

Houston Area HIV Services Ryan White Planning Council

HIV Community Needs Assessment Group (NAG) Meeting

12:00 p.m., Thursday, March 26, 2020

Meeting Location: Online or via phone

Zoom Meeting ID: 914 345 246

To join via phone: (346) 248-7799

AGENDA

- | | |
|--|---|
| I. Call to Order | Jon-Michael Gillispie,
Eric James, and
Steven Vargas, Co-Chairs |
| A. Welcome | |
| B. Moment of Reflection | |
| C. Adoption of the Agenda | |
| D. Approval of the Minutes | |
| II. Review Data Necessary for How to Best Meet the Need | Amber Harbolt, Health Planner
Office of Support |
| A. Review, offer feedback, and approve introduction,
Chapters 1-2, and Service-Specific Fact Sheets
for use in the How to Best Meet the Need process | |
| III. Next Steps | Jon-Michael Gillispie,
Eric James, and
Steven Vargas, Co-Chairs |
| A. Sent tentative meeting to approve remaining chapters
and final report | |
| IV. Announcements | |
| V. Adjourn | |

Houston Area HIV Services Ryan White Planning Council

HIV Community Needs Assessment Group (NAG)

Monday, August 19, 2019

Meeting Location: 2223 West Loop South, Room 532; Houston, Texas 77027

Meeting Summary

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Steven Vargas, Co-chair	Bobbie Andrews	Reachelian Ellison, TRG
Jeffrey Campbell, Co-chair	Cynthia Deverson, excused	Amber Harbolt, Office of Support
Adrienne Gilmore-Thomas	Denis Kelly	Diane Beck, Office of Support
Allen Murray	Eric James, excused	
Angela F. Hawkins (phone)	Jeff Benavides, excused	
Ardry Skeet Boyle	Kathryn Fergus	
Berta Salazar	Mel Joseph, excused	
Cecilia Oshingbade	Mohammed Jamal	
Gilberto Rosales	Nancy Miertschin, excused	
Isis Torrente	Peta-gay Ledbetter	
Lionel Pennamon	Scot More	
Ronnie Galley	Tony Crawford	
Tana Pradia		

Call to Order: Steven Vargas, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. He welcomed everyone and asked for a moment of reflection.

Adoption of Agenda: Motion #1: *it was moved and seconded (Boyle, Galley) to adopt the agenda. Motion Carried.*

Approval of the Minutes: Motion #2: *it was moved and seconded (Pradia, Hawkins) to approve the April 15, 2019 meeting minutes. Motion Carried.* Abstentions: Oshingbade, Rosales, Salazar.

Mid-Data Collection Check-In: Harbolt reviewed the 2019 Sampling Plan and Current Sample Comparison. See attached. She described how the survey process works for new committee members.

2019 Needs Assessment Data Analysis Principles: Harbolt reviewed the attached. **Motion #3:** *it was moved and seconded (Pradia, Hawkins) to approve the Principles for FY 2019 Needs Assessment Analysis. Motion Carried.* Abstention: Rosales.

Next Meeting: The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for November 18th at 1:00 p.m.

Announcements: Vargas said that FLAS had their 25th anniversary gala last Saturday. Campbell said that the Houston Health Dept. and Black AIDS Institute are collaborating on a campaign about PrEP for Black women. They will host an event at TSU on August 29th for female students on the topics of prevention and care. Dena Gray and her daughter will facilitate. He also said to watch for

the I am Life campaign messages. Pradia said that PWN is raising funds to send 4 individuals to Atlanta for training on effective grassroots organizing. Hawkins said that PWN is hosting an event October 19th at Habitat House from 11am-2pm in recognition of the National Day of Violence Against Women.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

INTRODUCTION

What is an HIV needs assessment?

An HIV needs assessment is a process of collecting information about the needs of people living with HIV (PLWH) in a specific geographic area. The process involves gathering data *from multiple sources* on the number of HIV cases, the number of PLWH who are not in care, the needs and service barriers of PLWH, and current resources available to meet those needs. This information is then analyzed to identify what services are needed, what barriers to services exist, and what service gaps remain.

Special emphasis is placed on gathering information about the need for services funded by the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program and on the socio-economic and behavioral conditions experienced by PLWH that may influence their need for and access to services both today and in the future.

In the Houston Area, data collected directly from PLWH in the form of a *survey* are the principal source of information for the HIV needs assessment process. Surveys are administered every three years to a representative sample of PLWH residing in the Houston Area.

How are HIV needs assessment data used?

Needs assessment data are integral to the information base for HIV services planning, and they are used in almost every decision-making process of the Ryan White Planning Council (RWPC), including setting priorities for the allocation of funds, designing services that fit the needs of local PLWH, developing the comprehensive plan, and crafting the annual implementation plan. The community also uses needs assessment data for a variety of *non-Council* purposes, such as in writing funding applications, evaluation and monitoring, and the improvement of services by individual providers.

In the Houston Area, HIV needs assessment data are used for the following purposes:

- Ensuring the consumer point-of-view is infused into all of the data-driven decision-making activities of the Houston Area RWPC.
- Revising local service definitions for HIV care, treatment, and support services in order to best meet the needs of PLWH in the Houston Area.
- Setting priorities for the allocation of Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program funds to specific services.

- Establishing goals for and then monitoring the impact of the Houston Area's comprehensive plan for improving the HIV prevention and care system.
- Determining if there is a need to target services by analyzing the needs of particular groups of PLWH.
- Determining the need for special studies of service gaps or subpopulations that may be otherwise underrepresented in data sources.
- By the Planning Council, other Planning Bodies, specific Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts, providers, or community partners to assess needs for services.

Needs assessment data are specifically mandated for use during the Planning Council's *How to Best Meet the Need, Priority & Allocations*, and Comprehensive HIV Planning processes.

Because surveys are administered every three years, results are used in RWPC activities for a three year period. Other data sources produced during interim years of the cycle, such as epidemiologic data and estimates of unmet need, are used to provide additional context for and to better understand survey results.

Sources:

2020 Houston Area HIV Needs Assessment Group (NAG), Analysis Workgroup, Principles for the 2020 Needs Assessment Analysis. Approved 08-19-19.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, HIV/AIDS Bureau, Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part A Manual Revised 2013. Section XI, Ch 3: Needs Assessment.

METHODOLOGY

Needs Assessment Planning

Planning the 2020 Houston Area HIV Care Services Needs Assessment was a collaborative process between HIV prevention and care stakeholders, the Houston Area planning bodies for HIV prevention and care, all Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts, and individual providers and consumers of HIV services. To guide the overall process and provide specific subject matter expertise, a series of Needs Assessment-related Workgroups reconvened under the auspices of the Ryan White Planning Council (**RWPC**):

- The Needs Assessment Group (**NAG**) provided overall direction to the needs assessment process. As such, the NAG consisted of voting members from each collaborating partner and from the following workgroups.
- The Epidemiology Workgroup developed the consumer survey sampling plan, which aimed at producing a representative sample of surveys.
- The Survey Workgroup developed the survey instrument and consent language.
- The Analysis Workgroup determined how survey data should be analyzed and reported in order to serve as an effective tool for HIV planning.

In total, 38 individuals in addition to staff participated in the planning process, of which at least 45% were people living with HIV (**PLWH**).

Survey Sampling Plan

Staff calculated the 2020 Houston Area HIV Care Services Needs Assessment sample size based on current total HIV prevalence for the Houston Eligible Metropolitan Area (**EMA**) (2017), with a 95% confidence interval, at both 3% and 4% margin of error. Respondent composition goals were proportional to demographic and geographic representation in total prevalence. Desired sample sizes for funded-agency representation were proportional to total client share for the most recent complete calendar year (2018). Efforts were also taken to over-sample out-of-care consumers and members of special populations. Regular reports of select respondent characteristics were provided to NAG, the Comprehensive HIV Planning Committee, and RWPC during survey administration to assess real-time progress toward attainment of sampling goals and to make sampling adjustments when necessary.

Survey Tool

Data for the 2020 Houston Area HIV Care Services Needs Assessment were collected using a 54-question paper or electronic survey of open-ended, multiple

choice, and scaled questions addressing nine topic areas (in order):

- HIV services, needs, and barriers to care
- Communication with HIV medical providers
- HIV diagnosis history
- HIV care history including linkage to care
- Non-HIV co-occurring health concerns (incl. mental health)
- Substance use
- Housing, transportation, and social support
- Financial resources
- Demographics
- HIV prevention activities

The Survey Workgroup determined topics and questions, restructuring and expanding the 45-question 2016 needs assessment survey. Subject matter experts were also engaged to review specific questions. Consistency with the federally-mandated HIV prevention needs assessment for the Houston Area was assured through participation of Houston Health Department staff during the survey development process and alignment of pertinent questions such as those designed to gather demographic information and HIV prevention knowledge and behaviors. A cover sheet explained the purpose of the survey, risks and benefits, planned data uses, and consent. A double-sided tear-sheet of emergency resources and HIV service grievance/complaint process information was also attached, and liability language was integrated within the survey.

Data Collection

Surveys for the 2020 Houston Area HIV Care Services Needs Assessment were administered (1) in pre-scheduled group sessions at Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program providers, HIV Prevention providers, housing facilities, support groups, Harris County community centers, and specific community locations and organizations serving special populations; and (1) online via word of mouth, print, and social media advertising. Staff contacts at each physical location were responsible for session promotion and participant recruitment. Out-of-care consumers were recruited through flyers, word of mouth, print advertisement, and staff promotion.

Inclusion criteria were an HIV diagnosis and residency in counties in the greater Houston Area. Participants were self-selected and self-identified according to these criteria. Surveys were self-administered in English, Spanish, and large-print formats, with staff and bilingual interpreters available for verbal interviewing.

Participation was voluntary, anonymous, and monetarily incentivized; and respondents were advised of these conditions verbally and in writing. Most surveys were completed in 30 to 40 minutes. Surveys were reviewed on-site by trained staff, interns, and interpreters for completion and translation of written comments; completed surveys were also logged in a centralized tracking database.

In total, 589 consumer surveys were collected from April 2019 to February 2020 during 47 survey sessions at 27 survey sites and online.

Data Management

Data entry for the current Houston Area HIV Care Services Needs Assessment was performed by trained staff and contractors at the RWPC Office of Support using simple numerical coding. Skip-logic questions were entered based on first-order responses; and affirmative responses only were entered for “check-all” questions. Additional variables were recoded during data entry and data cleaning. Surveys that could not be accurately entered by staff were eliminated. Data are periodically reviewed for quality assurance, and a line-list level data cleaning protocol was applied prior to analysis. When data entry and cleaning are complete, a data weighting syntax will be created and applied to the sample for: sex at birth, primary race/ethnicity, and age group based on a three-level stratification of current HIV prevalence for the Houston EMA (2018). Missing or invalid survey entries will be excluded from analysis per variable; therefore, denominators vary across results. Also, proportions will not be calculated with a denominator of the total number of completed surveys for every variable due to missing or “check-all” responses. Data entry for the 2020 Houston Area HIV Care Services Needs Assessment was performed by trained staff and contractors at the RWPC Office of Support using simple numerical coding. Skip-logic questions were entered based on first-order responses; and affirmative responses only were entered for “check-all” questions. Additional variables were recoded during data entry and data cleaning. Surveys that could not be accurately entered by staff or that were found to be duplicates were eliminated (n=11). Data were periodically reviewed for quality assurance, and a line-list level data cleaning protocol was applied prior to analysis. In addition, a data weighting syntax was created and applied to the sample for: sex at birth, primary race/ethnicity, and age group based on a three-level stratification of current HIV prevalence for the Houston EMA (2018), producing a total weighted sample size of 589 (8% in Spanish). Missing or invalid

survey entries are excluded from analysis per variable; therefore, denominators vary across results. Also, proportions are not calculated with a denominator of 589 surveys for every variable due to missing or “check-all” responses. All data management and analysis was performed in IBM® SPSS® Statistics (v. 22) and QSR International® NVivo 10.

Limitations

The 2020 Houston Area HIV Care Services Needs Assessment produced data that are unique because they reflect the first-hand perspectives and lived experiences of PLWH in the Houston Area. However, there are limitations to the generalizability, reliability, and accuracy of the results that should be considered during their interpretation and use. These limitations are summarized below:

- *Convenience Sampling.* Multiple administrative methods were used to survey a representative sample of PLWH in the Houston Area proportional to geographic, demographic, transmission risk, and other characteristics. Despite extensive efforts, respondents were not randomly selected, and the resulting sample is not proportional to current HIV prevalence. To mitigate this bias, data were statistically weighted for sex at birth, primary race/ethnicity, and age group using current HIV prevalence for the Houston EMA (2018). Results presented from Chapters 2 through the end of this report are proportional for these three demographic categories only. Similarly, the majority of respondents were Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients at the time of data collection, but may have received services outside the program that are similar to those currently funded. Therefore, it is not possible to determine if results reflect non-Ryan White systems.
- *Margin of Error.* Staff met the minimum sampling plan goal of at least 588 valid surveys for a margin of error of 4.00%, based on a 95% confidence interval. This indicates that 95% of the time, the quantitative results reported in this document are anticipated to be correct by a margin of 4 percentage points. For this reason, results reported in this document are statistically significant, generalizable, and are suitable for planning purposes to draw general conclusions about the overall needs and experiences of people living with HIV in the Houston area.
- *Reporting Bias.* Survey participants were self-selected and self-identified, and the answers they provided to survey questions were self-reported. Since the survey tool was anonymous, data could not be corroborated with medical or other records. Consequently, results

should not be used as empirical evidence of reported health or treatment outcomes. Other data sources should be used if confirmation of results is needed.

- *Instrumentation.* Full data accuracy cannot be assured due to variability in comprehension and completeness of surveys by individual respondents. Though trained staff performed real-time quality reviews of each survey, there were missing data as well as indications of misinterpretation of survey questions. It is possible that literacy and language barriers contributed to this limitation as well.
- *Data management.* The use of both staff and contractors to enter survey data could have produced transcription and transposition errors in the dataset. A line-list level data cleaning protocol was applied to help mitigate errors.

Data presented here represent the most current repository of *primary* data on PLWH in the Houston Area. With these caveats in mind, the results can be used to describe the experiences of PLWH in the Houston Area and to draw conclusions on how to best meet the HIV service needs of this population.

Sources:

Houston Area HIV Needs Assessment Group (NAG),
Epidemiology Workgroup, 2019 Survey Sampling Principles
and Plan, Approved 03-18-19.

Texas Department of State Health Services (DSHS) eHARS
data through 12-31-2018, extracted as of spring 2020.

University of Illinois, Applied Technologies for Learning in the
Arts and Sciences (ATLAS), Statistical & GIS Software
Documentation & Resources, SPSS Statistics 20, Post-
stratification weights, 2009.

DRAFT

BACKGROUND

The Houston Area

Houston is the fourth largest city in the U.S., the largest city in the State of Texas, and as well as one of the most racially and ethnically diverse major American metropolitan area. Spanning 600 square miles, Houston is also the least densely populated major metropolitan area. Houston is the seat of Harris County, the most populous county in the State of Texas and the third most populous in the country. The United States Census Bureau estimates that Harris County has almost 4.7 million residents, around half of which live in the city of Houston.

Beyond Houston and Harris County, local HIV service planning extends to four geographic service areas in the greater Houston Area:

- *Houston/Harris County* is the geographic service area defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for HIV prevention. It is also the local reporting jurisdiction for HIV surveillance, which mandates all laboratory evidence related to HIV/AIDS performed in Houston/Harris County be reported to the local health authority.
- The *Houston Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA)* is the geographic service area defined by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) for the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part A and Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI). The Houston EMA includes six counties: Chambers, Fort Bend, Harris, Liberty, Montgomery, and Waller.
- The *Houston Health Services Delivery Area (HSDA)* is the geographic service area defined by the Texas Department of State Health Services (TDSHS) for the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part B and the Houston Area's HIV service funds from the State of Texas. The HSDA includes the six counties in the EMA listed above plus four additional counties: Austin, Colorado, Walker, and Wharton.
- The *Houston Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area (EMSA)* is the geographic service area defined by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) program. The EMSA consists of the six counties in the EMA listed above plus Austin, Brazoria, Galveston, and San Jacinto Counties.

Together, these geographic service areas encompass 13 counties in southeast Texas, spanning from the Gulf of Mexico into the Texas Piney Woods.

HIV in the Houston Area

In keeping with national new HIV diagnosis trends, the number of new cases of HIV in the Houston Area has remained relatively stable; HIV-related mortality has steadily declined, and the number of people living with HIV has steadily increased. According to current disease surveillance data, there are 29,078 diagnosed people living with HIV in the Houston EMA (Table 1). The majority are male (75%), over the age of 45 (52%), and have MSM transmission risk (58%), while almost half are Black/African American (48%).

TABLE 1-Diagnosed People Living with HIV in the Houston EMA, 2018^a

	#	%
Total	29,078	100.0%
Sex at Birth		
Male	21,829	75.1%
Female	7,249	24.9%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	5,109	17.6%
Black/African American	14,044	48.3%
Hispanic/Latino	8,493	29.2%
Other/Multiracial	1,432	4.9%
Age		
0 - 12	54	0.2%
13 - 24	1,170	4.0%
25 - 34	5,986	20.6%
35 - 44	6,752	23.2%
45 - 54	7,594	26.1%
55 - 64	5,580	19.2%
65+	1,942	6.7%
Transmission Risk^b		
Male-male sexual contact (MSM)	16,818	57.8%
Person who injects drugs (PWID)	2,256	7.8%
MSM/PWID	1,192	4.1%
Sex with Male/Sex with Female	8,455	29.1%
Perinatal transmission	340	1.2%
Adult other	17	0.1%

^aSource: Texas eHARS, Diagnosed PLWH in the Houston EMA between 1/1/2018 and 12/31/2018

^bCases with unknown risk have been redistributed based on historical patterns of risk ascertainment and reclassification.

The CDC ranks the Houston Area (specifically, the Houston-Baytown-Sugarland, TX statistical area) 10th highest in the nation for new HIV diagnoses and 11th in cases of progressed/Stage 3 HIV (formerly known as AIDS). In February 2019, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (**HHS**) launched the cross-agency initiative *Ending the HIV Epidemic: A Plan for America* with an overarching goal to reduce new HIV transmission in the U.S. by 90% by 2030. This initiative identified Harris County as a priority county due to the high rate and number of new HIV diagnoses, and plans to introduce additional resources, technology, and technical assistance to support local HIV prevention and treatment activities. Of the 29,078 diagnosed PLWH in the Houston Area, 75% are in medical care for HIV, but only 59% have a suppressed viral load.

HIV Services in the Houston Area

Both governmental agencies and non-profit organizations provide HIV services in the Houston Area through direct HIV services provision and/or function as Administrative Agents which contract to direct service providers. The goal of HIV care in the Houston Area is to create a seamless system that supports people at risk for or living with HIV with a full array of educational, clinical, mental, social, and support services to prevent new infections and support PLWH with high-quality, life-extending care. In addition, two local HIV Planning Bodies provide mechanisms for those living with and affected by HIV to design prevention and care services. Each of the primary sources in the Houston Area HIV service delivery system is described below:

- Comprehensive HIV prevention activities in the Houston Area are provided by the Houston Health Department (**HHD**), a directly-funded CDC grantee, and the Texas Department of State Health Services (**DSHS**). Prevention activities include health education and risk reduction, HIV testing, disease investigation and partner services, linkage to care for newly diagnoses and out of care PLWH. The Houston Area HIV Prevention Community Planning Group provides feedback and to HHD in its design and implementation of HIV prevention activities.
- The Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part A and MAI provide core medical and support services for

HIV-diagnosed residents of the Houston EMA. These funds are administered by the Ryan White Grant Administration of Harris County Public Health. The Houston Area Ryan White Planning Council designs Part A and MAI funded services for the Houston EMA.

- The Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts B, C, D, and State Services provide core medical and support services for HIV-diagnosed residents of the Houston HSDA, with special funding provided to meet the needs of women, infants, children, and youth. The Houston Regional HIV/AIDS Resource Group (**TRG**) administers these funds. The Ryan White Planning Council also designs Part B and State Services for the Houston HSDA. Additional programs supported by TRG include reentry housing through HOPWA funds and support of the grassroots END HIV Houston coalition.
- HOPWA provides grants to community organizations to meet the housing needs of low-income persons living with HIV. HOPWA services include assistance with rent, mortgage, and utility payments, case management, and supportive housing. These funds are administered by the City of Houston Housing and Community Development for the Houston EMSA.

Together, these key agencies, the direct service providers that they fund, and the two local Planning Bodies ensure the greater Houston Area has a seamless system of prevention, care, treatment, and support services that best meets the needs of people at risk for or living with HIV.

Sources:

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Diagnoses of HIV Infection in the United States and Dependent Areas, 2018*; vol. 30. Published November 2015. Accessed 03/06/2020. Available at: www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/surveillance/resources/reports/.
- U.S. Census Bureau, American FactFinder. Houston (city), Texas and Harris (county), Texas Accessed: 03/03/2020. Available at: <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Ending the HIV Epidemic: A Plan for America*. February 2019.

DRAFT



Chapter 1: Demographics

PARTICIPANT COMPOSITION

The following summary of the geographic, demographic, socio-economic, and other composition characteristics of individuals who participated in the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment provides both a “snapshot” of who is living with HIV in the Houston Area today as well as context for other needs assessment results.

(Table 1) Overall, 95% of needs assessment participants resided in Harris County at the time of data collection. The majority of participants were male (66%), African American/Black (63%), and heterosexual (57%). Over half (60%) were age 50 or over, with a median age of 50-54.

The average unweighted household income of participants was \$13,493 annually, with the majority living below 100% of federal poverty (FPL). A majority of participants (63%) was not working at the time of survey, with 39% collecting disability benefits and 16% unemployed and seeking employment, and 9% retired. Most participants paid for healthcare using Medicaid/Medicare or assistance through Harris Health System (Gold Card).

TABLE 1-Select Participant Characteristics, Houston Area HIV Needs Assessment, 2020

No.		%		No.		%		No.		%	
County of residence				Age range (median: 50-54)				Sex at birth			
Harris	545	94.9%	13 to 17	0	-	Male	384	65.8%			
Fort Bend	10	41.7%	18 to 24	17	2.9%	Female	200	34.2%			
Liberty	3	0.5%	25 to 34	50	8.6%	Intersex	0	-			
Montgomery	7	1.2%	35 to 49	160	27.6%	Transgender	22	3.9%			
Other	9	1.6%	50 to 54	105	18.1%	Non-binary / gender fluid	8	1.4%			
			55 to 64	161	27.8%	Currently pregnant*	4	2.0%			
			65 to 74	79	13.6%	*All currently pregnant respondents reported being in care. The denominator is all respondents reporting female sex at birth					
			75+	8	1.4%						
			Youth (13 to 27)	17	2.9%						
			Seniors (≥50)	353	59.9%						
Primary race/ethnicity				Sexual orientation				Health insurance			
White	78	13.6%	Heterosexual	329	56.8%	Private insurance	53	9.1%			
African American/Black	343	59.8%	Gay/Lesbian	176	30.4%	Medicaid/Medicare	388	66.7%			
Hispanic/Latino	122	21.3%	Bisexual/Pansexual	52	9.0%	Harris Health System	168	30.1%			
Asian American	4	0.7%	Other	22	3.8%	Ryan White Only	138	23.7%			
Other/Multiracial	27	4.7%	MSM	238	40.5%	None	11	1.9%			
Residency				Yearly income (average: \$13,493)				Employment			
Born in the U.S.	511	87.8%	Federal Poverty Level (FPL)				Disabled	263	38.9%		
Lived in U.S. > 5 years	58	10.0%	Below 100%	191	67.3%	Unemployed and seeking work	105	15.5%			
Lived in U.S. < 5 years	8	1.4%	100%	54	19.0%	Employed (PT)	59	8.7%			
In U.S. on visa	1	0.2%	150%	16	5.6%	Retired	59	8.7%			
Prefer not to answer	4	0.7%	200%	15	5.3%	Employed (FT)	53	7.8%			
			250%	2	0.7%	Self Employed	19	2.8%			
			≥300%	6	2.1%	Other	118	17.5%			

(Table 2) Certain subgroups of PLWH have been historically underrepresented in HIV data collection, thereby limiting the ability of local communities to address their needs in the data-driven decision-making processes of HIV planning. To help mitigate underrepresentation in Houston Area data collection, efforts were made during the 2020 needs assessment process to *oversample* PLWH who were also members of groups designated as “special populations” due to socio-economic circumstances or other sources of disparity in the HIV service delivery system.

The results of these efforts are summarized in Table 2.

	No.	%
Young adult (18-24 years)	17	2.9%
Adult age 50+ years	353	59.9%
Homeless	65	11.1%
Unstably Housed	159	29.0%
People who inject drugs (PWID)*	47	8.2%
Male-male sexual contact (MSM)	238	40.5%
Out of care (last 12 months)	24	4.3%
Recently released from incarceration	65	11.6%
Rural (non-Harris County resident)	29	5.1%
Women of color	194	33.2%
Transgender	22	3.8%


*Includes self-administered medications, insulin, steroids, hormones, silicone, or drugs.

DRAFT

COMPARISON OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT PARTICIPANTS TO HIV PREVALENCE

HIV needs assessments generate information about the needs and service barriers of persons living with HIV (PLWH) in a specific geographic area to assist planning bodies and other stakeholders with designing HIV services that best meet those needs. As it is not be feasible to survey every PLWH in the Houston area, multiple administrative and statistical methods are used to generate a sample of PLWH that are reliably representative of *all* PLWH in the area. The same is true in regards to assessing the needs of clients of the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program.

GRAPH 1-Needs Assessment Participants Compared to Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Clients^a and Total HIV Diagnosed Population^b in the Houston EMA, by Sex at Birth, 2018




^aSource: CPCDMS as of 12/31/18, Total number of clients served by the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part A, the Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI), Part B, and State Services (State of Texas matching funds). Accessed 4/1/19.
^bSource: Texas eHARS. Living HIV cases as of 12/31/18.

As such, awareness of participant representation compared to the composition of both Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program clients and the total HIV diagnosed population is beneficial when reviewing needs assessment results to document actions taken to mitigate any disproportional results.

(Graph 1) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment males (sex at birth) comprised 66% of participants but 75% of all Ryan White clients, and all PLWH in the Houston Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA). This indicates that male PLWH were underrepresented in the needs assessment sample, while female PLWH were overrepresented.

(Graph 2) Analysis of race/ethnicity composition also shows disproportionate representation between participants, all Ryan White clients, and all PLWH in the Houston EMA. Black/African American participants were overrepresented at 60% of participants when compared to the proportions of Black/African American Ryan White clients and PLWH. Conversely, White PLWH and Hispanic/Latino PLWH were slightly underrepresented in the needs assessment.


GRAPH 2- Needs Assessment Participants Compared to Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Clients^a and Total HIV Diagnosed Population^b in the Houston EMA, by Race/Ethnicity, 2018



^aSource: CPCDMS as of 12/31/18, Total number of clients served by the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part A, the Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI), Part B, and State Services (State of Texas matching funds). Accessed 4/1/19.
^bSource: Texas eHARS. Living HIV cases as of 12/31/18

(Graph 3) As referenced in Table 1, 60% of the total needs assessment sample was comprised of individuals age 50 and over. An analysis of age range shows that more needs assessment participants were older than Ryan White clients and PLWH in the Houston EMA. Among needs assessment participants, 28% were ages 55 to 64 and 15% age 65 years and over. Compared to Ryan White clients, 18% were ages 55 to 64 and 4% were 65 and over. Among all PLWH 19% and 7% were in these age groups, respectively. No adolescents (those age 13 to 17) were surveyed. This suggests that youth and young adult PLWH (those age 13 to 24) are generally underrepresented in the needs assessment, while older adults (those age 55 and above) are overrepresented.

GRAPH 3- Needs Assessment Participants Compared to Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Clients^a and Total HIV Diagnosed Population^b in the Houston EMA, by Age^c, 2018



^aSource: CPCDMS as of 12/31/18, Total number of clients served by the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Part A, the Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI), Part B, and State Services (State of Texas matching funds). Accessed 4/1/19.
^bSource: Texas eHARS. Living HIV cases as of 12/31/18
^cExcludes ages 0-12
*Age ranges 35-44 and 45-54 combined due to differences in question structuring.

Weighting the Sample

Needs assessment data were statistically weighted by sex at birth, primary race/ethnicity, and age group using current HIV prevalence for the Houston EMA (2018) *prior to* the analysis of results related to service needs and barriers. This was done because the demographic composition of 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment participants was *not* comparable to the composition of all PLWH in the Houston EMA. As such, the results presented in the remaining Chapters of this document are proportional for these three demographic categories only. Appropriate statistical methods were applied throughout the process in order to produce an accurately weighted sample, including a three-level stratification of prevalence data and subsequent data

weighting syntax. Voluntary completion on the survey and non-applicable answers comprise the missing or invalid survey entries and are excluded in the statistical analysis; therefore, denominators will further vary across results. All data management and quantitative analysis, including weighting, was performed in IBM© SPSS© Statistics (v. 22). Qualitative analysis was performed in QSR International© NVivo 10.

Sources:

Texas Department of State Health Services (TDSHS) eHARS data through 12-31-2018.

University of Illinois, Applied Technologies for Learning in the Arts and Sciences (ATLAS), Statistical & GIS Software Documentation & Resources, SPSS Statistics 20, Post-stratification weights, 2009.

DRAFT

DRAFT



Chapter 2: Service Needs and Barriers

OVERALL SERVICE NEEDS AND BARRIERS

As payer of last resort, the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program provides a spectrum of HIV-related services to people living with HIV (PLWH) who may not have sufficient resources for managing HIV. The Houston Area HIV Services Ryan White Planning Council identifies, designs, and allocates funding to locally-provided HIV care services. Housing services for PLWH are provided through the federal Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) program through the City of Houston Housing and Community Development Department and for PLWH recently released from incarceration through the Houston Regional HIV/AIDS Resource Group (TRG). The primary function of HIV needs assessment activities is to gather information about the need for and barriers to services funded by the local Houston Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program, as well as other HIV-related programs like HOPWA and the Houston Health Department’s (HHD) prevention program.

Overall Ranking of Funded Services, by Need


At the time of survey, 17 HIV core medical and support services were funded through the Houston Area Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program. Participants of

the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment were asked to indicate which of these funded services they needed in the past 12 months.

(Graph 1) All funded services except hospice and linguistics were analyzed and received a ranking of need. Emergency financial assistance was merged with local medication assistance, and non-medical case management was merged with medical case management. At 89%, primary care was the most needed funded service in the Houston Area, followed by local medication assistance at 79%, case management at 73%, oral health care at 72%, and vision care at 68%. Primary care had the highest need ranking of any core medical service, while ADAP enrollment worker received the highest need ranking of any support service. Compared to the last Houston Area HIV needs assessment conducted in 2016, need ranking decreased for most services. The percent of needs assessment participants reporting need for a particular service decreased the most for case management and primary care, while the percent of those indicating a need for local medication assistance and early intervention services increased from 2016.

GRAPH 1-Ranking of HIV Services in the Houston Area, By Need, 2020

Definition: Percent of needs assessment participants stating they needed the service in the past 12 months, regardless of service accessibility.
Denominator: 569-573 participants, varying between service categories



Overall Ranking of Funded Services, by Accessibility

Participants were asked to indicate if each of the funded Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program services they needed in the past 12 months was easy or difficult for them to access. If difficulty was reported, participants were then asked to provide a brief description on the barrier experienced. Results for both topics are presented below.


(Graph 2) All funded services except hospice and linguistics were analyzed and received a ranking of accessibility. The most accessible service was ADAP enrollment worker at 97% ease of access, followed by

local medication assistance at 94% and case management at 92%. Local medication assistance had the highest accessibility ranking of any core medical service, while ADAP enrollment worker received the highest accessibility ranking of any support service. Compared 2016 needs assessment, reported accessibility on remained stable on average. The greatest increase in percent of participants reporting ease of access was observed in local medication assistance, while the greatest decrease in accessibility was reported for early intervention services.

GRAPH 2-Ranking of HIV Services in the Houston Area, By Accessibility, 2020

Definition: Of needs assessment participants stating they needed the service in the past 12 months, the percent stating it was easy to access the service.

Denominator: 569-573 participants, varying between service categories



Overall Ranking of Barriers Types Experienced by Consumers

Since the 2016 Houston Area HIV Needs Assessment, participants who reported *difficulty* accessing needed services have been asked to provide a brief description of the barrier or barriers encountered, rather than select from a list of pre-selected barriers. In 2016, staff used recursive abstraction to categorize participant descriptions into 39 distinct barriers, then grouped together into 12 nodes, or barrier types. This categorization schema was applied to reported barriers in the 2020 survey.

(Graph 3) Overall, fewer barriers were reported in 2020 (415 barrier reports) than in previous 2016 needs assessment (501 barrier reports), despite the increase in sample size in 2020. Across all funded services, the


barrier types reported most often related to service education and awareness issues (19% of all reported barriers); interactions with staff (16%), wait-related issues (12%); administrative issues (10%); and issues relating to health insurance coverage (10%). Housing issues (homelessness or intimate partner violence) were reported least often as barriers to funded services (1%). Between the 2016 and 2020 HIV needs assessments, the percentage of barriers relating to interactions with staff increased by 3 percentage points, while wait-related issues decreased by 3 percentage points.

For more information on barrier types reported most often by service category, please see the Service-Specific Fact Sheets.

GRAPH 3-Ranking of Types of Barriers to HIV Services in the Houston Area, 2018

Definition: Percent of times each barrier type was reported by needs assessment participants, regardless of service, when difficulty accessing needed services was reported.

Denominator: 415 barrier reports



Descriptions of Barriers Encountered

All funded services were reported to have barriers, with an average of 35 reports of barriers per service. Participants reported the least barriers for Linguistic Services (one barrier) and the most barriers for Oral Health Care (90 barriers). In total, 415 reports of barriers across all services were indicated in the sample.

(Table 1) Within education and awareness, knowledge of the availability of the service and where to go to access the service accounted for 81% of barriers reported. Being put on a waitlist accounted for a majority (56%) of wait-related barriers. Poor communication and/or follow up from staff members when contacting participants comprised a majority (53%) of barriers related to staff interactions. Forty-five percent (45%) of eligibility barriers related to participants being told they did not meet eligibility requirements to receive the service while redundant or complex processes for renewing eligibility accounted for an additional 39% of eligibility barriers. Among administrative issues, long or complex processes required to obtain services sufficient to create a burden

to access comprised most (57%) of the barriers reported.

A majority of health insurance-related barriers occurred because the participant was under-insured or experiencing coverage gaps for needed services or medications (55%) or they were uninsured (25%). The largest proportion (91%) of transportation-related barriers occurred when participants had no access to transportation. Inability to afford the service accounted for all barriers relating to participant financial resources. Services being offered at an inaccessible distance accounted for most (76%) of accessibility-related barriers, though it is noteworthy that low or no literacy accounted for 12% of accessibility-related barriers. Receiving resources that were insufficient to meet participant needs accounted for most resource availability barriers. Intimate partner violence accounted for both reports of housing-related barriers. Instances in which the participant's employer did not provide sufficient sick/wellness leave for attend appointments comprised most (80%) employment-related barriers.

TABLE 1-Barrier Proportions within Each Barrier Type, 2020

Education & Awareness	%	Wait-Related Issues	%	Interactions with Staff	%
Availability (Didn't know the service was available)	51%	Waitlist (Put on a waitlist)	56%	Communication (Poor correspondence/ Follow up from staff)	53%
Definition (Didn't know what service entails)	2%	Unavailable (Waitlist full/not available resulting in client not being placed on waitlist)	22%	Poor Treatment (Staff insensitive to clients)	13%
Location (Didn't know where to go [location or location w/in agency])	30%	Wait at Appointment (Appointment visits take long)	12%	Resistance (Staff refusal/ resistance to assist clients)	6%
Contact (Didn't know who to contact for service)	16%	Approval (Long durations between application and approval)	10%	Staff Knowledge (Staff has no/ limited knowledge of service)	19%
				Referral (Received service referral to provider that did not meet client needs)	10%
Eligibility	%	Administrative Issues	%	Health Insurance	%
Ineligible (Did not meet eligibility requirements)	45%	Staff Changes (Change in staff w/o notice)	10%	Uninsured (Client has no insurance)	25%
Eligibility Process (Redundant process for renewing eligibility)	39%	Understaffing (Shortage of staff)	7%	Coverage Gaps (Certain services/medications not covered)	55%
Documentation (Problems obtaining documentation needed for eligibility)	16%	Service Change (Change in service w/o notice)	7%	Locating Provider (Difficulty locating provider that takes insurance)	18%
		Complex Process (Burden of long complex process for accessing services)	57%	ACA (Problems with ACA enrollment process)	3%
		Dismissal (Client dismissal from agency)	7%		
		Hours (Problem with agency hours of operation)	12%		
Transportation		Financial	%	Accessibility	%
No Transportation (No or limited transportation options)	91%	Financial Resources (Could not afford service)	100%	Literacy (Cannot read/difficulty reading)	12%
Providers (Problems with special transportation providers such as Metrolift or Medicaid transportation)	9%			Spanish Services (Services not made available in Spanish)	0%
				Released from Incarceration (Restricted from services due to probation, parole, or felon status)	12%
				Distance (Service not offered within accessible distance)	76%
Resource Availability	%	Housing	%	Employment	%
Insufficient (Resources offered insufficient for meeting need)	81%	Homeless (Client is without stable housing)	0%	Unemployed (Client is unemployed)	20%
Quality (Resource quality was poor)	19%	IPV (Interpersonal domestic issues make housing situation unsafe)	100%	Leave (Employer does not provide sick/wellness leave for appointments)	80%

NEEDS AND ACCESSIBILITY FOR UNFUNDED SERVICES

The Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program allows funding of 13 core medical services and 15 support services, though only 17 of these services were funded in the Houston area at the time of survey. For this first time, the 2020 Houston Area HIV Needs Assessment collected data on the need for and accessibility to services that are allowable under Ryan White, but not currently funded in the Houston area. While these services are not funded under Ryan White, other funding sources in the community may offer them.

Overall Ranking of Unfunded Services, by Need

Participants of the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment were asked to indicate which of allowable but currently unfunded services they needed in the past 12 months.

(Graph 4) At 53%, housing was the most needed unfunded service in the Houston Area, followed by


food bank at 43%, health education/risk reduction at 41%, psychosocial support services at 38%, and other professional services at 34%. Of participants indicating a need for food bank, 69% reported needing services from a food bank, 6% reported needing home delivered meals, and 25% indicated need for both types of food bank service. Among participants indicating a need for psychosocial support services, 89% reported needing an in-person support group, 3% reported needing an online support group, and 8% indicated need for both types of psychosocial support.

Home health care had the highest need ranking of any unfunded core medical service, while housing received the highest need ranking of any unfunded support service.

GRAPH 4-Ranking of Unfunded HIV Services in the Houston Area, By Need, 2020

Definition: Percent of needs assessment participants stating they needed the unfunded service in the past 12 months, regardless of service accessibility.

Denominator: 569-572 participants, varying between service categories



Overall Ranking of Unfunded Services, by Accessibility

Participants were asked to indicate if each of the unfunded HIV services they needed in the past 12 months was easy or difficult for them to access.


(Graph 5) The most accessible unfunded service was health education/risk reduction at 93% ease of access, followed by rehabilitation services at 81%,

psychosocial support services at 81%, residential substance abuse services at 78%, and respite care at 73%. The least accessible needed unfunded services was housing at 61%. Home health care had the highest accessibility ranking of any core medical service, while rehabilitation services received the highest accessibility ranking of any support service.

GRAPH 5-Ranking of Unfunded HIV Services in the Houston Area, By Accessibility, 2020

Definition: Of needs assessment participants stating they needed the unfunded service in the past 12 months, the percent stating it was easy to access the service.

Denominator: 569-572 participants, varying between service categories



Other Identified Needs

In addition to the allowable HIV services listed above, participants were also encouraged to write-in other types of needed services to gauge any new or emerging service needs in the community.


(Graph 6) Participants identified nine additional needs not otherwise described in funded and unfunded

services above. The most common identified needs related to pharmacy, such as having medications delivered and automatic refills, at 37%. This was followed by insurance education at 16%, and housing coordination, social opportunities, coverage for medical equipment, and nutrition education, each at 8%.

GRAPH 6-Other Needs for HIV Services in the Houston Area, 2020

Definition: Percent of write-in responses by type for the survey question, "What other kinds of services do you need to help you get your HIV medical care?"

Denominator: 38 write-in responses



DRAFT



Service-Specific Fact Sheets

ADAP ENROLLMENT WORKER

AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) enrollment worker, technically referred to as *referral for health care and support*, describes a service that helps people living with HIV (PLWH) access medication coverage by ensuring the efficient and accurate submission of ADAP applications to the Texas HIV Medication Program (THMP). ADAP enrollment workers meet with all potential new ADAP enrollees, explain ADAP program benefits and requirements, assist clients with the submission of complete, accurate ADAP applications, and submit annual re-certifications.


(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 60% of participants indicated a need for *ADAP enrollment worker* in the past 12 months. 58% reported the service was easy to access, and 2% reported difficulty. 12% stated they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *ADAP enrollment worker* were reported, the most common barrier type was education and awareness (30%). Education and awareness barriers reported include lack of knowledge about service availability and who to contact to access the service.

TABLE 1-Top 3 Reported Barrier Types for ADAP Enrollment Worker, 2020

	No.	%
1. Education and Awareness (EA)	3	30%
2. Administrative (AD)	2	20%
3. Eligibility (EL)	2	20%

GRAPH 1-ADAP Enrollment Worker, 2020



(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *ADAP enrollment worker*, this analysis shows the following:

- More females than males found the service accessible.
- More Hispanic/Latino PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 18 to 24 found the service accessible than other age groups.

In addition, more out of care, rural, and homeless PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-ADAP Enrollment Worker, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	12%	9%	8%	13%	12%	4%	12%	9%	8%
Did not need service	28%	31%	32%	36%	20%	12%	28%	31%	32%
Needed, easy to access	57%	58%	57%	50%	66%	77%	57%	58%	57%
Needed, difficult to access	2%	1%	3%	2%	1%	8%	2%	1%	3%

TABLE 3-ADAP Enrollment Worker, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	8%	6%	0%	5%	0%	18%
Did not need service	7%	12%	0%	0%	3%	9%
Needed, easy to access	76%	71%	100%	89%	91%	64%
Needed, difficult to access	10%	11%	0%	5%	6%	9%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

CASE MANAGEMENT

Case management, technically referred to as *medical case management*, *clinical case management*, or *service linkage*, describes a range of services that help connect persons living with HIV (PLWH) to HIV care, treatment, and support services and to retain them in care. Case managers assess client needs, develop service plans, and facilitate access to services through referrals and care coordination. Case management also includes treatment readiness and adherence counseling.

(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 73% of participants indicated a need for *case management* in the past 12 months. 67% reported the service was easy to access, and 6% reported difficulty. 12% stated they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *case management* were reported, the most common barrier type was interactions with staff (37%). Staff interaction barriers reported include poor correspondence or follow up, poor treatment, limited staff knowledge of services, and service referral to provider that did not meet client needs.

GRAPH 1-Case Management, 2020




TABLE 1-Top 4 Reported Barrier Types for Case Management, 2020

	No.	%
1. Interactions with Staff (S)	13	37%
2. Education and Awareness (EA)	8	8%
3. Administrative (AD)	6	8%
4. Wait (4)	2	2%

(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *case management*, this analysis shows the following:

- More females than males found the service accessible.
- More white PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 50+ found the service accessible than other age groups.

In addition, more out of care, transgender, recently released from incarceration, and homeless PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Case Management, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	17%	7%	10%	11%	15%	4%	5%	15%	9%
Did not need service	59%	68%	22%	14%	13%	8%	29%	12%	17%
Needed, easy to access	20%	23%	64%	68%	66%	81%	52%	67%	69%
Needed, difficult to access	4%	3%	4%	7%	6%	8%	14%	6%	5%

TABLE 3-Case Management, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	10%	13%	13%	11%	37%	17%
Did not need service	13%	18%	16%	8%	9%	13%
Needed, easy to access	68%	63%	58%	71%	51%	58%
Needed, difficult to access	10%	6%	13%	11%	3%	13%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

DAY TREATMENT

Day treatment, technically referred to as *home and community-based health services*, provides therapeutic nursing, support services, and activities for persons living with HIV (PLWH) at a community-based location. This service does not currently include in-home health care, in-patient hospitalizations, or long-term nursing facilities.


(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 32% of participants indicated a need for *day treatment* in the past 12 months. 29% reported the service was easy to access, and 3% reported difficulty. 21% stated that they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *day treatment* were reported, the most common barrier type was education and awareness (25%). Education and awareness barriers reported include lack of knowledge about service availability and where to access the service.

TABLE 1-Top 3 Reported Barrier Types for Day Treatment, 2020

	No.	%
1. Education and Awareness (EA)	3	25%
2. Administrative (AD)	2	17%
3. Wait (W)	2	17%

GRAPH 1-Day Treatment, 2020



(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *day treatment*, this analysis shows the following:

- More females than males found the service accessible.
- More other/multiracial PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 18 to 24 found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more transgender and homeless PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2- Day Treatment, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	22%	18%	18%	24%	20%	19%	14%	26%	15%
Did not need service	46%	50%	69%	49%	40%	42%	38%	45%	51%
Needed, easy to access	28%	29%	12%	24%	38%	31%	52%	25%	32%
Needed, difficult to access	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%	4%	0%	4%	1%

TABLE 3- Day Treatment, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	27%	24%	23%	31%	26%	28%
Did not need service	29%	49%	52%	30%	66%	36%
Needed, easy to access	35%	24%	26%	38%	9%	20%
Needed, difficult to access	8%	3%	0%	2%	0%	16%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

EARLY INTERVENTION (JAIL ONLY)

Early intervention services (EIS) refers to the provision of HIV testing, counseling, and referral in the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program setting. In the Houston Area, the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program funds EIS to persons living with HIV (PLWH) who are incarcerated in the Harris County Jail. Services focus on post-incarceration care coordination to ensure continuity of primary care and medication adherence post-release.

(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston Area HIV needs assessment, 9% of participants indicated a need for *early intervention services* in the past 12 months. 7% reported the service was easy to access, and 2% reported difficulty. 12% stated that they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *early intervention services* were reported, the most common barrier type was interactions with staff (67%). Interactions with staff barriers reported include poor correspondence or follow up, poor treatment, and service referral to provider that did not meet client needs.

GRAPH 1-Early Intervention (Jail Only), 2020




TABLE 1-Top 4 Reported Barrier Types for Early Intervention (Jail Only), 2020

	No.	%
1. Interactions with Staff (S)	6	67%
2. Education and Awareness (EA)	3	33%

(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *early intervention services*, this analysis shows the following:

- More females than males found the service accessible.
- More Hispanic/Latino PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 18 to 24 found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more recently released, homeless, transgender, and MSM PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Early Intervention (Jail Only), by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	13%	8%	5%	12%	12%	12%	5%	12%	11%
Did not need service	77%	84%	83%	78%	81%	31%	86%	77%	82%
Needed, easy to access	8%	7%	8%	9%	5%	38%	5%	9%	6%
Needed, difficult to access	2%	1%	4%	2%	1%	19%	0%	3%	1%

TABLE 3-Early Intervention (Jail Only), by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	13%	14%	6%	15%	14%	4%
Did not need service	66%	79%	87%	43%	80%	83%
Needed, easy to access	16%	5%	6%	31%	6%	8%
Needed, difficult to access	5%	3%	0%	11%	0%	4%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

HEALTH INSURANCE ASSISTANCE

Health insurance assistance, also referred to as *health insurance premium and cost-sharing assistance*, provides financial assistance to persons living with HIV (PLWH) with third-party health insurance coverage (such as private insurance, ACA Qualified Health Plans, COBRA, or Medicare) so they can obtain or maintain health care benefits. This includes funding for premiums, deductibles, Advanced Premium Tax Credit liability, and co-pays for both medical visits and medication.

(**Graph 1**) In the 2016 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 57% of participants indicated a need for *health insurance assistance* in the past 12 months. 48% reported the service was easy to access, and 9% reported difficulty. 12% stated that they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *health insurance assistance* were reported, the most common barrier types were eligibility and financial (each 23%). Eligibility barriers reported include not meeting eligibility requirements, and redundant or complex processes for meeting/renewing eligibility, while financial barriers reported include inability to afford the service.

GRAPH 1-Health Insurance Assistance, 2020




TABLE 1-Top 5 Reported Barrier Types for Health Insurance Assistance, 2020

	No.	%
1. Eligibility (EL)	9	23%
2. Financial (F)	9	23%
3. Health Insurance Coverage (I)	7	18%
4. Administrative (AD)	5	13%
5. Education and Awareness (EA)	4	10%

(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *health insurance assistance*, this analysis shows the following:

- No difference in service accessibility by sex at birth.
- More white PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 18 to 24 found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more transgender, homeless, MSM, and rural PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Health Insurance Assistance, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	12%	9%	15%	13%	8%	12%	0%	12%	11%
Did not need service	30%	34%	43%	29%	32%	12%	14%	30%	34%
Needed, easy to access	48%	48%	40%	48%	50%	58%	81%	47%	49%
Needed, difficult to access	9%	9%	3%	9%	10%	15%	5%	12%	6%

TABLE 3-Health Insurance Assistance, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	21%	11%	16%	25%	17%	13%
Did not need service	32%	30%	42%	25%	23%	25%
Needed, easy to access	34%	47%	42%	43%	49%	33%
Needed, difficult to access	13%	12%	0%	8%	11%	29%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

HOSPICE

Hospice is end-of-life care for persons living with HIV (PLWH) who are in a terminal stage of illness (defined as a life expectancy of 6 months or less). This includes room, board, nursing care, mental health counseling, physician services, and palliative care.


(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 8% of participants indicated a need for *hospice* in the past 12 months. 7% reported the service was easy to access, and 1% reported difficulty. 17% stated that they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) Only two barriers were reported for hospice. This number is too small to detect any pattern in service barriers for hospice.

TABLE 1- Reported Barrier Types for Hospice, 2020

	No.	%
1. Health Insurance Coverage (I)	1	50%
2. Transportation (T)	1	50%

GRAPH 1-Hospice, 2020



(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *hospice*, this analysis shows the following:

- More females than males found the service accessible.
- More White, Hispanic/Latino, and other/multiracial PLWH found the service accessible than Black/African American PLWH.
- More PLWH age 50+ found the service accessible than other PLWH age 25 to 49.
- In addition, more MSM PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Hospice, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	20%	15%	10%	18%	23%	23%	10%	23%	13%
Did not need service	72%	78%	87%	76%	65%	65%	95%	67%	80%
Needed, easy to access	8%	5%	3%	5%	11%	12%	0%	9%	6%
Needed, difficult to access	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%

TABLE 3- Hospice, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	19%	8%	26%	27%	11%	36%
Did not need service	68%	54%	61%	63%	83%	64%
Needed, easy to access	13%	33%	13%	11%	6%	0%
Needed, difficult to access	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

LOCAL HIV MEDICATION ASSISTANCE

Local HIV medication assistance, technically referred to as the *Local Pharmacy Assistance Program (LPAP)*, provides HIV-related pharmaceuticals to persons living with HIV (PLWH) who are not eligible for medications through other payer sources, including the state AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP).


(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 79% of participants indicated a need for *local HIV medication assistance* in the past 12 months. 74% reported the service was easy to access, and 5% reported difficulty. 6% stated that they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *local HIV medication assistance* were reported, the most common barrier type was eligibility (25%). Eligibility barriers reported include redundant or complex processes for meeting/renewing eligibility, problems obtaining documentation needed for eligibility and not meeting eligibility requirements.

TABLE 1-Top 5 Reported Barrier Types for Local HIV Medication Assistance, 2020

	No.	%
1. Eligibility (EL)	7	25%
2. Administrative (AD)	4	14%
3. Education and Awareness (EA)	4	14%
4. Health Insurance Coverage (I)	4	14%
5. Interactions with Staff (S)	3	11%

GRAPH 1-Local HIV Medication Assistance, 2020



(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *local HIV medication assistance*, this analysis shows the following:

- More males than females found the service accessible.
- More White PLWH than other race/ethnicities found the service accessible.
- More PLWH age 50+ found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, homeless, MSM, rural, and transgender PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Local HIV Medication Assistance, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	7%	2%	1%	5%	7%	8%	0%	6%	6%
Did not need service	16%	12%	29%	17%	10%	4%	14%	15%	16%
Needed, easy to access	73%	79%	69%	72%	76%	88%	81%	73%	75%
Needed, difficult to access	4%	7%	1%	5%	6%	4%	5%	6%	3%

TABLE 3-Local HIV Medication Assistance, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	11%	6%	10%	6%	6%	8%
Did not need service	15%	17%	20%	8%	17%	46%
Needed, easy to access	68%	71%	70%	83%	71%	42%
Needed, difficult to access	6%	6%	0%	3%	6%	4%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

MEDICAL NUTRITION THERAPY

Medical nutrition therapy provides nutrition supplements and nutritional counseling to persons living with HIV (PLWH) outside of a primary care visit by a licensed registered dietician based on physician recommendation and a nutrition plan. The purpose of such services can be to address HIV-associated nutritional deficiencies or dietary needs as well as to mitigate medication side effects.


(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 36% of participants indicated a need for *medical nutrition therapy* in the past 12 months. 31% reported the service was easy to access, and 5% reported difficulty. 29% stated that they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *medical nutrition therapy* were reported, the most common barrier type was education and awareness (35%) Education and awareness barriers reported include lack of knowledge about service availability, what the service entails, and who to contact to access the service.

TABLE 1-Top 3 Reported Barrier Types for Medical Nutrition Therapy, 2020

	No.	%
1. Education and Awareness (EA)	8	35%
2. Eligibility (EL)	6	26%
3. Interactions with Staff (S)	4	17%

GRAPH 1-Medical Nutrition Therapy, 2020



(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *medical nutrition therapy*, this analysis shows the following:

- More female than males found the service accessible.
- More Hispanic/Latino PLWH than other race/ethnicities found the service accessible.
- More PLWH age 18 to 24 found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more homeless PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Medical Nutrition Therapy, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	29%	28%	24%	28%	31%	27%	19%	35%	20%
Did not need service	35%	33%	36%	35%	36%	27%	71%	30%	39%
Needed, easy to access	31%	33%	36%	31%	31%	38%	10%	29%	37%
Needed, difficult to access	5%	6%	4%	6%	2%	12%	0%	6%	4%

TABLE 3-Medical Nutrition Therapy, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	29%	31%	35%	41%	43%	17%
Did not need service	37%	36%	45%	28%	40%	54%
Needed, easy to access	24%	29%	16%	30%	17%	29%
Needed, difficult to access	10%	4%	3%	2%	0%	0%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender


MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mental health services, also referred to as *professional mental health counseling*, provides psychological counseling services for persons living with HIV (PLWH) who have a diagnosed mental illness. This includes group or individual counseling by a licensed mental health professional in accordance with state licensing guidelines.

(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 51% of participants indicated a need for *mental health services* in the past 12 months. 46% reported the service was easy to access, and 5% reported difficulty. 9% stated that they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *mental health services* were reported, the most common barrier types were administrative, and education and awareness (each 22%). Administrative barriers reported include staff changes, hours of operation, client dismissal from the agency, and understaffing. Education and awareness barriers reported include lack of knowledge about service availability, where to go to access the service, and who to contact to access the service.

GRAPH 1-Mental Health Services, 2020



(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *mental health services*, this analysis shows the following:

- More males than females found the service accessible.
- More Hispanic/Latino PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 18 to 24 found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more recently released, rural, and homeless PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 1-Top 5 Reported Barrier Types for Mental Health Services, 2020

	No.	%
1. Administrative (AD)	7	22%
2. Education and Awareness (EA)	7	22%
3. Health Insurance Coverage (I)	4	13%
4. Interactions with Staff (S)	3	9%
5. Transportation (T)	3	9%

TABLE 2-Mental Health Services, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	11%	5%	6%	10%	11%	12%	5%	12%	6%
Did not need service	39%	39%	35%	40%	42%	19%	43%	36%	44%
Needed, easy to access	46%	47%	47%	45%	45%	54%	52%	46%	45%
Needed, difficult to access	4%	8%	12%	5%	2%	12%	0%	5%	5%

TABLE 3-Mental Health Services, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	16%	9%	7%	11%	11%	8%
Did not need service	38%	38%	63%	25%	57%	54%
Needed, easy to access	39%	48%	30%	49%	17%	33%
Needed, difficult to access	7%	5%	0%	14%	11%	4%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender


ORAL HEALTH CARE

Oral health care, or dental services, refers to the diagnostic, preventative, and therapeutic services provided to persons living with HIV (PLWH) by a dental health care professional (such as a dentist or hygienist). This includes examinations, periodontal services (such as cleanings and fillings), extractions and other oral surgeries, restorative dental procedures, and prosthodontics (or dentures).

(Graph 1) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 72% of participants indicated a need for *oral health care* in the past 12 months. 57% reported the service was easy to access, and 15% reported difficulty. 17% stated that they did not know the service was available.

(Table 1) When barriers to *oral health care* were reported, the most common barrier type was wait-related issues (35%). Wait-related barriers reported include placement on a waitlist, long waits at appointments, and being told to call back as a wait list was full/unavailable. Of note, at least seven participants reported unprompted that their provider stated Ryan White does not cover prosthodontics, and that the participants would need to pay several hundred dollars out of pocket for treatment. Administrative agent and agency staff were notified immediately to resolve this issue.

GRAPH 1-Oral Health Care, 2020



(Table 2 and Table 3) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *oral health care*, this analysis shows the following:

- More males than females found the service accessible.
- More Hispanic/Latino PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWHA age 18 to 24 found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more out of care, recently released, and MSM found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 1-Top 5 Reported Barrier Types for Oral Health Care, 2020

	No.	%
1. Wait (W)	20	22%
2. Interactions with Staff (S)	16	18%
3. Health Insurance Coverage (I)	12	13%
4. Education and Awareness (EA)	11	12%
5. Administrative (AD)	9	10%

TABLE 2-Oral Health Care, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	18%	12%	6%	19%	19%	15%	24%	22%	8%
Did not need service	11%	12%	22%	12%	8%	4%	14%	9%	14%
Needed, easy to access	57%	59%	49%	55%	63%	54%	52%	52%	65%
Needed, difficult to access	14%	17%	22%	14%	10%	27%	10%	17%	12%

TABLE 3-Oral Health Care, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	34%	15%	34%	20%	9%	8%
Did not need service	6%	10%	9%	11%	20%	13%
Needed, easy to access	45%	59%	34%	50%	69%	67%
Needed, difficult to access	15%	16%	22%	19%	3%	13%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.


^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

OUTREACH SERVICES

Outreach services are provided for people living with HIV (PLWH) who have missed primary medical care appointments without rescheduling, and who may have other risk factors for falling out of care. The goal of *outreach services* is to support retention in care. Services are field-based, and include assistance with medical appointment setting and accessing supportive services, advocating on behalf of clients to decrease service gaps and remove barriers to services, and helping clients develop and utilize independent living skills and strategies.

(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 5% of participants indicated a need for *outreach services* in the past 12 months. 4% reported the service was easy to access, and 1% reported difficulty. 9% stated that they did not know the service was available.

GRAPH 1-Outreach Services, 2020



(**Table 1**) When barriers to *outreach services* were reported, the most common barrier type was interactions with staff (71%). Interactions with staff barriers reported include poor correspondence or follow up.

TABLE 1-Top Reported Barrier Type for Outreach Services, 2020

	No.	%
1. Interactions with Staff (S)	5	71%

(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *outreach services*, this analysis shows the following:

- More males than females found the service accessible.
- More Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 50+ found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more homeless, MSM, recently released, and transgender PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Outreach Services, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	22%	17%	22%	19%	22%	23%	57%	25%	11%
Did not need service	42%	40%	57%	45%	33%	38%	24%	34%	53%
Needed, easy to access	34%	40%	17%	34%	42%	38%	19%	37%	34%
Needed, difficult to access	3%	2%	4%	2%	2%	0%	5%	3%	1%

TABLE 3-Outreach Services, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	23%	23%	20%	28%	26%	21%
Did not need service	28%	42%	37%	30%	37%	42%
Needed, easy to access	37%	32%	43%	39%	37%	35%
Needed, difficult to access	12%	3%	0%	3%	0%	2%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

PRIMARY HIV MEDICAL CARE

Primary HIV medical care, technically referred to as *outpatient/ambulatory medical care*, refers to the diagnostic and therapeutic services provided to persons living with HIV (PLWH) by a physician or physician extender in an outpatient setting. This includes physical examinations, diagnosis and treatment of common physical and mental health conditions, preventative care, education, laboratory services, and specialty services as indicated.


(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 89% of participants indicated a need for *primary HIV medical care* in the past 12 months. 80% reported the service was easy to access, and 90% reported difficulty. 7% stated that they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *primary HIV medical care* were reported, the most common barrier type was transportation (26%). Transportation barriers reported include having no or limited transportation options, and having problems with special transportation providers such as Metrolift or Medicaid transportation

TABLE 1-Top 5 Reported Barrier Types for Primary HIV Medical Care, 2020

	No.	%
1. Transportation (T)	11	26%
2. Education and Awareness (EA)	8	19%
3. Interactions with Staff (S)	8	19%
4. Eligibility	4	9%
5. Wait (W)	4	9%

GRAPH 1-Primary HIV Medical Care, 2020



(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *primary HIV medical care*, this analysis shows the following:

- More females than males found the service accessible.
- More White PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 50+ found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more rural, out of care, and MSM PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Primary HIV Medical Care, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	8%	4%	1%	5%	12%	0%	0%	9%	5%
Did not need service	4%	4%	9%	3%	3%	0%	0%	2%	8%
Needed, easy to access	92%	85%	86%	83%	74%	92%	76%	79%	83%
Needed, difficult to access	9%	8%	4%	8%	12%	8%	24%	11%	5%

TABLE 3-Primary HIV Medical Care, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	10%	9%	19%	9%	3%	13%
Did not need service	2%	5%	10%	2%	0%	13%
Needed, easy to access	82%	77%	55%	83%	71%	75%
Needed, difficult to access	6%	10%	16%	6%	26%	0%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.


^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

Substance abuse services, also referred to as *outpatient alcohol or drug abuse treatment*, provides counseling and/or other treatment modalities to persons living with HIV (PLWH) who have a substance use disorder concern in an outpatient setting and in accordance with state licensing guidelines. This includes services for alcohol use and/or use of legal or illegal drugs.

(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 24% of participants indicated a need for *substance abuse services* in the past 12 months. 21% reported the service was easy to access, and 4% reported difficulty. 15% stated they did not know the service was available. When analyzed by type of substance concern, 17% of participants cited alcohol, 47% cited drugs, and 37% cited both.

GRAPH 1-Substance Abuse Services, 2020



(**Table 1**) When barriers to *substance use services* were reported, the most common barrier type was education and awareness (46%). Education and awareness barriers reported include lack of knowledge about service availability

TABLE 1-Top 2 Reported Barrier Types for Substance Abuse Services, 2020

	No.	%
1. Education and Awareness (EA)	4	46%
2. Transportation (T)	2	18%

(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *substance abuse services*, this analysis shows the following:

- More females than males found the service accessible.
- More other/multiracial PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 50+ found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more recently released and homeless PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Substance Abuse Services, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	17%	7%	12%	12%	18%	19%	43%	15%	12%
Did not need service	59%	68%	69%	63%	58%	58%	43%	59%	65%
Needed, easy to access	20%	23%	16%	21%	21%	23%	10%	22%	21%
Needed, difficult to access	4%	3%	3%	5%	2%	0%	5%	4%	2%

TABLE 3-Substance Abuse Services, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	13%	18%	16%	15%	23%	8%
Did not need service	55%	60%	61%	44%	71%	71%
Needed, easy to access	20%	18%	23%	24%	6%	17%
Needed, difficult to access	12%	3%	0%	18%	0%	4%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.


^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation services provides transportation to persons living with HIV (PLWH) to locations where HIV-related care is received, including pharmacies, mental health services, and substance abuse services. The service can be provided in the form of public transportation vouchers (bus passes), gas vouchers (for rural clients), taxi vouchers (for emergency purposes), and van-based services as medically indicated.

(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 48% of participants indicated a need for *transportation services* in the past 12 months. 41% reported the service was easy to access, and 7% reported difficulty. 15% stated they did not know the service was available. When analyzed by type transportation assistance sought, 81% of participants needed bus passes, 17% needed van services, and 11% needed both forms of assistance.

GRAPH 1-Transportation Services, 2020



(**Table 1**) When barriers to *transportation services* were reported, the most common barrier type was education and awareness (24%). Transportation barriers reported include lack of knowledge about service availability and where to go to access the service.

TABLE 1-Top 5 Reported Barrier Types for Transportation Services, 2020

	No.	%
1. Education and Awareness (EA)	7	24%
2. Resource Availability (R)	5	17%
3. Transportation (T)	5	17%
4. Eligibility (EL)	3	10%
5. Financial (F)	3	10%

(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *transportation services*, this analysis shows the following:

- More males than females found the service accessible..
- More Hispanic/Latino PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 18 to 24 found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more homeless, out of care, and recently released PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Transportation Services, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	17%	10%	5%	14%	8%	12%	43%	20%	7%
Did not need service	38%	35%	51%	32%	81%	31%	14%	38%	37%
Needed, easy to access	39%	47%	36%	49%	9%	38%	43%	35%	50%
Needed, difficult to access	6%	8%	8%	5%	1%	19%	5%	7%	7%

TABLE 3-Transportation Services, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	7%	19%	30%	12%	14%	8%
Did not need service	28%	38%	17%	21%	71%	32%
Needed, easy to access	51%	37%	40%	59%	14%	16%
Needed, difficult to access	15%	6%	13%	8%	0%	4%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender

VISION CARE

Vision care, technically a subcategory of primary HIV medical care, provides optometric/ophthalmologic treatment, vision screening, and glasses to people living with HIV (PLWH). This does not include fitting of contact lenses.

(**Graph 1**) In the 2020 Houston HIV Care Services Needs Assessment, 68% of participants indicated a need for *vision care* in the past 12 months. 59% reported the service was easy to access, and 9% reported difficulty. 16% stated they did not know the service was available.

(**Table 1**) When barriers to *vision care* were reported, the most common barrier type was wait-related issues. Wait-related barriers reported include scheduling appointments 2-3 months out, placement on a waitlist, being told to call back as a wait list was full/unavailable, and long waits at appointments.

GRAPH 1-Vision Care, 2020




TABLE 1-Top 5 Reported Barrier Types for Vision Care, 2020

	No.	%
1. Wait (W)	15	34%
2. Health Insurance Coverage (I)	8	18%
3. Education and Awareness (EA)	6	14%
4. Financial (F)	4	9%
5. Interactions with Staff (S)	3	7%

(**Table 2 and Table 3**) Need and access to services can be analyzed for needs assessment participants according to demographic and other characteristics, revealing the presence of any potential disparities in access to services. For *vision care*, this analysis shows the following:

- More males than females found the service accessible.
- More Black/African American PLWH found the service accessible than other race/ethnicities.
- More PLWH age 50+ found the service accessible than other age groups.
- In addition, more homeless and out of care PLWH found the service difficult to access when compared to all participants.

TABLE 2-Vision Care, by Demographic Categories, 2020

Experience with the Service	Sex (at birth)		Race/ethnicity				Age		
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	18-24	25-49	50+
Did not know about service	17%	10%	12%	15%	15%	15%	14%	21%	8%
Did not need service	16%	18%	19%	21%	11%	4%	62%	15%	15%
Needed, easy to access	60%	58%	60%	56%	65%	69%	14%	56%	69%
Needed, difficult to access	7%	14%	9%	8%	9%	15%	14%	9%	8%

TABLE 3-Vision Care, by Selected Special Populations, 2020

Experience with the Service	Homeless ^a	MSM ^b	Out of Care ^c	Recently Released ^d	Rural ^e	Transgender ^f
Did not know about service	20%	17%	10%	28%	6%	20%
Did not need service	16%	13%	10%	16%	20%	24%
Needed, easy to access	51%	63%	70%	47%	66%	56%
Needed, difficult to access	13%	7%	10%	9%	6%	0%

^aPersons reporting current homelessness ^bMen who have sex with men ^cPersons with no evidence of HIV care for 12 mo.

^dPersons released from incarceration in the past 12 mo. ^eNon-Houston/Harris County residents ^fPersons with discordant sex assigned at birth and current gender