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Summary

The federal government provides grants for family planning services through the Family Planning Program, Title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. §§300 to 300a-6). Enacted in 1970, it is the only domestic federal program devoted solely to family planning and related preventive health services. In 2015, Title X-funded clinics served 4.0 million clients.

Title X is administered through the Office of Population Affairs (OPA) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Although the authorization of appropriations for Title X ended with FY1985, funding for the program has continued through appropriations bills for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies (Labor-HHS-Education).

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114-113) provided $286 million for Title X, the same as the FY2015 level. The FY2016 act continued previous years’ requirements that Title X funds not be spent on abortions, that all pregnancy counseling be nondirective, and that funds not be spent on promoting or opposing any legislative proposal or candidate for public office. Grantees continued to be required to certify that they encourage “family participation” when minors seek family planning services and to certify that they counsel minors on how to resist attempted coercion into sexual activity. The appropriations law also clarified that family planning providers are not exempt from state notification and reporting laws on child abuse, child molestation, sexual abuse, rape, or incest.

The President’s FY2017 budget proposes to increase Title X funding by 5% to $300 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee bill S. 3040, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017, would provide $286 million for Title X, the same as the FY2016 level. The House Appropriations Committee bill H.R. 5926, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017, would provide no funding for Title X in FY2017.

In September 2016, OPA released a proposed rule to limit the criteria Title X grantees can use to restrict subawards: “No recipient making subawards for the provision of services as part of its Title X project may prohibit an entity from participating for reasons unrelated to its ability to provide services effectively.” OPA requested public comments on the proposal by October 7, 2016.

The law (42 U.S.C. §300a-6) prohibits the use of Title X funds in programs where abortion is a method of family planning. According to OPA, family planning projects that receive Title X funds are closely monitored to ensure that federal funds are used appropriately and that funds are not used for prohibited activities such as abortion. The prohibition on abortion does not apply to all the activities of a Title X grantee, but only to activities that are part of the Title X project. A grantee’s abortion activities must be “separate and distinct” from the Title X project activities.
Contents

Title X Program Administration and Grants ................................................................. 1
  Administration ........................................................................................................... 1
  Family Planning Services Grants ............................................................................. 1
    Services .................................................................................................................. 1
  Client Charges .......................................................................................................... 2
  Client Characteristics ................................................................................................. 2
  Grantees and Clinics ................................................................................................. 3
Family Planning Training and Research Grants .................................................................. 4
Funding .......................................................................................................................... 4
  FY2016 Funding ........................................................................................................ 4
  FY2017 Budget Request ............................................................................................ 6
  FY2017 Senate Appropriations Bill ............................................................................. 7
  FY2017 House Appropriations Bill ............................................................................. 7
History of Funding ......................................................................................................... 7
Institute of Medicine Evaluation .................................................................................... 9
The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and Title X ........................................ 10
Proposed Rule on Selecting Subrecipients .................................................................... 15
Abortion and Title X .................................................................................................... 16
Teenage Pregnancy and Title X .................................................................................. 18
Confidentiality for Minors and Title X ......................................................................... 19
Planned Parenthood and Title X .................................................................................. 21

Figures

Figure 1. Title X Family Planning Program Appropriations, FY1978-FY2016 .................. 9

Tables

Table 1. Title X Family Planning Program Appropriations, FY1971-FY2016 ................... 8

Contacts

Author Contact Information ......................................................................................... 22
Title X Program Administration and Grants

The federal government provides grants for family planning services through the Family Planning Program, Title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. §§300 to 300a-6). Enacted in 1970, it is the only domestic federal program devoted solely to family planning and related preventive health services. Participation in family planning services by Title X clients is, by law, voluntary.1

Although Title X is the only federal domestic program primarily focused on family planning, other programs also finance family planning, among their other services. These programs include Medicaid, the Health Centers program under Section 330 of the Public Health Service Act, Maternal and Child Health Block Grants, and Social Services Block Grants. In FY2010, Medicaid accounted for 75% of U.S. public family planning expenditures (including federal, state, and local government spending). In comparison, Title X accounted for 10%.2

Administration

Title X is administered by the Office of Population Affairs (OPA) under the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Although the program is administered through OPA, funding for Title X activities is provided through the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) in HHS. Authorization of appropriations expired at the end of FY1985, but the program has continued to be funded through appropriations bills for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies (Labor-HHS-Education).

OPA administers three types of project grants under Title X: family planning services;3 family planning personnel training;4 and family planning service delivery improvement research.5

Family Planning Services Grants

Services

Ninety percent of Title X funds are used for clinical services.6 Grants for family planning services fund family planning and related preventive health services, such as contraceptive services; natural family planning methods; infertility services; services to adolescents; breast and cervical

---

1 42 U.S.C. §300a-5 states: “The acceptance by any individual of family planning services or family planning or population growth information (including educational materials) provided through financial assistance under this title (whether by grant or contract) shall be voluntary and shall not be a prerequisite to eligibility for or receipt of any other service or assistance from, or to participation in, any other program of the entity or individual that provided such service or information.”


cancer screening and prevention; sexually transmitted disease (STD) and HIV prevention education, counseling, testing, and referral; preconception health services; and counseling on establishing a reproductive life plan.7 The services must be provided “without coercion and with respect for the privacy, dignity, social, and religious beliefs of the individuals being served.”

Title X clinics provide confidential screening, counseling, and referral for treatment. In this regard, OPA has expressed a commitment to integrating HIV-prevention services in all family planning clinics.8 OPA has provided supplemental grants to help Title X projects implement the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC’s) “Revised Recommendations for HIV Testing of Adults, Adolescents, and Pregnant Women in Health Care Settings.”9

Title X services offered to males include condoms, education and counseling, STD testing and treatment, HIV testing, and, in some cases, vasectomy services.10

Client Charges

Priority for services is given to persons from low-income families, who may not be charged for care.12 Clients from families with income between 100% and 250% of the federal poverty guideline (FPL) are charged on a sliding scale based on their ability to pay. Clients from families with income higher than 250% FPL are charged fees designed to recover the reasonable cost of providing services. If a third party (such as a state Medicaid program or a private health insurance plan) is authorized or legally obligated to pay for a client’s services, all reasonable efforts must be made to obtain the third-party payment without discounts.13

Client Characteristics

In 2015, Title X-funded clinics served 4.018 million clients, primarily low-income women and adolescents. Of those clients, 10% were male, 66% had incomes at or below the federal poverty level, and 86% had incomes at or below 200% of the federal poverty level.14 For 61% of clients,

---

8 CFDA, Program number 93.217. See also 42 C.F.R. §59.5.
12 42 C.F.R. §59.2 defines “low-income family” as having income at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines (FPL). The regulation states that “Low-income family’ also includes members of families whose annual family income exceeds this amount, but who, as determined by the project director, are unable, for good reasons, to pay for family planning services. For example, emancipated minors who wish to receive services on a confidential basis must be considered on the basis of their own resources.”
13 42 C.F.R. §59.5.
Title X clinics are their “usual” or only regular source of health care. In 2015, 48% of Title X clients were uninsured. The number of Title X clients served in 2015 was 3% lower than in 2014 (when there were 4.129 million clients), 12% lower than in 2013 (when there were 4.558 million clients), and 23% lower than in 2010 (when there were 5.225 million clients). The Family Planning Annual Report and the HRSA FY2017 Budget Justification suggested several reasons for grantees’ decreased capacity to serve clients, including reduced revenues for family planning projects, such as decreases in funding from state and local government programs, Title X, block grants, and other funding sources.

Grantees also suggested several potential reasons for a decrease in demand, including Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) insurance coverage expansions, because newly insured clients can choose to seek care from private practitioners and other non-Title X providers. Increased use of long-acting reversible contraception (LARC), which could reduce the frequency of client visits in the long run, compared with some other types of contraception (such as oral contraceptives that require refills). Recent clinical guideline changes. For example, pap tests are now recommended every three years instead of annually.

Grantees and Clinics

In 2015, there were 91 Title X family planning services grantees. Such grantees included 46 state, local, and territorial health departments and 45 nonprofit organizations, such as community health agencies, family planning councils, and Planned Parenthood affiliates.
Title X grantees can provide family planning services directly or they can subaward Title X monies to other public or nonprofit entities to provide services. Although there is no fixed matching amount required for grants, regulations specify that no Title X projects may be fully supported by Title X funds. In 2015, Title X provided services through 3,951 clinics located in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories and Freely Associated States.

Family Planning Training and Research Grants

Family planning training grants are used to train staff and to improve the use and career development of paraprofessionals. Staff are trained through five national training programs for Coordination and Strategic Initiatives; Management and Systems Improvement; Family Planning Service Delivery; Quality Assurance, Quality Improvement and Evaluation; and a National Clinical Training Center. These programs have produced provider education resources, training tools, and webinars on topics such as ACA implementation, the Zika virus, and clinical efficiency, among other topics. Family planning service delivery improvement research grants are used for studies to enhance effectiveness and efficiency of the service delivery system.

For more information on the Title X program, see http://www.hhs.gov/opa/title-x-family-planning.

Funding

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114-113) provided $286.479 million for Title X in FY2016, the same as the FY2015 enacted level. The President’s FY2017 budget proposes to increase Title X funding by 5% to $300 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee bill S. 3040, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017, would provide $286 million for Title X, the same as the FY2016 level. The House Appropriations Committee bill H.R. 5926, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017, would provide no funding for Title X in FY2017.

FY2016 Funding

As mentioned previously, P.L. 114-113 provided $286.479 million for Title X in FY2016, the same as the FY2015 enacted level. The FY2016 act continued previous years’ requirements that Title X funds not be spent on abortions, among other requirements (see text box “Requirements on the Use of Title X Funds in P.L. 114-113, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016”).

---

23 42 C.F.R. §59.7(c).
25 CFDA. Program number 93.260.
28 A list of research grant projects is at HHS, OPA, Research, http://www.hhs.gov/opa/title-x-family-planning/research-and-data/research/.
29 P.L. 114-113, Division H, Title II; P.L. 113-235, Division G, Title II.
FY2016 appropriations were subject to a clause, known as the Weldon amendment, stating that “None of the funds made available in this Act may be made available to a Federal agency or program, or to a State or local government, if such agency, program, or government subjects any institutional or individual health care entity to discrimination on the basis that the health care entity does not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortions.”\(^3\) Some have argued that the Weldon amendment conflicts with regulations that require Title X family planning services projects to give pregnant women the opportunity to receive information, counseling, and referral upon request for several options, including “pregnancy termination.”\(^3\) In the February 23, 2011, Federal Register, HHS stated that potential conflicts would be handled on a case-by-case basis: “The approach of a case by case investigation and, if necessary, enforcement will best enable the Department to deal with any perceived conflicts within concrete situations.”\(^3\)


\(^{31}\) 42 C.F.R. §59.5(a)(5). Examples of this argument appear in “Weldon Amendment,” Congressional Record, daily edition, vol. 151, no. 51 (April 25, 2005), p. S4222; and “Federal Refusal Clause,” Congressional Record, daily edition, vol. 151, no. 52 (April 26, 2005), p. S425. The National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association (NFPRHA), many of whose members provide Title X services, filed a lawsuit challenging the Weldon Amendment in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The court found that “While Weldon may not provide the level of guidance that NFPRHA or its members would prefer, may create a conflict with pre-existing agency regulations, and may impose conditions that NFPRHA members find unacceptable, none of these reasons provides a sufficient basis for the court to invalidate an act of Congress in its entirety.” Upon appeal, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit found that the plaintiff lacked the standing to challenge the Weldon Amendment. See National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association, Inc., v. Alberto Gonzales, et al., 468 F.3d 826 (D.C. Cir. 2006), and 391 F. Supp. 2d 200, 209 (D.D.C. 2005).

Requirements on the Use of Title X Funds in P.L. 114-113, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016

P.L. 114-113 continues previous years’ requirements regarding the use of Title X funds:

- Title X funds shall not be spent on abortions.
- All pregnancy counseling shall be nondirective.  
- Funds shall not be spent on promoting or opposing any legislative proposal or candidate for public office.
- Grantees must certify that they encourage “family participation” when minors decide to seek family planning services and that they counsel minors on how to resist attempted coercion into sexual activity.
- Family planning providers are not exempt from state notification and reporting laws on child abuse, child molestation, sexual abuse, rape, or incest.


FY2017 Budget Request

The President’s FY2017 budget, submitted February 9, 2016, requests $300 million for Title X, 5% higher than the FY2016 enacted level. The budget would continue previous years’ provisions in appropriations laws prohibiting the use of Title X funds for abortion, among other requirements (see text box “Requirements on the Use of Title X Funds in P.L. 114-113, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016”).

According to the HRSA Justification, the proposed FY2017 funding level would support family planning services for 4.26 million clients. The program’s FY2017 goals include preventing 1,278 cases of infertility through Chlamydia screening and preventing 977,400 unintended pregnancies. The FY2017 target for cost per client served is $328.41, with the goal of maintaining the cost per client below the medical care inflation rate.

OPA also plans to use FY2017 funds to train and support providers in adopting the standards in “Providing Quality Family Planning Services, Recommendations of CDC and the U.S. Office of Populations Affairs.” OPA would also use FY2017 funds to develop a Family Planning Delivery System Improvement Center “that will use evidence based principles to support the delivery of quality family planning services within a sustainable system of care.” OPA also plans to create a

---

33 OPA has explained that “grantees may provide as much factual, neutral information about any option, including abortion, as they consider warranted by the circumstances, but may not steer or direct clients toward selecting any option, including abortion, in providing options counseling.” (65 Federal Register 41273).
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A centralized data center for Family Planning Annual Report (FPAR) data, supporting a shift from grantee-level aggregate reporting to de-identified encounter-level reporting. As more clients have gained health insurance through the ACA, the Title X program has encouraged clinics to increase their number of contracts with insurance plans and to recover more costs through reimbursements and billing third-party payers. OPA expects that clinics’ additional investment in third-party billing, along with improved electronic health records adoption, will increase revenue and allow the Title X program to serve more clients.

**FY2017 Senate Appropriations Bill**

On June 9, 2016, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported S. 3040. It would provide $286 million for Title X, the same as the FY2016 level. It would also continue to contain the Weldon amendment and would continue previous years’ requirements that Title X funds not be spent on abortions, among other requirements (see text box “Requirements on the Use of Title X Funds in P.L. 114-113, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016”).

**FY2017 House Appropriations Bill**

On July 22, 2016, the House Appropriations Committee reported H.R. 5926. It would provide no funding for Title X in FY2017. Section 228 of the bill states that “None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to carry out title X of the PHS Act.”

**History of Funding**

Table 1 shows Title X appropriations amounts since FY1971, when the program was created. Figure 1 shows Title X appropriations amounts since FY1978, in current dollars (not adjusted for inflation) and constant FY2015 dollars (adjusted for medical care inflation).

---

38 Title X grantees will be asked to leverage electronic health records (EHR) technology to securely transmit FPAR data on each client encounter, including data on client demographics, services provided, and health outcomes. The information will be de-identified to protect patient privacy. HHS, HRSA, *Fiscal Year 2017, Justification of Estimates for Appropriations Committee,* pp. 394-395.

39 Ibid., pp. 391 and 394.
Table 1. Title X Family Planning Program Appropriations, FY1971-FY2016

(in millions, current dollars, not adjusted for inflation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>$142.5</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$273.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>$61.8</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>$139.7</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$278.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>$100.6</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$138.3</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$286.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>$100.6</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$139.1</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$282.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$100.6</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$144.3</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$283.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>$100.6</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$149.6</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$113.0</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$173.4</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$307.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$135.0</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$180.9</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$317.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>$135.0</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$193.3</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$299.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$162.0</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$192.6</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$293.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>$161.7</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$198.5</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$278.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$124.2</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$203.5</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$286.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$124.1</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$215.0</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$286.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>$140.0</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$238.9</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$286.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>$142.5</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$253.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>$136.4</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$265.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institute of Medicine Evaluation

At the request of OPA’s Office of Family Planning, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) of the National Academy of Sciences independently evaluated the Title X program and made recommendations in A Review of the HHS Family Planning Program: Mission, Management, and Measurement of Results (2009).\(^{40}\)

IOM found that family planning—"helping people have children when they want to and avoid conception when they do not—is a critical social and public health goal," and that the "federal government has a responsibility to support the attainment of this goal." IOM noted, for example, that family planning can prevent unintended and high-risk pregnancies, thereby reducing fetal, infant, and maternal mortality and morbidity. IOM also stated that the appropriate use of contraception can reduce abortion rates and cited "ample evidence that family planning services are cost-effective."\(^{41}\) IOM made specific recommendations to increase program funding and to improve program management, administration, and evaluation.

---


Among IOM’s recommendations was that OPA’s Office of Family Planning “review and update the Program Guidelines to ensure that they are evidence-based.” IOM noted, for example, that the guidelines required female Title X clients, including adolescents, to have pelvic and breast examinations within six months of their initial visit, though “relevant abnormalities are rarely found in adolescents.” At the time of the IOM report, Title X Program Guidelines had not been updated since 2001.\textsuperscript{42}

In response to the IOM recommendations, OPA released new program guidelines in April 2014.\textsuperscript{43} The new guidelines draw on systematic literature reviews and existing recommendations from organizations, such as the CDC, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Congress for Reproductive Medicine, and the American Urological Association. For example, the new guidelines state that pelvic exams and clinical breast exams are “not needed routinely to provide contraception safely to a healthy client” (though they may be recommended for some cases, such as inserting an intrauterine device, fitting a diaphragm, cancer screening for non-adolescents, assessing gestational age after a positive pregnancy test, if the client has certain STD symptoms, as part of infertility care, or to address other non-contraceptive health needs). OPA states that the new guidelines have “a foundation of empirical evidence and information supporting clinical practice.”\textsuperscript{44} Also in response to the IOM report, HHS contracted with IOM to convene a Standing Committee to advise the Title X program on issues raised by the 2009 report, as well as other emerging family planning issues.\textsuperscript{45}

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and Title X

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA, P.L. 111-148, as amended) has numerous provisions that may impact Title X clinics. Notably, ACA increases access to health insurance.\textsuperscript{46} (In 2015, 48\% of Title X clients were uninsured, down from 63\% in 2013.)\textsuperscript{47} Federal ACA regulations and guidance also require most health plans and health insurers to cover contraceptive services without cost-sharing.

\textsuperscript{42} IOM, A Review of the HHS Family Planning Program: Mission, Management, and Measurement of Results, pp. 13, 15, 240; the 2001 guidelines are reprinted in Appendix D.


\textsuperscript{44} HHS, HRSA, Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Estimates for Appropriations Committees, p. 394.


\textsuperscript{46} The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) estimate that 22 million more nonelderly people will have health insurance in 2016 than would have without the ACA. CBO, Federal Subsidies for Health Insurance Coverage for People Under Age 65: 2016 to 2026, March 24, 2016, Table 4, “Effects of the Affordable Care Act on Health Insurance Coverage for People Under Age 65” https://www.cbo.gov/publication/51385. One study found that uninsurance rates among reproductive age women declined by almost 40\% between 2012 and 2015. Rachel K. Jones and Adam Sonfield, “Health Insurance Coverage Among Women of Reproductive Age Before and After Implementation of the Affordable Care Act,” Contraception, vol. 93, no. 5 (May 2016), pp. 386-391, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2016.01.003.

ACA has several provisions that may increase health insurance coverage in the populations served by Title X. These provisions could help free up funds that Title X clinics have historically spent on serving the uninsured. For example,

- States can expand Medicaid eligibility to include most nonelderly, nonpregnant individuals with income at or below 133% of FPL, effectively 138% FPL with the 5% income disregard.\(^{48}\) (In 2015, 66% of Title X clients had incomes under 101% of FPL; another 14% had incomes between 101% and 150% of FPL.)\(^{49}\)
- ACA gives states the option, through a Medicaid state plan amendment, of providing targeted Medicaid family planning services and supplies to certain individuals who would otherwise be ineligible for Medicaid.\(^{50}\)
- ACA requires most private health plans that offer dependent coverage for children to continue to make such coverage available for young adult children under the age of 26.\(^{51}\) (In 2015, 45% of Title X clients were younger than 25 years old; another 22% were aged 25 to 29.)\(^{52}\)
- ACA provides certain individuals and small businesses with access to private health plans through new health insurance exchanges and subsidizes the premium costs for certain individuals. To ensure access for low-income individuals, exchange plans are required to have a sufficient number and geographic distribution of “essential community providers,” which include Title X projects.\(^{53}\)

---

\(^{48}\) P.L. 111-148, §2001 as modified by §10201; P.L. 111-152, §1004 and §1201. This provision is summarized in CRS In Focus IF10399, Overview of the ACA Medicaid Expansion, by Alison Mitchell, is jointly financed by federal and state governments. All state Medicaid programs are mandated to include family planning services and supplies in their benefit packages, with no cost-sharing. In states that choose to expand Medicaid eligibility, the federal government pays 100% of Medicaid expenditures for those in the new eligibility group in 2014 through 2016, including family planning expenditures, gradually declining to 90% in 2020 and thereafter. For all other Medicaid enrollees, the federal government pays 90% of Medicaid family planning expenditures.


\(^{51}\) P.L. 111-148, §1001, as amended by P.L. 111-152, §2301. This dependent coverage provision is effective for plan years beginning on or after September 23, 2010. The provision is summarized in CRS Report R42069, Private Health Insurance Market Reforms in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), by Annie L. Mach and Bernadette Fernandez.
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- Beginning in 2014, ACA’s individual mandate provision requires most individuals to have health insurance or pay a penalty.\(^{54}\)

OPA has established FY2016 Program Priorities to guide the project plans of family planning services grantees. In response to ACA, one of these priorities is demonstrating Title X clinics’ ability to bill Medicaid and private health insurance. Project plans should have “evidence of contracts with insurance and systems for third party billing as well as the ability to facilitate the enrollment of clients into insurance and Medicaid optimally onsite; and to report on numbers assisted and enrolled.”\(^{55}\)

According to the FY2017 HRSA Justification, the Administration expects that Title X clinics will increase revenue, in part by raising the proportion of clients who have health insurance and by billing third parties.\(^{56}\) Title X clinics also provide enrollment assistance to clients eligible for Medicaid or exchange plans under ACA.\(^{57}\) OPA awarded one-year grants in FY2014 and FY2015 to help Title X clinics enroll uninsured clients in health coverage.\(^{58}\)

Title X supporters state that, although clinics funded by Title X could see increased revenues from Medicaid and private insurance, the Title X program is still necessary:

In addition to medical care, Title X supports activities that are not reimbursable under Medicaid and commercial insurance plans… Title X has made a major contribution to the training of clinicians; that need remains today… Title X helps to support staff salaries, not just for clinicians but for front-desk staff, educators and finance and administrative staff. Title X provides for individual patient education as well as community-level outreach and public education about family planning and women’s health issues. Title X also helps to support the infrastructure necessary to keep the doors open—subsidizing rent, utilities and infrastructure needs like health information technology.\(^{59}\)

Some Title X supporters argue that Medicaid and private health insurance reimbursements do not cover the full cost of providing care.\(^{60}\) Some advocates also note that even with ACA’s health coverage expansions, family planning services will still be sought by uninsured persons\(^{61}\) and

\(^{54}\) P.L. 111-148, §1501 and §10106, as amended by P.L. 111-152, §1002. This provision is summarized in CRS Report R44438, *The Individual Mandate for Health Insurance Coverage: In Brief*, by Annie L. Mach.


\(^{56}\) HHS, HRSA, Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Estimates for Appropriations Committees, p. 394.


\(^{61}\) CBO and JCT estimate that about 28 million people will be uninsured in 2026. CBO, *Federal Subsidies for Health Insurance Coverage for People Under Age 65: 2016 to 2026*, March 24, 2016, Table 1. One study found that as of 2015, uninsurance rates had not declined significantly for Latinas and low-income women in states that did not expand (continued...)
dependents who, for confidentiality reasons, might not wish to bill reproductive health services to their parent’s or spouse’s health insurance. Advocates maintain that even with the ACA, there will still be strong demand for safety net providers, such as many Title X clinics, that provide health care to underserved populations.

ACA requires most private health plans to cover certain preventive services for women without cost-sharing. HHS commissioned the Institute of Medicine to recommend preventive services to be included in this requirement. Adopting the IOM recommendations, federal rules and guidelines require that most health plans cover, without cost-sharing, “All Food and Drug Administration approved contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures, and patient education and counseling for all women with reproductive capacity,” as prescribed. Some have noted that this requirement, by removing up-front cost barriers, could result in more women switching to longer-acting contraceptive methods, such as hormonal implants and intrauterine devices.

(continued)


P.L. 111-148, §1101. This requirement does not apply to grandfathered plans. Grandfathered plans are those that existed on March 23, 2010, and have not made certain specified changes (for example, to benefits and cost-sharing).


has identified “Patient access to a broad range of contraceptive options, including long acting reversible contraceptives (LARC)” as one of the key Title X issues in FY2016. HHS has also added Title X clients’ rate of LARC use to the list of outcome measures for assessing program performance.

The Family Planning Annual Report: 2015 National Summary contains Title X program data from 2015, the second year that ACA’s major coverage provisions were in effect. Clients’ insurance coverage rates have risen: 50% of Title X clients had health insurance in 2015, compared with 43% in 2014, 35% in 2013 and 31% in 2010. Projects that received Title X funds also reported increased revenues from private third-party payers such as private health insurance plans: $104.0 million in 2015, compared with $95.1 million in 2014, $69.2 million in 2013, and $50.4 million in 2010. Projects that received Title X funds had Medicaid revenues of $501.4 million in 2015, compared with $481.3 million in 2010.

The number of Title X clients served in 2015 (4.018 million) was 3% lower than in 2014 (when there were 4.129 million clients), 12% lower than in 2013 (when there were 4.558 million clients), and 23% lower than in 2010 (when there were 5.225 million clients). As noted above in “Client Characteristics,” a decrease in demand might be explained in part by ACA coverage expansions, because newly insured clients can now seek care from private practitioners and other providers. Increased LARC use could also affect demand by reducing the frequency of client visits in the long run, compared with some other contraceptive methods (such as oral contraceptives that require refills). The number of female Title X clients using hormonal implants or intrauterine devices in 2015 was 11% higher than in 2014, 16% higher than in 2013, and 50% higher than in 2010.

ACA may also impact Title X clinics in other ways. For example, because ACA increased the rebate percentage drug makers pay on drugs purchased for Medicaid beneficiaries, Title X clinics likely will receive larger discounts on drugs obtained through the 340B drug discount program. ACA also increased funding for teen pregnancy prevention efforts, expanded health care workforce programs, and increased funding for community health centers (many of which are

69 In FY2014, 13% of female clients used LARC as their primary contraception method; the FY2017 target is 11%. HHS, HRSA, Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Estimates for Appropriations Committees, p. 396.
74 P.L. 111-148, §2501. Title X clinics are among the entities eligible to receive discounts on certain drugs’ prices under §340B of the Public Health Service Act. The maximum prices that drug manufacturers can charge 340B entities are calculated using the Medicaid rebate formula. The ACA provision is summarized in CRS Report R41210, Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Provisions in ACA: Summary and Timeline, by Evelyne P. Baumrucker et al. The 340B program website is http://www.hrsa.gov/opा.
Title X providers. HHS contracted with IOM to convene a Standing Committee to advise the Title X program. Among other topics, the IOM Standing Committee was tasked with examining the roles of family planning, reproductive health, and Title X in health reform. OPA also awarded FY2014 research funding to “conduct data analysis and related research and evaluation on the impact of the Affordable Care Act on Title X funded family planning centers.” For Title X grantees and clinics, the Title X Family Planning National Training Centers have compiled resources and provided training on how ACA may affect Title X.

**Proposed Rule on Selecting Subrecipients**

As mentioned earlier, Title X grantees can provide family planning services directly or they can subaward Title X funds to other government or nonprofit entities (subrecipients) to provide services. In September 2016, OPA released a proposed rule, “Compliance With Title X Requirements by Project Recipients in Selecting Subrecipients.” The proposed rule would apply to grantees that make subawards; it would not apply to grantees that provide all their Title X services directly. The proposed rule would add the following language to Title X Family Planning Services grant program regulations: “No recipient making subawards for the provision of services as part of its Title X project may prohibit an entity from participating for reasons unrelated to its ability to provide services effectively.”

In the proposed rule’s preamble, OPA explained that some states have taken actions to limit Title X participation by certain types of providers. For example, some states have enacted laws to prohibit state and local agencies from giving Title X subawards to abortion providers. Some other states have established a priority system for allocating Title X subawards, for example by giving preference to community health centers over specialized family planning clinics.

---


81 The proposed language would amend 42 C.F.R. §59.3, and would also revise the section’s heading to read “Who is eligible to apply for a family planning services grant or to participate as a subrecipient as part of a family planning project?” The section’s current heading is “Who is eligible to apply for a family planning services grant?”

82 OPA notes the example of Florida law H.B. 1411, 2016 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Fla. 2016). According to OPA, this law was permanently enjoined on August 18, 2016, in an unpublished court order. (81 *Federal Register* 61641, footnote 9.)

83 OPA discusses the example of the Texas state government’s “tiered” system for Title X subaward competition in 2011. (81 *Federal Register* 61640-61641; Texas General Appropriations Act, 82nd Leg., R.S., ch. 1355, art. II, rider 77, at II-71, http://www.lrl.state.tx.us/scanned/ApproBills/82_0/82_R_ALL.pdf#page=179.) In FY2013, the Women’s Health and Family Planning Association of Texas became the state’s Title X grantee; previously it had been the Texas Department of State Health Services.
argued that “These policies, and varying court decisions on their legality, has led to uncertainty among grantees, inconsistency in program administration, and diminished access to services for Title X target populations.”

The proposed rule would limit the criteria a grantee can use to restrict subawards. OPA explained that under the proposed rule, Title X grantees could still prefer certain types of subrecipients over others, but the preference would have to be justified by showing that they provide family planning services at least as or more effectively. The proposed rule’s preamble discussed several example factors related to the effective provision of Title X services. Examples included the number of low-income patients to be served by a provider, the scope of family planning services provided, the adequacy of a provider’s facilities and staff, and a provider’s adherence to recommendations in “Providing Quality Family Planning Services: Recommendations of CDC and the U.S. Office of Population Affairs.”

OPA requested public comment by October 7, 2016, on several topics, including how to minimize the rule’s potential administrative burden, whether OPA should require compliance reports or rely instead on a complaint-driven process, and how the rule may interact with other state law provisions.

Supporters of the proposed rule have argued that it would protect funding to specialized family planning providers that offer higher quality services than other provider types. Critics of the proposed rule have argued that it would violate states’ rights, and the conscience rights of voters and states that object to public funding of abortion providers.

### Abortion and Title X

The law prohibits the use of Title X funds in programs where abortion is a method of family planning. On July 3, 2000, OPA released a final rule with respect to abortion services in family

---

84 81 Federal Register 61644.
85 81 Federal Register 61643. The preamble states that “Under the proposed rule, a tiering structure—described above—would not be allowable unless it could be shown that the top tier provider (e.g., community health center or other provider type) more effectively delivered Title X services than a lower tier provider. In addition, a preference for particular subspecialty providers would have to be justified by showing that they more effectively deliver Title X services. Furthermore, actions that favor ‘comprehensive providers’ would require justification that those providers are at least as effective as other subrecipients applying for funds. The proposed rule does not limit all types of providers from competing for subrecipient funds, but delimits the criteria by which a project recipient can allocate those funds based on the objectives in Title X.”
86 81 Federal Register 61640-61645
87 81 Federal Register 61643.
90 42 U.S.C. §300a-6. In addition, language in annual Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations bills have also prohibited the use of Title X funds for abortions. (In FY2016, this provision appeared in P.L. 114-113, Division H, Title II.) For background on abortion funding restrictions in general, see CRS Report RL33467, Abortion: Judicial History and Legislative Response, by Jon O. Shimabukuro.
planning projects. The rule updated and revised regulations that had been in effect since 1988. The major revision revoked the “gag rule,” which restricted family planning grantees from providing abortion-related information. The regulation at 42 C.F.R. §59.5 had required, and continues to require, that abortion not be provided as a method of family planning. The July 3, 2000, rule amended the section to add the requirement that a project must give pregnant women the opportunity to receive information and counseling on each of the following options: prenatal care and delivery; infant care, foster care, or adoption; and pregnancy termination. If the woman requests such information and counseling, the project must give “neutral, factual information and nondirective counseling on each of the options, and referral upon request, except with respect to any option(s) about which the pregnant woman indicates she does not wish to receive such information and counseling.”

According to OPA, family planning projects that receive Title X funds are closely monitored to ensure that federal funds are used appropriately and that funds are not used for prohibited activities such as abortion. The prohibition on abortion does not apply to all the activities of a Title X grantee, but only to activities that are part of the Title X project. The grantee’s abortion activities must be “separate and distinct” from the Title X project activities. Safeguards to maintain this separation include (1) careful review of grant applications to ensure that the applicant understands the requirements and has the capacity to comply with all requirements; (2) independent financial audits to examine whether there is a system to account for program-funded activities and non-allowable program activities; (3) yearly comprehensive reviews of the grantees’ financial status and budget report; and (4) periodic and comprehensive program reviews and site visits by OPA regional offices.

It is unclear exactly how many Title X clinics also provide abortions through their non-Title X activities. In 2004, following appropriations conference report directions, HHS surveyed its Title X grantees on whether their clinic sites also provided abortions with non-federal funds. Grantees were informed that responses were voluntary and “without consequence, or threat of consequence, to non-responsiveness.” The survey did not request any identifying information. HHS mailed surveys to 86 grantees and received 46 responses. Of these, 9 indicated that at least one of their clinic sites (17 clinic sites in all) also provided abortions with non-federal funds, and

---


92 42 C.F.R. Part 59, “Grants for family planning services.”

93 On December 19, 2008, HHS published a provider conscience rule which, according to HHS at the time, was “inconsistent” with the requirement that Title X grantees provide clients with abortion referrals upon request (73 Federal Register 78087). The rule was later rescinded in 2011 (76 Federal Register 9968).


95 Email from Barbara Clark, HHS, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, August 24, 2006. See also OPA Program Instruction Series, OPA 11-01: Title X Grantee Compliance with Grant Requirements and Applicable Federal and State Law, including State Reporting Laws, Letter from Marilyn J. Keefe, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs, to Regional Health Administrators, Regions I-X; Title X Grantees, March 1, 2011, http://www.hhs.gov/opa/pdfs/opa-11-01-program-instruction-re-compliance.pdf. Site visits and comprehensive program reviews are described in IOM, A Review of the HHS Family Planning Program: Mission, Management, and Measurement of Results, pp. 349-354.

96 HHS, Report to Congress Regarding the Number of Family Planning Sites Funded Under Title X of the Public Health Service Act That Also Provide Abortions with Non-Federal Funds, 2004. HHS was directed to conduct the survey by FY2004 appropriations conference report H.Rept. 108-801, pp. 800-801.
34 indicated that none of their clinic sites provided abortions with non-federal funds; 3 responses had no numerical data or said the information was unknown.

Title X supporters argue that family planning reduces unintended pregnancies, thereby reducing abortion.\(^\text{97}\) HHS estimates that Title X family planning services helped avert 941,000 unintended pregnancies in 2014.\(^\text{98}\) It is unclear exactly how many unintended pregnancies would have ended in abortion; however the Guttmacher Institute estimates that clinics receiving Title X funds helped avert 345,000 abortions in 2013.\(^\text{99}\)

On the other hand, Title X critics argue that federal funds should be withheld from any organization that performs or promotes abortions, such as the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. These critics argue that federal funding for non-abortion activities frees up Planned Parenthood’s other resources for its abortion activities.\(^\text{100}\) Some critics also argue that if a family planning program is operated by an organization that also performs abortions, the implicit assumption and the message to clients is that abortion is a method of family planning.\(^\text{101}\)

**Teenage Pregnancy and Title X**

In 2015, 18% of Title X clients were aged 19 or younger.\(^\text{102}\) Critics argue that by funding Title X, the federal government is implicitly sanctioning nonmarital sexual activity among teens. These critics argue that a reduced teenage pregnancy rate could be achieved if family planning programs emphasized efforts to convince teens to delay sexual activity, rather than efforts to decrease the percentage of sexually active teens who become pregnant.\(^\text{103}\) (See CRS Report RS20301, *Teenage Pregnancy Prevention: Statistics and Programs*, by Carmen Solomon-Fears.)

The program’s supporters, on the other hand, argue that the Title X program should be expanded to serve more people in order to reduce the rate of unintended pregnancies. According to HHS, in 2014, Title X family planning services helped avert an estimated 171,800 unintended teen

---


\(^{101}\) An example of these arguments can be found in U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, *Threat to Title X and Other Women’s Health Services*, pp. 22-35.


\(^{103}\) An example of these arguments can be found in U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, *Threat to Title X and Other Women’s Health Services*, pp. 22-35.
Supporters of expanding family planning services argue that the United States has a higher teen pregnancy rate than some countries (such as Sweden) where a similar percentage of teens are sexually active, in part because U.S. teens use contraception less consistently. Some also argue that recent declines in U.S. teen birth rates can be explained in part by changes in teen contraceptive use.\footnote{105}

**Confidentiality for Minors and Title X**

By law, Title X providers are required to “encourage” family participation when minors seek family planning services.\footnote{106} However, confidentiality is required for personal information about Title X services provided to individuals, including adolescents.\footnote{107} OPA instructs grantees on confidentiality for minors:

> It continues to be the case that Title X projects may not require written consent of parents or guardians for the provision of services to minors. Nor can any Title X project staff notify a parent or guardian before or after a minor has requested and/or received Title X family planning services.\footnote{108}

The April 2014 Title X guidelines state,

> Providers of family planning services should offer confidential services to adolescents and observe all relevant state laws and any legal obligations, such as notification or reporting of child abuse, child molestation, sexual abuse, rape, or incest, as well as human trafficking. Confidentiality is critical for adolescents and can greatly influence their willingness to access and use services. As a result, multiple professional medical associations have emphasized the importance of providing confidential services to adolescents.

> Providers should encourage and promote communication between the adolescent and his or her parent(s) or guardian(s) about sexual and reproductive health. Adolescents who


\footnote{106}{42 U.S.C. 300(a) states that Title X grantees shall encourage family participation “to the extent practical.” P.L. 114-113, Division H, §207 requires Title X grantees to certify that they encourage family participation in minors’ decisions to seek family planning services.}

\footnote{107}{42 C.F.R. §59.11. Also, several court cases have interpreted Title X statute as supporting confidentiality for minors; see Glenn A. Guarino, “Provision of family planning services under Title X of Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C.A. §300-300a-8) and implementing regulations,” *American Law Reports Federal*, 1985, 71 A.L.R. Fed. 961.}

come to the service site alone should be encouraged to talk to their parents or guardians. Educational materials and programs can be provided to parents or guardians that help them talk about sex and share their values with their child. When both parent or guardian and child have agreed, joint discussions can address family values and expectations about dating, relationships, and sexual behavior.  

Although minors are to receive confidential services, Title X providers are not exempt from state notification and reporting laws on child abuse, child molestation, sexual abuse, rape, or incest. Some minors who use Title X clinics have dependent health coverage through a parent’s private health insurance policy. However, for confidentiality reasons, they may not wish to bill family planning or STD services to their parent’s health insurance. According to OPA, Title X clinics “commonly forgo billing” health insurers in order to maintain confidentiality.

As for payment of services provided to minors, Title X regulations indicate that “unemancipated minors who wish to receive services on a confidential basis must be considered on the basis of their own resources.” Program requirements instruct that “Eligibility for discounts for unemancipated minors who receive confidential services must be based on the income of the minor.”

Supporters of confidentiality argue that parental notification or parental consent requirements would lead some sexually active adolescents to delay or forgo family planning services, thereby increasing their risk of pregnancy or sexually transmitted diseases.

Critics argue that confidentiality requirements can interfere with parents’ right to know of and to guide their children’s health care. Some critics also disagree with discounts for minors without


111 Private health insurance policy holders often receive “explanations of benefits” that describe services charged to their insurance policy. Often policy holders may also view a history of claims made under their policies. These common health insurance practices may inadvertently breach the confidentiality of dependents who receive care through those policies. OPA has awarded research funding to study these practices’ effects on Title X clinics’ revenues. HHS, OPA, FY14 Announcement of Availability of Funds for Family Planning Affordable Care Act (ACA) Impact Analysis Research Cooperative Agreements, March 7, 2014, pp. 5-6, 10-11. https://www.grantsolutions.gov/gs/preaward/preview/PublicAnnouncement.do?id=49223. See also Abigail English, Rachel Benson Gold, and Elizabeth Nash, et al., Confidentiality for Individuals Insured as Dependents: A Review of State Laws and Policies, Guttmacher Institute, July 2012, http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/confidentiality-review.pdf; and Guttmacher Institute, State Policies in Brief as of September 1, 2016: Protecting Confidentiality for Individuals Insured as Dependents, http://www.guttmacher.org/statecenter/spibs/spib_CMII.pdf.

112 42 C.F.R. §59.2.

113 HHS, OPA, Program Requirements for Title X Funded Family Planning Projects, April 2014, p. 13.

regard to parents’ income, because the Title X program was intended to serve “low-income families.”

Planned Parenthood and Title X

The Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) operates through a national office and 57 affiliates, which operate approximately 650 local health centers. Affiliates participating in Title X can receive funds directly from HHS or indirectly from other Title X grantees, such as their state or local health departments. The Guttmacher Institute found that in 2010, Planned Parenthood clinics made up 13% of Title X clinics, but served 37% of Title X clients.

In March 2015, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report with data on the obligations, disbursements, and expenditures of federal funds for several nonprofit organizations, including PPFA and its affiliates. According to the GAO report, in FY2012, HHS reported obligating $18.67 million, and disbursing $19.08 million, to PPFA affiliates through the Title X program. These figures reflected funds that HHS provided directly to these organizations. They did not include Title X funds that reached Planned Parenthood or its affiliates indirectly through subgrants or that passed through from state agencies or other organizations.

The GAO report also showed PPFA affiliates’ expenditures of Title X funds. Most of these expenditures were identified through audit reports that PPFA affiliates submitted to comply with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) audit requirements. Expenditures included federal funds provided directly or indirectly to these organizations. The most recent expenditure data were from FY2012, when Planned Parenthood and its affiliates reported spending $64.35 million from the Title X Family Planning Services program.


117 The Title X Family Planning Service Site Database currently includes more than 300 Planned Parenthood sites, https://www.opa-fpclinicdb.com/.


120 According to GAO, the term obligation refers to “a definite commitment by a federal agency that creates a legal liability to make payments immediately or in the future,” while the term disbursement refers to “amounts paid by federal agencies, in cash or cash equivalents, to satisfy government obligations.” GAO, Health Care Funding: Federal Obligations to and Expenditures by Selected Entities Involved in Health-Related Activities, 2010–2012, pp. 30, 32.

121 Organizations with annual expenditures of federal funds of $500,000 or more are required to have an audit. For several PPFA affiliates that did not meet the expenditure threshold for audits, GAO obtained data directly from the affiliates. GAO, Health Care Funding: Federal Obligations to and Expenditures by Selected Entities Involved in Health-Related Activities, 2010–2012, pp. 2, 39, 40.

122 Tables 24 and 25, GAO, Health Care Funding: Federal Obligations to and Expenditures by Selected Entities Involved in Health-Related Activities, 2010–2012, pp 39, 40. In their single audits to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse, (continued...)
On September 22, 2015, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that PPFA and its affiliates receive approximately $60 million annually through the Title X program.\(^{123}\)
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PPFA affiliates reported spending $58.03 million in Title X funds in FY2012 (Table 24). According to data GAO obtained directly from PPFA, affiliates spent an additional $6.32 million in Title X funds in FY2012 that they were not required to report to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse because the amounts did not meet the reporting threshold (Table 25). These two dollar amounts total $64.35 million. However, the total is approximate, because expenditure data were reported using affiliates’ 12-month fiscal years, which vary.