2000 estimated 945,000 people living with HIV, and for the data for the most recent year, we find around a million people. This is about a 5 percent. Does a 5 percent increase in people living with HIV produce an 80 percent decrease in your goal and a 20 percent decrease in funding for preventions? I'm not going to be able to do that Dr. GERBERDING. math in my head, but I think what you're getting to is, you know, what is the full picture of the recalibration? again, I was on the advisory committee when we were struggling to develop that first 50 percent reduction. recognized at that time that there was a bell shaped survival curve for HIV, so the projections were that we would see an excalation in death rates, and that was factored into the projection of the transmission. So it was a--I don't want to

living because that isn't our public health goal, but the calculus was different then. And that's not the only reason, as I already said, but that is one of the factors--

say it would be easier to prevent if there were fewer people

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I asked that question--Dr. GERBERDING. --different as opposed to now.

Chairman WAXMAN. Because I was troubled by the answer you had given earlier so I just wanted to pursue that point. And I thank you for responding.

This panel has been very helpful. I think it is unfair to criticize the four of you for what you are trying to do.

I think you're trying to do the best you can, and you're trying to do as much as you can without sufficient funds and without the barriers to your efforts being removed. And the purpose of having you here is not to criticize you but to try to be constructive in working with you to be sure that you have the ability to do the job because we are all very concerned and frustrated that there are so many people whose lives are at risk and will be lost unless we in government do what's needed. And if it is not coming from the U.S. Government, it is not going to happen at all. I thank each of you for your testimony today.

I want to now call forward the witnesses for our second panel, Dr. David Holtgrave. We will wait a minute and have the second panel come forward.

STATEMENTS OF DAVID HOLTGRAVE, Ph.D., PROFESSOR AND CHAIR, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, BEHAVIOR & SOCIETY, JOHNS HOPKINS BLOOMBERG SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH; ADAORA A. ADIMORA, M.D., DIVISION OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL OF MEDICINE; GEORGE AYALA, Psy.D., RESEARCH HEALTH ANALYST, RTI INTERNATIONAL AND AIDS PROJECT LOS ANGELES; HEATHER HAUCK, DIRECTOR, AIDS ADMINISTRATION, MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE; FRANK OLDHAM, JR., PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PEOPLE WITH AIDS

Chairman WAXMAN. We're pleased that you are here today, and I want to introduce those of you on the second panel.

Dr. David Holtgrave is founding Chair and professor at the Department of Health, Behavior and Society at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. Had he served as director of behavioral and social sciences at the Emory Center for AIDS Research and as director of the intervention research and CDC's Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention. Dr. Holtgrave has focused on the efficacy, effectiveness and economic evaluation of a variety of HIV prevention interventions, contributing to over 175 professional publication.

Dr. Ada Adimora is associate professor of medicine at the University of North Carolina School of Medicine and

adjunct associate professor of epidemiology at the School of Public Health. She has been the principal investigator on multiple CDC and NIH funded research projects and has published extensively on the epidemiology of HIV in America with a focus on African Americans. Dr. Adimora a practicing clinician and a fellow of the American College of Physicians.

Dr. George Ayala, works as a research psychologist and public health analyst at RTI International's Urban Health Program in San Francisco, California; is also the executive officer of the Global Forum on Men Who Have Sex with Men and HIV. He is the former director of health promotion community research and capacity building at HIV/AIDS Project LA where he managed HIV prevention technical assistance research. A clinical psychologist by training, Dr. Ayala's research focuses on the mechanisms through which social discrimination impacts health.

Health and Mental Hygiene AIDS administration, leading statewide public health efforts to reduce HIV transmission in Maryland and to help Marylanders with HIV/AIDS live longer healthier lives. Ms. Hauck is currently Chair-elect of the National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors. She has served as the section chief of the STD/HIV section for New Hampshire and as a consultant on HIV program issues for hospitals, national associations and state public health

1933 agencies.

1944

1945

1946

1947

1948

1949

1950

1951

1952

1953

1954

1955

1956

1957

Frank J. Oldham, Jr., is the executive director for 1934 National Association of People with AIDS. He has spent over 1935 1936 two decades as a leader in HIV policy, administering HIV 1937 programs for the cities of New York and Chicago, and working 1938 in numerous AIDS service organizations. Mr. Oldham has 1939 served and is currently serving on several planning and other 1940 policy bodies, including the New York City Commission on 1941 AIDS; the National Minority AIDS Council; CDC's 5-year 1942 strategic planning committee; and Lambda Lesbian & Gay 1943 Community services.

We are pleased to have you here today. I want to inform you that, in this committee's practice, all witnesses who appear before us do so under oath, so we'd like to administer and oath to you if you would please stand and raise your right hand.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Chairman WAXMAN. The record will indicate that each of the witnesses answered in the affirmative.

Your prepared statements will be in the record in full.

We'd like to ask, however, that you limit the oral presentation to 5 minutes. And we will have a clock that will tell you, for 4 minutes, it is green; and the last minute, it will turn orange; and when the time is up, it will turn red.

Dr. Holtgrave, let's start with you. There is a button on the base of the mike. Be sure it is pressed so we can hear you.

1961 | STATEMENT OF DAVID R. HOLTGRAVE, Ph.D.

Mr. HOLTGRAVE. Chairman Waxman, Representative Davis and distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you.

Today's hearing is truly urgent. CDC's HIV incidence estimate suggests that there is a new infection every 9 and a half minutes in the Nation. There is an AIDS-related death every 33 minutes. The ratio in ethnic health disparities are staggering. And the lifetime HIV care and treatment costs for one person can easily top \$275,000.

Because of the new incidence estimates, one might ask two key questions: Are HIV prevention programs effective, and are they delivered at a sufficient scale in the U.S.? My answer will be yes to the first question and no to the second. To assess prevention effectiveness at the National level, we must examine HIV transmission rates. Obviously, HIV is spread from a person living with the virus to someone who is HIV negative. The transmission rate is the number of new HIV infections in a year divided by the number of people

living with HIV in that year. As seen in this first slide the HIV transmission rate dropped from over 92 in 1980 to 6.6 in 1991.

On the second slide, we see that the transmission rate stayed at roughly this level until 1997 when, after the advent of new therapies, the transmission rate actually went up temporarily to 7.5. Thereafter it declined once again.

In 2006, the transmission rate appears to be just under 5. This means over 95 percent of persons living with HIV in the U.S. are not transmitting the virus to someone else in a given year.

Another key measure of prevention success is the difference between what we observed in the HIV epidemic and what would have occurred had prevention programs not been in place in slide three. From the beginning of the epidemic through 2006, I estimate very conservatively that roughly 362,000 infections were prevented in the Nation and over 3.3 million quality adjusted life years were saved.

There is a clear relationship between HIV prevention program funding and incidence, as seen in the fourth slide.

The bottom line is that, in terms of HIV prevention investment, the Nation gets what it pays for. One must be concerned, therefore, that when adjusted for inflation, CDC's HIV prevention budget has fallen over 19 percent since fiscal year 2002, and in real dollar terms, the investment in the

minority AIDS initiative is also in decline.

2005 l

2017

2018

2019

2020

2021

2022

2023

2024

2025

2026

2027

2028

2029

2006 Further, CDC's data shows that a small fraction of gay 2007 men in need of HIV prevention services report receiving them. 2008 Clearly our investment in prevention is lacking. 2009 therefore scale up the use of evidence-based HIV prevention 2010 tools already at our disposal even we hope for new 2011 intervention, such as a vaccine. As seen in slide five, some 2012 currently available evidence-based HIV prevention 2013 interventions are readily available to us. What's most 2014 important to emphasize is that we possess the technology to 2015 influence HIV-related risk behaviors, and an extensive 2016 scientific literature leaves very little on that point.

So what is the right level of investment? I estimate that CDC's HIV prevention budget, now at \$0.75 billion, needs to increase to about \$1.32 billion per year and remain, on average, at that level for about 4 years at least so as to undo the damage done since fiscal year 2002 and to address HIV prevention needs in the U.S.

What new services could be delivered at this higher level of investment? On the sixth and final slide, I list some of these. I believe it would provide sufficient resources to field the new very large-scale targeted HIV counseling and testing campaign; a nationwide public information and anti-stigma campaign; intensive client-centered, evidence-based prevention services for the

minority persons living with HIV who engage in any risk behavior that could result in transmission; in brief, the science-based intervention for 15 million HIV negative persons at risk of infection.

What public health impact would this achieve? After 4 years of heightened service delivery, the U.S. could reduce HIV transportation rates by 50 percent and HIV incidence by 50 percent. Further, we could achieve and maintain a 90 percent level of serostatus awareness of persons living with HIV. This is a great fiscal investment. The cost per infection averted via this new heightened response would be roughly \$27,000, and that indicates the prevention programs could easily save more medical resources than cost to implement.

But accountability is key. The proposed intensification of these programs must be accompanied by a quick but careful review of current HIV prevention resources across the Federal Government, and we need a national AIDS plan. Further, the performance of all HIV prevention resources should be summarized in an annual report card so that mid-course corrections can be made.

In conclusion, we are at a historic crossroads in the HIV Epidemic in the U.S. Doing more of the same will achieve more of the same. And as asserted by a recent report of Black AIDS Institute, the U.S. is indeed being "left behind."

But we can find the national will to scale up evidence-based
HIV prevention programs sufficiently to change the course of
the epidemic in the U.S. once and for all.

Thank you, again, sincerely for your strong interest in
HIV prevention.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Holtgrave follows:]

HG0260.000 90 PAGE

2062 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Holtgrave. 2063 Dr. Adimora.

2064 STATEMENT OF ADAORA A ADIMORA, M.D.

2065

2067

2068

2069

2070

2071

2072

2073

2074

2075

2076

2077

2078

2079

2080

2081

2082

2083

Dr. ADIMORA. Thank you for this opportunity to speak 2066 with you.

I have been asked to testify concerning HIV epidemiology in the U.S. particularly with respect to African Americans and structural and social forces that affect individual and community vulnerability HIV.

These are some of the essential concepts. individual level sexual behavior, such as partner number and condom use, don't completely explain racial disparities in the U.S. HIV rates. Second, sexual network patterns are critical in the spread of HIV throughout the population.

A sexual network is a set of people who are linked directly or indirectly through sexual contact. distribution of network characteristics that promote population HIV spread, like concurrent partnerships and sexual mixing patterns, appears to differ by race in ways that increase HIV transmission among African Americans.

Third, social forces and social contacts that is social macro-economic and other features that are outside the

individual's control contribute to sexual network patterns that spread HIV. So some potential pathways between HIV and several social forces are relatively clear. For example, residential segregation by race supported by structural mechanisms, like mortgage lending practices, concentrates poverty in the segregated group.

Segregation may especially influence young people's HIV risk since residence often dictates school districts which influence adolescents' social and sexual networks. Also the sex ratio, the ratio of men to women, is a key determinant of the structure of the networks. The sex ratio among African Americans is strikingly low due to high mortality among black men and is further decreased by high incarceration rates.

The relative scarcity of men contributes to low marriage and higher divorce rates. There is a strong association between being unmarried and having concurrent partnerships. Poverty, another force, works with the low sex ratio to help destabilize marriage and makes marriage less feasible in many black communities.

The disproportionate incarceration of black men dramatically effects sexual networks in black communities.

Incarceration disrupts existing partnerships, making it more likely that each partner will have concurrent partnerships.

While inmates are in prison, they can join gangs and forge new long-term links with antisocial networks. These new

links can then connect members of high-risk sub groups to previously low-risk people and their networks. High incarceration rates contribute to increased unemployment in poor minority communities shrinking the number of financially viable male partners as well as the absolute number of men.

Rod Wallace showed how macro level forces shapes social contacts and AIDS death rates in a New York City borough. In the 1970s, New York's fiscal crisis prompted city agencies to embark on a deliberate policy of planned shrinkage of the populations in black and Hispanic neighborhoods. The plan involved withdrawing critical city services, including fire fighting services, from poor areas that already had high fire rates. So neighborhoods burned. Many people moved to other parts of borough, and social networks and community structure were disrupted. What was presumably not anticipated when these policies were implemented were the changes in the geography of drug abuse that resulted from this migration and the resulting upsurge years later in HIV.

So, finally, the pathways between social forces and HIV suggest that continuing to focus prevention efforts solely on individual risk factors and individual determinants won't significantly impact HIV rates among blacks in the U.S. Certainly the search for and implementation of effective biological and behavioral interventions must continue and must certainly be funded. However, public health research

2134 must also take into account the social forces that are 2135 driving the extraordinary racial disparity in HIV rates in 2136 this country. 2137 I believe several steps, among others, should be taken 2138 immediately. First, the HIV epidemic among African Americans 2139 should be formally declared a national emergency, and 2140 moreover, the U.S. should act as if the epidemic is a true 2141 national emergency by developing and appropriately funding an effective domestic HIV plan that addresses not only 2142 biological and behavioral interventions but also the 2143 epidemic's social and economic roots. This will require 2144 2145 involving clinicians and public health researchers as well as 2146 experts in sociology, economics, political science, criminal justice and other disciplines. 2147 2148 Secondly, incarceration affects the health of black 2149 communities. Attention should be given to the markedly 2150 disproportionate incarceration of black men. 2151 Third, comprehensive sex education can be effective in 2152 reducing risky sexual behavior and should be given in 2153 schools. Thank you very much. 2154 [Prepared statement of Dr. Adimora follows:] 2155

\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 2-2 \*\*\*\*\*\*

2156

2157 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Adimora.
2158 Dr. Ayala.

2159 STATEMENT OF GEORGE AYALA, Psy.D.

Mr. AYALA. Chairman Waxman and distinguished committee members, thank you for this opportunity to speak with you today on the critical topic of HIV prevention in the United States. It is my privilege to be here with you today.

Presently HIV prevention in the U.S. lacks the resources and comprehensiveness that will significantly drive down HIV incidence rates, as has been demonstrated by my esteemed colleague Dr. Holtgrave. I ask that you consider the following: Serious HIV-related health disparities often fueled by stigma and discrimination continue to undermine HIV prevention efforts in communities of color. Men who have sex with men continue to make up the majority of new HIV infections nationally, across race and ethnicity, with black and Latino men especially hard hit. Only four of the CDC's 49 recommended evidence-based interventions specifically target gay men, and only one of them is designed address the needs the gay men of color.

In addition, and just as important to consider, are these facts: Substance abuse, prevention and treatment are

underfunded and not routinely viewed as integral to overall HIV prevention efforts. Structural interventions are not commonly researched or endorsed, even when sound science support their broadbased adoption, as has been the case with multi-component syringe access and disposal programs.

Other than new HIV treatments, we have not yet harnessed the full potential of other promising biomedical interventions, including pre-exposure prophylaxis and microbicides. And many science-based prevention interventions are difficult for community-based providers to implement because they were tested under research conditions that are different from real-life settings or tested on populations other than those currently most vulnerable to HIV infection.

While HIV testing and treatment are crucial in our fight against AIDS, a singular focus on testing and treatment is inadequate and narrows an already sparse continuum of prevention strategies. We need a comprehensive national HIV prevention plan in the U.S. At its core, such a plan would, one, work to eliminate disparities in health access and stigma associated with HIV, drug use, and homosexuality. The personal benefits of knowing one's HIV status early are lost on those who must overcome the significant barriers to treatment and persistent stigma that keep so many away from care.

2204 Two, target interventions to those most at risk to HIV 2205 exposure and keep a steady and respectful focus on the 2206 prevention needs of gay and bisexual men, substance users and women at sexual risk. The alternative is that we accept silence and denial about sexuality, drug use and economic and 2208 equality, permitting stigma and discrimination to compromise 2209 our provision efforts.

2207

2210

2211

2212

2213

2214

2215

2216

2217

2218

2219

2220

2221

2222

2223

2224

2225

2226

2227

2228

Three, ensure that priority be given to expanding social science and intervention research aimed at gay and bisexual men, especially men of color.

Four, make the prevention and treatment of drug and alcohol addiction central to our HIV prevention efforts. risk for HIV infection is heightened by drug and/or alcohol abuse.

Five, research and adopt community-sensitive structural interventions to compliment behavior modification programs. Structural level changes buttress the gains and behavior change made through individually geared prevention interventions by addressing the social factors that were addressed by my colleague Dr. Adimora that underline HIV vulnerability.

Six, support continued HIV treatment, vaccine and other biomedical interventions that are safe, ethical, and show promise of efficacy.

And finally, seven, balance the policy of promoting

pre-packaged evidence-based HIV prevention interventions by supporting and evaluating more localized bottom-up and collaborative HIV prevention strategies. It is critical to respect on-the-ground responses to the HIV/AIDS epidemic by protecting local control over how HIV prevention strategies are developed, researched, prioritized and implemented.

In closing, HIV prevention efforts in general have not received the funding needs--it needs to make them ubiquitous and continuous, nor have our resources been adequately targeted to reach those at highest risk for HIV infection. We need a comprehensive national HIV prevention plan in the U.S. that clear clearly calls for culturally relevant, multilevel combination approaches that are well funded, targeted and sustained over many years.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Ayala follows:]

2245 \*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 2-3 \*\*\*\*\*\*

2246 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much Dr. Ayala. 2247 Ms. Hauck. 2248 STATEMENT OF HEATHER HAUCK 2249 Ms. HAUCK. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Representative 2250 Davis, members of the committee. 2251 Thank you for inviting me to participate on this very 2252 distinguished panel. 2253 State Health Department AIDS directors appreciate that 2254 this committee is focusing on domestic HIV prevention activities, especially in light of the CDC's release of new 2255 2256 HIV incidence estimates and the alarming rates of infection 2257 among African Americans and gay and bisexual men of all races 2258 and ethnicities.

2259	RPTS JURA
2260	DCMN ROSEN
2261	[12:10 p.m.]
2262	I will focus today on describing State Health Department
2263	HIV prevention portfolios, including the central importance
2264	of HIV/AIDS surveillance. I will also share key
2265	recommendations from State AIDS directors for an HIV
2266	prevention response to end the epidemic in our Nation.
2267	State Health Department HIV directors are responsible
2268	for implementing comprehensive HIV prevention care and
2269	treatment strategies in our States. We have stewards of more
2270	than half of CDC's \$692 million budget for domestic HIV
2271	prevention surveillance programs, as well as significant
2272	State resources.
2273	All States implement CDC's required HIV prevention
2274	program components, such as HIV counseling, testing, and
2275	referral, partner services, health education risk reduction,
2276	community planning, program evaluation. Over the past 6
2277	years, however, CDC's funding to State and local health
2278	departments has decreased by \$30 million. For many States,
2279	especially medium and low prevalence States, this decline in
2280	Federal funding has resulted in significant reductions in
2281	core components of HIV prevention services. At the same
2282	time, there has also been an increased directive from CDC to
2283	focus resources on HIV testing. When faced with such

directives and funding reductions, States are forced to eliminate effective interventions that are needed to prevent HIV transmission in our regions or among our populations.

HIV prevention efforts must be aligned to meet the needs of those who bear the greatest HIV/AIDS burden in the U.S. As the recent CDC HIV incidence estimates clearly illustrate, African Americans, men and women, and gay and bisexual men of all races and ethnicities are significantly impacted by HIV. State and local health department HIV programs work to eliminate health disparities based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, and class.

In Maryland, our data show that HIV largely disproportionately impacts African Americans, regardless of transmission risk category, and therefore we prioritize the reduction of health disparities among racial and ethnic communities as a cross-cutting theme for all of our HIV initiatives.

A central activity of State HIV prevention programs is measuring and describing the epidemic through HIV surveillance activities. These activities are essential to understanding our local HIV epidemics so that we can then target HIV prevention activities appropriately. These data also determine the allocation and distribution of resources for HIV care and treatment via the Ryan White Program.

The CDC has been unable to adequately sustain funding

for core surveillance or for projects such as the incidence surveillance projects which led to the new estimates released in August. For example, Maryland's total budget for HIV/AIDS surveillance was reduced by 40 percent in the last year, and the State is no longer funded for incidence surveillance.

The loss of surveillance funds in the States jeopardizes our ability to know that the populations most impacted by the HIV epidemic, in Maryland, heterosexuals ages 30 through 49, disproportionately African American and living in the Baltimore metro area, Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties. If we can't describe our epidemics, we can't plan effective HIV prevention strategies and interventions appropriate for our local communities. The CDC needs additional funding to restore and expand incidence surveillance and to shore up core surveillance across all jurisdictions.

AIDS directors articulated our vision for America's prevention response in a new blueprint for the Nation, Ending the Epidemic Through the Power of Prevention, and copies have been made available to the committee.

Three key elements are required to successfully reduce the number of new HIV infections. One, adequately fund CDC's HIV prevention and surveillance program at the level of at least \$1.3 billion annually. Two, significantly invest in interventions that work to prevent infection, including research to develop new population specific interventions,

access to sterile injection equipment, enhanced program in
correctional settings, and establish a comprehensive
sexuality education as the standard. Three, meaningfully
invest in programs that support HIV prevention, including STD
treatment, hepatitis vaccinations, substance abuse prevention
and treatment, mental health services, housing, and expanded
research for biomedical intervention.

State and local health departments know that HIV prevention works, and we know that health department, health care providers, businesses, faith leaders, community based organizations, and persons living with HIV and AIDS must all be equipped with adequate tools and resources to help prevent new infections.

Thank you again for holding this important hearing and for your thoughtful consideration of our recommendations to increase access to HIV prevention interventions provided by State and local health departments. I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of Ms. Hauck follows:]

2354 \*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 3-1 \*\*\*\*\*\*

2355 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Oldham.

## 2356 STATEMENT OF FRANK OLDHAM

Mr. OLDHAM. Chairman Waxman and the entire Oversight Committee, people living with HIV/AIDS thank you for your demonstrated leadership and an opportunity to speak with you about the state of HIV prevention in the United States of America.

As a trusted and representative voice of more than 1 million people living with HIV/AIDS in America, I say with great confidence that we know our status, and that has enabled us to save lives.

HIV-related stigma and homophobia, homo-hatred continue to result in disproportionate HIV incidence among gay and bisexual men, black and Hispanic men and women, and individuals challenged by poverty, incarceration, and mental illness. As a black gay man, a person living with AIDS, and as a proud American, I ask, is this acceptable in our America?

HIV prevention can only succeed through access to evidence-based interventions, accurate information and education, protected and voluntary HIV testing and screening services, effective use of care--HIV care and treatment as

prevention, reduced stigma, and increased support for zero status disclosure, and by addressing structural, systemic, and economic barriers that continue to perpetuate HIV vulnerability among the most marginalized groups of Americans.

This is the basis of support for our communities' call for a national AIDS strategy that is coordinated, evidence based, outcome driven, and inclusive of people living with HIV/AIDS.

We have heard testimony from the Centers for Disease

Control that annual HIV incidents has been as much as 40

percent higher than the past 15 years. Prevention efforts

have been flat-funded in our country for more than two

decades, and the minority AIDS initiative has not been funded

adequately to address the real HIV needs in communities of

color.

As we increase resources for minority AIDS initiatives, we must be sure to hold organizations that receive MAI funds accountable. We must scale up HIV prevention in America to an annual investment of \$1.3 billion. This investment will prove to those at increased risk for HIV that we care about their lives.

We hope that this will be a priority for the next administration. In the meantime, we urge an initial investment of \$200 million for fiscal year 2009. The AIDS

2402 communities consent to this request.

Eight years of abstinence only until marriage programs has had dire human consequences. HIV risk reduction strategies such as comprehensive sex education and syringe exchange programs have been proven to reduce HIV infections; yet, these interventions have not received the requisite level of Federal funding. It is imperative that we make decisions based in science and don't sacrifice lives and waste already constrained resources on programs that have been proven to be ineffective.

The vast majority of individuals aware of their status are making decisions about their health and behavior that are not contributing to the spread of HIV. And I repeat, that are not contributing to the spread of HIV. Diagnosis, care, and treatment is effective HIV prevention, and our lives depend on it. This is all the more reason why we must ramp up our efforts to make sure people are aware of their HIV status.

Sixteen years ago, the National Association of People With AIDS launched National HIV Testing Day, because we believe that taking an HIV test makes it possible for people to protect themselves and their loved ones. NAPWA supports increased in targeted testing at-risk populations, routine opt out screening for HIV in medical settings, and strongly believes there is an obligation to link people who test

positive to high quality care, treatment, and support services. The Kaiser Foundation continues to report that 45 to 55 percent of those with HIV are still not in care. 45 to 55 percent of people who have HIV are not in care.

With the passing of the Early Treatment for HIV Act our efforts to reform health care, America must ensure access to comprehensive and coordinated care for all persons living with HIV/AIDS. Aggressive research and treatment advances have helped more people live with HIV than ever before. The benefits of this research extend beyond HIV.

CDC needs more resources to do the requisite research and work on the ground. HRSA, the National Institutes of Health, and the substance abuse and health agencies also need appropriate resources to identify new research opportunities and collectively further expand the toolkit of prevention strategies.

Perceptions of stigma directly impact an individuals' willingness to be open about their HIV status, NAPWA invites more leadership from all sectors of American society in life to increase the visibility of people living with HIV and AIDS and opposes stigmatizing or negative language toward them. This is especially true in minority communities, in gay communities, and all communities challenged with social and economic inequality. The critical issue of AIDS in America must be a priority for all of us.

2452	NAPWA supports HIV prevention activities that are
2453	culturally and gender specific. NAPWA supports community
2454	mobilization strategies for all communities
2455	disproportionately impacted by this disease, and will launch
2456	the first National Gay Men's HIV Awareness Day on September
2457	27, later this month, in Raleigh, North Carolina. They will
2458	seek to accomplish increased awareness about the needs of gay
2459	men for HIV prevention, care, and treatment, forums to
2460	strategize effective responses to the epidemic in our
2461	community. We ask your support on this historic day, Gay
2462	Men's HIV Awareness Day, September 27. Thank you.
2463	Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Oldham.
2464	[Prepared statement of Mr. Oldham follows:]

2465

\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 3-2 \*\*\*\*\*\*

2466 Chairman WAXMAN. I thank all of you for your testimony. 2467 Dr. Holtgrave, you prepared for us your idea of what a 2468 budget should be for HIV prevention, and it seems like what 2469 you've suggested is pretty much in the same ball park as what 2470 CDC said to us was their best professional judgment. Would 2471 you say that is an accurate statement? 2472 Mr. HOLTGRAVE. I would say so. I would say there are 2473 more points of agreement probably than disagreements. 2474 think that the central message probably from both is that we 2475 need to substantially scale up our investment in HIV 2476 prevention. And, also, that it is achievable to think about reducing transmission rates and incidence by 50 percent in 2477 2478 the U.S., and that it will take some years to do so. 2479 I think some of the difference in terms of the \$1.3 2480 billion versus, say, the \$1.7 billion or so that CDC called 2481 for is that they have some research funding, some activities 2482 on STD, TB, and hepatitis, which are very important, but that 2483 allows for some of the difference. And also, I think we 2484 could even be a little bit more aggressive and achieve the 50

Chairman WAXMAN. But both you and CDC suggest that we could be preventing many more HIV infections than we are doing now, as well as increasing the proportion of people who

percent reduction a bit sooner than CDC has estimated. But,

again, I think there is much more to agree than disagree

between the two estimates.

2485

2486

2487

2488

2489

2490

2491 know their HIV status, which of course goes together.

Do you think that the two estimates reflect a general consensus among HIV experts that better outcomes are within reach, even based on current knowledge?

Mr. HOLTGRAVE. I believe so. I think there is a general consensus scientifically that we have an outstanding array of tools, some of which that Dr. Fauci mentioned earlier, that are available to us now. And we need to make sure that we are using those tools. We must develop vaccines, we must develop microbicides. But we need to use immediately what we have available at our disposal.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you.

Dr. Adimora, I thought your presentation was very interesting. You presented a perspective that I hadn't heard before within the African American community. One of the aspects of the African American community, especially those who have HIV and AIDS, is that they live--many of them, if not most of them, live in poverty. How does poverty contribute to HIV risk for African Americans?

Dr. ADIMORA. There are a variety of pathways between poverty and HIV and population HIV transmission. In fact, I would consider this to be--not consider the culprits to be not only poverty, but also racial discrimination.

Among the pathways that I mentioned were segregation.

And I mentioned some of the ways by which it works in terms

2516 of structuring people's social and sexual networks. 2517 Particularly alarming is the way in which it can structure 2518 the sexual networks of youth. Another issue concerning 2519 poverty is homelessness. Homeless people are particularly at 2520 risk for HIV. I mentioned just a few of the potential 2521 structural interventions that could be implemented, but I think that attention to homelessness and improved housing is 2522 certainly major consideration, and that relates certainly to 2523 2524 poverty. 2525 Another issue is incarceration, given the 2526 disproportionate incarceration of black men. And I think 2527 that it is important, in thinking about incarceration, there 2528 is sometimes a tendency to start talking about mandatory 2529 testing in prison. Certainly everyone should have available 2530 to them a means for learning their HIV diagnoses and for 2531 appropriate treatment; but in addition, I think that 2532 incarceration is actually a major symbol of racial 2533 discrimination and oppression in this country, and there 2534 needs to be -- significant attention needs to be paid to

Chairman WAXMAN. You mentioned incarceration in your original presentation to us. And you said, not only are

the other issue is that it is clearly having an impact on the

having--well, certainly it is wrong in the first place.

because of the myriad of consequences that it is

health of people, particularly black people.

2535

2536

2537

2538

2539

2540

people getting HIV when they are incarcerated, but that there is a social disruption that imprisonment causes. I thought that was an interesting point. Do you see bias, racial bias as well as discrimination among gay and bisexual men in the black community as factors that are important for us to take note of?

Dr. ADIMORA. Unquestionably. There are pathways between racial discrimination and HIV infection. This is beyond a matter of simply social justice because that is a good thing. The absence of social justice is a major root cause of many of the racial disparities in health that we are seeing in the United States, and specifically of HIV infection.

Chairman WAXMAN. Dr. Ayala, do you have recommendations on how programs should take into account the specific needs of gay and bisexual men of color?

Mr. AYALA. As I said in my testimony, very, very few of the recommended prevention interventions are specifically designed or geared to men of color, gay men of color.

I think we have to do two things. One, we have to invest in a greater research portfolio that build with HIV prevention interventions that are specifically geared to gay, gay men of color. And the second thing is that we should take what we have available and tailor them for use in the communities, both for the target population in question, but

also with consideration to the needs of providers who have to ultimately implement the interventions.

Chairman WAXMAN. Ms. Hauck, at the State level, you stated surveillance measuring and monitoring the HIV/AIDS epidemic is crucial to HIV prevention efforts. The surveillance data not only helps you understand the epidemic but appropriately targeting resources. And I understand that Maryland was among eight States that actually lost funding, and you mentioned this in your opening statement, to conduct the kind of new incidence measurements in which the CDC based its recent estimates.

What has been the impact of this cut on Maryland and other States?

Ms. HAUCK. Thank you for the question. What happened at the State level was that our surveillance activities had been integrated. So we certainly received funding for core surveillance, which is really the basics of HIV surveillance and AIDS surveillance. And then we received these--funding for these projects. And we had integrated all of the activities, so that we were really gathering information in a holistic way about our epidemic.

When you start to peel off special projects that have been integrated into your core surveillance activities, you are no longer able to fully fund the staff that are gathering the information, you are not able to do the data collection

that we need to the level that we need the data in order to accurately describe our epidemic. So we may be missing some important components, like risk transmission categories, like race, like ethnicity, as well as potentially missing cases, because it is a rather intensive process to gather this information through our surveillance activities. So I think over time, what you will see is that States aren't able to sustain even our core surveillance activities, which again allow us to describe our epidemics, and, therefore, use that funding to allocate, distribute, and plan

prevention as well as care and treatment services in our

jurisdictions.

Chairman WAXMAN. CDC presented to us their professional judgment of what the budget should look like; and they would request more funding to strengthen behavioral and clinical surveillance activities in the States. Do you think that they have adequately funded that aspect, in their professional judgment, budget?

Ms. HAUCK. The National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors certainly states that at least an investment of \$35 million in additional funding for surveillance is needed to both restore the cuts in surveillance that we've seen over time and to really bring all the jurisdictions up to standard operating budgets.

Chairman WAXMAN. Dr. Fenton in the first panel

testified about the importance of integrating HIV services with services for other sexually transmitted diseases. I want to ask you about that at the State level.

Since 2000, the rate of syphilis in the U.S. has increased by 76 percent. As you know, this epidemic is primarily concentrated in the southeastern region of the U.S. among heterosexual African Americans and men who have sex with men. What will the States need to do to eliminate syphilis in these impacted populations? And, should those efforts be coordinated with HIV prevention efforts?

Ms. HAUCK. Thank you for asking the question, Mr. Chairman. I'll answer the first part first.

Yes, the CDC's budget for STD prevention has suffered many of the same declines that the HIV prevention budget has suffered over the years. Maryland is a southern State as well, and has certainly seen a significant syphilis epidemic, especially in Baltimore City and Prince Georges County, among African Americans, particularly men who have sex with men, and heterosexuals. And yet our funding has not kept pace with our need to address the syphilis epidemic in our State and certainly the majority of States that have had a syphilis epidemic. So I would say that the increase in resources is also needed. And we do integrate and do need to continue to integrate STD prevention and HIV prevention at the State level and at the local level.

Many of the clients who come to seek services certainly need to be given similar messages, similar education, similar screening, and need to receive that in a holistic manner when they walk in the door of a clinic or an emergency room or a community-based organization, and we need the resources to enable the clients to receive those services at the time when they see them. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you. We have infection rates continuing to rise among men who have sex with men, and in the meantime, discrimination and marginalization of men who have sex with men remains widespread.

Mr. Oldham, how does discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation affect gay and bisexual men who are living with HIV? And have any national campaigns in the U.S. HIV prevention directly addressed this kind of discrimination?

Mr. OLDHAM. There have been campaigns from community-based organizations, such as Gay Men's Health Crisis, the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center in Los Angeles, and AIDS-Positive Los Angeles. However, there has not been the governmental campaigns. Like, for example, we have National Black AIDS Awareness Day, Chairman Waxman, we have National Hispanic AIDS Awareness Day and a number--there are 12 of them.

Even though the new CDC numbers indicate that gay men of all ethnic backgrounds make up the bulk of the epidemic and

the loss of life in the epidemic, we do not even have a Gay Men's HIV/AIDS Awareness Day, which is why NAPWA is launching this on the 27th, to make sure that gay men are aware and are involved in this epidemic and not complacent about it themselves, and the rest of society deals with the issues of homophobia and homo-hatred, as barriers to HIV prevention and care services for gay men.

Chairman WAXMAN. I want to thank all of you on this panel for your presentation and your willingness to answer questions. We may have members submitting to you additional questions, which you may respond to in writing for the record, because I know many members had a lot of things that they wanted to pursue but there are so many competing things going on that not everybody can be here.

I think the purpose of this hearing has been to sound an alarm, because we have an increasing HIV epidemic in the United States. It is different than where we were in the early days, but it is very much with us. And unless we set a high priority to do the things we know that will work and to try to research and develop new ways of approaching the epidemic, we are going to fall further and further behind.

We know that when budgets are sent to us, they are budgets that are developed ultimately by the budget people in the administration. They may get the input from the agencies and the experts, but they are trying to figure out their

overall priorities. And the overall priority for this
administration has not been to deal with the HIV/AIDS
epidemic in the way that we need to, to stop and prevent the
transmission of this disease.

That is why I was pleased to have CDC and NIH present to

That is why I was pleased to have CDC and NIH present to us what their best professional judgment would be. It is always different when you ask that than what they have to say to us when they are making presentations before Congress, because then their presentations have to be consistent with the views of the administration in which they serve.

Well, I think that presentation to us and your expanded discussion of the groups that are primarily affected and all the complications that we need to be aware of is going to help us face this epidemic and, I hope, to defeat it. Thank you very much for your presentation.

That concludes the presentations at this hearing, and we stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:33 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

PAGE

1

SPEAKER	LISTING
******	<u> </u>

	ADIMORA.	90	109	111				
	AYALA.	94	111					:
	DAVIS OF VI	RGI <b>NIA.</b>	33	34	35	36	37	38
	FAUCI.	21	39	43	45	46	47	48
		50	57	58	69	70	74	
	FENTON.	20	29	30	41	42	53	54
		63	64	65	66	74		
	GERBERDING.	13	27	28	29	30	31	32
		33	34	35	36	37	38	40
		42	43	44	45	46	48	50
		51	52	53	54	55	56	57
		60 .	68	73	74	75	77	78
		79	80					
	HAUCK.	98	112	113	114			
	HOLTGRAVE.	85	108	109				
	INSEL.	27						
	MCCOLLUM.	48	49	59	61			
	OLDHAM.	103	115					
	RPTS DEAN	52						
	RPTS JURA	1	99					
	SARBANES.	67	70					
	SHAYS.	44	45	46	47	48	49	51
ŀ								

	52						
SPEIER.	53	54	55	56	57	58	
TIERNEY.	38	40	41	42	43	44	
TURNER.	7						
WATERS.	71	73	74	75	76		
WATSON.	63	64	65	66	67		
WAXMAN.	3	7	9	10	12	19	20
	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
	33	38	44	46	49	50	51
	52	53	59	62	63	67	71
	76	77	78	79	80	81	82
	84	90	94	98	102	103	107
	108	109	110	111	112	113	115
	116						

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

STATEMENTS OF JULIE GERBERDING, DIRECTOR, CENTERS FOR DISEASE
CONTROL AND PREVENTION, ACCOMPANIED BY KEVIN FENTON,
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CENTER FOR HIV/AIDS, VIRAL HEPATITIS, STD
AND TB PREVENTION, CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND
PREVENTION; AND ANTHONY S. FAUCI, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL
INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASE, NATIONAL
INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS INSEL, DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR MENTAL HEALTH, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF
HEALTH

PAGE 13

STATEMENT OF JULIE GERBERDING

PAGE 13

STATEMENT OF ANTHONY S. FAUCI

PAGE 21

STATEMENTS OF DAVID HOLTGRAVE, Ph.D., PROFESSOR AND CHAIR,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, BEHAVIOR & SOCIETY, JOHNS HOPKINS
BLOOMBERG SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH; ADAORA A. ADIMORA, M.D.,
DIVISION OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE; GEORGE AYALA, Psy.D., RESEARCH HEALTH
ANALYST, RTI INTERNATIONAL AND AIDS PROJECT LOS ANGELES;
HEATHER HAUCK, DIRECTOR, AIDS ADMINISTRATION, MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND MENTAL HYGIENE; FRANK OLDHAM, JR.,

PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PEOPLE WITH AIDS	
PAGE	82
STATEMENT OF DAVID R. HOLTGRAVE, Ph.D.	
PAGE	85
STATEMENT OF ADAORA A ADIMORA, M.D.	
PAGE	90
STATEMENT OF GEORGE AYALA, Psy.D.	
PAGE	94
STATEMENT OF HEATHER HAUCK	
PAGE	98
STATEMENT OF FRANK OLDHAM	
PAGE	103

HGO260.000

PAGE

5

## INDEX OF INSERTS \* \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1-1 \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 6 \*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 9 \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1-2 \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 19 \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1-3 \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 26 \*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 50 \*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 62 \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 2-1 \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 89 \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 2-2 \*\*\*\*\*\* 93 PAGE \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 2-3 \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 97 \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 3-1 \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 102 \*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 3-2 \*\*\*\*\*\* PAGE 107

\*