

**FAMILY PLANNING ANNUAL REPORT:  
2004 SUMMARY**

**PART 1**

**Submitted to**

**The Office of Population Affairs,  
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services**

**Prepared by**

**The Alan Guttmacher Institute**

**July 2005**

### **Acknowledgments**

This report was written by Jennifer J. Frost, senior research associate, and Lori Frohwirth, research associate, The Alan Guttmacher Institute. Data coordination and review were managed by Ms. Frohwirth, and assistance in data tabulation and verification was provided by Claire Evans and Mia Zolna. The authors would like to thank Evelyn Glass, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), for help with grantee reports and Brad Hendrick, DHHS, for help with the electronic FPAR files. Support for this report was provided by DHHS, under grant FPR000072. The conclusions and opinions expressed in this article do not necessarily represent the views of DHHS.

# FAMILY PLANNING ANNUAL REPORT: 2004 SUMMARY

## Table of Contents

### PART 1.

#### DESCRIPTIVE ANALYTICAL REPORT

<b>I.</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Demographic Characteristics of Family Planning Users .....</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>A. Total Users .....</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>B. Total Users by Age .....</b>	<b>10</b>
	Table 1-FP: Users by Age and Sex-National/Regional Summary	
	<b>C. Total Users by Race .....</b>	<b>14</b>
	Table 1-FP: Users by Race and Sex-National/Regional Summary	
	<b>D. Total Users by Ethnicity .....</b>	<b>18</b>
	Table 1A-FP: Users by Ethnicity and Sex-National/Regional Summary	
	<b>E. Total Users by Income/Poverty Status .....</b>	<b>22</b>
	Table 2-FP: Users by Income/Poverty Status-National/Regional Summary	
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Contraceptive Method Use.....</b>	<b>26</b>
	Table 3-FP: Female Users by Contraceptive Method-National/Regional Summary	
<b>V.</b>	<b>Selected Services and Staff.....</b>	<b>31</b>
	<b>A. Selected Services.....</b>	<b>31</b>
	Table 4-FP: Selected Services Delivered-National/Regional Summary	
	<b>B. Staffing Profiles .....</b>	<b>35</b>
	Table 5-FP: Mid-level and Physician Staffing Profile-National/Regional Summary	
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Funding Sources.....</b>	<b>39</b>
	Table 6-FP Revenue Report-National/Regional Summary	
<b>Appendix A.</b>	<b>Trend Tables and Charts .....</b>	<b>45</b>
	<b>Table A-1:</b> Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by region, 1995 to 2004	
	<b>Table A-2:</b> Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by age, 1995 to 2004, National totals	
	<b>Table A-3:</b> Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by race, 1995 to 2004, National totals	
	<b>Table A-4:</b> Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by ethnicity, 1995 to 2004, National totals	
	<b>Table A-5:</b> Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by poverty level, 1995 to 2004, National totals	

**Appendix A. Trend Tables (continued)**

**Table A-6:** Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by Method of Contraception, 1995 to 2004, National totals

**Table A-7:** Dollars and percentage distribution of Revenue by source of funding, 1995 to 2004, National totals

**Chart A-1:** Numbers of clients served in Title X funded sites by region

**Chart A-2:** Numbers of clients served in Title X funded sites by age

**Chart A-3:** Distribution of contraceptive users by method used among Title X clients

**Chart A-4:** Title X clinic revenues by source of funding

**Appendix B. State Tables.....61**

Table B-1: Female Users by Age

Table B-2: Total Users by Poverty Status

**Appendix C. Methodological Notes .....71**

**PART 2.**

**DETAILED TABLES AND DATA FORMS**

- I. Detailed National Tables - Numbers and Percentages**
- II. Detailed Regional Tables - Numbers and Percentages**
- III. Copies of Data Forms Used by Grantees**

# DESCRIPTIVE ANALYTICAL REPORT

## I. INTRODUCTION

All grantees receiving funding under the federal Title X program are required to submit annual service data. The responsibility for collection and tabulation of annual service data from Title X grantees rests with the Office of Population Affairs (OPA), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), which is responsible for administering Title X funds. The Alan Guttmacher Institute (AGI), under a grant from DHHS, has tabulated the grantee reports and prepared this report summarizing the regional and national totals.

Part I of the summary report begins with a presentation of the methodology used in both collection and tabulation of grantee reports. Included here are the definitions developed and provided by OPA to the grantees for use in completing data requests. The body of the report presents the demographic characteristics of family planning users, contraceptive methods used, selected services and staff, and funding sources. In each section of the report, national totals and regional highlights are discussed and, in some cases, trends between 1995 and 2004 are mentioned. Tabulations by state for female users by age and for total users by poverty status are included in Appendix B. Also included in Part I of the report are general notes and comments provided by grantees to describe variations or clarifications of the data provided. (Appendix C).

Part II of this report provides detailed national and regional tables.

## II. METHODOLOGY

The forms completed by each Title X grantee include a brief grantee profile (Legal name, address, contact names and numbers, number of clinics supported by the Title X Family Planning Services grant) and seven tables requesting information about users, service use and revenue for the 2004 reporting period (calendar year 2004). (See Part 2-III for copies of these forms.)

Title X grantees are instructed to report on the scope of services or activities proposed in their approved application and supported with OPA Title X grant funds or grant-related funds. The report for 2004 was to be submitted by February 15, 2005. Grantees were strongly encouraged to submit their reports electronically using the e-Grants system. More than 90% of grantees were able to do so for the 2004 reporting period. For those grantees that submitted paper forms, OPA staff entered the totals into the electronic file, thus consolidating all reports into one electronic file. This file was initially reviewed by OPA staff and then forwarded to AGI in March 2005. Further revisions to the file were submitted to AGI as grantees provided updated information to their reports.

AGI research staff reviewed the electronic file and grantee reports for comments and obvious data problems. Those problems requiring follow-up were identified and reported to OPA in order to resolve data errors and inconsistencies.

Although the electronic template used by the eGrants system for FPAR reporting checks for internal consistency in the total number of users reported on each table, it does not check for row or column consistency. AGI staff performed these checks and uncovered numerous inconsistencies that required grantees to resubmit data. In addition, family planning users include some clients who are part of counseling and referral programs who may or may not have made a medical family planning visit and for whom method status is unknown. We believe that there are inconsistencies in how these nonmedical clients are reported on Table 3. Some may be included in the category of “method unknown,” while others may be included as part of the group, “other methods.”

After completing all editing and receiving the final, corrected, electronic data file, the reported numbers for each grantee were totaled across regions and for the nation as a whole. In addition to replicating the FPAR tables, we calculated percentage tables for Tables 1, 1a, 2, 3 and 6. The national totals for each table have been calculated in two ways: one version for all grantees (including those located in the U.S. territories) and one version that excludes territorial grantees. The overall totals (including territorial numbers) are included in this report. Tables that exclude the territories are available upon request.

Appendix A provides trend data for 1995-2004 in the numbers of clients served by region (Table A-1), age (Table (A-2), race (Table A-3), ethnicity (Table A-4), poverty level (Table A-5), contraceptive method used (Table A-6) and revenue by source of funding (Table A-7).

## **DEFINITIONS:**

The following definitions were provided by OPA to grantees for use in preparing the Family Planning Annual Report (reprinted from *Title X Grantees Family Planning Annual Report, Forms and Instructions*, See Part II for complete copy):

### **“Definitions of Encounters**

Encounter definitions are needed both to determine who is counted as a user and to report the total number of medical encounters provided by physicians and mid-level personnel.

***Family Planning Encounter.*** An encounter between a user and a medical provider or other health provider, the primary purpose of which is to provide family planning services, i.e., clinical or educational services related to contraception, infertility, or sterilization. All family planning encounters are either medical encounters or other health encounters that involve family planning services. *Only face-to-face contacts documented in a medical or health record can be counted as encounters.*

***Family Planning Encounter with a Medical Provider.*** An encounter between a medical provider and a user in which the user is provided (in association with the proposed or adopted method of contraception or treatment of infertility) one or more of the following medical services related to family planning:

- Pap smear
- Pelvic examination
- Rectal examination
- Testicular examination
- Hemoglobin or hematocrit
- Blood pressure reading
- Sexually transmitted disease (STD) testing
- Sterilization
- Infertility treatment

***Family Planning Encounter with an Other Health Provider.*** An encounter between an other health provider (i.e. non-medical health educator) and a user in which family planning education or counseling services are provided. The counseling should include a thorough discussion of the following:

- Reproductive anatomy and physiology
- Infertility, as appropriate
- STD's
- The variety of family planning methods available, including abstinence and natural family planning
- The uses, health risks, and benefits associated with each family planning method
- Detailed instruction regarding the adopted method
- The need to return for evaluation on a regularly scheduled basis and as potential problems are recognized

Education or counseling, which may occur in a group setting or on an individual basis, must be documented in the individual patient records.

Laboratory tests, in and of themselves, do not constitute encounters of any type. If laboratory testing, e.g., pregnancy test, urinalysis, blood test, STD test, is performed and there is no other face-to-face contact between a provider and a user, then an encounter is not counted. However, if these tests are accompanied by family planning counseling or education, an individual will have had *an other health provider encounter* by virtue of such counseling. Because this other health provider encounter involved family planning counseling, the encounter is considered a family planning other health provider encounter.

Pap smears and associated pelvic examinations in and of themselves, constitute a medical encounter, but not a *family planning medical encounter*. However, if a Pap smear and pelvic examination are accompanied by other medical services involving family planning (related to contraception, infertility, or sterilization) an individual is considered to have had a *family planning medical encounter*.

### **Definition of Users**

***Family Planning User.*** An individual who received **one or more family planning encounters** during the reporting period, i.e., encounters with a medical and/or other health provider in which family planning services were provided. An individual may be counted as a family planning user **only once** during a reporting period. Grantees should follow the instructions for specific report tables to determine applicable users and activities.”



### III. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILY PLANNING USERS

#### A. TOTAL USERS

Title X grantees reported serving 5,067,785 family planning users in 2004 at 4,568 clinic sites. This represents about 1% more clients served in 2004 than were served in 2003, an increase of over 55,000 users, and the highest client level ever reported. Of these, 4,823,404 or 95%, were women and 244,381, or 5%, were men. The small increase in overall users between 2003 and 2004, suggests a continuing trend of leveling off in client numbers, following the more substantial gain experienced between 2000-2001 (7%). About one-third of the overall increase in users can be attributed to more male clients served (over 17,000 more males reported). The number of male clients served between 2003 and 2004 rose 8%, and can be compared to increases of 12% between 2002 and 2003, 2% between 2002 and 2001, 17% between 2000 and 2001 and 34% between 1999 and 2000. Among regions, the percentage of males served ranged from 2% to 9%, with higher percentages reported in the Northeast, West and Northwest (Regions I, IX and X).

Region*	Number of Users			% Change		Clinics	
	2002	2003	2004	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004	Users per clinic
<b>NATIONAL TOTAL</b>	<b>4,974,874</b>	<b>5,012,048</b>	<b>5,067,785</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>4,568</b>	<b>1,109</b>
<b>REGION I</b>	220,094	212,422	207,450	-3.5%	-2.3%	193	1,075
<b>REGION II</b>	449,854	460,798	468,635	2.4%	1.7%	312	1,502
<b>REGION III</b>	551,759	562,182	571,883	1.9%	1.7%	647	884
<b>REGION IV</b>	1,077,707	1,065,310	1,052,584	-1.2%	-1.2%	1,170	900
<b>REGION V</b>	617,372	607,756	610,058	-1.6%	0.4%	427	1,429
<b>REGION VI</b>	532,268	539,704	547,802	1.4%	1.5%	615	891
<b>REGION VII</b>	260,651	260,034	257,833	-0.2%	-0.8%	285	905
<b>REGION VIII</b>	143,595	147,730	154,924	2.9%	4.9%	192	807
<b>REGION IX</b>	870,070	878,088	920,543	0.9%	4.8%	483	1,906
<b>REGION X</b>	251,504	278,024	276,073	10.5%	-0.7%	244	1,131

Six regions experienced growth in the number of total family planning users between 2003 and 2004, with most experiencing small increases of under 2%. Regions VIII and IX experienced increases in client numbers of nearly 5%. Four regions (I, IV, VII and X) experienced small declines in client numbers, ranging from 0.8% to 2.3%. Overall, the number of clinics receiving Title X funds rose slightly from 4,531 in 2003 to 4,568 in 2004,

\* The 10 U.S. regions are constituted as follows: **Region I** – Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont; **Region II** – New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; **Region III** – Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia; **Region IV** – Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee; **Region V** – Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin; **Region VI** – Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas; **Region VII** – Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska; **Region VIII** – Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming; **Region IX** – Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, American Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Mariana Islands and Palau; **Region X** – Alaska, Idaho, Oregon and Washington.

still somewhat below the 2002 clinic count of 4,645. Among three regions (I, II, VII), clinic numbers fluctuated only slightly over the past five years. Among two regions (VIII and X), clinic numbers rose substantially between 1999 and 2001/2002, but have now leveled off. Among three regions that experienced large declines in clinic numbers between 2002 and 2003 (III, IV and V), clinic numbers continued to drop slightly this year. In Region VI, which had experienced declining clinic counts over the past five years, the number rose by 40 clinics between 2003 and 2004. Region IX continued an upward trend started in 2002, and gained 28 clinics.

On average, 1,110 family planning users were served per Title X funded clinic site in 2004. This represents a slight increase from 2003, when the average number of users per clinic was 1,106. More than 1,900 clients were served per clinic in Region IX, compared with 807 clients per clinic in Region VIII.

**B. TOTAL USERS BY AGE (Table 1-FP)**

Sixty percent of all family planning users are either in their teens (28% are under age 20) or early 20s (32% are aged 20-24). Nearly one in four (23%) are aged 30 or older. Male users are slightly more likely than females to be teenagers (31% versus 27%) and slightly less likely to be in their 20s (44% versus 49%).

**Users by Age - National Summary**

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Women</b> %	<b>Men</b> %	<b>All Users</b> %
<b>&lt;20</b>	27	29	28
<b>20-24</b>	32	30	32
<b>25-29</b>	18	16	18
<b>30+</b>	23	26	23
<b>Total</b>	100	100	100

The age distribution of users is quite similar across regions, but there are some variations. In Regions V and VIII, users are more likely to be in their teens (31%-33%) and less likely to be aged 30+ (18%), when compared to the nation overall. In contrast, in Region IX, users are less likely to be teenagers (23%) and more likely to be aged 30 or over (28%). Users in Region I are also more likely to be 30 years or older (27%). Among male family planning users, regional variations are even more striking. Compared to the nation overall, where 29% of male users are teens, higher percentages of male teens (46%-47%) are found in Regions VI and VIII. Typically, about one in four male users are aged 30 or older (26%). This pattern differs in Regions V, VI and VIII, where only 14%-16% of male users are aged 30 or over.

The distribution of family planning users by age has remained fairly constant over time, with only minor fluctuations from year to year. The percentage of family planning users who are teens is nearly the same in 2004 as it was in 1995 (28% and 29%); while the percentage who are age 30 or over is slightly higher now than it was in 1995 (23% versus 20%).

TABLE 1-FP: USERS BY AGE, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY

AGE GROUP	SEX	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>UNDER 18</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	667,734	28,352	60,503	89,926	146,549	86,001	70,968	27,808	23,780	93,319	40,528
	%	13%	14%	13%	16%	14%	14%	13%	11%	15%	10%	15%
<b>AGES 18-19</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	716,399	29,593	66,204	80,503	144,108	100,733	71,894	36,587	26,110	118,745	41,922
	%	14%	14%	14%	14%	14%	17%	13%	14%	17%	13%	15%
<b>AGES 20-24</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	1,608,278	59,045	146,500	177,687	330,643	214,857	166,559	90,320	53,521	279,640	89,506
	%	32%	28%	31%	31%	31%	35%	30%	35%	35%	30%	32%
<b>AGES 25-29</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	898,231	33,798	84,954	94,335	192,177	100,689	99,727	44,873	24,479	175,824	47,375
	%	18%	16%	18%	16%	18%	17%	18%	17%	16%	19%	17%
<b>AGES 30-44</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	1,028,661	44,072	97,149	108,919	215,616	97,129	123,430	48,295	24,034	219,928	50,089
	%	20%	21%	21%	19%	20%	16%	23%	19%	16%	24%	18%
<b>AGE 45 AND OVER</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	148,482	12,590	13,325	20,513	23,491	10,649	15,224	9,950	3,000	33,087	6,653
	%	3%	6%	3%	4%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	4%	2%
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>		5,067,785	207,450	468,635	571,883	1,052,584	610,058	547,802	257,833	154,924	920,543	276,073
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 1-FP: USERS BY AGE AND SEX, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY

AGE GROUP	SEX	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
UNDER 18	MALE	39,275	1,990	3,368	4,638	6,657	3,267	6,481	691	2,015	8,626	1,542
	FEMALE	628,459	26,362	57,135	85,288	139,892	82,734	64,487	27,117	21,765	84,693	38,986
AGES 18-19	MALE	30,937	1,527	3,032	3,029	1,920	2,953	3,590	1,132	1,125	10,768	1,861
	FEMALE	685,462	28,066	63,172	77,474	142,188	97,780	68,304	35,455	24,985	107,977	40,061
AGES 20-24	MALE	73,333	3,914	6,698	6,813	4,766	6,913	6,907	4,291	1,812	26,000	5,219
	FEMALE	1,534,945	55,131	139,802	170,874	325,877	207,944	159,652	86,029	51,709	253,640	84,287
AGES 25-29	MALE	39,201	2,190	3,172	3,479	3,906	3,097	2,008	2,204	792	15,266	3,087
	FEMALE	859,030	31,608	81,782	90,856	188,271	97,592	97,719	42,669	23,687	160,558	44,288
AGES 30-44	MALE	45,675	2,637	2,794	4,982	5,288	2,605	2,428	1,923	767	18,611	3,640
	FEMALE	982,986	41,435	94,355	103,937	210,328	94,524	121,002	46,372	23,267	201,317	46,449
AGE 45 AND OVER	MALE	15,960	1,123	705	2,347	2,151	595	685	533	195	6,542	1,084
	FEMALE	132,522	11,467	12,620	18,166	21,340	10,054	14,539	9,417	2,805	26,545	5,569
TOTALS/AGE	MALE	244,381	13,381	19,769	25,288	24,688	19,430	22,099	10,774	6,706	85,813	16,433
	FEMALE	4,823,404	194,069	448,866	546,595	1,027,896	590,628	525,703	247,059	148,218	834,730	259,640
TOTAL USERS		5,067,785	207,450	468,635	571,883	1,052,584	610,058	547,802	257,833	154,924	920,543	276,073

TABLE 1-FP: USERS BY AGE AND SEX, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY - PERCENTS

AGE GROUP	SEX	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
UNDER 18	MALE	16%	15%	17%	18%	27%	17%	29%	6%	30%	10%	9%
	FEMALE	13%	14%	13%	16%	14%	14%	12%	11%	15%	10%	15%
AGES 18-19	MALE	13%	11%	15%	12%	8%	15%	16%	11%	17%	13%	11%
	FEMALE	14%	14%	14%	14%	14%	17%	13%	14%	17%	13%	15%
AGES 20-24	MALE	30%	29%	34%	27%	19%	36%	31%	40%	27%	30%	32%
	FEMALE	32%	28%	31%	31%	32%	35%	30%	35%	35%	30%	32%
AGES 25-29	MALE	16%	16%	16%	14%	16%	16%	9%	20%	12%	18%	19%
	FEMALE	18%	16%	18%	17%	18%	17%	19%	17%	16%	19%	17%
AGES 30-44	MALE	19%	20%	14%	20%	21%	13%	11%	18%	11%	22%	22%
	FEMALE	20%	21%	21%	19%	20%	16%	23%	19%	16%	24%	18%
AGE 45 AND OVER	MALE	7%	8%	4%	9%	9%	3%	3%	5%	3%	8%	7%
	FEMALE	3%	6%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%
TOTAL	MALE	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	FEMALE	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### **C. TOTAL USERS BY RACE (Table 1-FP)**

Nearly two-thirds of family planning users (64%) are white. One in five (20%) is black; one in twenty is either Asian (3%), Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (1%) or Native American (1%). However, because some grantees do not collect race information, or do not collect it for all clients, a total of 12% of users are reported as unknown race. This race profile holds true for all female users (who make up 95% of all users), but varies somewhat for male users: just over half of the men (52%) are white while over one quarter (26%) are black; 15% of male clients have no race reported.

Reflecting national differences in the geographic distribution of racial groups, the racial distribution of family planning users also varies by region<sup>†</sup>. More than eight in ten users in Regions VII and VIII are white, compared with less than six in ten in Regions II, IV and IX. More than one-third of users (37%) in Region IV are black, compared with 2 - 7% in Regions VIII, IX and X. Region IX (which includes the Pacific territories), has the highest percentage of users identifying themselves as Asian (9%) or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (5%). Race was not reported for 18% of all users in Region I, for 23% of users in Region II and for 26% of users in Region IX.

Over time there have been some fluctuations in the reported distribution of family planning users by race, which partly reflect the percentage of users for which race was unreported in each year (varying between 8% and 12% in each year). Between 1997 and 2004 the percentage of users who are white fluctuated between 67% and 62% and the percentage of users who are Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, or Native American or Alaskan rose from 3% to 5%.

---

<sup>†</sup> See footnote, page 9, for constitution of regions by state.

TABLE 1-FP: USERS BY RACE, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY

		NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	36,050	446	1,651	1,151	2,262	2,507	6,924	1,478	2,352	12,983	4,296
	%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%
<b>ASIAN</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	136,813	6,221	9,481	8,482	9,405	6,233	3,207	3,172	1,430	79,408	9,774
	%	3%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	9%	4%
<b>BLACK (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	1,027,880	23,040	103,890	162,990	388,780	118,018	119,853	32,438	3,290	65,513	10,068
	%	20%	11%	22%	29%	37%	19%	22%	13%	2%	7%	4%
<b>NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC IS.</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	58,881	116	885	516	2,149	2,551	873	1,838	244	47,067	2,642
	%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	5%	1%
<b>WHITE (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	3,225,150	141,097	245,215	345,685	614,579	449,978	388,650	213,591	137,100	472,411	216,844
	%	64%	68%	52%	60%	58%	74%	71%	83%	88%	51%	79%
<b>UNKNOWN OR NOT REPORTED</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	583,011	36,530	107,513	53,059	35,409	30,771	28,295	5,316	10,508	243,161	32,449
	%	12%	18%	23%	9%	3%	5%	5%	2%	7%	26%	12%
<b>TOTAL</b>		5,067,785	207,450	468,635	571,883	1,052,584	610,058	547,802	257,833	154,924	920,543	276,073
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 1-FP: USERS BY RACE AND SEX, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY

	SEX	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE</b>	<b>MALE</b>	2,121	34	68	35	15	128	305	98	191	860	387
	<b>FEMALE</b>	33,929	412	1,583	1,116	2,247	2,379	6,619	1,380	2,161	12,123	3,909
<b>ASIAN</b>	<b>MALE</b>	7,929	194	271	215	115	155	77	83	33	6,271	515
	<b>FEMALE</b>	128,884	6,027	9,210	8,267	9,290	6,078	3,130	3,089	1,397	73,137	9,259
<b>BLACK (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)</b>	<b>MALE</b>	63,280	2,109	6,175	12,412	12,055	5,679	10,442	2,359	581	10,195	1,273
	<b>FEMALE</b>	964,600	20,931	97,715	150,578	376,725	112,339	109,411	30,079	2,709	55,318	8,795
<b>NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC IS.</b>	<b>MALE</b>	7,687	14	33	8	6	90	73	105	9	7,199	150
	<b>FEMALE</b>	51,194	102	852	508	2,143	2,461	800	1,733	235	39,868	2,492
<b>WHITE (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)</b>	<b>MALE</b>	127,285	8,276	8,622	10,163	11,671	12,071	9,990	7,892	5,661	40,525	12,414
	<b>FEMALE</b>	3,097,865	132,821	236,593	335,522	602,908	437,907	378,660	205,699	131,439	431,886	204,430
<b>UNKNOWN OR NOT REPORTED</b>	<b>MALE</b>	36,079	2,754	4,600	2,455	826	1,307	1,212	237	231	20,763	1,694
	<b>FEMALE</b>	546,932	33,776	102,913	50,604	34,583	29,464	27,083	5,079	10,277	222,398	30,755
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>MALE</b>	244,381	13,381	19,769	25,288	24,688	19,430	22,099	10,774	6,706	85,813	16,433
	<b>FEMALE</b>	4,823,404	194,069	448,866	546,595	1,027,896	590,628	525,703	247,059	148,218	834,730	259,640
<b>TOTAL</b>		5,067,785	207,450	468,635	571,883	1,052,584	610,058	547,802	257,833	154,924	920,543	276,073



TABLE 1-FP: USERS BY RACE AND SEX, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY - PERCENTS

	SEX	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE	MALE	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%
	FEMALE	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%
ASIAN	MALE	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	7%	3%
	FEMALE	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	9%	4%
BLACK (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)	MALE	26%	16%	31%	49%	49%	29%	47%	22%	9%	12%	8%
	FEMALE	20%	11%	22%	28%	37%	19%	21%	12%	2%	7%	3%
NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC IS.	MALE	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	8%	1%
	FEMALE	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	5%	1%
WHITE (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)	MALE	52%	62%	44%	40%	47%	62%	45%	73%	84%	47%	76%
	FEMALE	64%	68%	53%	61%	59%	74%	72%	83%	89%	52%	79%
UNKNOWN OR NOT REPORTED	MALE	15%	21%	23%	10%	3%	7%	5%	2%	3%	24%	10%
	FEMALE	11%	17%	23%	9%	3%	5%	5%	2%	7%	27%	12%
TOTAL	MALE	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	FEMALE	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### **D. TOTAL USERS BY ETHNICITY (Table 1a-FP)**

Nationwide, 23% of all family planning users identify themselves as Hispanic or Latino. Three-quarters (75%) are classified as non-Hispanic/non-Latino and ethnicity is unknown for three percent of users, again reflecting incomplete data collection on this characteristic by some grantees.

The percentage of users who are Hispanic/Latino is higher than the national average in Region II (30%), Region VI (39%) and Region IX (45%). The lowest percentage of Hispanic/Latino users is found in Regions III and VII (9%-10%)<sup>‡</sup>.

Similar proportions of men and women (24% and 23%, respectively), identify themselves as being of Hispanic/ Latino origin. Like all users, Hispanic female users are represented in higher than average proportions in Regions II, VI and IX (30%, 39% and 46%, respectively). In addition, the percentage of male users who report being Hispanic is also highest in Regions II (27 %), VI (31%) and IX (37%).

Compared to the age distribution of all female users, Hispanic women are less likely to be teenagers (17% versus 27%) and more likely to be age 30 and over (31% versus 23%). (See the detailed tables in Part II for age by ethnicity distributions of users.)

Although the percentage of family planning users reporting Hispanic or Latino ethnicity has increased, from 15% in 1995 to 23% in 2004, this change has partly occurred because of better reporting and reflects both a reduction in the percentage of users with unknown ethnicity (from 8% to 3%) and an increase in the percentage of users who are of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity.

---

<sup>‡</sup> See footnote, page 9, for constitution of regions by state.

TABLE 1A-FP: USERS BY ETHNICITY, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY

TOTAL	SEX	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>HISPANIC/ LATINO (ALL RACES)</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	1,159,637	36,005	140,596	51,892	135,365	74,160	212,108	25,529	23,903	411,972	48,107
	<b>%</b>	23%	17%	30%	9%	13%	12%	39%	10%	15%	45%	17%
<b>NON- HISPANIC/LATINO (ALL RACES)</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	3,780,396	171,382	308,622	491,751	909,004	525,302	315,074	227,071	124,430	479,959	227,801
	<b>%</b>	75%	83%	66%	86%	86%	86%	58%	88%	80%	52%	83%
<b>UNKNOWN/ NOT REPORTED</b>	<b>ALL USERS</b>	127,752	63	19,417	28,240	8,215	10,596	20,620	5,233	6,591	28,612	165
	<b>%</b>	3%	0%	4%	5%	1%	2%	4%	2%	4%	3%	0%
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>		5,067,785	207,450	468,635	571,883	1,052,584	610,058	547,802	257,833	154,924	920,543	276,073
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TOTAL	SEX	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
HISPANIC/ LATINO (ALL RACES)	MALE	57,965	2,619	5,414	1,880	3,727	1,714	6,799	1,067	765	31,978	2,002
	FEMALE	1,101,672	33,386	135,182	50,012	131,638	72,446	205,309	24,462	23,138	379,994	46,105
NON- HISPANIC/LATINO (ALL RACES)	MALE	170,647	10,762	13,445	22,541	20,775	17,210	6,901	9,466	4,762	50,371	14,414
	FEMALE	3,609,749	160,620	295,177	469,210	888,229	508,092	308,173	217,605	119,668	429,588	213,387
UNKNOWN/ NOT REPORTED	MALE	15,769	0	910	867	186	506	8,399	241	1,179	3,464	17
	FEMALE	111,983	63	18,507	27,373	8,029	10,090	12,221	4,992	5,412	25,148	148
TOTAL	MALE	244,381	13,381	19,769	25,288	24,688	19,430	22,099	10,774	6,706	85,813	16,433
	FEMALE	4,823,404	194,069	448,866	546,595	1,027,896	590,628	525,703	247,059	148,218	834,730	259,640

TOTAL AS PERCENT OF EACH SEX	SEX	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
HISPANIC/ LATINO (ALL RACES)	MALE	24%	20%	27%	7%	15%	9%	31%	10%	11%	37%	12%
	FEMALE	23%	17%	30%	9%	13%	12%	39%	10%	16%	46%	18%
NON-HISPANIC/LATINO (ALL RACES)	MALE	70%	80%	68%	89%	84%	89%	31%	88%	71%	59%	88%
	FEMALE	75%	83%	66%	86%	86%	86%	59%	88%	81%	51%	82%
UNKNOWN/ NOT REPORTED	MALE	6%	0%	5%	3%	1%	3%	38%	2%	18%	4%	0%
	FEMALE	2%	0%	4%	5%	1%	2%	2%	2%	4%	3%	0%
TOTAL	MALE	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	FEMALE	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### **E. TOTAL USERS BY INCOME/POVERTY STATUS (Table 2-FP)**

Over two-thirds (68 %) of Title X family planning users have incomes at or below the poverty level. Another seventeen percent of users have family incomes that are between 101% and 150% of the poverty level. Six percent of users have incomes that are 151% to 200% of poverty, while only seven percent of users have incomes that are more than 200% of poverty. The income status for 2% of family planning users is unknown.

A higher percentage of family planning users with incomes at or below the poverty level is found in Regions IV (76 %), VI (73%) and IX (73%)<sup>§</sup>.

In three regions, the percentage of users at or below the poverty level is nearly equal to the national average of 68%, ranging from 64% in Regions VII to 68% in Region V. In two regions, only about half or fewer users are at or below the federal poverty level (Region VII at 53% and Region I at 49 %). However, the low percentage of users below poverty in Region I is largely due to the high percentage with unknown income (6%), which, in turn, is the result of one grantee reporting over 40% of all family planning users with unknown income.

The proportion of users at or below 200% of poverty ranges from 81% in Region VII to 94% in Regions II, IV and IX.

Over time there have been some small fluctuations in the distribution of family planning users by income/poverty status, with a slightly higher percentage reporting being at or below the federal poverty level in 2004 (68%) as compared to 2002 (65%). However, this does not represent a trend, since the proportion of users below the poverty level was similar or higher in earlier years (e.g., in 1995, it was 68%).

---

<sup>§</sup> See footnote, page 9, for constitution of regions by state.

## INSTRUCTIONS

The following instructions were provided to grantees for completion of Tables 1, 1a and 2 of the Family Planning Annual Report:

**Table 1: “Family Planning Program Demographic Profile” and Table 1a: “Users by Hispanic/Latino Origin.”** These tables detail total user numbers by the major demographic characteristics of age, gender, and race or ethnicity. Grantees were instructed that each table include all individuals receiving at least one face-to-face family planning encounter during the reporting period and that they should refer to the General Instructions for guidance on determining applicable encounters.

For *Age Group*, grantees were instructed to use the individual’s age as of June 30 within the relevant reporting period. For *Race and Ethnicity*, they were advised that aggregate categories used in these tables have been changed to conform to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Statistical Directive 15 reporting requirements and are used by compilers of such major national data sets as the National Survey of Family Growth. If grantees track this information using more detailed subcategories for clinical and/or local planning purposes, relevant subcategories should be added together for this report table. Reported data should reflect racial and ethnic categories as identified by the user, not by the provider. Further... Hispanic/Latino and Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino categories include individuals of all races. OMB defines “Hispanic” as a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

Finally, grantees were instructed that total figures reported for Tables 1 and 1a should be the same.

**Table 2: “Income Status.”** Grantees were instructed to count users as for Tables 1 and 1a.

For *Income as a Percent of the Poverty Level*, grantees were instructed, because income information for users may change during the year, to report the most current information available. In addition, they were instructed that for the *number of users*, individuals should be counted only once and the categories should add together to equal the total number of male and female users reported in Tables 1 and 1a.

INCOME AS PERCENT OF POVERTY LEVEL	NUMBER OF USERS										
	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>100% AND BELOW</b>	3,461,649	100,900	281,526	372,802	796,071	415,928	399,682	137,345	99,174	676,466	181,755
<b>101% - 150%</b>	838,704	48,661	130,134	83,556	135,575	94,989	83,886	50,885	27,090	131,222	52,706
<b>151% - 200%</b>	312,393	21,023	26,886	34,384	51,305	40,590	24,226	19,393	14,228	59,847	20,511
<b>MORE THAN 200%</b>	355,025	23,473	28,200	62,972	57,142	51,387	17,680	46,704	13,757	33,304	20,406
<b>UNKNOWN</b>	100,014	13,393	1,889	18,169	12,491	7,164	22,328	3,506	675	19,704	695
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	<b>5,067,785</b>	<b>207,450</b>	<b>468,635</b>	<b>571,883</b>	<b>1,052,584</b>	<b>610,058</b>	<b>547,802</b>	<b>257,833</b>	<b>154,924</b>	<b>920,543</b>	<b>276,073</b>



TABLE 2-FP: USERS BY INCOME/POVERTY STATUS, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY - PERCENTS

INCOME AS PERCENT OF POVERTY LEVEL	NUMBER OF USERS										
	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>100% AND BELOW</b>	68%	49%	60%	65%	76%	68%	73%	53%	64%	73%	66%
<b>101% - 150%</b>	17%	23%	28%	15%	13%	16%	15%	20%	17%	14%	19%
<b>151% - 200%</b>	6%	10%	6%	6%	5%	7%	4%	8%	9%	7%	7%
<b>MORE THAN 200%</b>	7%	11%	6%	11%	5%	8%	3%	18%	9%	4%	7%
<b>UNKNOWN</b>	2%	6%	0%	3%	1%	1%	4%	1%	0%	2%	0%
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### IV. CONTRACEPTIVE METHOD USE (Table 3-FP)

Among all female family planning users, over 4 million, or 86%, reported use of a contraceptive method. Six percent of users are not currently using a contraceptive method because they were pregnant at their last visit and the remaining eight percent are classified as not using a method for some other reason. Family planning users who are not using a method for other reasons include users who know that they or their partners are non-surgically sterile, those who received infertility testing or treatment, and may include some users for whom a method was unknown or not recorded. Among those classified as method users, 4% are coded as unknown method. This may include a small number of clients that received only counseling and referral and it is unknown whether a method was actually adopted or continued.

Across the regions<sup>\*\*</sup>, the proportion of female family planning users who are reported method users varies from 82% in Regions I and II to 90% in Region IX. However, even this variation may be due to reporting differences among grantees in different regions and not to differences in the provision of contraceptive methods.

Considering female users for whom contraceptive method use is reported, just under half, 47%, are using oral contraceptives. This represents a decrease of 15 percentage points over nine years, down from 62% of users in 1995. Until last year, the decrease in pill use was mostly offset by an increase in use of injectable contraceptives. In 2002, Depo-Provera was used by 20 percent of method users, an increase of 8 percentage points, up from 12% reported in 1995. However, in 2003 the percentage of method users relying on Depo-Provera decreased slightly to 18% and remains at 18% in 2004, while the percentage of those using “Other methods” increased 5 percentage points over two years (from 3% in 2002 to 7% in 2003 and 8% in 2004). Many grantees noted that the increases they reported in this category came from two new methods, the Patch and the Ring (Ortho-Evra and NuvaRing). “Other methods” also includes any reported use of the sponge or abstinence. Eighteen percent of method users rely on condoms as their primary method, an increase from the 13% relying on this method in 1995. Three percent of users rely on sterilization and 0.5% rely on spermicides as their contraceptive method. Use of the IUD has remained constant at 2% of method users over the past 2 years. Numerically, IUD users have risen by 105% over nine years, from 38,000 in 1995 to 78,000 in 2004. At the same time, use of the hormonal implant has continued to drop; from 65,000 users in 1995 to only 6,000 users in 2004. (See the trend table for users by Method of Contraception, found in Appendix A.)

Regionally, there is wide variation in the distribution of users according to method used. In Regions IV, VII and VIII, nearly 75% of method users rely on either oral contraceptives (50%-58%) or injectables (16-24%); while only 7%-11% use condoms and a similar percent (6%-11%) use “other methods.” In contrast, users in Regions I and II are much less likely to use either pills (39%-40%) or injectables (11-13%) and much more likely to rely on condoms (26%-31%) and “other methods” (11%-15%) .

---

<sup>\*\*</sup> See footnote, page 9, for constitution of regions by state.

## INSTRUCTIONS

The following instructions were provided to grantees for completion of Table 3 of the Annual Family Planning Report:

**Table 3:** “Contraceptive Methods for Female Users” This table provides information on the contraceptive method adopted or continued by female users at the end of their last visit during the reporting period. For reporting purposes, the grantee need not have provided the method, which may have been dispensed/performed during an earlier reporting period. Instructions outlining method categories were given as follows:

**Method of Contraception:** Report the primary contraceptive method adopted or continued at the end of the user’s last visit during the reporting period

- Sterilization (tubal ligation, vasectomy): Procedure performed on either a female user or her male partner in the current or any previous reporting period
- Oral contraceptives (the Pill): Combination and progestin-only minipills
- IUD (Copper-T 380, Progesterone T, Levonorgestrel)
- Hormone implant: (Norplant)
- Injection: Depo-Provera (DMPA)
- Cervical cap
- Diaphragm with or without jelly or cream
- Condom with or without spermicide (male or female, rubber, vaginal pouch)
- Spermicidal foam, jelly, or cream; or contraceptive film, used with jelly, cream or foam. Include here only if used without *another* method of contraception
- Natural methods (natural family planning): Safe period by temperature or cervical mucus test. This does not include rhythm or safe period by calendar
- Other methods (withdrawal, pulling out, rhythm, safe period by calendar, sponge, suppository, insert, douching, abstinence, etc.)
- Method Unknown: There is documentation that the female user adopted or continued method but records are not clear as to specific method(s) used.

**No Method:** User was not using any methods to avoid pregnancy.

- Pregnant
- No method used for other reasons—this would include a situation where either partner is sterile without having had an operation or users seeking to achieve pregnancy.

Grantees were instructed that **Total Female Users** include all those females who have had at least one family planning encounter during the reporting period, to refer to the General Instructions for definition of encounter, and that this number should be the same as that reported on Tables 1 and 1a.

TABLE 3-FP: FEMALE USERS BY CONTRACEPTIVE METHOD, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY

METHOD OF CONTRACEPTION	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>Sterilization (user or partner)</b>	105,103	8,260	8,811	11,238	17,047	10,634	23,310	8,234	1,457	9,211	6,901
<b>Oral contraceptives</b>	1,974,050	63,875	142,323	196,122	430,271	265,127	200,256	124,260	74,472	377,022	100,322
<b>IUD</b>	77,773	3,303	9,137	4,474	10,901	7,082	8,910	1,953	2,545	21,956	7,512
<b>Hormone implant</b>	5,602	319	152	381	912	654	384	248	51	2,319	182
<b>Injection</b>	740,028	17,580	47,565	90,005	209,894	93,169	94,648	37,695	21,183	92,244	36,045
<b>Cervical cap</b>	2,034	88	99	24	9	95	30	38	22	1,626	3
<b>Diaphragm (with or without jelly or cream)</b>	9,683	512	819	678	1,332	669	1,762	311	254	2,745	601
<b>Condom (with or without spermicide)</b>	737,169	41,062	112,307	118,670	90,531	78,810	48,564	16,210	11,964	187,631	31,420
<b>Spermicidal foam, jelly or cream, or contraceptive film -- used without another method</b>	19,861	299	1,070	1,584	2,900	3,096	2,585	319	279	7,359	370
<b>Natural methods</b>	25,906	704	666	3,428	1,070	542	3,297	663	211	5,743	9,582
<b>Other Methods</b>	313,688	23,866	41,024	31,225	49,673	62,445	25,606	18,671	14,125	24,971	22,082
<b>Method Unknown</b>	146,417	204	2,933	11,825	46,939	3,405	44,417	9,950	2,533	18,318	5,893
<b>No method:</b>											
<b>Pregnant</b>	287,485	9,490	40,017	29,688	55,401	37,319	30,635	8,256	9,340	44,091	23,248
<b>No method used for other reasons</b>	378,605	24,507	41,943	47,253	111,016	27,581	41,299	20,251	9,782	39,494	15,479
<b>TOTAL FEMALE USERS</b>	4,823,404	194,069	448,866	546,595	1,027,896	590,628	525,703	247,059	148,218	834,730	259,640
<b>TOTAL FEMALE USERS USING A METHOD</b>	4,157,314	160,072	366,906	469,654	861,479	525,728	453,769	218,552	129,096	751,145	220,913

TABLE 3-FP: FEMALE USERS BY CONTRACEPTIVE METHOD, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY - PERCENTS

METHOD OF CONTRACEPTION	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>Sterilization (user or partner)</b>	2%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	3%	1%	1%	3%
<b>Oral contraceptives</b>	41%	33%	32%	36%	42%	45%	38%	50%	50%	45%	39%
<b>IUD</b>	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	3%	3%
<b>Hormone implant</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Injection</b>	15%	9%	11%	16%	20%	16%	18%	15%	14%	11%	14%
<b>Cervical cap</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Diaphragm (with or without jelly or cream)</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Condom (with or without spermicide)</b>	15%	21%	25%	22%	9%	13%	9%	7%	8%	22%	12%
<b>Spermicidal foam, jelly or cream, or contraceptive film -- used without another method</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
<b>Natural methods</b>	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	4%
<b>Other methods</b>	7%	12%	9%	6%	5%	11%	5%	8%	10%	3%	9%
<b>Method Unknown</b>	3%	0%	1%	2%	5%	1%	8%	4%	2%	2%	2%
<b>No method:</b>											
<b>Pregnant</b>	6%	5%	9%	5%	5%	6%	6%	3%	6%	5%	9%
<b>No method used for other reasons</b>	8%	13%	9%	9%	11%	5%	8%	8%	7%	5%	6%
<b>TOTAL FEMALE USERS</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 3-FP: FEMALE METHOD USERS BY CONTRACEPTIVE METHOD, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY OF  
METHOD USERS - PERCENTS

METHOD OF CONTRACEPTION	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>Sterilization (user or partner)</b>	3%	5%	2%	2%	2%	2%	5%	4%	1%	1%	3%
<b>Oral contraceptives</b>	47%	40%	39%	42%	50%	50%	44%	57%	58%	50%	45%
<b>IUD</b>	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	3%	3%
<b>Hormone implant</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Injection</b>	18%	11%	13%	19%	24%	18%	21%	17%	16%	12%	16%
<b>Cervical cap</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Diaphragm (with or without jelly or cream)</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Condom (with or without spermicide)</b>	18%	26%	31%	25%	11%	15%	11%	7%	9%	25%	14%
<b>Spermicidal foam, jelly or cream, or contraceptive film -- used without another method</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%
<b>Natural methods</b>	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	4%
<b>Other methods</b>	8%	15%	11%	7%	6%	12%	6%	9%	11%	3%	10%
<b>Method Unknown</b>	4%	0%	1%	3%	5%	1%	10%	5%	2%	2%	3%
<b>TOTAL METHOD USERS (FEMALE)</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>No method:</b>											
<b>Pregnant</b>											
<b>No method used for other reasons</b>											
<b>METHOD USERS AS % OF TOTAL FEMALE USERS</b>	86%	82%	82%	86%	84%	89%	86%	88%	87%	90%	85%

## **V. SELECTED SERVICES AND STAFF (Table 4-FP)**

### **A. SELECTED SERVICES**

In 2004, Title X funds were used to provide a reported 2,782,641 pap tests and 2,668,228 breast exams. In addition to these services for women, a reported 5,415,750 tests for sexually transmitted diseases (excluding HIV) were provided to both male and female users. An additional 530,569 HIV tests were provided to both male and female users under Title X family planning services grants. Nationally, the 302,558 STD tests reported for male users represent about 6% of all STD tests provided; however the 75,478 HIV tests reported for male users represents 14% of all HIV tests provided, indicating a higher ratio of HIV tests per male user as compared to female users.

The number of pap tests and breast exams declined from 2003 to 2004, and the number of STD and HIV tests increased during that period. Pap tests decreased by 2% or 69,797 fewer pap tests; breast exams declined by 4% or 103,443 fewer breast exams; while STD tests increased by 7% or 363,019 more STD tests and HIV tests increased by 1% or 4,209 more HIV tests compared to those reported in 2003.

In order to look further at variation in the numbers of services provided, we have calculated ratios of the number of pap tests and breast exams performed to the total number of female family planning users and ratios of the number of STD and HIV tests performed to the total number of family planning users.

The ratio of reported tests to total female users is .58 for pap tests and .55 for breast exams, indicating that approximately 6 pap tests and breast exams were performed for every 10 female family planning users. These ratios have gradually declined over the past nine years, from about 7 pap tests or breast exams per female user in 1995 to about 6 now.

In comparing ratios of pap tests to users among the regions, we find that seven regions have ratios that are similar to or better than the national average and perform about six to seven pap smears for every ten female users. Regions I and IX have slightly lower ratios of .50 and .48, or about five tests for every ten female users, and Region X has a ratio of .42, or about 4 tests for every 10 female users. Similarly, in comparing ratios of breast exams to users, six out of the ten regions match or are better than the national ratio with about six to seven exams for every ten female users. Region III has the highest ratio (.70). Four regions have slightly lower ratios of about 4 or 5 exams for every 10 female users – Region I (.44), Region IV (.54), Region IX (.45) and Region X (.44).

The ratio of STD tests to users is 1.07, representing slightly more than one test per user; the ratio of HIV tests to total users is .10 or one test for every ten users, a ratio that has remained stable between 2004 and 2003. Looking at ratios of STD tests to users in 2004, four of the regions match or exceed the national ratio of 1.07, with Regions II and III reporting the highest ratios, 1.29 and 1.46 respectively, or between 12 and 15 STD tests for every 10 family planning users. Four regions perform between seven and nine STD tests for every ten users; Region VIII reports the lowest ratio of .52.

Regionally, the ratios for HIV tests to users range from a low of .03 in Regions V and VIII to a high of .16 in Region II. (Several grantees report that these tests are provided but not funded with Title X monies and are therefore not reported on the FPAR.)



TABLE 4-FP: SELECTED SERVICES DELIVERED, 2004

NATIONAL/REGIONAL SUMMARY

SELECTED SERVICE TYPES	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>NUMBERS OF TESTS:</b>											
<b>Pap Smears</b>											
Female tests	2,782,641	97,984	269,318	354,960	622,085	345,470	348,255	156,529	81,966	398,094	107,980
Tests to users	0.58	0.50	0.60	0.65	0.61	0.58	0.66	0.63	0.55	0.48	0.42
<b>Breast Exams</b>											
Female exams	2,668,228	84,898	246,349	384,987	557,036	345,161	317,309	147,979	92,098	378,793	113,618
Exams to users	0.55	0.44	0.55	0.70	0.54	0.58	0.60	0.60	0.62	0.45	0.44
<b>STD Tests (excluding HIV)</b>											
Female tests	5,113,192	155,195	578,847	790,453	1,062,232	475,128	528,957	267,524	73,695	992,493	188,668
Male tests	302,558	15,114	24,484	44,971	5,453	17,749	13,072	20,994	7,175	133,853	19,693
Total STD tests	5,415,750	170,309	603,331	835,424	1,067,685	492,877	542,029	288,518	80,870	1,126,346	208,361
Tests to users	1.07	0.82	1.29	1.46	1.01	0.81	0.99	1.12	0.52	1.22	0.75
<b>HIV Tests</b>											
Female tests	455,091	12,054	66,900	59,660	132,426	17,803	61,500	12,882	3,390	80,853	7,623
Male tests	75,478	3,882	8,108	10,402	5,282	3,012	3,153	4,800	1,667	30,539	4,633
Total HIV tests	530,569	15,936	75,008	70,062	137,708	20,815	64,653	17,682	5,057	111,392	12,256
Tests to users	0.10	0.08	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.03	0.12	0.07	0.03	0.12	0.04



## **B. STAFFING PROFILES (Table 5-FP)**

In 2004, family planning services were provided at Title X-funded sites by a reported 511 FTE (full-time equivalent) physicians and 2,602 FTE (full-time equivalent) mid-level staff members - physician assistants, nurse practitioners and certified nurse midwives. The physicians were involved in a reported 931,497 medical encounters with family planning users. Mid-level staff, in contrast, were involved in face-to-face contact with users in 5,449,099 medical encounters.

The number of medical encounters performed by mid-level staff in 2004 is nearly six times that of physicians. As in prior years, the number of medical encounters per physician FTE (1,823) is less than that per mid-level staff FTE (2,094). The number of medical encounters reported per mid-level staff member had declined over the past few years, rose last year, and declined again this year, rising from 1,987 in 2002 to 2,250 in 2003 and falling to 2,094 in 2004; the number of reported medical encounters per physician FTE declined in recent years but rose this year, from 1,737 in 2003 to 1,823 in 2004. The changes in these ratios may reflect an actual change in the amount of time needed for each encounter; they may also reflect a variety of data reporting and systems variations experienced by grantees in reporting these data.

In several regions, the average number of medical encounters per physician FTE differs considerably when compared to the national average of 1,737. In three regions (II, V and VI), the ratios are significantly higher, with encounters per doctor of 3,565, 2,439 and 2,397, respectively. Three regions have significantly lower numbers of encounters per physician FTE than that seen nationally: 1,015 in Region VII, 1,320 in Region IX and 1,247 in Region X. This variation, as well as differences in FTE's and encounters from year to year indicate possible inconsistencies in reporting, both between grantees and over time.

Encounters per mid-level staff FTE vary as well in several regions. Regions IX and X, with 1,642 and 1,290 encounters per mid-level staff FTE, are much lower than the national average of 2,094. On the other hand, Regions V, VII and VIII report 3,016, 2,963 and 3,023 encounters per mid-level staff FTE, respectively.

Nationally, there are 5.09 mid-level staff FTE's for each physician FTE. Comparing the number of mid-level staff FTE's to physician FTE's, there is considerable regional variation. In four of the ten regions, the ratio of mid-level staff FTE's to physician FTE is similar to the national average of about 5. In three regions it is lower, with about 3 to 4 mid-level staff FTE's for every physician FTE. In Region VIII the number rises to about 12, while in Region X the number jumps to 31 mid-level staff FTE's for each physician FTE.

<b>PRIMARY MEDICAL CARE SERVICES PERSONNEL</b>	<b>NATIONAL TOTAL</b>	<b>REGION I</b>	<b>REGION II</b>	<b>REGION III</b>	<b>REGION IV</b>	<b>REGION V</b>	<b>REGION VI</b>	<b>REGION VII</b>	<b>REGION VIII</b>	<b>REGION IX</b>	<b>REGION X</b>
<b>Physicians</b>											
<b>Total FTEs</b>	510.84	22.33	40.73	106.14	84.84	40.05	33.27	29.00	5.22	142.22	7.04
<b>Total Encounters</b>	931,497	45,895	145,193	185,453	141,587	97,665	79,739	29,432	9,974	187,782	8,777
<b>Encounters per FTE</b>	1,823	2,055	3,565	1,747	1,669	2,439	2,397	1,015	1,911	1,320	1,247
<b>Physician Assistant/Nurse Practitioners/Certified Nurse Midwives</b>											
<b>Total FTEs</b>	2601.74	96.12	199.36	328.75	415.42	205.06	235.72	103.22	64.18	734.75	219.16
<b>Total Encounters</b>	5,449,099	250,466	491,952	675,652	914,348	618,452	509,600	305,809	194,001	1,206,150	282,669
<b>Encounters per FTE</b>	2,094	2,606	2,468	2,055	2,201	3,016	2,162	2,963	3,023	1,642	1,290
<b>Mid-level FTE per Physician FTE</b>	5.09	4.30	4.89	3.10	4.90	5.12	7.09	3.56	12.30	5.17	31.13

## INSTRUCTIONS

The following instructions were provided to grantees for completion of Tables 4 and 5 of the Annual Family Planning Report:

**Table 4: “Selected Services Delivered During Family Planning Visits.”** This table provides information on selected services that are important indicators for family planning providers. Grantees were instructed to include as users all individuals who received at least one of the named tests from the grantee during the reporting period. They were further instructed that test totals include the total number of the named tests performed by the grantee during a family planning visit in a family planning clinic within the reporting period.

For *Selected Service Types*, grantees were instructed to report the number of documented Pap smears, breast exams, and STD tests. STD tests include tests for herpes simplex virus (HSV), hepatitis B virus (HBV), syphilis, gonorrhea, chlamydia, or trichomoniasis, but not tests for human immunodeficiency virus (HIV). HIV tests were to be reported separately. Grantees were further instructed that the *Number of tests* include tests only if they are funded under the family planning services grant. Tests provided on an anonymous basis should be included in this report if they are funded under the family planning services grant.

**Table 5: “Mid-level Practitioner and Physician Staffing Profile.”** This table provides a profile of medical care physicians and mid-level practitioners supported by Title X Family Planning Service grants.

Under *Primary Medical Care Services Personnel*, grantees were instructed to include staff time involved in the provision of family planning encounters with a medical provider and to include the staff listed EXCEPT when such personnel perform administrative duties. For *Physicians* they were to include primary care/generalist physicians and specialists and for *Physician Assistants, Nurse Practitioners and Certified Nurse Midwives* only those staff who provide medical care services and not nurses or social workers who performed family planning counseling and education.

For *Total FTE’s*, they were to report full-time equivalents (FTE’s) for all program staff in each medical care services category.

For *Total Family Planning Medical Encounters*, they were advised that an encounter involves face-to-face contact between a user and a provider of medical services who exercises independent judgment. To be counted as an encounter, the contact must be recorded in the patient’s medical record. Include both on- and off-site contacts. Grantees were further instructed to refer to the General Instructions for the definition of a family planning encounter with a medical provider.



## VI. FUNDING SOURCES (Table 6-FP)

Altogether, Title X grantees reported total revenues of over \$900 million to support the provision of family planning services in 2004. Nearly two-thirds of these funds came from federal sources, including both federal grants (35% or \$342 million) and third party payments from federal sources, e.g. Medicaid (28% or \$277 million).

Title X funds represent 26% of total revenues (\$252 million), a 3% increase over 2003 Title X funds reported by grantees. Although most Title X funds reported by grantees are undoubtedly from service delivery grants, it remains true that some grantees include research and special education or services grants as part of the funds reported, while others exclude these monies from the totals reported. An additional 8% of total revenues comes from other federal sources. These include Title V (MCH Block Grant) (3%), Title XX (Social Services Block Grant) (3%) and other federal grants (2%).

The remaining third of all family planning revenues came from state (13%), local (5%) or other (5%) sources (totaling \$224 million) and private sources such as patient fees (10%) or private insurance (2%) and other third party collections (2%) (totaling \$139 million from private sources).

With the exception of Medicaid and state revenues, the distribution of revenues by funding source reported by Title X grantees is very similar to what was reported last year and has remained steady throughout the 1990s. The reason for the overall shift in Medicaid and state revenues is related to reporting by one grantee and is discussed subsequently. Variation in funding sources between 1981 and 2000 has been reported in previous reports and is summarized below:

### Distribution of revenues by source for Title X grantees, selected years, 1981-2004

	1981*	1991*	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002	2003	2004
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Federal-Total	77.2	51.5	50.3	49.8	50.8	53.4	51.6	53.0	63.1
Title X	45.8	27.8	27.3	26.2	24.8	27.3	25.7	26.5	25.7
Medicaid	6.6	9.8	12.8	12.9	13.6	16.0	16.5	16.8	28.2
Other federal	24.8	13.6	10.2	10.7	12.4	10.1	9.3	9.7	9.2
State and Local	13.1	29.6	31.8	31.7	33.0	31.1	33.0	33.0	22.8
Private	9.8	18.9	17.8	18.4	16.2	15.5	15.4	14.3	14.1
Total <sup>1</sup>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Revenues (actual \$) (in 000 <sup>s</sup> )	268,400	485,600	614,181	668,682	737,981	830,968	899,340	927,082	982,538
Total Revenues (in constant 1981\$) (in 000 <sup>s</sup> )**	268,400	227,436	226,825	236,290	244,129	252,519	261,048	258,684	262,665

\* Source: Ku, L., 1993 "Publicly supported family planning in the United States: Financing of Family Planning Services." Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute and Child Trends. \*\* Adjustment based on Consumer Price Index for Medical Care Services.

<sup>1</sup> Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

The distribution of revenues by funding source varies among the regions. Overall, Title X funds represent 26% of all revenues. However, in Region X, Title X funds represent only 14% of revenues, while in six regions, Title X funds represent 31-36% of all revenues (Regions I, III, V, VI, VII and VIII).

Reported Medicaid funding shows tremendous variation by region—with 3% of revenues coming from Medicaid in Region VIII compared with 58% in Regions IX and X. This extreme variation is due both to the existence of Medicaid family planning waiver programs in some states and to reporting differences among regions in how funding from Medicaid waiver programs is categorized. In Region IX, until this year, most Medicaid waiver program funds were reported as state revenues. This year, revenues from California’s FamilyPACT (Medicaid waiver program) were reported as Medicaid, not state revenues. This shift had national consequences. The overall percentage of revenues from Medicaid rose from 17% in 2003 to 28% in 2004, while reported state and local revenues fell—from 23% to 13%.

While Title XX accounts for only 3% of revenue nationally, in Region VI it accounts for over one fifth (19%) of regional revenues. State funds in four regions are significantly lower than the national average of 13% – Region V (7%), Region VII (2%), Region VIII (7%), Region IX (1%) and Region X (6%).

Funding from patient fees also varies widely from region to region. Funds from patient collections represent 23-37 % of revenues in Regions I, VII and VIII, and only 4-5% of revenues in Regions IV, VI, IX and X.

Finally, the regional distribution of both total revenues and Title X funds are very similar to the regional distribution of clients served.

**Distribution of Total Revenues, Title X Funds and Clients Served by Region, 2004**

Region	Total Revenues %	Title X Funds %	Clients Served %
Region I	4.3	5.2	4.1
Region II	13.7	9.6	9.2
Region III	8.9	10.8	11.3
Region IV	20.3	22.6	20.8
Region V	10.7	13.9	12.0
Region VI	10.2	12.4	10.8
Region VII	3.7	5.2	5.1
Region VIII	3.0	3.7	3.1
Region IX	17.8	12.6	18.2
Region X	7.5	4.0	5.4
Total	100.1	100.0	100.0
	\$982,537,801	\$252,141,527	\$5,067,785



## INSTRUCTIONS

The following instructions were provided to grantees for completion of Table 6 of the Annual Family Planning Report:

**Table 6:** “Revenue Report.” This table collects information on funds that support services within the scope of the grantee’s Title X Family Planning Services grant and that are received during the reporting period.

For *Federal Grants*, grantees were instructed to report grant funds based on the source of funds, if known. Instructions describe further to “Report by specific Federal program, if known, even though the Title X grantee organization/agency did not receive the funding directly, e.g., any MCH Title V funds transferred to Title X program ”and to “Count grants awarded/received during the reporting period, even if the funds are not expended during the reporting period.”

For *Payment for Services*, they were advised that reimbursement should be reported according to the primary source. [For example, if the grantee has a contract with a private HMO to provide services to enrolled Medicaid patients, reimbursements for services to these patients should be reported under Medicaid.] Only revenue from prepayment managed care arrangements, e.g., capitated Medicare, Medicaid, and private managed care contracts, should be reported as “Prepaid.” Revenues received after the service is rendered, even under managed care arrangements, should not be reported as prepaid.

For **Medicaid**: Include revenue from state-only Medicaid programs, e.g., special state-only covered services and services to state-only general assistance recipients.

For **Other Third-Party Payers**: This refers to sources of reimbursement not listed, e.g., CHAMPUS. This category also includes state insurance programs other than Medicaid.

Under *Other Sources*, they were to report other state and local government funds and funds not reported above. State and/or local government funds include Federal and other funds awarded by the state or local authority.

Grantees were further instructed to calculate a subtotal for each revenue type and combine the subtotals to determine total revenue.

SOURCE	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>Federal Grants:</b>											
Title X (Family Planning)	252,141,527	13,123,093	24,329,370	27,166,598	56,975,050	35,053,992	31,147,040	13,001,606	9,382,243	31,778,744	10,183,791
Title V (MCH Block Grant)	32,992,292	181,203	2,734,316	3,645,860	16,297,309	3,040,086	3,002,716	150,000	462,096	2,349,014	1,129,692
Bureau of Primary Health Care	3,959,649	3,300	0	0	105,121	91,860	0	975,976	0	2,783,392	0
Social Services Block Grant (Title XX)	30,835,001	1,462,347	1,505,130	3,421,149	0	4,582,120	19,514,547	345,510	4,198	0	0
Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)	3,344,085	0	0	0	0	232,787	0	0	0	3,111,298	0
Other Federal Grants (Specify)	18,408,627	187,930	9,076,328	678,536	4,542,664	917,976	55,000	592,430	404,259	1,367,007	586,497
<b>Subtotal Federal Grants</b>	<b>\$341,681,181</b>	<b>\$14,957,873</b>	<b>\$37,645,144</b>	<b>\$34,912,143</b>	<b>\$77,920,144</b>	<b>\$43,918,821</b>	<b>\$53,719,303</b>	<b>\$15,065,522</b>	<b>\$10,252,796</b>	<b>\$41,389,455</b>	<b>\$11,899,980</b>
<b>Payment for Services:</b>											
Patient Collections	\$99,774,741	\$9,615,820	\$17,090,099	\$11,246,593	\$9,841,431	\$18,360,484	\$5,054,365	\$13,340,013	\$6,293,494	\$6,283,484	\$2,648,957
<b>Third Party Payers (Prepaid and Not Prepaid):</b>											
Medicaid (Title XIX)	277,174,817	5,080,749	30,686,964	7,202,109	55,677,963	13,962,081	16,928,533	2,605,335	806,514	101,690,542	42,534,026
Medicare (Title XVIII)	755,938	70,358	115,522	13,200	88,122	19,044	345,053	43,630	826	59,292	891
Private Insurance	23,923,861	4,101,774	7,792,654	1,947,487	439,607	2,879,571	474,839	2,596,707	1,210,115	1,075,423	1,405,684
Other Third Parties	15,231,967	382,859	2,851,630	6,201,518	3,057,721	298,698	286,128	205,777	195,699	61,156	1,690,781
<b>Subtotal Payment for Services</b>	<b>\$416,861,324</b>	<b>\$19,251,560</b>	<b>\$58,536,869</b>	<b>\$26,610,907</b>	<b>\$69,104,844</b>	<b>\$35,519,878</b>	<b>\$23,088,918</b>	<b>\$18,791,462</b>	<b>\$8,506,648</b>	<b>\$109,169,898</b>	<b>\$48,280,339</b>
<b>Other Sources:</b>											
State Government	125,848,881	6,714,971	26,051,969	20,720,716	40,128,011	7,566,478	15,171,478	745,752	1,962,953	2,487,779	4,298,774
Local Government	50,028,918	83,432	4,111,106	225,750	10,999,723	9,732,108	8,186,621	767,419	4,682,460	3,945,869	7,294,430
Other (specify)	48,117,498	912,855	8,230,602	4,679,608	1,406,862	8,550,134	441,247	598,115	3,814,308	17,856,950	1,626,817
<b>Subtotal Other Sources</b>	<b>\$223,995,296</b>	<b>7,711,258</b>	<b>38,393,677</b>	<b>25,626,074</b>	<b>52,534,596</b>	<b>25,848,720</b>	<b>23,799,346</b>	<b>2,111,286</b>	<b>10,459,721</b>	<b>24,290,598</b>	<b>13,220,021</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>\$982,537,801</b>	<b>\$41,920,691</b>	<b>\$134,575,690</b>	<b>\$87,149,124</b>	<b>\$199,559,584</b>	<b>\$105,287,419</b>	<b>\$100,607,567</b>	<b>\$35,968,270</b>	<b>\$29,219,165</b>	<b>\$174,849,951</b>	<b>\$73,400,340</b>

SOURCE	NATIONAL TOTAL	REGION I	REGION II	REGION III	REGION IV	REGION V	REGION VI	REGION VII	REGION VIII	REGION IX	REGION X
<b>EACH REVENUE SOURCE AS % OF TOTAL REVENUE</b>											
<b>Federal Grants:</b>											
Title X (Family Planning)	26%	31%	18%	31%	29%	33%	31%	36%	32%	18%	14%
Title V (MCH Block Grant)	3%	0%	2%	4%	8%	3%	3%	0%	2%	1%	2%
Bureau of Primary Health Care	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	2%	0%
Social Services Block Grant (Title XX)	3%	3%	1%	4%	0%	4%	19%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Other Federal Grants (Specify)	2%	0%	7%	1%	2%	1%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%
<b>Subtotal Federal Grants</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>Payment for Services:</b>											
Patient Collections	10%	23%	13%	13%	5%	17%	5%	37%	22%	4%	4%
<b>Third Party Payers (Prepaid and Not Prepaid):</b>											
Medicaid (Title XIX)	28%	12%	23%	8%	28%	13%	17%	7%	3%	58%	58%
Medicare (Title XVIII)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Private Insurance	2%	10%	6%	2%	0%	3%	0%	7%	4%	1%	2%
Other Third Parties	2%	1%	2%	7%	2%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	2%
<b>Subtotal Payment for Services</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>66%</b>
<b>Other Sources:</b>											
State Government	13%	16%	19%	24%	20%	7%	15%	2%	7%	1%	6%
Local Government	5%	0%	3%	0%	6%	9%	8%	2%	16%	2%	10%
Other (specify)	5%	2%	6%	5%	1%	8%	0%	2%	13%	10%	2%
<b>Subtotal Other Sources</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>



## **APPENDIX A. TREND TABLES AND CHARTS**

FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

**TABLE A-1. Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by region, 1995 to 2004**

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002	2003	2004
	<b>Numbers</b>						
<b>REGION I</b>	203,340	199,514	187,589	216,098	220,094	212,422	207,450
<b>REGION II</b>	409,529	397,424	415,848	428,169	449,854	460,798	468,635
<b>REGION III</b>	510,044	512,497	499,163	533,956	551,759	562,182	571,883
<b>REGION IV</b>	1,029,995	1,091,160	1,025,865	1,043,788	1,077,707	1,065,310	1,052,584
<b>REGION V</b>	651,651	575,474	532,036	595,982	617,372	607,756	610,058
<b>REGION VI</b>	486,423	492,927	488,372	529,997	532,268	539,704	547,802
<b>REGION VII</b>	249,824	242,063	247,863	254,278	260,651	260,034	257,833
<b>REGION VIII</b>	135,561	136,034	138,469	148,353	143,595	147,730	154,924
<b>REGION IX</b>	635,625	623,664	709,360	844,781	870,070	878,088	920,543
<b>REGION X</b>	194,841	206,319	197,573	262,315	251,504	278,024	276,073
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	4,506,833	4,477,076	4,442,138	4,857,717	4,974,874	5,012,048	5,067,785
Total female users	4,412,977	4,371,689	4,315,040	4,658,472	4,772,254	4,784,889	4,823,404
Total male users	93,856	105,387	127,098	199,245	202,620	227,159	244,381
	<b>Percentage Distribution - Total Users</b>						
<b>REGION I</b>	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
<b>REGION II</b>	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%
<b>REGION III</b>	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%
<b>REGION IV</b>	23%	24%	23%	21%	22%	21%	21%
<b>REGION V</b>	14%	13%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%
<b>REGION VI</b>	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%	11%
<b>REGION VII</b>	6%	5%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%
<b>REGION VIII</b>	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
<b>REGION IX</b>	14%	14%	16%	17%	17%	18%	18%
<b>REGION X</b>	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%	6%	5%
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

<b>TABLE A-2. Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by age, 1995 to 2004, National totals</b>							
<b>AGE</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
	<b>Numbers</b>						
<b>UNDER 18</b>	679,623	655,980	627,496	690,718	693,416	674,639	667,734
<b>AGES 18-19</b>	614,841	622,748	648,224	720,939	728,049	711,364	716,399
<b>AGES 20-24</b>	1,421,246	1,330,820	1,312,102	1,493,687	1,550,715	1,590,344	1,608,278
<b>AGES 25-29</b>	877,076	875,653	812,323	835,897	851,926	870,394	898,231
<b>AGES 30-44</b>	844,981	912,568	937,691	995,231	1,016,055	1,021,266	1,028,661
<b>AGE 45 +</b>	65,517	78,461	104,302	121,245	134,713	144,041	148,482
<b>UNKNOWN</b>	3,549	846	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	4,506,833	4,477,076	4,442,138	4,857,717	4,974,874	5,012,048	4,857,717
	<b>Percentage Distribution</b>						
<b>UNDER 18</b>	15%	15%	14%	14%	14%	13%	14%
<b>AGES 18-19</b>	14%	14%	15%	15%	15%	14%	15%
<b>AGES 20-24</b>	32%	30%	30%	31%	31%	32%	33%
<b>AGES 25-29</b>	19%	20%	18%	17%	17%	17%	18%
<b>AGES 30-44</b>	19%	20%	21%	20%	20%	20%	21%
<b>AGE 45 +</b>	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%
<b>UNKNOWN</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

**TABLE A-3. Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by race, 1995 to 2004, National totals**

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002	2003	2004
	<b>Numbers</b>						
<b>ASIAN</b>	96,118	99,189	115,564	109,007	137,064	117,122	136,813
<b>NATIVE HAWAIIAN/ PACIFIC ISLANDER</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	46,330	51,672	124,055	58,881
<b>BLACK (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)</b>	976,558	997,598	986,448	1,049,740	1,041,329	1,028,446	1,027,880
<b>NATIVE AMERICAN/ ALASKAN</b>	37,229	30,529	31,372	34,241	34,811	35,320	36,050
<b>WHITE (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)</b>	2,960,892	2,991,108	2,896,882	3,079,264	3,137,887	3,100,808	3,225,150
<b>UNKNOWN OR NOT REPORTED</b>	436,036	358,652	411,872	539,135	572,111	606,297	583,011
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	4,506,833	4,477,076	4,442,138	4,857,717	4,974,874	5,012,048	5,067,785
	<b>Percentage Distribution</b>						
<b>ASIAN</b>	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%
<b>NATIVE HAWAIIAN/ PACIFIC ISLANDER</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	1%	1%	2%	1%
<b>BLACK (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)</b>	22%	22%	22%	22%	21%	21%	20%
<b>NATIVE AMERICAN/ ALASKAN</b>	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
<b>WHITE (HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC)</b>	66%	67%	65%	63%	63%	62%	64%
<b>UNKNOWN OR NOT REPORTED</b>	10%	8%	9%	11%	12%	12%	12%
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%



FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

**TABLE A-4. Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by ethnicity, 1995 to 2004, National totals**

	1995	1997	1999	2001	2002	2003	2004
<b>Numbers</b>							
<b>HISPANIC/ LATINO (ALL RACES)</b>	698,093	758,653	772,129	982,314	1,044,045	1,081,207	1,159,637
<b>NON-HISPANIC/LATINO (ALL RACES)</b>	3,433,491	3,520,054	3,472,143	3,735,945	3,825,440	3,806,566	3,780,396
<b>UNKNOWN/ NOT REPORTED</b>	375,251	198,369	197,866	139,458	105,389	124,275	127,752
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	4,506,835	4,477,076	4,442,138	4,857,717	4,974,874	5,012,048	5,067,785
<b>Percentage Distribution</b>							
<b>HISPANIC/ LATINO (ALL RACES)</b>	15%	17%	17%	20%	21%	22%	23%
<b>NON-HISPANIC/LATINO (ALL RACES)</b>	76%	79%	78%	77%	77%	76%	75%
<b>UNKNOWN/ NOT REPORTED</b>	8%	4%	4%	3%	2%	2%	3%
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

**TABLE A-5. Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by Poverty Level, 1995 to 2004, National totals**

<b>INCOME AS PERCENT OF POVERTY LEVEL</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
	<b>Numbers</b>						
<b>100% AND BELOW</b>	3,052,740	2,912,900	2,886,684	3,177,934	3,256,554	3,374,895	3,461,649
<b>101% - 150%</b>	749,460	794,551	803,360	832,137	872,911	854,878	838,704
<b>151% - 200%</b>	289,760	326,964	328,084	328,019	335,792	318,001	312,393
<b>MORE THAN 200%</b>	297,171	316,773	346,735	422,460	408,346	370,790	355,025
<b>UNKNOWN</b>	117,704	125,888	77,275	97,167	101,271	93,484	100,014
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	4,506,835	4,477,076	4,442,138	4,857,717	4,974,874	5,012,048	5,067,785
	<b>Percentage Distribution</b>						
<b>100% AND BELOW</b>	68%	65%	65%	65%	65%	67%	68%
<b>101% - 150%</b>	17%	18%	18%	17%	18%	17%	17%
<b>151% - 200%</b>	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%	6%	6%
<b>MORE THAN 200%</b>	7%	7%	8%	9%	8%	7%	7%
<b>UNKNOWN</b>	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
<b>TOTAL USERS</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE


**TABLE A-6. Numbers and percentage distribution of Title X family planning users by Method of Contraception, 1995 to 2004, National totals**

<b>METHOD OF CONTRACEPTION</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
	<b>Numbers: All Female Users</b>							<b>Percentage Distribution: Method Users Only</b>						
<b>Sterilization (user or partner)</b>	128,921	118,423	111,609	117,787	115,742	110,513	105,103	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
<b>Oral contraceptives</b>	2,327,020	2,148,920	1,981,664	2,111,124	2,111,088	1,994,310	1,974,050	62%	56%	53%	52%	51%	48%	48%
<b>IUD</b>	38,349	40,292	48,015	63,045	68,802	72,378	77,773	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%
<b>Hormone implant</b>	65,307	30,337	22,881	12,390	12,791	13,180	5,602	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Injection</b>	465,404	637,787	699,932	799,521	809,170	765,266	740,028	12%	17%	19%	20%	20%	18%	18%
<b>Cervical cap</b>	2946	796	581	753	732	623	2,034	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Diaphragm (with or without jelly or cream)</b>	28,355	19,393	14,235	9,689	8,289	7,240	9,683	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Condom (with or without spermicide)</b>	483,100	523,660	527,248	616,696	679,656	698,248	737,169	13%	14%	14%	15%	17%	17%	18%
<b>Spermicidal foam, jelly or cream, or contraceptive film -- used without another method</b>	122,564	121,918	78,762	65,309	45,977	33,483	19,861	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%
<b>Natural methods</b>	1,693	12,793	9,931	17,573	18,265	22,972	25,906	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%
<b>Other methods</b>	8,651	97,496	89,199	88,579	133,529	293,383	313,688	0%	3%	2%	2%	3%	7%	8%
<b>Method Unknown</b>	91,554	63,427	153,785	175,780	106,785	128,432	146,417	2%	2%	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%
<b>No method:</b>														
<b>Pregnant</b>	213,394	226,978	261,399	244,706	273,051	265,190	287,485	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>No method used for other reasons</b>	423,428	320,310	307,528	335,520	388,377	379,671	378,605	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>TOTAL FEMALE USERS</b>	4,400,686	4,362,530	4,306,769	4,658,472	4,772,254	4,784,889	4,823,404	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>TOTAL FEMALE USERS USING A METHOD</b>	3,763,864	3,815,242	3,737,842	4,078,246	4,110,826	4,140,028	4,157,314	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE


<b>TABLE A-7. Dollars and percentage distribution of Revenue by source of funding, 1995-2004, National totals</b>														
<b>SOURCE</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
	<b>Dollars (in ,000)</b>							<b>Percentage Distribution</b>						
<b>Federal Grants:</b>														
Title X (Family Planning)	167,499	174,912	183,164	226,582	231,550	245,715	252,142	27%	26%	25%	27%	26%	27%	26%
Title V (MCH Block Grant)	24,748	28,982	32,055	23,931	28,604	30,827	32,992	4%	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Bureau of Primary Health Care	1,182	5,823	2,960	1,209	2,258	843	3,960	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Social Services Block Grant (Title XX)	N/A	29,028	34,049	31,285	27,626	32,914	30,835	N/A	4%	5%	4%	3%	4%	3%
Special Supplemental Food														
Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)	230	1,360	5,109	4,189	3,639	2,486	3,344	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Other Federal Grants (Specify)	35,555	6,443	16,592	22,884	21,372	18,107	18,409	6%	1%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%
<b>Subtotal Federal Grants</b>	<b>229,214</b>	<b>246,547</b>	<b>273,930</b>	<b>310,080</b>	<b>315,049</b>	<b>330,892</b>	<b>341,681</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>Payment for Services:</b>														
Patient Collections	91,914	95,570	97,377	95,257	96,842	97,562	99,775	15%	14%	13%	11%	11%	11%	10%
<b>Third Party Payers (Prepaid and Not Prepaid):</b>														
Medicaid (Title XIX)	78,645	86,263	100,362	133,121	148,747	156,183	277,175	13%	13%	14%	16%	17%	17%	28%
Medicare (Title XVIII)	1,353	424	468	128	330	586	756	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Private Insurance	3,158	6,456	11,722	15,829	21,129	22,717	23,924	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Other Third Parties	14,309	20,745	10,345	17,894	20,413	12,036	15,232	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%
<b>Subtotal Payment for Services</b>	<b>189,380</b>	<b>209,458</b>	<b>220,273</b>	<b>262,228</b>	<b>287,461</b>	<b>289,083</b>	<b>416,861</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>Other Sources:</b>														
State Government	137,714	139,319	169,674	171,766	193,509	211,815	125,849	22%	21%	23%	21%	22%	23%	13%
Local Government	37,026	44,360	44,383	52,745	61,588	57,940	50,029	6%	7%	6%	6%	7%	6%	5%
Other (specify)	20,847	28,999	29,721	34,148	41,733	37,351	48,117	3%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%
<b>Subtotal Other Sources</b>	<b>195,587</b>	<b>212,677</b>	<b>243,777</b>	<b>258,659</b>	<b>296,830</b>	<b>307,106</b>	<b>223,995</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>614,181</b>	<b>668,682</b>	<b>737,981</b>	<b>830,968</b>	<b>899,340</b>	<b>927,082</b>	<b>982,538</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

# Chart A-1. Numbers of clients served in Title X funded sites by region






# Chart A-2. Numbers of clients served in Title X funded sites by age







# Chart A-3. Distribution of contraceptive users by method used among Title X clients




AGI, 2005

Family Planning Annual Report (FPAR)



# Chart A-4. Title X clinic revenues by source of funding





## **APPENDIX B. STATE TABLES**

TABLE B-1. NUMBER OF FEMALE FAMILY PLANNING USERS BY AGE AND STATE, 2004

NUMBERS

STATE	Age (females only)						Total
	Under 18	Ages 18-19	Ages 20-24	Ages 25-29	Ages 30-44	Age 45 and over	
AL	14,793	14,451	31,690	16,537	16,663	1,104	95,238
AK	1,449	1,369	2,214	1,095	1,728	447	8,302
AZ	6,634	6,957	11,466	8,719	10,613	903	45,292
AR	10,880	10,908	24,701	14,019	15,031	1,896	77,435
CA	69,330	93,391	224,637	138,065	170,848	23,778	720,049
CO	7,019	7,384	15,856	8,986	9,049	816	49,110
CT	6,121	5,979	11,386	6,340	7,717	1,871	39,414
DE	2,970	3,275	6,955	3,224	3,627	614	20,665
DC	1,503	1,442	4,858	3,856	4,756	1,291	17,706
FL	28,713	29,098	65,721	40,514	49,400	6,667	220,113
GA	22,076	22,003	51,331	32,208	40,425	5,480	173,523
HI	4,067	2,652	3,966	1,961	2,058	280	14,984
ID	3,500	4,254	9,708	5,237	6,515	911	30,125
IL	21,306	22,250	48,103	27,542	30,787	2,297	152,285
IN	6,264	7,634	16,695	7,864	7,422	469	46,348
IA	9,624	12,297	29,673	12,723	13,286	2,428	80,031
KS	4,517	5,823	14,506	8,837	9,755	2,027	45,465
KY	15,016	16,499	37,312	19,654	20,156	1,602	110,239
LA	10,430	10,769	27,035	13,834	14,138	1,082	77,288
ME	4,079	4,754	9,240	4,467	5,159	2,058	29,757
MD	12,259	11,015	24,129	12,879	14,309	1,209	75,800
MA	8,731	9,032	17,677	11,410	15,523	3,257	65,630
MI	22,811	29,262	64,257	29,892	25,749	2,683	174,654
MN	6,085	8,581	17,982	5,378	4,170	617	42,813
MS	11,456	11,338	24,217	13,874	14,566	1,783	77,234
MO	9,599	11,806	27,856	13,997	16,645	3,532	83,435

TABLE B-1. NUMBER OF FEMALE FAMILY PLANNING USERS BY AGE AND STATE, 2004

NUMBERS

STATE	Age (females only)						Total
	Under 18	Ages 18-19	Ages 20-24	Ages 25-29	Ages 30-44	Age 45 and over	
MT	4,179	4,502	9,489	4,449	4,749	814	28,182
NE	3,377	5,529	13,994	7,112	6,686	1,430	38,128
NV	3,361	3,340	7,547	5,649	7,039	742	27,678
NH	4,361	5,059	9,629	4,636	5,038	798	29,521
NJ	12,448	15,740	36,222	23,355	26,903	3,928	118,596
NM	6,780	6,040	10,359	5,970	7,746	2,706	39,601
NY	43,102	44,884	96,209	54,144	62,925	8,240	309,504
NC	18,701	18,160	43,557	27,151	29,087	1,283	137,939
ND	1,661	2,530	5,967	2,183	2,220	315	14,876
OH	20,462	21,666	43,433	19,986	20,885	3,333	129,765
OK	11,219	12,341	27,747	13,168	13,022	971	78,468
OR	14,447	11,748	25,464	15,758	16,526	1,743	85,686
PA	48,006	41,715	91,472	46,444	51,530	11,978	291,145
RI	1,689	1,809	4,469	3,275	6,031	2,745	20,018
SC	9,821	13,324	36,399	20,312	20,779	1,554	102,189
SD	1,694	2,456	5,723	1,945	1,852	187	13,857
TN	19,316	17,315	35,650	18,021	19,252	1,867	111,421
TX	25,178	28,246	69,810	50,728	71,065	7,884	252,911
UT	5,143	5,431	9,282	3,911	3,140	202	27,109
VT	1,381	1,433	2,730	1,480	1,967	738	9,729
VA	12,324	10,870	22,059	13,910	18,429	2,065	79,657
WA	19,590	22,690	46,901	22,198	21,680	2,468	135,527
WV	8,226	9,157	21,401	10,543	11,286	1,009	61,622
WI	5,806	8,387	17,474	6,930	5,511	655	44,763
WY	2,069	2,682	5,392	2,213	2,257	471	15,084
Territories	2,886	4,185	13,395	10,447	15,286	1,294	47,493
<b>Total</b>	<b>628,459</b>	<b>685,462</b>	<b>1,534,945</b>	<b>859,030</b>	<b>982,986</b>	<b>132,522</b>	<b>4,823,404</b>

TABLE B-1. NUMBER OF FEMALE FAMILY PLANNING USERS BY AGE AND STATE, 2004

PERCENTS

STATE	Age (females only)						Total
	Under 18	Ages 18-19	Ages 20-24	Ages 25-29	Ages 30-44	Age 45 and over	
AL	16%	15%	33%	17%	17%	1%	100%
AK	17%	16%	27%	13%	21%	5%	100%
AZ	15%	15%	25%	19%	23%	2%	100%
AR	14%	14%	32%	18%	19%	2%	100%
CA	10%	13%	31%	19%	24%	3%	100%
CO	14%	15%	32%	18%	18%	2%	100%
CT	16%	15%	29%	16%	20%	5%	100%
DE	14%	16%	34%	16%	18%	3%	100%
DC	8%	8%	27%	22%	27%	7%	100%
FL	13%	13%	30%	18%	22%	3%	100%
GA	13%	13%	30%	19%	23%	3%	100%
HI	27%	18%	26%	13%	14%	2%	100%
ID	12%	14%	32%	17%	22%	3%	100%
IL	14%	15%	32%	18%	20%	2%	100%
IN	14%	16%	36%	17%	16%	1%	100%
IA	12%	15%	37%	16%	17%	3%	100%
KS	10%	13%	32%	19%	21%	4%	100%
KY	14%	15%	34%	18%	18%	1%	100%
LA	13%	14%	35%	18%	18%	1%	100%
ME	14%	16%	31%	15%	17%	7%	100%
MD	16%	15%	32%	17%	19%	2%	100%
MA	13%	14%	27%	17%	24%	5%	100%
MI	13%	17%	37%	17%	15%	2%	100%
MN	14%	20%	42%	13%	10%	1%	100%
MS	15%	15%	31%	18%	19%	2%	100%
MO	12%	14%	33%	17%	20%	4%	100%
MT	15%	16%	34%	16%	17%	3%	100%



TABLE B-1. NUMBER OF FEMALE FAMILY PLANNING USERS BY AGE AND STATE, 2004

PERCENTS

STATE	Age (females only)						Total
	Under 18	Ages 18-19	Ages 20-24	Ages 25-29	Ages 30-44	Age 45 and over	
NE	9%	15%	37%	19%	18%	4%	100%
NV	12%	12%	27%	20%	25%	3%	100%
NH	15%	17%	33%	16%	17%	3%	100%
NJ	10%	13%	31%	20%	23%	3%	100%
NM	17%	15%	26%	15%	20%	7%	100%
NY	14%	15%	31%	17%	20%	3%	100%
NC	14%	13%	32%	20%	21%	1%	100%
ND	11%	17%	40%	15%	15%	2%	100%
OH	16%	17%	33%	15%	16%	3%	100%
OK	14%	16%	35%	17%	17%	1%	100%
OR	17%	14%	30%	18%	19%	2%	100%
PA	16%	14%	31%	16%	18%	4%	100%
RI	8%	9%	22%	16%	30%	14%	100%
SC	10%	13%	36%	20%	20%	2%	100%
SD	12%	18%	41%	14%	13%	1%	100%
TN	17%	16%	32%	16%	17%	2%	100%
TX	10%	11%	28%	20%	28%	3%	100%
UT	19%	20%	34%	14%	12%	1%	100%
VT	14%	15%	28%	15%	20%	8%	100%
VA	15%	14%	28%	17%	23%	3%	100%
WA	14%	17%	35%	16%	16%	2%	100%
WV	13%	15%	35%	17%	18%	2%	100%
WI	13%	19%	39%	15%	12%	1%	100%
WY	14%	18%	36%	15%	15%	3%	100%
Territories	6%	9%	28%	22%	32%	3%	100%

TABLE B-2. NUMBER OF FAMILY PLANNING USERS BY POVERTY STATUS AND STATE, 2004

NUMBERS

STATE	Income (all users)					TOTAL USERS
	100% AND BELOW	101% - 150%	151% - 200%	MORE THAN 200%	UNKNOWN	
AL	75,653	13,515	3,521	3,043	73	95,805
AK	8,060	1,169	631	650	9	10,519
AZ	40,855	3,080	1,875	590	1,285	47,685
AR	48,044	13,154	5,999	3,988	6,775	77,960
CA	578,526	120,671	51,609	30,202	14,486	795,494
CO	34,000	10,891	3,619	3,132	102	51,744
CT	13,720	17,368	4,514	4,714	1,604	41,920
DE	13,947	4,759	2,224	1,695	1,885	24,510
DC	10,498	2,976	855	4,354	1,242	19,925
FL	152,161	41,708	16,390	15,595	2,571	228,425
GA	129,064	30,084	10,989	4,014	6,128	180,279
HI	12,446	1,041	428	916	456	15,287
ID	20,160	6,782	2,847	2,918	2	32,709
IL	110,587	24,462	8,079	9,509	453	153,090
IN	36,186	7,335	3,359	2,881	68	49,829
IA	47,129	11,714	5,998	17,804	0	82,645
KS	25,467	11,916	4,318	5,985	1,680	49,366
KY	83,220	15,498	6,977	6,100	3,055	114,850
LA	67,000	2,779	1,103	348	14,617	85,847
ME	18,415	5,275	2,916	4,292	614	31,512
MD	47,105	7,859	3,310	8,256	11,552	78,082
MA	38,587	16,187	7,568	4,890	3,824	71,056
MI	112,740	30,484	14,006	17,050	5,959	180,239
MN	30,036	6,932	3,510	5,217	333	46,028
MS	66,258	7,505	2,467	1,326	24	77,580
MO	49,292	18,116	5,981	12,510	2	85,901
MT	16,682	4,234	2,523	5,914	0	29,353

TABLE B-2. NUMBER OF FAMILY PLANNING USERS BY POVERTY STATUS AND STATE, 2004

NUMBERS

STATE	Income (all users)					TOTAL USERS
	100% AND BELOW	101% - 150%	151% - 200%	MORE THAN 200%	UNKNOWN	
NE	15,457	9,139	3,096	10,405	1,824	39,921
NV	21,311	2,913	1,418	1,497	1,273	28,412
NH	14,285	5,157	3,490	6,329	1,556	30,817
NJ	60,434	53,947	4,629	5,123	0	124,133
NM	37,403	4,532	1,048	1,939	327	45,249
NY	202,725	74,709	21,665	22,565	1,731	323,395
NC	115,573	8,029	3,782	10,886	0	138,270
ND	7,780	3,855	3,966	61	12	15,674
OH	93,940	19,393	8,101	11,769	78	133,281
OK	61,584	11,854	4,093	2,270	62	79,863
OR	65,625	14,719	5,932	3,268	2	89,546
PA	194,269	47,934	21,227	39,411	2,324	305,165
RI	11,875	2,655	1,099	938	5,325	21,892
SC	96,661	3,583	2,099	2,294	640	105,277
SD	8,931	1,826	1,323	2,140	0	14,220
TN	77,481	15,653	5,080	13,884	0	112,098
TX	185,651	51,567	11,983	9,135	547	258,883
UT	21,502	3,713	1,476	902	558	28,151
VT	4,018	2,019	1,436	2,310	470	10,253
VA	51,273	14,771	4,754	8,579	1,166	80,543
WA	87,910	30,036	11,101	13,570	682	143,299
WV	55,710	5,257	2,014	677	0	63,658
WI	32,439	6,383	3,535	4,961	273	47,591
WY	10,279	2,571	1,321	1,608	3	15,782
Territories	41,695	4,995	5,109	611	2,362	54,772
Total	3,461,649	838,704	312,393	355,025	100,014	5,067,785

TABLE B-2. NUMBER OF FAMILY PLANNING USERS BY POVERTY STATUS AND STATE, 2004

PERCENTS

STATE	Income (all users)					TOTAL USERS
	100% AND BELOW	101% - 150%	151% - 200%	MORE THAN 200%	UNKNOWN	
AL	79%	14%	4%	3%	0%	100%
AK	77%	11%	6%	6%	0%	100%
AZ	86%	6%	4%	1%	3%	100%
AR	62%	17%	8%	5%	9%	100%
CA	73%	15%	6%	4%	2%	100%
CO	66%	21%	7%	6%	0%	100%
CT	33%	41%	11%	11%	4%	100%
DE	57%	19%	9%	7%	8%	100%
DC	53%	15%	4%	22%	6%	100%
FL	67%	18%	7%	7%	1%	100%
GA	72%	17%	6%	2%	3%	100%
HI	81%	7%	3%	6%	3%	100%
ID	62%	21%	9%	9%	0%	100%
IL	72%	16%	5%	6%	0%	100%
IN	73%	15%	7%	6%	0%	100%
IA	57%	14%	7%	22%	0%	100%
KS	52%	24%	9%	12%	3%	100%
KY	72%	13%	6%	5%	3%	100%
LA	78%	3%	1%	0%	17%	100%
ME	58%	17%	9%	14%	2%	100%
MD	60%	10%	4%	11%	15%	100%
MA	54%	23%	11%	7%	5%	100%
MI	63%	17%	8%	9%	3%	100%
MN	65%	15%	8%	11%	1%	100%
MS	85%	10%	3%	2%	0%	100%
MO	57%	21%	7%	15%	0%	100%

TABLE B-2. NUMBER OF FAMILY PLANNING USERS BY POVERTY STATUS AND STATE, 2004

PERCENTS

STATE	Income (all users)					TOTAL USERS
	100% AND BELOW	101% - 150%	151% - 200%	MORE THAN 200%	UNKNOWN	
MT	57%	14%	9%	20%	0%	100%
NE	39%	23%	8%	26%	5%	100%
NV	75%	10%	5%	5%	4%	100%
NH	46%	17%	11%	21%	5%	100%
NJ	49%	43%	4%	4%	0%	100%
NM	83%	10%	2%	4%	1%	100%
NY	63%	23%	7%	7%	1%	100%
NC	84%	6%	3%	8%	0%	100%
ND	50%	25%	25%	0%	0%	100%
OH	70%	15%	6%	9%	0%	100%
OK	77%	15%	5%	3%	0%	100%
OR	73%	16%	7%	4%	0%	100%
PA	64%	16%	7%	13%	1%	100%
RI	54%	12%	5%	4%	24%	100%
SC	92%	3%	2%	2%	1%	100%
SD	63%	13%	9%	15%	0%	100%
TN	69%	14%	5%	12%	0%	100%
TX	72%	20%	5%	4%	0%	100%
UT	76%	13%	5%	3%	2%	100%
VT	39%	20%	14%	23%	5%	100%
VA	64%	18%	6%	11%	1%	100%
WA	61%	21%	8%	9%	0%	100%
WV	88%	8%	3%	1%	0%	100%
WI	68%	13%	7%	10%	1%	100%
WY	65%	16%	8%	10%	0%	100%
Territories	76%	9%	9%	1%	4%	100%



## **APPENDIX C. METHODOLOGICAL NOTES**

## APPENDIX C. METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

Grantees were strongly encouraged to submit their reports electronically using the e-Grants system. Most grantees were able to do so for the 2004 reporting period. For those grantees that submitted paper forms, OPA staff entered the totals into the electronic file, thus consolidating all reports into one electronic file. This file was initially reviewed by OPA staff and then forwarded to AGI in March 2005. Further revisions to the file were submitted to AGI as grantees provided updated information to their reports.

AGI staff reviewed all reports and requested revisions for tables with inconsistent or inaccurate data. Although the electronic template used by the eGrants system for FPAR reporting checks for internal consistency in the total number of users reported on each table, inconsistencies between tables have persisted. For instance, although the total numbers of users agreed between tables 1 and 1A for every grantee, many grantees reported inconsistent numbers of users in each age category on these tables. The problems detected by AGI staff were resolved by OPA staff by contacting individual grantees, and a final electronic data file, with all grantee corrections, was forwarded to AGI on April 27, 2005.

### GENERAL NOTES

**Planned Parenthood of Connecticut, Inc. – Region I** – Note from grantee, “The number of sites does not include SBHC partners.”

**Rhode Island Department of Health – Region I** – Note from grantee, “Out of the 20 clinics/sites, 14 are Community Health Centers, one is a hospital, one is a Visiting Nurse Services, one is a Women's Prison, one is a teen clinic and two are School Based Health Centers.”

**Emory University – Region IV** – Note from grantee, “Teen pregnancy prevention projects providing primarily education and counseling. Education included, abstinence, self esteem building, goal setting, etc.”

**Planned Parenthood of Central Ohio, Inc. – Region V** – Note from grantee, “Five (5) clinics plus education are supported.”

**State of Ohio - Department of Health – Region V** – Note from grantee, “The ODH Title X Family Planning Program funds twenty-four delegate agencies that provide services in forty-four sites or locations.”

**Louisiana Dept. of Health and Hospitals – Region VI** – Note from grantee, “Data from Women with Vision (WWV) program were not included in the Initial Submission of FPAR 2004. Data was collected, compiled, analyzed and included in this revision.”

**Texas Department of State Health Services – Region VI** – Note from grantee, “The number of DSHS delegate agencies increased from 37 in 2003 to 42 in 2004. Delegate agencies reported serving 5044 fewer unduplicated users in 2004. This amounts to a 1.9% decrease since the last reporting period. 13 delegates reported a decrease in clients served. Of these 13, two delegates reported significant decreases in client numbers. The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center reported 2659 fewer users; whereas, the University of Texas Medical Branch Regional Maternal and Child Health Program reported 7818 fewer users. This can be partly attributed to a cut in Title XX funding to these 2 agencies. The DSHS was directed to reduce the Title XX budget by \$3.1 million for FY05. Contractors that had a combination of Title V, X, and XX funding received the largest cuts. The reduction in Title XX funds was replaced with Title V family planning dollars; however, Title V family planning funds are not part of the Title X budget. This switch in funding strategy reduced the Title XX dollars in the Title X Total budget for FY05 by \$1,936,422.”

**Iowa Department of Public Health – Region VII** – Note from grantee, “In 2004, 9 clinics closed for financial reasons. This is reflected fewer unduplicated clients served by the program.”



**Missouri Family Health Council – Region VII** – Note from grantee, “Clinic and user numbers decreased in 2004 due to loss of state family planning funds in Missouri in 2003.”

**Navajo Family Health Resource Network – Region IX**– Note from grantee, “Users/Encounters seen in community for health education, data/numbers not included. Collection of data is being revised.”

**International Community Health Services – Region X**– Note from grantee, “Franklin clinic removed from Title X funding March 30, 2004.”

**Oregon Department of Human Services – Region X**– Note from grantee, “We believe the drop in Title X clients from 2003 is due to the fact the two of our biggest delegate agencies closed clinic sites in 2004. Multnomah Co. Health Dept. closed two sites and Lane Co. Health dept. closed three.”

**State of Washington Department of Health – Region X**– Note from grantee, “These tables were generated using the DOH Grantee total from Region X Family Planning Reporting System. Per instructions from Region X, the total number of unknown users on Table 1 was reduced by 228 in order for all tables to match the total count. In WA State, some clients identify with more than one race.”

## **DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS (Tables 1, 1a and 2)**

### **USERS BY GENDER**

There were no reported problems of unknown gender in the 2004 reports.

**New Mexico Department of Health – Region VI**– Note from grantee, “In 2004, the total users were 45,249 (1,472 increase from 2003). The increase was proportionately prominent in male users (878, 15.5% male user increase, 59.6% of total increase) when compared to the increase in female users (594, 1.5% increase of female users and 40.4% of the total user increase). The increase in male users was noticed among users ages 15-24 as follows: ages 15-17: 166, 18.9% increase; ages 18-19: 166, 18.9%; ges 20-24: 289, 32.9% users increase and % of all the male user, repectively. Overall, the increase in male users ages 15-24 accounted for 70.7% of all the male user increase. The number of male users increase despite the decrease in the number of vasectomy performed in 2004 as compared to 2003. The increase in female users was prominent among users ages 15-19, 852 users, accounted for 144.1% of all the female user increase (the percentage increase of these 2 age groups exceeds 100% because there are reductions in other age group numbers of users).”

### **USERS BY AGE**

**Medical and Health Research Association of New York City, Inc. – Region II**– Note from grantee, “For one Female User, both age and race are unknown. Due to the inability to submit FPAR with unequal totals in tables, she has been added to the unknown race, age 20-24 category.”

### **USERS BY RACE**

**Rhode Island Department of Health – Region I** – Note from grantee, “Out of the 7,882 race unknown/not reported, 87.2 %(6,878) are "other" race. Only 4.7 %(371) are truly race unknown/not reported and 8%(633)are more than one race. Latinos and to a far lesser extent, Portuguese, do not feel that they belong to any of the racial categories in FPAR.”

**Medical and Health Research Association of New York City, Inc. – Region II**– Note from grantee, “For one Female User, both age and race are unknown. Due to the inability to submit FPAR with unequal totals in tables, she has been added to the unknown race, age 20-24 category.”

**Georgia Department of Human Resources– Region IV** – The grantee submitted table 1 with the cell for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Male Users ages 20-24 outnumbering female users in

that age and race category. We verified that this was inaccurate and the grantee submitted a revised table 1.

**Planned Parenthood Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota – Region V** – Note from grantee, “The “Unknown or Not Reported” category includes our clients who identified as having more than one race (multi-racial).”

**St. Paul – Ramsey County Public Health– Region V** – The grantee originally submitted table 1 with more Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Male Users than Female users in this race category. We verified that this was inaccurate and the grantee submitted a revised table.

**Arkansas Department of Health – Region VI** – Note from grantee, “For the first 6 months of the calendar year, until July 1, 2004, the Arkansas Dept. of Health data collection still combined Pacific Islander with Asian. We have used 2002 American Community Survey-Arkansas, to calculate what percent of these races are of the combination, assuming participation in proportion to their percentage in the population. Asian 94.70% and Pacific Islander 5.30%.”

#### USERS BY ETHNICITY

**St. Paul – Ramsey County Public Health– Region V** – The grantee submitted table 1A with significantly fewer Hispanic/Latino clients than the previous year. We verified that this was inaccurate, and the grantee submitted a revised table.

**Louisiana Dept. of Health and Hospitals – Region VI** – Note from grantee, “Data from Women with Vision (WWV) program were not included in the Initial Submission of FPAR 2004. Data was collected, compiled, analyzed and included in this revision. As the data for “Hispanic/Latino Origin” were not available, the clients served by the WWV Program were included as “Unknown/Not Reported”. As this program targets the population segment of 24 and under, the age groups of “Under 15”, “Ages 15-17”, “Ages 18-19” and “Ages 20-24” have a higher number of “Unknown/Not Reported”.”

**Republic of the Marshall Islands – Region IX** – Note from grantee, “No users from this origin.”

#### USERS BY INCOME/POVERTY STATUS

**Rhode Island Department of Health – Region I** – Note from grantee, “This data is an estimate based on statewide Medicaid data. Income information is not collected on patients with private insurance and most patients with Medicaid. 90% of unknowns are privately insured. 10% is truly unknown.”

**State of Ohio - Department of Health – Region V** – Note from grantee, “63.5% of clients had incomes at or below 100% of the FPL; 81.7% of clients had incomes at or below 150% of the FPL.”

**Louisiana Dept. of Health and Hospitals – Region VI** – Note from grantee, “Data from Women with Vision (WWV) program were not included in the Initial Submission of FPAR 2004. Data was collected, compiled, analyzed and included in this revision. As the data for “Income Status” were not available, the clients served by the WWV Program were included as “Unknown”.”

**New Mexico Department of Health – Region VI** – Note from grantee, “Table 2 showed an increase (1,915) in the number of clients whose family income was in 100% or less of the federal poverty guidelines. There were also an increase in the number of clients whose family income was in 101-150% and more than 200% of the federal poverty guidelines (455 and 312, respectively). The number of clients with unknown family income decreased dramatically to 327 from 1,150 in 2003 (823 decrease) despite the increase in the number of overall unduplicated users. We think that this number reflected the fee collection training effort throughout the state in 2004.”

**Texas Department of State Health Services – Region VI** – Note from grantee, “The income status of users remained statistically proportionate to previous years, however users with incomes higher than 200% of poverty level did increase by 3.5%.”

### CONTRACEPTIVE METHOD USE (Table 3)

**Medical and Health Research Association of New York City, Inc. – Region II**– The grantee originally reported 0 pregnant women in table 3. We verified that this was inaccurate, and the grantee sent a revision.

**Community Health Centers, Inc. – Region IV**– Note from grantee, “Other Methods” includes hormonal patch (727) and abstinence (106)”

**Emory University – Region IV**– Note from grantee, “No clinical services provided.”

**Florida Department of Health – Region IV**– Note from grantee, “Clients on Contraceptive Patch and Nuva Ring are included in Other Methods.”

**Illinois Department of Human Services – Region V**– Note from grantee, “Other Methods include Hormonal Patch 10381, Vaginal Ring 1444, Abstinence 1305, Other 1336.”

**State of Ohio - Department of Health – Region V**– Note from grantee, “All clients are advised (and supplied) to use condoms in addition to any other form of contraception.”

**Louisiana Dept. of Health and Hospitals – Region VI**– Note from grantee, “Data from Women with Vision program were not included in the Initial Submission of FPAR 2004. Data was collected, analyzed and included in this revision. As the data for contraceptive methods were not available, data were included as ‘Method Unknown’. “Method Unknown” row captured a much higher number than that of the previous year for the following reasons: 1. The web based COMPASS system for medical and financial data collection and Cognos Data Cube system for capturing that data was introduced to all DHH-OPH clinics from the first business day the year 2004. Because of the new system, the data were not collected properly, and in many cases, was collected as “Unknown” or “missing”. “Contraceptive Methods for Female” was one of them. 2. As the WWV program is a health education and outreach program, contraceptive methods data is not available for these clients. Inclusion of these clients increased the number in “Method Unknown” category significantly.”

**New Mexico Department of Health – Region VI**– Note from grantee, “Table 3 showed an increase in the number of sterilization female or their partner users (229) although the number of vasectomy procedures performed in 2004 decreased in comparison to 2003 (66 done to date and 122 approved in 2004 vs. 105 done and 152 approved in 2003). The total number of hormonal method users was decreased (-1,027) with the decrease in % of hormonal to total female users of -3.3%. There was no change in % of IUD female users (2%). The number of female users using condoms decreased (-546) with increases with female users who used natural (383) and other methods (1,080). There was also ~ 50% reduction of the female with no method used for other reasons than pregnancy (-961). The number of unknown method users increased by 1,303. Most of these female users were seen in our new provider agreement sites. Their clients’ methods would not be captured until Title X supplies were dispensed to them. This issue can be addressed by training of the new sites.”

**Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands – Region IX**– Note from grantee, “Permanent sterilization was not covered by Title X Program.”

**Republic of Palau Ministry of Health Services – Region IX**– The total number of female clients originally reported in table 3 did not match the total number of female clients reported in tables 1 and 1A. We verified that this was inaccurate, and the grantee sent a revised table.

**International Community Health Services – Region X**– Note from grantee, “Data based on Ahlers “Contraceptive Method-After Visit” and “Medical Services” for period of 1/1/04-12/31/04.”

**Municipality of Anchorage – Region X**– Note from grantee, “Patch and ring included in “other”.”

**State of Washington Department of Health – Region X**–The grantee originally reported a very large number of cervical cap users. We verified that this was inaccurate, and the grantee sent a revised table.

#### **SELECTED SERVICES DELIVERED (Table 4)**

**Rhode Island Department of Health – Region I**– Note from grantee, “STD tests include Gonorrhoea, Syphilis, and Chlamydia tests.”

**North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services – Region IV**– The grantee originally reported the same number of Pap smears, breast exams and STD tests for females. We verified that this was inaccurate, and the grantee sent a revised table.

**Michigan Dept. of Community Health – Region V**– Note from grantee, “Paps-6538 Follow-up – 6530.”

**State of Ohio - Department of Health – Region V**– Note from grantee, “There were 37 male breast exams.”

**New Mexico Department of Health – Region VI**– Note from grantee, “The number of breast exam increased by 1,899 from 2003, which exceeds the increase in the number of female users (594). The STD tests excluding HIV among male users were increased by 2,575 tests. This number is disproportionate to the male user increase (878) due to the new test for chlamydia and gonorrhoea were offered as a combination tests and multiple tests could be done in one patient. The change in the annual numbers of chlamydia test in female family planners 2004 vs. 2003 (-1,340).”

**Texas Department of State Health Services – Region VI**– Note from grantee, “The total number of Pap tests performed decreased by 11,564 or 6% from 2003. This decrease is in part due to changes in DSHS Policy with regard to the requirement of annual Pap tests. In February 2004 the DSHS Title X & XX Policy Manual was revised to bring DSHS policy into compliance with OPA Program Instructions on Screening for Cervical Cancer that were issued in October 2003. This policy does not require DSHS delegates to perform annual pap tests on clients, but rather requires delegates to establish the optimal interval for conducting Pap tests on each individual client. The interval for each individual client should not exceed three years. The number of male STD tests and the number of HIV tests for both male and female users increased as a result of the inclusion of data from the two expansion projects (hard-to-reach populations) and data from the two clinic-based male projects.”

**South Dakota Department of Health – Region VIII**– The grantee originally reported a large number of breast exams. We verified that this was inaccurate, and the grantee submitted a revised number.

**Wyoming Health Council – Region VIII**– The grantee originally reported very few breast exams. We verified that this was inaccurate, and the grantee submitted a revised table.

**Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands – Region IX**– Note from grantee, “All eligible pap tests and CBEs were covered by the local Breast and Cervical Screening Program. All eligible STD tests and HIV tests were covered by the HIV/STD Prevention Program. Title X did not cover these services because of budget shortfalls.”

**Republic of the Marshall Islands – Region IX**– Note from grantee, “Re STD: the women usually do not complain of signs and symptoms but they are the ones who come in to seek family planning assistance.”

**State of Hawaii Department of Health – Region IX**– Note from grantee, “HIV tests were reported as “0” because HIV test data on FP clients is combined with non-FP client data. We are unable to separate the data.”

#### **MID-LEVEL AND PHYSICIAN STAFFING PROFILE (Table 5)**

**Alivio Medical Center – Region V**– Note from grantee, “NP/CNM provider FTEs were 1.1 Jan.-May 2004, and 0.9 June - December 2004. The 0.98 value is an average of the 2. The physician position terminated on 9/29/04, at the end of our HIV services expansion grant.”

**Michigan Dept. of Community Health – Region V**– Note from grantee, “Nurses, Medical/110.368 Med. Enc./199212.”

**New Mexico Department of Health – Region VI**– Note from grantee, “The numbers in table 5 came from the time study that the program conducted in 2004. We believe that these numbers better reflect the actual family planning medical encounters than the numbers collected from the 2003 methodology.”

**Navajo Family Health Resource Network – Region IX**– Note from grantee, “Medical Care Service/Providers are given by the Indian Health Services via match In-Kind Services.”

**Municipality of Anchorage – Region X**– Note from grantee, “This includes visits by PHNs working in an expanded role providing male and female genital exam, diagnosis and treatment for sexually transmitted infections.”

#### **REVENUE REPORT (Table 6)**

FPAR instructions are not clear as to where revenues received from state-initiated Medicaid family planning waiver programs should be recorded. Some grantees have always listed revenues from these programs under Medicaid. Others have varied between listing such revenues as "other third parties," "state government," "local government," or Medicaid. While it appears that the majority of grantees with Medicaid family planning waiver programs are now listing these revenues as Medicaid, we suspect that grantees from Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Maryland and Virginia continue to list family planning waiver programs as "state" or "local" revenues, not Medicaid revenues.

**Action for Boston Community Development, Inc. – Region I**– Note from grantee, “Delegates did not report any patient fees for CY04. ABCD is in the process of estimating patient fees and all other program income by April 1, 2005 as requested in the current NGA.” Also, the grantee originally reported all third-party payers dollars as “prepaid”. We verified that those dollars should appear in the “not prepaid” column, and adjusted accordingly.

**Medical and Health Research Association of New York City, Inc. – Region II** – Note from grantee, “Total program revenue increased 18% over 2002, due to two principle factors: 1) A 4th delegate was added to MHRA's Title X program, and 2) Medicaid revenue increased by 60% (thanks to NY State's Family Planning Benefit Program).”

**Virginia State Department of Health and Family Planning – Region III**– The grantee originally reported all monies in the Third Party Payers section, in the “Prepaid” column. We verified that this was inaccurate and the grantee submitted a revision.

**Mississippi State Department of Health – Region IV** – Note from grantee, “Reporting period for the revenue report reflect dates of July 1 2002 thru June 30, 2003. Includes Y.O.U., Inc. Project regional funding.” The grantee originally reported Medicaid revenues on the Medicare line. We verified that this was inaccurate, and the grantee submitted a revised table.

**Planned Parenthood of Central Ohio, Inc. – Region V** – Note from grantee, “State Government” revenue includes Ohio Department of Health and “Local Government” revenue includes Franklin County.”

**Texas Department of State Health Services – Region VI**– Note from grantee, “We have omitted the reporting of Title V revenues since this is not a part of our State Title X project. However, Title X contractors reported using \$4,780,159 in Title V contract funds for family planning. Medicaid revenue reported by contractors has increased by 24%. In 2003, delegates reported \$3,703,519 in Medicaid revenue and the 2004 report shows \$4,593,465 in Medicaid revenue (both prepaid and not prepaid). Other state and local government revenue has continued to increase as delegates attempt to maintain level services in the face of increasing operational costs. In the 2003 FPAR, \$527,534 in

state government funds and \$658,325 in local government revenue were reported, whereas in 2004, the numbers were \$1,735,230 and \$611,766 respectively.”

**International Resource Group LTD. – Region VI** – Note from grantee, “Project officer should see hardcopy of Table 6 submitted 2/17/04 for breakdown of CBO agency funding.”

**Bienvenidos Children's Center, Inc. – Region IX** – The grantee originally reported FamilyPACT revenues on the “Other (Specify)” line. After discussion, they submitted a revised table with these revenues in the Medicaid line.

**California Family Health Council, Inc. – Region IX** – The grantee originally reported FamilyPACT revenues on the “Other Third Parties” line. After discussion, they submitted a revised table with these revenues in the Medicaid line.

**Idaho Department of Health and Welfare – Region X**– Note from grantee, “The Project scope was redefined in the FY 2004 grant application (July 1, 2003). Table 6 reflects 6 months revenue under prior budget definition and 6 months July 1- December 31,2003) with new budget.”

**Municipality of Anchorage – Region X** – The grantee originally submitted table 6 with all monies in the Third Party Payers section listed in the “Prepaid” column. We verified that this was inaccurate and were authorized to correct it by moving the monies to the “Not Prepaid column”.

**Oregon Department of Human Services – Region X** – Note from grantee, “Medicaid” revenue (Title XIX) includes Family Planning Expansion Project (FPEP)Medicaid waiver funds as well as regular Medicaid billing reimbursement. FPEP = \$24,094,403 and “State Government” funds are used as match funds for the FPEP program.”

Descriptions of “other” revenue sources:

Under the category “Other Federal Grants,” some grantees specified the grant types they were including. Those specified were: Abstinence Education, AIDS, BCCCP, Breast & Cervical Cancer & STD, CCHD, CDC, CDC BCHP, CDC IPP (Infertility Prevention Project), CDC/STD, CDC (Wash. U.), CFHS SUBSIDY, CSBG, Cultural Outreach, DSHS Medicaid Match, FP/CSO, HIV Prevention, HIV Supplement, HIV surveillance, HRSA – Healthcare Other Facilities, HRSA, HUD Funds, Infertility prevention, Infertility Project, JFS, PHBG, PHHS Block Grant, Preventive Block Grant, Preventive Health Services, Respect, Site – Block Grant, SSDI, STD, STD/HIV, TANF, Title X Male Involvement, U.S. Grant Direct, Various.

Under the category “Other Sources,” some grantees specified the funding types as follows: 330, Administrative Claiming, Agnes Lindsay Trust, Applicant, Avon Grant, Breast/Cervical CA Program, Cancer Consortium, Clarion Hospitals, Client donations, Community Benefits, Contract with Texas Center for Health Training, Contracted Services, contracts, Contributions, County, County Teen Pregnancy Prevention Contract, Delegate Agency, Donations, DSHS CSO, Education Fees, Education Prog. Fees, FLE fees, Fundraising, Grants, HIV Rapid Test Clinical Test Grant, HMO, HUD Funds, Human Papilloma Virus Study Grant, In-Kind, In-Kind providers services, Inkind/Restricted, Institutional funds, Interest, Interest income, IPA, Jefferson & Mobile County interest, Job Corp, KidCare App. Fee, local health, Local Hlth. Prot. Grant, Local Match, Maine Community Foundation, Maine Health Access Foundation, MA N’CMP CARE, March of Dimes, MDC Assoc., MeHaf Grant, MidCoast Charities, Minneapolis Contract: uncompensated care, misc. income, MO Foundation for Health, Non-citizens proj., Non-family planning program income, Oak Grove Foundation, Other Contractual, Other Non-federal, other non-profits, pamphlet sales, Private/General Fund, Private Foundations, Private Foundation Grants, Private Sources, Program Revenue, Proteus, Reimbursements, Rental income, Sacopee Valley Health Center, SEARHC – BCCEDP, Student fees, Subgrantee Funds, Take Charge, TANF, Title XX, Tobacco Settlement, UNFPA, United Way, United Way of Kennebec Valley, United Way of MidCoast, Unity Foundation, universities, Unrestricted funding, vendor reimbursements, VNA, Women’s Health Network Grant.