

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## Assessing the role of local health departments in implementing PrEP in the US, 2020 update

Julia R. Zigman<sup>1\*</sup>, Karen W. Hoover<sup>2¶</sup>, Rupa R. Patel<sup>2¶</sup>, Kellie Hall<sup>1&</sup>, Roman J. Gvetadze<sup>2&</sup>,  
Ya-lin A. Huang<sup>2&</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Association of County and City Health Officials, Washington, District of Columbia,  
United States of America

<sup>2</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Division of HIV Prevention, Atlanta, California,  
United States of America

\* Corresponding author

Email: [jzigman@naccho.org](mailto:jzigman@naccho.org) (JZ)

*Disclaimer:* The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

& These authors also contributed equally to this work.

## Abstract

*Objectives:* To identify current and potential roles for, and systematic barriers encountered by, local health departments (LHDs) engaging in PrEP implementation. *Methods:* Web-based assessment created with Qualtrics® from Oct.-Dec. 2020 distributed via e-mail to 1,096 LHDs that indicated they provided HIV or STD screening and/or treatment in NACCHO's 2019 National Profile of Local Health Departments. *Results:* Of 354 respondents, 46% of LHDs were engaged in PrEP implementation compared with 29% in 2015. Activities included: referring to PrEP providers (68%); conducting consumer education (65%); promoting PrEP (59%); educating providers; (48%); and prescribing PrEP (42%). The top challenges to initiating or expanding PrEP implementation were lack of funding and staff, and 41% described staff reductions during COVID-19. *Conclusions:* LHD engagement in PrEP implementation has increased significantly since 2015 but many LHDs still encounter barriers to initiating or expanding PrEP activities. *Policy Implications:* Robust funding of public health infrastructure can ensure that LHDs and their partners are equipped to provide PrEP access for all who may benefit from it during future public health emergencies.

## 20 Introduction

21 Preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is a biomedical intervention for the prevention of HIV.  
22 The initial PrEP medication approved by the Food and Drug Administration in 2012, a daily oral  
23 pill of two co-formulated antiretroviral drugs, was recommended for men and women who are at  
24 risk for HIV, by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in 2014.(1) Since then,  
25 two additional agents for PrEP have been approved including an injectable long-acting  
26 antiretroviral medication.(1) The use of PrEP has increased markedly in the United States since it  
27 became available, with 48% of persons with PrEP indications prescribed it in 2022.(2) But  
28 disparities in PrEP use by persons in racial and ethnic minority populations and women have

29 persisted.(2) The public health community is responding to a call to action to reduce these  
30 disparities in order to achieve the Ending the HIV Epidemic in the U.S. (EHE) goal to decrease  
31 new HIV infections by 90% by 2030.(3)

32 State and local health departments play a critical role in HIV prevention in the United  
33 States including the implementation of PrEP. Supported by federal, state, and local governments  
34 and other entities, the health department conducts a multitude of HIV prevention services and  
35 activities.(4) These activities include, but are not limited to: direct and community-based  
36 organization (CBO) supported community outreach; sexually transmitted infections (STIs),  
37 PrEP, and other clinical services; HIV testing; linkage of persons in the community to PrEP  
38 clinical services; laboratory testing support for HIV, STI, hepatitis, and other conditions;  
39 provider and community education; partner services; and liaising with community groups.

40 Understanding the needs of health departments can help CDC support them to achieve  
41 both increased PrEP implementation and EHE goals for all populations. Increased understanding  
42 of health department needs can help to guide the development of funding announcements and  
43 CDC's capacity building resources. In 2015, the National Association of County and City Health  
44 Officials (NACCHO) and CDC conducted a survey of U.S. local health departments (LHDs) to  
45 understand their activities to implement PrEP and support its use by persons in their  
46 jurisdictions.(5) Responses revealed that support of PrEP implementation was in early stages at  
47 most health departments, and specific resource needs were reported including materials to  
48 support healthcare providers to prescribe PrEP, materials for community education about HIV  
49 and PrEP, and protocols for PrEP referrals. We repeated a modified version of the 2015 survey in  
50 2022 to assess the progress made by health departments in their PrEP implementation programs  
51 and to understand ongoing challenges and resource needs.

## 52 **Methods**

53 NACCHO and CDC conducted an inaugural web-based survey of approximately 500  
54 LHDs assessing their engagement in and support for PrEP implementation in 2015. We  
55 conducted a second iteration of this web-based survey in 2020 to examine LHD engagement in  
56 PrEP implementation before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. The NACCHO team  
57 developed the 2020 instrument by first reviewing the previous (i.e., 2015) survey to determine  
58 which questions to keep, which to modify, and whether any new questions should be added. We  
59 piloted the 2020 survey with nine LHDs recruited from NACCHO advisory groups and finalized  
60 the questions based on their feedback. The sampling method used in 2020 was similar to that of  
61 2015. The survey sample was drawn from 1,463 LHDs which indicated that they provide or  
62 contract out HIV or STI screening, treatment or family planning services in the NACCHO's  
63 2019 National Profile of Local Health Departments (Profile) study.(6) LHDs receiving multiple  
64 NACCHO surveys were removed from the sample to reduce survey burden. The sampling frame  
65 was stratified by U.S. census region and population size served by the LHD (<50,000; 50,000–  
66 499,999; 500,000+).(6) Between October and December 2020, we distributed the survey to 1,096  
67 LHDs using Qualtrics. The survey was e-mailed to the LHD's primary contact, or the individual  
68 designated to respond to inquiries about PrEP. After the initial e-mail invitation, each LHD  
69 representative received up to nine reminder emails and reminder calls. The primary objective of  
70 this assessment was to understand the mechanisms through which LHDs engage in PrEP  
71 implementation, and secondary objectives included assessing the impact of COVID-19 and other  
72 systemic challenges on the ability to implement these mechanisms, as well as identifying  
73 changes in the prevalence of, and mechanisms used for, LHD engagement in PrEP  
74 implementation from 2015 to 2020.

## 75 **Measures**

76           The 2020 survey included questions assessing LHD HIV prevention program structure,  
77 services, and engagement in PrEP implementation. We defined LHDs that were supporting PrEP  
78 implementation as engaged. This broad definition of engagement in PrEP included any activities  
79 to support PrEP delivery (e.g., education and outreach, referral and linkage, prescribing,  
80 monitoring, planning). LHDs that indicated they were engaged in PrEP received a module  
81 questionnaire, assessing specific PrEP implementation activities, resources needed to advance  
82 PrEP implementation, and the impact of COVID-19 on PrEP-related services. LHDs that  
83 indicated that they were not engaged in PrEP implementation received an alternate module  
84 questionnaire, assessing their awareness and interest in PrEP, barriers to future PrEP  
85 engagement, resources needed to initiate PrEP implementation, and perceived potential roles in  
86 future PrEP engagement. Finally, all LHDs regardless of PrEP engagement received a third  
87 module questionnaire, assessing familiarity with patient assistance programs for PrEP and pre-  
88 and post-COVID-19 HIV testing policies and strategies.

89           The primary objective was measured by analyzing the prevalence of reported methods of,  
90 and challenges to, PrEP engagement by LHDs. The change in LHD engagement in PrEP was  
91 measured by comparing repeated and/or rephrased questions between the 2015 and 2020  
92 versions of the assessment, while the impact of COVID-19 was assessed via specific descriptive  
93 questions.

## 94 **Data analysis**

95           We reported descriptive statistics and weighted proportions for all LHDs responding to  
96 the survey, stratified by LHD's PrEP engagement. We compared the weighted responses  
97 between the 2015 and 2020 surveys and tested the differences using Rao-Scott chi-square tests.  
98 Estimates from both years were weighted similarly to produce nationally representative  
99 estimates, accounting for the stratified survey design in each year. All the analyses were  
100 performed using Stata® version 15.1 (StataCorp) and SAS version 9.4 (Cary, NC).

101           This activity was reviewed by CDC, deemed not research, and was conducted consistent  
102 with applicable federal law and CDC policy.

## 103 **Results**

104           A total of 353 LHDs across all U.S. Census regions responded to the 2020 survey,  
105 comprising a 32% response rate. Forty-three (43%) respondents represented LHDs serving small  
106 populations (<50,000), with 45% and 12% serving medium (50,000 – 499,999) and large  
107 (>500,000) populations respectively.

108           Engagement in PrEP implementation among surveyed LHDs increased from 29.2% in  
109 2015 to 45.8% in 2020 ( $p < 0.0001$ ). A greater proportion of LHDs engaged in PrEP  
110 implementation if they were in larger jurisdictions or operated STI clinics (**Table 1**).

**Table 1. Characteristics of local health departments responding to PrEP implementation surveys and involvement in PrEP over survey years, United States, 2015 and 2020**

| Characteristic             | 2015 NACCHO Survey: Involvement in PrEP |   |   | 2020 NACCHO Survey: Involvement in PrEP |   |   | Rao-Scott<br>ChiSq<br>p-value |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
|                            | LHD (n=284)<br>Unweighted<br>n (%)      | Engaged (n=109)<br>Weighted %<br>(95% CI) | Not engaged (n=175)<br>Weighted %<br>(95% CI) | LHD (n=353)<br>Unweighted<br>n (%)      | Engaged (n=171)<br>Weighted %<br>(95% CI) | Not engaged (n=182)<br>Weighted %<br>(95% CI) |                               |
| <b>All respondents</b>     | 284 (100.0)                             | 29.2 (23.3, 35.1)                         | 70.8 (64.9, 76.7)                             | 353 (100.0)                             | 45.8 (40.6, 51.0)                         | 54.2 (49.0, 59.4)                             | <.0001                        |
| <b>Jurisdiction size</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                               |
| Small                      | 98 (34.5)                               | 17.9 (10.0, 25.8)                         | 82.1 (74.2, 90.0)                             | 150 (42.5)                              | 36.0 (28.3, 43.7)                         | 64.0 (56.3, 71.7)                             | 0.0024                        |
| Medium                     | 116 (40.8)                              | 32.0 (22.4, 41.7)                         | 68.0 (58.3, 77.6)                             | 160 (45.3)                              | 50.0 (42.2, 57.8)                         | 50.0 (42.2, 57.8)                             | 0.0055                        |
| Large                      | 70 (24.6)                               | 68.0 (57.0, 79.1)                         | 32.0 (20.9, 43.0)                             | 43 (12.2)                               | 86.0 (75.7, 96.4)                         | 14.0 (3.6, 24.3)                              | 0.0325                        |
| <b>Census region</b>       |   |   |   |   |   |   |                               |
| West                       | 60 (21.1)                               | 46.8 (33.9, 59.8)                         | 53.2 (40.2, 66.1)                             | 44 (12.5)                               | 58.0 (42.9, 73.0)                         | 42.0 (27.0, 57.1)                             | 0.2734                        |
| South                      | 117 (41.2)                              | 33.3 (24.3, 42.3)                         | 66.7 (57.7, 75.7)                             | 175 (49.6)                              | 51.1 (43.6, 58.6)                         | 48.9 (41.4, 56.4)                             | 0.0040                        |
| Northeast                  | 62 (21.8)                               | 36.7 (24.7, 48.7)                         | 63.3 (51.3, 75.3)                             | 32 (9.1)                                | 44.8 (27.4, 62.3)                         | 55.2 (37.7, 72.6)                             | 0.4448                        |
| Midwest                    | 45 (15.8)                               | 15.9 (5.2, 26.5)                          | 84.1 (73.5, 94.8)                             | 102 (28.9)                              | 32.5 (23.5, 41.6)                         | 67.5 (58.4, 76.5)                             | 0.0356                        |
| <b>Operates STI clinic</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |                               |
| Yes                        | 201 (70.8)                              | 36.5 (28.8, 44.2)                         | 63.5 (55.8, 71.2)                             | 157 (44.5)                              | 65.3 (57.7, 73.0)                         | 34.7 (27.0, 42.3)                             | <.0001                        |
| No                         | 81 (28.5)                               | 15.9 (8.0, 23.7)                          | 84.1 (76.3, 92.0)                             | 133 (37.7)                              | 35.6 (27.3, 43.8)                         | 64.4 (56.2, 72.7)                             | 0.0011                        |

LHD: Local Health Department; CI: Confidence Interval; PrEP: Preexposure prophylaxis; NACCHO: National Association of County and City Health Officials 2015/2020 Survey

Notes: The unweighted values do not always add to total because of missing responses or rounding error. The weighted percentage in each cell is computed using the total number of non-missing responses in the denominator

## 111 **Engagement in PrEP implementation**

112 Respondents were asked to identify specific activities related to PrEP implementation  
113 engaged in by their LHDs. Frequently reported activities included referring or linking individuals  
114 to PrEP providers (69%), conducting consumer education and outreach (65%), using health  
115 communication methods and strategies to promote PrEP (59%), and providing education and/or  
116 training to healthcare providers (48%). Notably, the proportion of LHDs prescribing PrEP in a  
117 health department clinic more than quadrupled between 2015 (9%) and 2020 (42%) ( $p < 0.0001$ ).  
118 Less frequently reported activities included maintaining or actively updating a directory of local  
119 PrEP providers (42%); providing PrEP adherence support (32%), providing routine HIV/STI  
120 screening for patients prescribed PrEP by a non-health department provider (32%), monitoring  
121 PrEP uptake (17%), and funding community partners to provide PrEP services (5%) (**Table 2**).



**Table 2. Local health department PrEP implementation activities and optimal roles, United States, 2015 and 2020, weighted response proportions**

| Implementation Activities and Roles  | Activities  |   |                         | Optimal Roles   |   |                         |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
|  | Engaged in PrEP in 2015 (n=109)<br>Weighted %<br>(95% CI) | Engaged in PrEP in 2020 (n=171)<br>Weighted %<br>(95% CI) | Rao-Scott ChiSq p-value | Engaged in PrEP in 2015 (n=109)<br>Weighted %<br>(95% CI) | Engaged in PrEP in 2020 (n=171)<br>Weighted %<br>(95% CI) | Rao-Scott ChiSq p-value |
| Conduct consumer education and outreach  | 51.4 (40.0, 62.8)   | 65.1 (57.5, 72.6)   | 0.0513                  | 58.2 (46.8, 69.5)   | 59.1 (51.5, 66.8)   | 0.8885                  |
| Provide education and/or training to healthcare providers  | 40.0 (28.8, 51.1)   | 48.0 (40.3, 55.8)   | 0.2479                  | 54.2 (42.8, 65.7)   | 43.8 (36.2, 51.5)   | 0.1349                  |
| Maintain or actively update a directory of local PrEP providers                                    | 44.6 (33.4, 55.7)   | 41.7 (34.1, 49.3)   | 0.6769                  | 59.1 (48.2, 69.9)   | 44.5 (36.8, 52.1)   | 0.0328                  |
| Refer or link individuals to PrEP providers  | 74.4 (64.5, 84.2)   | 68.5 (61.1, 75.9)   | 0.3561                  | 75.9 (66.1, 85.6)   | 59.0 (51.4, 66.6)   | 0.0115                  |
| Prescribe PrEP via health department clinic  | 9.0 (3.5, 14.5)   | 41.8 (34.3, 49.4)   | <.0001                  | 27.1 (18.2, 36.1)   | 46.4 (38.9, 54.0)   | 0.0016                  |
| Fund community partners to provide PrEP services   | 3.0 (0.5, 5.4)  | 5.1 (2.2, 8.1)  | 0.2790                  | 6.1 (2.5, 9.8)  | 7.0 (3.5, 10.4)   | 0.7531                  |
| Monitor PrEP uptake  | 8.9 (3.7, 14.1)   | 16.8 (11.2, 22.4)   | 0.0512                  | 23.3 (15.2, 31.4)   | 23.5 (17.0, 30.0)   | 0.9714                  |
| Other optimal roles  | 5.9 (2.0, 9.7)  | 2.8 (0.2, 5.3)  | 0.1900                  | 1.1 (0.0, 2.6)  | 5.8 (2.3, 9.3)  | 0.0113                  |
| Our optimal role is what we are currently doing to support PrEP implementation                     | <i>Not asked</i>  | <i>Not asked</i>  |                         | 15.6 (7.2, 24.0)  | 44.1 (36.5, 51.6)   | <.0001                  |
| Use health communication methods and strategies to promote PrEP                                    | <i>Not asked</i>  | 59.3 (51.8, 66.9)   |                         | <i>Not asked</i>  | 66.3 (58.8, 73.7)   |                         |
| Provide PrEP adherence support   | <i>Not asked</i>  | 32.0 (24.9, 39.0)   |                         | <i>Not asked</i>  | 43.5 (36.4, 50.6)   |                         |
| Provide routine HIV/STI screening for patients prescribed PrEP by a non-health department provider | <i>Not asked</i>  | 32.1 (25.0, 39.3)   |                         | <i>Not asked</i>  | 44.3 (36.7, 51.9)   |                         |
| Internal training for health department staff  | 35.8 (25.0, 46.5)   | <i>Not asked</i>  |                         | 39.9 (28.5, 51.4)   | <i>Not asked</i>  |                         |
| Convene or participate in a working group on PrEP  | 32.4 (22.1, 42.7)   | <i>Not asked</i>  |                         | 30.8 (20.9, 40.6)   | <i>Not asked</i>  |                         |
| Collaborate with health care providers to support PrEP delivery                                    | 44.7 (33.3, 56.1)   | <i>Not asked</i>  |                         | 54.8 (43.1, 66.5)   | <i>Not asked</i>  |                         |
| Participation in a demonstration project or implementation study                                   | 4.7 (1.5, 7.8)  | <i>Not asked</i>  |                         | 13.6 (7.6, 19.6)  | <i>Not asked</i>  |                         |

PrEP: Preexposure prophylaxis, STI: Sexually Transmitted Infection

122 Respondents also reported what they perceived to be their LHD's optimal roles in PrEP  
123 implementation. Engaged LHDs in 2020 most frequently reported their optimal role as conducting  
124 PrEP promotion (66%), where in 2015 their most optimal role was referring or linking individuals  
125 to PrEP (76%), which is still frequently reported as an optimal role in 2020 but at a lower level  
126 (59%,  $p < 0.01$ ). The proportion of engaged LHDs who reported in 2020 that their optimal role  
127 was prescribing PrEP at the health department clinic (46%) almost doubled since 2015 (27%) ( $p$   
128  $< 0.002$ ). In 2020, 44% of engaged LHDs reported that they consider their current PrEP  
129 implementation activities to be an optimal role compared with 16% in 2015.

## 130 **Barriers to PrEP Engagement**

131 Both engaged and non-engaged LHDs were asked about barriers to expanding or initiating  
132 engagement in PrEP implementation. In 2020, a lack of funding was the most reported challenge  
133 by both engaged (56%) and non-engaged (42%) LHDs (**Table 3**). Similarly, 57% of engaged  
134 LHDs listed lack of staff as a challenge to PrEP implementation. Other major challenges for  
135 engaged LHDs included difficulty reaching underserved populations for PrEP (45%) and lack of  
136 healthcare providers in the community prescribing PrEP (52%). Among non-engaged LHDs,  
137 significant challenges to initiating PrEP engagement included lack of a plan or strategy for PrEP  
138 implementation (39%), concerns related to reimbursement for PrEP clinical services (37%), and  
139 client access to financial resources to pay for PrEP (33%). (**Table 3**).

**Table 3 Challenges to PrEP implementation for local health departments, United States, 2015 and 2020, weighted response proportions, year-to-year comparison**

| Challenges   | LHDs Engaged in PrEP                         |  |                               | LHDs Not Engaged in PrEP                     |  |                               |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
|  | NACCHO 2015<br>(n=109)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | NACCHO 2020<br>(n=171)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | Rao-Scott<br>ChiSq<br>p-value | NACCHO 2015<br>(n=175)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | NACCHO 2020<br>(n=182)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | Rao-Scott<br>ChiSq<br>p-value |
| Lack of staff to support PrEP implementation   | 61.0 (49.8, 72.2)                            | 57.1 (49.3, 64.9)                            | 0.5740                        | 26.7 (19.1, 34.4)                            | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               |
| Concern about reimbursement for PrEP clinical services provided by health department                           | 26.9 (17.1, 36.7)                            | 23.2 (16.7, 29.8)                            | 0.5376                        | 11.2 (6.7, 15.6)                             | 36.7 (28.0, 45.4)                            | <.0001                        |
| Difficulty assisting individuals with accessing financial resources to pay for PrEP                            | 52.8 (41.4, 64.2)                            | 26.1 (19.3, 33.0)                            | 0.0001                        | 17.3 (11.9, 22.7)                            | 33.3 (24.7, 41.9)                            | 0.0015                        |
| Lack of healthcare providers in the community prescribing PrEP   | 45.7 (34.2, 57.1)                            | 51.8 (44.0, 59.6)                            | 0.3851                        | 8.9 (4.2, 13.7)                              | 24.0 (16.0, 31.9)                            | 0.0012                        |
| Other challenges   | 1.3 (0.0, 2.8)                               | 6.8 (2.8, 10.7)                              | 0.0028                        | 4.6 (1.8, 7.3)                               | 4.5 (1.0, 8.1)                               | 0.9873                        |
| Do not experience any challenges   | 16.8 (7.7, 25.9)                             | 5.4 (1.7, 9.0)                               | 0.0070                        | 51.9 (42.9, 60.9)                            | 3.3 (0.1, 6.5)                               | <.0001                        |
| Lack of funding to support PrEP implementation   | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 55.7 (47.9, 63.5)                            |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 41.5 (32.9, 50.2)                            |                               |
| Staff are resistant to the health department getting involved in PrEP implementation                           | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 6.4 (2.7, 10.1)                              |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 0.8 (0.0, 2.3)                               |                               |
| Lack of a strong working relationship with community-based organizations serving priority populations for PrEP | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 12.6 (7.5, 17.8)                             |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 2.0 (0.0, 4.8)                               |                               |
| Lack of a strong relationship with health care systems serving priority populations for PrEP                   | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 12.5 (7.2, 17.7)                             |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 1.0 (0.0, 3.0)                               |                               |
| Difficulty reaching underserved populations for PrEP   | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 45.0 (37.2, 52.8)                            |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 12.9 (6.7, 19.2)                             |                               |

| Challenges  | LHDs Engaged in PrEP                         |  |                               | LHDs Not Engaged in PrEP                     |  |                               |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
|   | NACCHO 2015<br>(n=109)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | NACCHO 2020<br>(n=171)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | Rao-Scott<br>ChiSq<br>p-value | NACCHO 2015<br>(n=175)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | NACCHO 2020<br>(n=182)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | Rao-Scott<br>ChiSq<br>p-value |
| Mistrust of the health department by priority populations for PrEP                        | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 25.5 (18.9, 32.0)                            |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 6.5 (2.2, 10.9)                              |                               |
| Insurance privacy concern for adolescent youth and young adults on their parent insurance | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 29.1 (22.4, 35.8)                            |                               |  |  |                               |
| PrEP delivery constraints within the HD clinics (hours open to serve clients)             | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 21.6 (15.3, 27.9)                            |                               |  |  |                               |
| Lack of plan or strategy for PrEP implementation  | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 17.3 (11.3, 23.3)                            |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 39.1 (30.1, 48.0)                            |                               |
| Lack of effective messaging around PrEP for priority populations                          | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 22.7 (16.1, 29.3)                            |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 11.5 (5.4, 17.5)                             |                               |
| Lack of PrEP awareness and knowledge among health department staff                        | 47.3 (36.6, 58.0)                            | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               | 22.5 (15.8, 29.3)                            | 16.7 (9.7, 23.6)                             | 0.2368                        |
| Lack of support or interest from health department leadership                             | 15.4 (6.3, 24.5)                             | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               | 6.2 (2.4, 10.0)                              | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               |
| Lack of support or interest from health department staff                                  |  |  |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 1.0 (0.0, 3.0)                               |                               |
| Uncertainty about PrEP as an effective HIV prevention strategy                            | 22.0 (13.7, 30.2)                            | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               | 5.9 (2.2, 9.6)                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               |
| Health department was not sure what it should or could be doing                           | 28.8 (20.1, 37.5)                            | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               | 17.9 (11.4, 24.4)                            | 24.4 (16.6, 32.2)                            | 0.1921                        |
| Policy-related issues limiting health department's ability to reach priority populations  |  |  |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 0.5 (0.0, 1.6)                               |                               |

LHD: Local Health Department; CI: Confidence Interval; PrEP: Preexposure prophylaxis; NACCHO: National Association of County and City Health Officials 2015/2020 Survey

## 140 **Funding and staffing**

141 Almost one-third (32%) of LHDs reported that that there was no specific funding to support their  
142 PrEP activities. Moreover, fewer than half (40%) of LHDs engaged in PrEP implementation had  
143 a staff position of at least 0.5 fulltime employees that was responsible for coordinating PrEP  
144 activities, with large jurisdictions being four times (80%) more likely to have this staff capacity  
145 compared with small jurisdictions (17%) ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

146 Non-engaged LHDs broadly reported increased challenges in 2020 versus 2015: in 2015, 52% of  
147 non-engaged LHDs reported they didn't face any challenges to engaging in PrEP implementation  
148 compared with 3% in 2020 ( $p < 0.0001$ ). The proportion of non-engaged LHDs that reported  
149 concerns about reimbursement tripled from 2015 (11%) to 2020 (37%) ( $p < 0.0001$ ); similarly,  
150 twice as many non-engaged LHDs reported challenges assisting individuals with accessing  
151 financial resources to pay for PrEP from 2015 (17%) to 2020 (33%) ( $p = 0.0015$ ). However, it's  
152 notable that among *engaged* LHDs, significantly fewer reported this challenge in 2020 (26%) than  
153 in 2015 (53%) ( $p < 0.0001$ ). Lastly, almost a quarter of non-engaged LHDs report that the health  
154 department is not sure what it should or could be doing (24%) (**Table 3**).

## 155 **Future funding uses**

156 Both engaged and non-engaged LHDs were asked what they would prioritize if funding  
157 became available to support PrEP implementation. Echoing the 2015 survey, LHDs that had not  
158 yet engaged in PrEP implementation in 2020 most frequently reported that they would prioritize  
159 funding for PrEP planning (67%), followed by education and outreach to priority populations for  
160 PrEP (50%), and healthcare provider education (45%). Besides planning, these responses were

161 similar among LHDs already engaged in PrEP implementation in 2020, among which education  
162 and outreach to priority populations (70%) and healthcare provider education (47%) were the most  
163 reported priorities, followed by providing PrEP adherence support (38%) and hiring clinical  
164 personnel (35%). The proportion of engaged LHD that reported prioritizing funding for education  
165 and outreach more than doubled from 2015 (31%) to 2020 (70%) ( $p=0.0003$ ). **(Table 4).**

**Table 4. Priority areas for funding PrEP implementation by local health departments, United States, 2015 and 2020, weighted response proportions**

| Priority area for funding   | LHDs Engaged in PrEP                         |  |                               | LHDs Not Engaged in PrEP                     |  |                               |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
|   | NACCHO 2015<br>(n=109)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | NACCHO 2020<br>(n=171)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | Rao-Scott<br>ChiSq<br>p-value | NACCHO 2015<br>(n=175)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | NACCHO 2020<br>(n=182)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | Rao-Scott<br>ChiSq<br>p-value |
| Plan for how to most effectively incorporate PrEP into HIV prevention education and services  | 42.3 (28.0, 56.7)                            | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               | 68.9 (55.5, 82.4)                            | 66.7 (57.9, 75.6)                            | 0.7907                        |
| <sup>1</sup> Education and outreach to priority populations for PrEP  | 31.4 (14.7, 48.1)                            | 70.1 (62.8, 77.4)                            | 0.0003                        | 36.2 (22.8, 49.5)                            | 50.3 (40.8, 59.8)                            | 0.0968                        |
| Communications activities related to PrEP   | 31.9 (18.1, 45.7)                            | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               | 22.1 (11.3, 32.8)                            | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               |
| Healthcare provider education   | 60.7 (45.6, 75.9)                            | 46.8 (38.8, 54.8)                            | 0.1106                        | 43.5 (29.6, 57.4)                            | 45.4 (36.3, 54.5)                            | 0.8155                        |
| <sup>2</sup> Provide PrEP adherence support   | 25.4 (12.1, 38.6)                            | 37.9 (30.2, 45.6)                            | 0.1344                        | 29.9 (16.9, 42.8)                            | 24.8 (16.8, 32.8)                            | 0.5004                        |
| <sup>3</sup> Monitoring PrEP uptake   | 45.1 (29.6, 60.6)                            | 17.8 (11.8, 23.9)                            | 0.0009                        | 16.8 (6.3, 27.3)                             | 13.1 (6.8, 19.3)                             | 0.5195                        |
| Program staff to conduct non-clinical PrEP-related activities (e.g., assessment of eligibility for insurance, navigation or linkage to providers) | 46.7 (32.6, 60.8)                            | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               | 28.8 (15.8, 41.7)                            | <i>Not asked</i>                             |                               |
| Provide HIV, and STI screening for patients prescribed PrEP by a non-health department provider   | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 16.1 (10.1, 22.1)                            |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 35.3 (26.5, 44.1)                            |                               |
| Hire clinical personnel   | 28.4 (16.2, 40.5)                            | 34.9 (27.6, 42.2)                            | 0.3674                        | 32.8 (19.8, 45.8)                            | 25.1 (17.1, 33.2)                            | 0.3116                        |
| Hire non-clinical personnel   | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 19.6 (13.6, 25.7)                            |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 8.4 (3.1, 13.7)                              |                               |
| Provide funding to community partners to support PrEP implementation  | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 18.0 (12.1, 23.8)                            |                               | <i>Not asked</i>                             | 16.7 (9.8, 23.6)                             |                               |

| Priority area for funding | LHDs Engaged in PrEP                         |  |                               | LHDs Not Engaged in PrEP                     |  |                               |
|---------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
|                           | NACCHO 2015<br>(n=109)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | NACCHO 2020<br>(n=171)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | Rao-Scott<br>ChiSq<br>p-value | NACCHO 2015<br>(n=175)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | NACCHO 2020<br>(n=182)<br>% Checked (95% CI) | Rao-Scott<br>ChiSq<br>p-value |
| Other                     | 3.9 (0.0, 9.7)                               | 2.5 (0.1, 5.0)                               | 0.6498                        | 2.5 (0.0, 5.5)                               | 1.0 (0.0, 3.0)                               | 0.4295                        |

LHD: Local Health Department; CI: Confidence Interval; PrEP: Preexposure prophylaxis; NACCHO: National Association of County and City Health Officials 2015/2020 Survey

<sup>1</sup> For this analysis, the 2020 survey question "Education and outreach to priority populations for PrEP" is compared to the 2015 survey question "Develop educational materials about PrEP." However, respondents selecting this variable in 2020 may also overlap with respondents who selected the 2015 survey question "Communications activities related to PrEP."

<sup>2</sup> For this analysis, the 2020 survey question "Provide PrEP adherence support" is compared with its closest match in the 2015 survey, "Develop and deliver HIV risk-reduction counseling and behavioral interventions for persons taking PrEP." The authors note that the 2020 question focusing on adherence is more limited in scope than the 2015 question and may represent a smaller number of respondents than those who would choose in 2020 to prioritize funding for the full scope of activities listed in the 2015 question.

<sup>3</sup> For this analysis, the 2020 survey question "Monitoring PrEP uptake" is most closely matched to the 2015 question "Evaluation activities for PrEP-related activities." The authors note that the 2020 question focusing on uptake monitoring may not represent the full scope of evaluation activities covered by the 2015 variable and may represent a smaller number of respondents than those who would choose in 2020 to prioritize funding for the full scope of activities listed in the 2015 question.



## 166 **Impact of COVID-19 on LHD Engagement on HIV Testing and** 167 **PrEP Implementation**

168           At the time of this survey, LHDs were engaged in the COVID-19 pandemic response for  
169 over nine months, with significant impact on other essential public health functions performed  
170 year-round. LHDs who reported engagement in PrEP implementation (n=158) were asked about  
171 the impact of COVID-19 on their PrEP programs (**Table 5**). The most frequently reported impact  
172 for all engaged LHDs were a reduced number of staff working on PrEP implementation due to  
173 COVID-19 reassignments (41%). One-quarter (24%) of these LHDs (n=65) reported that over  
174 75% of staff were reduced or reassigned from PrEP to work on COVID-19 related activities.  
175 Other impacts of COVID-19 on PrEP programming included initiating PrEP in fewer persons  
176 (35%), clinic closure (23%), reduced adherence services (15%), and decreased frequency of  
177 follow-up visits for PrEP patients (15%). About 12% of the LHDs introduced telehealth services  
178 for PrEP and most were LHDs in large jurisdictions (Table 5).

**Table 5. Impact of COVID-19 on local health department PrEP programs, by jurisdiction size, United States, 2020, weighted response proportions**

| Impact Type  | Jurisdiction Size             |                                 |                                | Rao-Scott ChiSq<br>p-value |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
|  | Large<br>(n=43)<br>% (95% CI) | Medium<br>(n=160)<br>% (95% CI) | Small<br>(n=151)<br>% (95% CI) |                            |
| Initiating PrEP in fewer persons   | 44.4 (28.1, 60.8)             | 32.0 (21.4, 42.6)               | 34.0 (20.4, 47.6)              | 0.5119                     |
| Have suspended PrEP initiation visits                                    | 8.3 (0.0, 17.4)               | 14.7 (6.6, 22.7)                | 4.3 (0.0, 10.1)                | 0.1243                     |
| Have reduced services to support PrEP adherence and/or retention in care | 13.9 (2.4, 25.4)              | 17.3 (8.6, 26.1)                | 12.8 (3.2, 22.3)               | 0.7420                     |
| Reduced staff working on PrEP due to COVID-19 reassignments              | 52.8 (36.2, 69.3)             | 36.0 (25.0, 47.0)               | 42.6 (28.6, 56.5)              | 0.3058                     |
| Clinic closure   | 27.8 (13.0, 42.6)             | 30.7 (20.5, 40.9)               | 10.6 (1.7, 19.6)               | 0.0156                     |
| Introduced telehealth services for PrEP                                  | 36.1 (20.2, 52.0)             | 12.0 (4.5, 19.5)                | 2.1 (0.0, 6.3)                 | <.0001                     |
| Decreased frequency of follow-up visits for PrEP patients                | 16.7 (4.3, 29.0)              | 18.7 (9.8, 27.5)                | 10.6 (1.7, 19.6)               | 0.4235                     |
| Increased duration of prescriptions for PrEP medications                 | 8.3 (0.0, 17.4)               | 10.7 (3.7, 17.6)                | 0                              |                            |
| Other changes in PrEP service delivery                                   | 5.6 (0.0, 13.0)               | 6.7 (0.9, 12.4)                 | 0                              |                            |
| Other changes  | 25.0 (11.0, 39.0)             | 9.3 (2.6, 16.0)                 | 2.1 (0.0, 6.3)                 | 0.0039                     |
| No impact on PrEP program or activities                                  | 11.1 (0.7, 21.5)              | 24.0 (14.2, 33.8)               | 34.0 (20.4, 47.7)              | 0.0661                     |

CI: Confidence Interval; PrEP: Preexposure prophylaxis

## 179 **Impact on HIV testing**

180           Eighty-two percent of LHDs who directly provided HIV testing reported reduced or  
181 suspended HIV testing in clinical settings during COVID-19, and 55% reported reduced or  
182 suspended testing in off-site settings. When asked about challenges related to HIV testing, the  
183 most frequently reported response was concerns about social distancing due to COVID-19  
184 (39%), followed by lack of resources such as funding and staff (32%). Twenty-eight percent  
185 reported they did not experience any challenges in providing HIV testing.

186           Overall, 70% of LHDs engaged in PrEP implementation reported reduced (50%) or  
187 suspended (20%) provision of HIV and STI testing of PrEP users due to COVID-19, and 30%  
188 reported no impact. Among LHDs which reported reductions in HIV and STI testing of PrEP  
189 users during COVID-19, approximately one-third (37%) experienced greater than a 50%  
190 reduction in testing. Reported adaptations for HIV and STI testing of PrEP users due to COVID-  
191 19 included initiation of curbside testing options (8%) and initiation of provision of HIV (7%) or  
192 STI (5%) self-testing or self-specimen collection options. Six percent reported offering COVID-  
193 19 testing at PrEP care sites (6%).

## 194 **Discussion**

195           Local health departments are key partners in implementing and scaling up PrEP in their  
196 communities. Notably, since NACCHO's initial 2015 assessment of LHD PrEP engagement,  
197 LHDs were significantly more involved in prescribing PrEP. While the respondents identified  
198 areas for improvement, we observed that LHDs were finding their footing as PrEP providers,  
199 funders, navigators, and educators, with 41% of engaged LHDs reporting their current role in PrEP

200 implementation was optimal compared with 16% in 2015. Engaged LHDs reported decreased  
201 challenges such as those related to navigation for financial assistance and this administrative  
202 practice can be shared and scaled-up among U.S. health departments. The breadth and depth of  
203 LHDs' roles related to PrEP implementation highlight that LHDs are assets not only to their  
204 communities but also to broader PrEP implementation efforts. It is crucial that LHDs be included  
205 by federal, state, and local decisionmakers in plans to increase PrEP access. Funders should create  
206 opportunities for LHDs to leverage their experience with technical assistance and peer learning.

207           Unfortunately, these findings also underscore concerns about implementing PrEP with  
208 limited resources, complicated procedures for PrEP medication financial support, and non-  
209 adherence of third-party payers to Affordable Care Act requirements for no patient cost-sharing  
210 of medications and ancillary services. Respondents reported that increased and sustained funding  
211 for PrEP implementation is necessary to protect capacity to support PrEP use especially in public  
212 health emergencies such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, too few LHDs had no  
213 engagement in PrEP implementation despite evidence of an increased awareness of their  
214 potential roles in PrEP. These findings suggest that additional resources and staff are needed for  
215 these LHDs to engage in PrEP implementation. Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, LHDs  
216 had limited staff resources for developing community-driven plans for PrEP implementation.  
217 LHDs will continue to encounter barriers to initiate engagement in PrEP implementation without  
218 specific, streamlined support for planning activities. Engaged LHDs reported implementation  
219 planning, outreach, and PrEP education and promotion as optimal activities for PrEP  
220 implementation and non-engaged LHDs could benefit from these activities.

221           Additional needs identified by this assessment include technical assistance and planning  
222 support for PrEP implementation. Engaged LHDs are key sources of PrEP education in their

223 communities and are well-positioned to also provide peer-to-peer support to LHDs in earlier  
224 stages of engagement. While engaged and unengaged LHDs share some common priorities  
225 related to PrEP implementation – including outreach to priority populations, health care provider  
226 education, and referral and navigation to PrEP providers – differing resource needs by  
227 engagement status indicate areas where non-engaged LHDs may benefit from peer-to-peer  
228 learning led by early adopters. However, this work cannot be completed without resources for  
229 LHDs to provide technical assistance and/or contribute to regional or national capacity-building  
230 efforts.

231         The impact the COVID-19 pandemic had on LHD PrEP activities reflect the reality that  
232 LHDs were not prepared for a public health emergency that tapped their HIV prevention staffing  
233 and funding resources. Prior to COVID-19, limited resources were a challenge to LHD  
234 engagement in PrEP for HIV prevention, with one-third of engaged LHDs reporting lack of staff  
235 as an implementation challenge even before the onset of the pandemic. However, the results of  
236 this assessment illustrate that staff redirection to COVID-19 efforts exacerbated these  
237 difficulties, stymying ongoing efforts to end the HIV and STI epidemics. During the pandemic,  
238 public health agencies depended on the contact tracing expertise of HIV and STD/STI program  
239 staff to conduct COVID-19 contact tracing and to train new staff.(7) In May 2020, 78% of the  
240 HIV and STD/STI health department workforce was redeployed to the COVID-19 emergency  
241 response; in November 2020, at the time this survey was conducted, over 87% of STI programs  
242 were supporting or leading COVID-19 contact tracing efforts in their jurisdiction.(8,9) The  
243 repercussions of these service interruptions, combined with decreased demand for services, are  
244 reflected in estimates of HIV testing outcomes in CDC-funded health departments during  
245 COVID-19. In 2020 health departments reported an over one million (47%) reduction in the

246 number of CDC-funded HIV tests and a 30% reduction in persons newly diagnosed with  
247 HIV.(10) These findings underscore that HIV and STI prevention efforts were sidelined during  
248 the COVID-19 emergency with a public health infrastructure that disproportionately relied on  
249 HIV and STI professionals for an emergency response. The expertise of HIV and STI public  
250 health workers is important during a public health emergency but decreased HIV and STI  
251 services during the COVID-19 response. This underscores the need for models to ensure  
252 preparedness, without compromising HIV and STI activities, such as a dedicated emergency  
253 response team or upskilling and task shifting of the existing HIV and STI workforce. An  
254 adequately resourced public health workforce can provide community outreach, social network  
255 approaches to outreach, health promotion, and client navigation to health insurance, medication  
256 assistance programs, and PrEP providers.

## 257 **Public Health Implications**

258 Robust funding of public health infrastructure can ensure that LHDs and their partners  
259 are equipped to provide PrEP access for all who may benefit from it.

## 260 **Limitations**

261 While the present study is a unique source of information on HIV prevention and PrEP  
262 engagement at the local level, this study is not without limitations. First, the data were self-  
263 reported by LHD staff, and NACCHO did not independently verify the data provided. LHD  
264 respondents may have provided incomplete, imperfect, or inconsistent information for various  
265 reasons which may include skipping questions due to time constraints, estimating responses to  
266 reduce burden, or interpreting undefined questions or response options differently. In addition,

267 while the survey methods used in both the 2015 and 2020 surveys were comparable, the wording  
268 of some survey items was modified between the two years. This may have impacted  
269 respondents' interpretations, but modifications were typically minor and deemed likely  
270 comparable across years. Differences for items presented in this paper are indicated with  
271 disclaimers in the tables. The assessment also had a low response rate, which was likely  
272 contributed to by LHD capacity constraints during COVID-19. The low response rate may have  
273 introduced bias towards more engaged LHDs, LHDs with fewer PrEP responsibilities, or LHDs  
274 with fewer COVID-19-related impacts and therefore more time to respond. Future research  
275 would benefit from a longer response window and shorter survey, or a series of multiple shorter  
276 surveys about specific subtopics. Lastly, the assessment allows a limited point-in-time analysis  
277 of the COVID-19 response from October - November 2020 and does not necessarily reflect  
278 subsequent impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on LHD HIV prevention programs through the  
279 time of publishing.

## 280 **Acknowledgements**

281 The authors thank all those who contributed to study conception, survey design, data collection,  
282 and data interpretation for this assessment and manuscript, especially the late Dawn K Smith,  
283 MD, MS, MPH. Dr. Smith's origination of this assessment during her tenure at CDC was just  
284 one of her vast contributions to the development and implementation of pre-exposure  
285 prophylaxis (PrEP) for HIV prevention. Her championing of this work and commitment to health  
286 equity leaves a lasting impact on the lives of innumerable people.

## References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. US Public Health Service: Preexposure prophylaxis for the prevention of HIV infection in the United States—2021 Update: a clinical practice guideline. [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2024 Feb 1]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/risk/prep/cdc-hiv-prep-guidelines-2021.pdf>
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Monitoring selected national HIV prevention and care objectives by using HIV surveillance data—United States and 6 dependent areas, 2021. HIV Surveillance Supplemental Report [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 May 14];28(4). Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/library/reports/hiv-surveillance/vol-28-no-4/index.html>
3. United States Department of Health and Human Services. HIV.gov. 2023 [cited 2024 May 14]. EHE Overview: What Is Ending the HIV Epidemic in the U.S.? Available from: <https://www.hiv.gov/federal-response/ending-the-hiv-epidemic/overview>
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Health Departments: Supported Activities: Prioritizing High Impact HIV Prevention [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2024 May 14]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/programresources/healthdepartments/supportedactivities.html>
5. Weiss G, Smith DK, Newman S, Wiener J, Kitlas A, Hoover KW. PrEP implementation by local health departments in US cities and counties: Findings from a 2015 assessment of local health departments. PLoS One [Internet]. 2018 Jul 1 [cited 2024 May 14];13(7):e0200338. Available from: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0200338>
6. National Association of County and City Health Officials. 2019 National Profile of Local Health Departments [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2024 May 14]. Available from: [https://www.naccho.org/uploads/downloadable-resources/Programs/Public-Health-Infrastructure/NACCHO\\_2019\\_Profile\\_final.pdf](https://www.naccho.org/uploads/downloadable-resources/Programs/Public-Health-Infrastructure/NACCHO_2019_Profile_final.pdf)
7. National Coalition of STD Directors. COVID-19 and the State of the STD Field Phase III [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2024 May 14]. Available from: <https://www.ncsddc.org/resource/covid-19-and-the-state-of-the-STD-field-phase-iii/>
8. National Coalition of STD Directors. COVID-19 and the State of the STD Field [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2024 May 14]. Available from: <https://www.ncsddc.org/resource/covid-19-and-the-state-of-the-STD-field/>
9. National Coalition of STD Directors. COVID-19 & the State of the STD Field: Phase II [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2024 May 14]. Available from: <https://www.ncsddc.org/resource/covid-19-the-state-of-the-STD-field-phase-ii/>
10. Hoover KW, Zhu W, Gant ZC, Delaney KP, Wiener J, Carnes N, et al. HIV Services and Outcomes During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, 2019–2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]. 2023 Dec 2 [cited 2024 May 14];71(48):1505–10. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/71/wr/mm7148a1.htm>



## Supporting information

**S1 Table. Top five resources selected by local health departments as being most helpful for advancing or initiating PrEP implementation, United States, 2020, weighted response proportions.**