

**2019 Ryan White Services Report
Key Findings**

- The Ryan White system in San Diego County (Parts A, B, C, D and F) provided services to 7,234 clients in calendar year 2019, which is the second largest number of patients served by Ryan White in California (#1 is Los Angeles with 26,100 clients, #3 is San Francisco, with 5,932 clients, and #4 is Oakland, with 3,081 clients). (Table 19b, p. 77)
- The age distribution of clients in San Diego County’s Ryan White program is comparable with the age distribution of other California counties. The single largest demographic group by age is 45-54 years (26.7%, 1,929), followed by 55-64 years (25.3%, 1,830). (Table 20b, p. 80)
- From a race/ethnicity lens, the largest group of clients served is Hispanic, representing 44.7% (3,182), followed by White (37.7%, 2,686), and Black/ African American (12.6%, 900). (Table 21b, p. 84)
- From a gender lens, the largest group of clients served is men, representing 82.7% (5,986) of clients served, followed by women (14.9%, 1,080), transgender women (2.1%, 153) and transgender men (.2%, 14). (Table 22b, p. 88)
- The largest transmission category for men is male-to-male sexual contact (81.5%, 4,231). (Table 23b-i, p. 93)
- The largest transmission category for women is heterosexual contact (82.4%, 690). (Table 23b-ii, p. 95)
- The largest transmission category for transgender clients is sexual contact (89.8%, 123). (Table 23b-iii, p. 96)
- From an income lens, the largest group of clients served is persons who are at or below 100% of the federal poverty level (80.6%, 5,485). The proportion of clients in San Diego who live at or below 100% FPL is higher than any other EMA/TGA in California. San Diego is followed by Oakland (67.1%, 1,873) and Los Angeles (63.7%, 16,338). (Table 24b, p. 99)
- San Diego County’s affordable housing crisis can be seen in the data.

	<u>Stable</u>		<u>Temporary</u>		<u>Unstable</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Los Angeles	21,990	91.4	1,094	4.2	25,808	10.6
Oakland	2,330	81.1	204	7.1	340	11.8
Orange County	1952	83.3	246	10.5	144	6.1
Riverside–San Bernardino	2,935	88.5	164	4.9	218	6.6
Sacramento	2,233	92.7	72	3.0	105	4.4
San Francisco	4,201	72.5	1,184	20.4	410	7.1
San Diego	5,242	78.1	888	13.2	586	8.7
San Jose	1,365	73.3	320	17.2	178	9.6

Just over three-fourths of Ryan White clients in San Diego County are stably housed (78.1%), with 13.2% in temporary housing and 8.7% unstably housed. For stable housing, San Diego County ranks five out of the eight EMA/TGAs in California, with only San Jose (73.3%) and San Francisco (72.5%) having a lower proportion of clients stably housed. The pattern is the opposite for temporary housing, with only San Jose (17.2%) and San Francisco (20.4%) having higher proportions temporarily housed. (Table 25b, p. 102)

- For CY2019, the proportion of clients who are virally suppressed in San Diego County (92.1%, 4,833) is the second highest proportion of any EMA/TGA in California; first is San Jose (94.6%, 687). (Table 27b, p. 110)
- Age correlates strongly with viral suppression, with older persons having higher rates of viral suppression than younger persons:
 - <13 years: 100% (9)
 - 13 – 24 years: 90.4% (75)
 - 25 – 34 years: 89.1% (637)
 - 35 to 44 years: 90.2% (837)
 - 45 to 54 years: 91.2% (1,144)
 - 55 to 64 years: 94.4% (1,077)
 - >= 65 years: 98.5% (382; Table 29b, p. 118)
- There are differences in viral suppression among different racial/ethnic groups:
 - American Indian/Alaskan Native: 80.8% (21)
 - Asian: 94.5% (120)
 - Black/African American: 88.8% (467; second highest percentage among California EMAs/TGAs)
 - Hispanic/Latino: 93.2% (2,116; second highest percentage among California EMAs/TGAs)
 - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 75.0% (6)
 - White: 91.7% (1,355; Table 31b, p. 126)
- Income levels do not appear to correlate with viral suppression as they have in prior years:
 - <=100% FPL: 91.9% (3,733; second highest percentage among California EMAs/TGAs)
 - 101-138 FPL: 94.3% (281)
 - 139-250 FPL: 92.2% (330)
 - 251-400% FPL: 94.8% (92)
 - >400%: 92% (23; Table 33b, p. 134)
- Housing strongly correlates with viral suppression, with clients who are stably housed showing a much higher percentage of viral suppression:
 - Stable: 93.5% (3,334)
 - Temporary: 89.3% (476)
 - Unstable: 83.3% (294; Table 35b, p. 139)