Appendix 3: Selecting Locally-Relevant Focus Populations

The Texas HIV Plan and this RFA call for HIV prevention programming to be focused on the groups that are most epidemiologically relevant to local communities. To determine the populations that make the largest contributions to local HIV epidemic profiles, DSHS used a formula to create population morbidly scores within each HSDA for the 11 populations shown below. We did not have data to score transgender persons, but this group will be eligible for services in each HSDA. Note that there are no age restrictions for any of the groups.

Table 1: Populations included in the analysis

Population	Description
Hispanic MSM	Hispanic gay and bisexual men and other men who have sex with men
Black MSM	Black gay and bisexual men and other men who have sex with men
White MSM	White gay and bisexual men and other men who have sex with men
Black heterosexual women	Black women who most likely acquired their infections through heterosexual sex
Black heterosexual men	Black men who most likely acquired their infections through heterosexual sex
Hispanic heterosexual women	Hispanic women who most likely acquired their infections through heterosexual sex
Hispanic heterosexual men	Hispanic men who most likely acquired their infections through heterosexual sex
White heterosexuals	White men and women who most likely acquired their infections through heterosexual sex
MSM/PWID	Gay and bisexual men and other men who have sex with who also inject drugs
PWID	People who inject drugs

For each HSDA, each population's score was calculated by multiplying the proportion of 2016 PLWH for that population in the HSDA by 35 and the proportion of new diagnoses between 2012 and 2016 for that population in the HSDA by 65 and adding those two figures together. The populations scores for each HSDA are shown in the tables below.

We used the population score along with the number of new diagnoses to identify locally relevant populations. Using both makes sure that the groups with the largest contributions to local epidemic profile are included, but it also lets groups with a higher number of new diagnoses be included even if they don't meet the score threshold.

Table 2: Locally relevant populations in Area 1 HSDAs

Locally relevant populations in Area 1 HSDAs had a population score of at least 18 or at least 120 new diagnoses between 2012-2016

	Austin HSDA					Dallas HSDA					Fort Worth HSDA				
	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop. score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
Hispanic MSM	1,453	24%	513	34%	30	3,604	17%	1,059	21%	20	742	13%	224	16%	15
Black MSM	535	9%	159	10%	10	4,712	22%	1,469	30%	27	1,067	18%	390	28%	24
White MSM	1,995	33%	463	30%	31	5,371	26%	981	20%	22	1,233	21%	260	19%	19
Black Het Women	311	5%	76	5%	5	2,310	11%	518	10%	11	602	10%	157	11%	11
Black Het Men	113	2%	19	1%	1	563	3%	110	2%	2	217	4%	59	4%	4
Hispanic Het Women	181	3%	36	2%	3	555	3%	120	2%	2	162	3%	35	2%	3
Hispanic Het Men	104	2%	21	1%	1	188	1%	39	1%	1	103	2%	34	2%	2
White Heterosexuals	168	3%	26	2%	2	398	2%	94	2%	2	252	4%	71	5%	5
PWID	509	8%	75	5%	6	1,399	7%	194	4%	5	739	13%	51	4%	7
MSM/PWID	387	6%	62	4%	5	821	4%	120	2%	3	329	6%	25	2%	3

	Houston HSDA					San Antonio HSDA				
	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
Hispanic MSM	873	16%	326	22%	20	2,892	44%	1,001	53%	50
Black MSM	949	17%	348	23%	21	501	8%	155	8%	8
White MSM	1,107	20%	270	18%	19	1,083	16%	278	15%	15
Black Het Women	715	13%	159	11%	11	223	3%	54	3%	3
Black Het Men	249	5%	45	3%	4	63	1%	13	1%	1
Hispanic Het Women	257	5%	61	4%	4	369	6%	79	4%	5
Hispanic Het Men	123	2%	31	2%	2	159	2%	35	2%	2
White Heterosexuals	282	5%	50	3%	4	125	2%	20	1%	1
PWID	450	8%	77	5%	6	605	9%	136	7%	8
MSM/PWID	204	4%	42	3%	3	300	5%	50	3%	3

Table 3: Locally relevant populations in Area 2 HSDAs

Eligible populations in Area 2 HSDAs had a population score of at least 18 OR at least 45 new diagnoses

	Beaumont-Port Arthur HSDA					Brownsville HSDA					El Paso HSDA				
	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
Hispanic MSM	55	5%	29	8%	7	1169	56%	412	63%	61	1,292	62%	388	68%	66
Black MSM	211	19%	95	27%	24	8	0%	1	0%	0	52	2%	27	5%	4
White MSM	173	16%	45	13%	14	96	5%	13	2%	3	99	5%	33	6%	5
Black Het Women	192	18%	54	15%	16	5	0%	1	0%	0	17	1%	8	1%	1
Black Het Men	56	5%	13	4%	4	3	0%	0	0%	0	12	1%	2	0%	0
Hispanic Het Women	21	2%	8	2%	2	331	16%	97	15%	15	190	9%	37	6%	7
Hispanic Het Men	10	1%	0	0%	0	218	10%	90	14%	13	126	6%	13	2%	4
White Heterosexuals	55	5%	7	2%	3	14	1%	3	0%	1	17	1%	5	1%	1
PWID	141	13%	53	15%	14	145	7%	20	3%	4	141	7%	30	5%	6
MSM/PWID	55	5%	7	2%	3	66	3%	9	1%	2	96	5%	20	4%	4

	Galveston HSDA					Tyler HSDA				
	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
Hispanic MSM	193	12%	67	16%	15	94	6%	24	6%	6
Black MSM	203	13%	69	17%	15	267	17%	114	28%	24
White MSM	407	25%	83	20%	22	361	23%	97	24%	24
Black Het Women	149	9%	41	10%	10	215	14%	56	14%	14
Black Het Men	62	4%	18	4%	4	61	4%	15	4%	4
Hispanic Het Women	80	5%	28	7%	6	42	3%	9	2%	2
Hispanic Het Men	27	2%	7	2%	2	14	1%	1	0%	0
White Heterosexuals	109	7%	21	5%	6	103	7%	21	5%	6
PWID	207	13%	37	9%	10	224	14%	35	9%	11
MSM/PWID	109	7%	21	5%	6	100	6%	9	2%	4

Table 4: Locally relevant populations in Area 3 HSDAs

Eligible populations in Area 3 HSDAs had a population score of at least 18 OR at least 20 new diagnoses

	Amarillo HSDA					Bryan-College Sta. HSDA					Corpus Christi HSDA				
	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%		N	%	n	%	
Hispanic MSM	99	19%	44	34%	29	64	11%	36	19%	16	293	35%	113	52%	46
Black MSM	28	5%	14	11%	9	100	18%	44	24%	22	20	2%	3	1%	2
White MSM	137	26%	26	20%	22	99	18%	31	17%	17	136	16%	29	13%	14
Black Het Women	14	3%	3	2%	2	87	15%	20	11%	12	15	2%	2	1%	1
Black Het Men	9	2%	1	1%	1	31	6%	10	5%	5	10	1%	1	0%	1
Hispanic Het Women	30	6%	8	6%	6	23	4%	7	4%	4	95	11%	24	11%	11
Hispanic Het Men	12	2%	2	2%	2	8	1%	2	1%	1	44	5%	14	6%	6
White Het	30	6%	3	2%	4	24	4%	9	5%	5	24	3%	6	3%	3
PWID	82	16%	14	11%	13	76	13%	14	7%	10	116	14%	14	6%	9
MSM/PWID	42	8%	8	6%	7	25	4%	5	3%	3	57	7%	3	1%	3
	Laredo HSDA					Lubbock HSDA									
	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score					
Hispanic MSM	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%						
Black MSM	258	55%	107	68%	63	147	25%	77	36%	32					
White MSM	4	1%	0	0%	0	42	7%	24	11%	10					
Black Het Women	12	3%	0	0%	1	141	24%	52	25%	24					
Black Het Men	0	0%	0	0%	0	18	3%	7	3%	3					
Hispanic Het Women	0	0%	0	0%	0	4	1%	1	0%	1					
Hispanic Het Men	81	17%	23	15%	16	34	6%	14	7%	6					
White Heterosexuals	51	11%	21	13%	12	6	1%	4	2%	2					
PWID	1	0%	0	0%	0	18	3%	2	1%	2					
MSM/PWID	42	9%	4	3%	5	74	13%	14	7%	9					
	11	2%	2	1%	2	66	11%	9	4%	7					

Eligible populations in Area 3 HSDAs had a population score of at least 18 OR at least 20 new diagnoses

	Lufkin HSDA					Midland-Odessa HSDA					Temple-Killeen HSDA				
	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012 -2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012 -2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012 -2016		Pop score
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
Hispanic MSM	25	4%	16	9%	7	153	28%	69	41%	37	83	10%	32	14%	13
Black MSM	96	15%	44	25%	22	31	6%	9	5%	5	167	20%	88	38%	32
White MSM	111	18%	28	16%	17	105	20%	31	18%	19	150	18%	34	15%	16
Black Het Women	103	17%	28	16%	16	16	3%	6	4%	3	96	12%	22	10%	10
Black Het Men	35	6%	5	3%	4	10	2%	2	1%	1	25	3%	5	2%	2
Hispanic Het Women	19	3%	5	3%	3	35	7%	14	8%	8	26	3%	7	3%	3
Hispanic Het Men	9	1%	1	1%	1	12	2%	4	2%	2	6	1%	2	1%	1
White Heterosexuals	48	8%	9	5%	6	27	5%	4	2%	3	41	5%	9	4%	4
PWID	95	15%	21	12%	13	63	12%	9	5%	8	121	15%	14	6%	9
MSM/PWID	32	5%	5	3%	4	57	11%	15	9%	9	39	5%	3	1%	3

	Texarkana HSDA					Waco HSDA				
	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score	PLWH 2016		New dx 2012-2016		Pop score
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
Hispanic MSM	19	4%	10	8%	6	53	10%	19	13%	
Black MSM	80	18%	37	28%	24	85	16%	25	16%	12
White MSM	93	21%	28	21%	21	97	18%	26	17%	16
Black Het Women	47	11%	14	11%	11	81	15%	25	16%	17
Black Het Men	19	4%	3	2%	3	27	5%	8	5%	16
Hispanic Het Women	9	2%	1	1%	1	10	2%	6	4%	5
Hispanic Het Men	9	2%	2	2%	2	11	2%	2	1%	3
White Heterosexuals	39	9%	6	5%	6	28	5%	9	6%	2
PWID	63	14%	14	11%	12	87	16%	15	10%	6
MSM/PWID	29	7%	2	2%	3	35	6%	6	4%	12