

A Profile of the Capital Area Community

A Data Analysis Report for United Way Capital Area

Prepared by

Ying Tang
Christopher T. King
Erin Brown
Katie Ryan
**Ray Marshall Center for
the Study of Human Resources**

Suzanne Hershey
CommunitySync

March 2006



This report was prepared with funds provided by Agreement Number UTA05-876 from United Way Capital Area to the Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources. The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not represent the positions of the funding agency or of The University.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Methodology for Data Collection and Organization	3
Capital Area Region	5
Community Profile.....	5
Highlights on Statistics and Issues	5
Statistical Highlights	5
Issues Across the Region.....	11
Bastrop County	17
Community Profile.....	17
County Specific Highlights	17
Blanco County	23
Community Profile.....	23
County Specific Highlights	23
Burnet County.....	29
Community Profile.....	29
County Specific Highlights	29
Caldwell County.....	35
Community Profile.....	35
County Specific Highlights	35
Fayette County	41
Community Profile.....	41
County Specific Highlights	41
Hays County	47
Community Profile.....	47
County Specific Highlights	47
Lee County	53
Community Profile.....	53
County Specific Highlights	53
Llano County.....	59
Community Profile.....	59
County Specific Highlights	59
Travis County.....	65
Community Profile.....	65
County Specific Highlights	65
Williamson County	73
Community Profile.....	73
County Specific Highlights	73
Next Steps for the Community Agenda Project: Phase II	79
Bibliography	81
Appendix A: List of Acronyms.....	85
Appendix B: Description of Sources Identifying Issues & Priorities	87
Appendix C: Term Definitions and Sources	91

List of Tables

Table 1: Regional, Statewide and County Indicators for 2000: A side-by-side comparison	8
Table 2: Issues Shared by the 10 Counties	14
Table 3: Regional Indicators.....	15
Table 4: Bastrop County Issues/Priorities	19
Table 5: Bastrop County Indicators	21
Table 6: Blanco County Issues/Priorities.....	25
Table 7: Blanco County Indicators	26
Table 8: Burnet County Issues/Priorities	31
Table 9: Burnet County Indicators	32
Table 10: Caldwell County Issues and Priorities	37
Table 11: Caldwell County Indicators	39
Table 12: Fayette County Issues/Priorities.....	43
Table 13: Fayette County Indicators.....	44
Table 14: Hays County Issues/Priorities	49
Table 15: Hays County Indicators	50
Table 16: Lee County Issues/Priorities.....	55
Table 17: Lee County Indicators.....	56
Table 18: Llano County Issues/Priorities.....	61
Table 19: Llano county Indicators.....	62
Table 20: Travis County Issues/Priorities.....	68
Table 21: Travis County Indicators.....	70
Table 22: Williamson County Issues/Priorities	75
Table 23: Williamson County Indicators	77

List of Figures

Figure 1: Age Trends in the Capital Area	7
Figure 2: Median Household Income by Race, Capital Area	7
Figure 3: Racial Makeup of Capital Area 1990.....	7
Figure 4: Racial Makeup of Capital Area 2000.....	7
Figure 5: Age Trends in Bastrop County	7
Figure 6: Median Household Income by Race in Bastrop County, 2000	18
Figure 7: Racial Makeup of Bastrop County, 1990	18
Figure 8: Racial Makeup of Bastrop County, 2000.....	18
Figure 9: Age Trends in Blanco County	18
Figure 10: Median Household Income by Race in Blanco County, 2000.....	24
Figure 11: Racial Makeup of Blanco County in 1990	24
Figure 12: Racial Makeup of Blanco County, 2000	24
Figure 13: Age Trends in Burnet County.....	24
Figure 14: Median Household Income by Race in Burnet County, 2000	30
Figure 15: Racial Makeup of Burnet County in 1990	30
Figure 16: Racial Makeup of Burnet County, 2000	30
Figure 17: Age Trends in Caldwell County.....	30
Figure 18: Median Household Income by Race in Caldwell County, 2000	36
Figure 19: Racial Makeup of Caldwell County in 1990	36
Figure 20: Racial Makeup of Caldwell County, 2000	36
Figure 21: Age Trends in Fayette County	36
Figure 22: Median Household Income by Race in Fayette County, 2000.....	42
Figure 23: Racial Makeup of Fayette County in 1990	42
Figure 24: Racial Makeup of Fayette County, 2000	42
Figure 25: Age Trends in Hays County	42
Figure 26: Median Household Income by Race in Hays County, 2000.....	48
Figure 27: Racial Makeup of Hays County in 1990	48
Figure 28: Racial Makeup of Hays County, 2000.....	48
Figure 29: Age Trends in Lee County	48
Figure 30: Median Household Income by Race in Lee County, 2000.....	54
Figure 31: Racial Makeup of Lee County in 1990	54
Figure 32: Racial Makeup of Lee County, 2000.....	54
Figure 33: Age Trends in Llano County.....	54
Figure 34: Median Household Income by Race in Llano County, 2000.....	60
Figure 35: Racial Makeup of Llano County in 1990	60
Figure 36: Racial Makeup of Llano County, 2000	60
Figure 37: Age Trends in Travis County.....	60
Figure 38: Median Household Income by Race in Travis County, 2000.....	66
Figure 39: Racial Makeup of Travis County in 1990	66
Figure 40: Racial Makeup of Travis County, 2000	66
Figure 41: Age Trends in Williamson County	66
Figure 42: Median Household Income by Race in Williamson County, 2000	74
Figure 43: Racial Makeup of Williamson County in 1990	74
Figure 44: Racial Makeup of Williamson County, 2000.....	74

Introduction

United Way Capital Area (UWCA), Austin has been a key player in providing support to address the needs of individuals, families and communities in Central Texas, especially in the Austin/Travis County metropolitan area. UWCA conducts fundraising campaigns and currently provides funding to 44 area health and human service providers. For the 2005-2006 fiscal year, all UWCA funded agencies are non-profit organizations, and all but three are based in Travis County. Additionally, UWCA operates programs including 2-1-1 Texas and Hands on Central Texas which serve the ten-county area. UWCA has expanded its involvement in community collaborations in recent years, resulting in initiatives such as Success By 6, which focuses on early childhood.

UWCA attempts to align its program funding with a focus on outcomes measurement, requiring funded service providers to demonstrate how they address health and human service priorities. Periodically, UWCA re-assesses the priorities that guide its investment of financial and staff resources. In that pursuit, UWCA supports the Community Agenda Project with the goal of understanding and prioritizing critical health and human service issues facing the ten counties in its Central Texas service area: Bastrop, Blanco, Burnet, Caldwell, Fayette, Hays, Lee, Llano, Travis and Williamson.

To assist and inform the process of developing the Community Agenda, UWCA selected the Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources (RMC), a research center of the LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, to conduct research leading to a synthesis of existing information and stakeholder perspectives on the priorities in health and human services. Specifically, RMC is charged as follows:

Phase I: Identify, collect and analyze existing regional data on the state of major health and human services issues, indicators and demographic trend; and

Phase II: Gauge the perspectives of major stakeholders across the ten-county area regarding major issues, root causes, solutions and prospects for health and human services.

Each activity undertaken by the Ray Marshall Center research team inevitably affects one or more of the research purposes. Research designed to be inclusive of major stakeholder perspectives will likely yield quality information that UWCA staff and volunteers can use in setting UWCA priorities for focused work and investments in the future, to create buy-in from other stakeholders and to foster partnerships around the region.

This report is the product of the research team's Phase I work, which is to identify, collect and analyze existing regional data on the state of major health and human services issues, indicators and demographic trends. The report consists of a regional profile and a profile for each of the ten counties under study.

The regional profile and county profiles have identical variables for comparison. Each profile contains:

- Major indicators of demographic trends;
- Several indicators under important issue areas related to health and human services;
- Side-by-side comparison of county, regional and state indicators when available and appropriate;
- A number of regional and county-specific highlights based on data analysis; and
- A summary listing of the issues or priority issues previously identified by stakeholders through community assessment or planning processes in recent years.

The regional profile highlights special observations about the region as a whole or about a number of counties with common or individual characteristics and trends. A summary of issues or priority issues shared by six or more counties is provided, based on review of previous work by others

in the region. When available, further details about the issues are culled to provide additional contextual information.

The county profiles also highlight special observations for each county and issues that are worthy of special attention, based on review of existing information.

It is important to note that this report is not meant to be comprehensive with all social, economic, and health and human service indicators. There is a large volume of data that is not incorporated. There are probably many others that readers would like to see included. The researchers made a decision to include those indicators that have been frequently mentioned as indicators of community conditions and quality of life. As research continues into the next phase, more information and data will be discovered and analyzed. The researchers will be having discussions with decision makers at UWCA and in the region, to ascertain data elements for inclusion or exclusion, so that this document continues to evolve as a useful resource. It is the hope and intention of the Ray Marshall Center researchers that this product, in conjunction with our subsequent findings, will be informative to UWCA decision makers and to potential UWCA partners in the region.

Methodology for Data Collection and Organization

From the project onset, UWCA has emphasized the importance of inclusiveness: to include different communities in all of the geographic, social, economic and cultural senses; to capture issues and priorities related to health and human services without overlooking any issues that may appear unrelated but may ultimately be at the root of these issues and point to potential solutions.

The Ray Marshall Center research team has developed a number of strategies to guide data identification and collection efforts, including:


1. *Collaboration with entities that have a regional reach to identify data sources.* So far, the research team has helped UWCA organize and facilitate a kickoff event with more than forty participants representing more than 25 organizations that have regional focus and reach. In addition, RMC worked with Lower Colorado River Authority, 2-1-1 Texas, and Capital Area Council of Governments on data collection and stakeholder outreach.
2. *Close consultation with UWCA staff and volunteer groups.* To date, the researchers have had regular meetings with UWCA staff, and met with and received feedback from all the three Impact Councils, the Community Investment Cabinet, the UWCA Partner Agency Council, and the Executive Committee of the UWCA Board.

The researchers asked each of the above contacts to provide references to reports, planning documents, data sources and websites that address specific health and human service issues, priorities or general community conditions.

The researcher team has been reviewing these data sources and developing a master issues list for each of the ten counties on a continuing basis. Most of the documents identify a number of issues but do not identify which of the issues were considered *priority* issues. The reader, when noting an issue on the list that was not designated as a priority, should not assume that the stakeholders considered the issue to be “lesser” and not a priority; in most cases, this may simply have been a result of the process used to generate the lists, where participants were asked to identify issues but not to take the further step to prioritize them. As such, stakeholders may have considered some of these issues to be priorities, but if they did not designate them as such in the document, the researchers did not impose any “outside” judgment about the issues as to their quality and weight. In this report, an issue remains as an “issue” unless it was designated as a “priority issue” by the original author. The issues and priorities extracted from these documents have been incorporated into the regional and the county profiles.

For regional and county statistical data, the researchers highlight the similarities and differences among the ten counties, and compare them to the region or to the state as a whole. All the data came from public databases such as the Census data and Texas Kids Count. A complete list of data references is provided at the end of each profile and in the bibliography.

Capital Area Region



Community Profile

Population 1990: 781,572 2000: 1,346,833 2010: 1,676,273
Area in square miles 12,485

Counties Included: Bastrop, Blanco, Burnet, Caldwell, Fayette, Hays, Lee, Llano, Travis, Williamson

Highlights on Statistics and Issues

Statistical Highlights

The following highlights the main similarities and differences among the counties and between a county and the region or the state. Table 1, "Regional, Statewide and County Indicators: A side-by-side comparison," is provided for a quick reference.

Economic Security

The Capital Area region had a higher per capita income and median household income than the state as a whole. However, significant disparities existed among the ten counties. At the bottom, Fayette's median household income was less than 57% of that of Williamson – the highest -- a \$17,000 gap. Williamson was also ahead of the next tier of counties -- Travis, Bastrop and Hays -- by about \$15,000.

A substantial gap in per capita income also existed among the region's counties. Compared to the regional average of \$24,516, Travis ranked highest with \$25,883, closely followed by Williamson (\$24,547) and Llano (\$23,547). Caldwell experienced the lowest per capita income at \$15,099, with the other six counties in the range between \$17,163 for Lee and \$19,931 for Hays.

The region has a poverty rate of 11.1% for the overall population and 14.9% for children under age 18, both substantially lower than the statewide rates. Almost one out of every four people living in poverty in Llano was age 65 or older. Child poverty rate was evenly spread among many counties, with Williamson having the lowest rate. and the poverty rate was. Notably, these poverty rates did not correspond with a county's low per capita income or median household income, but higher scores in both indicators did match with considerably low poverty. Williamson had only 4.8% of all people under age 65 at or under poverty, and 5.4% for children. The rest of the counties were clustered around the regional rates: Hays had the highest overall poverty rate (14.3%) and Llano had the lowest (10.3%) for the overall population; Bastrop was at the high end (15.4%) and Hays at the lower end (12%) for child poverty. Eleven out of 100 poor persons were older than 65. With the highest rate of 16.1% for Lee, six counties (Bastrop, Blanco, Caldwell, Fayette, Hays and Lee) had a rate near or over 10%; four counties (Burnet, Llano, Travis and Williamson) were under 10%.

Education, Literacy and Early Childhood Development

The region as a whole fared better than the state in the proportion of adults with high school diplomas. Seven counties did better than the state rate, while Caldwell, Fayette and Lee had rates lower than the state. The range varied from 71.3% for Fayette to 88.8% for Williamson.

The region had a much higher proportion (36.7%) than the state (23.2%) of people with an educational level at college graduation or above. The presence of numerous colleges and universities in Travis, Hays, and Williamson clearly made the regional rate higher, whereas the rates for the other counties fell below the statewide number, by as much as 10 percentage points for Caldwell and Lee.

The Capital Area regions shows a great difference in the number of children attending programs accredited by the National Association of the Education for Young Children (NAEYC) – one of the highest accreditations in the country. While five counties (Bastrop, Burnet, Fayette, Lee and Llano) did not have any NAEYC-accredited centers, one in every 15 – 51 children attended an NAEYC program during 2004 and 2005 in the other five counties (Blanco, Caldwell, Hays, Travis and Williamson).

Health

Across the Capital Area, more than one in every five – or 21.2% -- of the region's total population under age 65 had no health insurance in 2000; neither did 18.1% of all children under age 19. Health insurance coverage did not seem to correlate with income and poverty levels in the region. Each of the ten counties had about 15%--24% of adults and 14%--23% of children with no insurance. Even for the wealthiest, Williamson County, 19% of all people under age 65 and 17.5% of all children had no health insurance, higher than the more rural and poorer counties of Burnet and Llano.

Across the region, 18.1% of the population had a disability status, just shy of the statewide rate of 19.2%. Llano had the highest rate (26.9%) and Williamson was at 13.3%.

There was significant variation among counties in the rate of births to adolescent mothers out of total live births, ranging from 10.3% for Caldwell to the low of 1.9% in Fayette. The regional rate was 4.8% and the Texas rate was 5.7%.

Housing

The region's rate of home ownership (58.3%) was lower than the state's by about five percentage points. Eight counties had home ownership at 70% or more, while Travis (51.4%) and Hays (64.8%) were at the lower end of the spectrum, possibly due to the presence of a large college population. Vacant housing units, a typical measure for available housing, varied greatly among the ten counties. Llano had the highest vacancy rate at 33.4%, followed by Fayette at 21.5%, while Williamson had the lowest rate at 3.9%. Bastrop, Blanco, Burnet, and Lee ranged from almost 10% to 19%; Caldwell, Travis and Hays were each below 10%.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita contributed to a sharp spike in housing and other needs in 2005.
(Community Action Network, 2005 a)

Public Safety

Certain urban areas had substantially more incidents of reported crimes compared to rural counties. Among the 10 counties, Hays had the highest juvenile violent crime arrests, followed by Williamson County. Travis and Hays had the highest rates for violent crimes at 36.7 and 35.3 per 10,000 people, respectively, which surpassed the regional rate (21.1 per 10,000 people). Travis had a higher rate than the region in property crimes, at 494 per 10,000 people, followed by Hays at 344. Forcible rape was highest in Hays, at 5.6, followed by Travis at 4.7. Williamson and Fayette counties did not report certain data to the state's Uniform Crime Report.

Figure 1: Age Trends in the Capital Area
US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000




Figure 2: Median Household Income by Race, Capital Area
US Census Bureau 2000




Figure 3: Racial Makeup of Capital Area 1990
US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 4: Racial Makeup of Capital Area 2000
US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 1: Regional, Statewide and County Indicators for 2000: A side-by-side comparison

	Region	Texas	Bastrop	Blanco	Burnet	Caldwell	Fayette	Hays	Lee	Llano	Travis	Williamson
Education & Literacy												
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	84.8%	75.70%	76.9%	80.6%	77.8%	71.3%	71.3%	84.7%	71.7%	83.5%	84.7%	88.8%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D., among those 25+ years old	36.7%	23.2%	17.0%	22.2%	17.4%	13.3%	14.6%	31.3%	13.1%	21.0%	40.6%	33.6%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	25.8%	31.2%	22.3%	16.5%	13.5%	32.3%	20.3%	23.1%	20.1%	6.7%	28.7%	17.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	10.5%	13.9%	8.7%	6.0%	5.2%	10.2%	8.7%	7.1%	7.4%	2.6%	12.5%	5.8%
Economic Security												
Per Capita Income	\$24,516	\$19,617	\$18,146	\$19,721	\$18,850	\$15,099	\$18,888	\$19,931	\$17,163	\$23,547	\$25,883	\$24,547
Median Household Income	\$48,950	\$39,927	\$43,578	\$39,369	\$37,921	\$36,573	\$34,526	\$45,006	\$36,280	\$34,830	\$46,761	\$60,642
Individuals below poverty level, of population	11.1%	15.4%	11.6%	11.2%	10.9%	13.1%	11.4%	14.3%	11.9%	10.3%	12.5%	4.8%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	14.9%	20.2%	15.4%	14.2%	14.5%	15.1%	12.7%	12.0%	13.7%	17.2%	13.9%	5.4%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	11.0%	12.8%	13.3%	9.8%	7.9%	15.4%	13.5%	9.7%	16.1%	6.0%	7.6%	8.4%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of population	1.1%	1.7%	1.16%	0.27%	0.8%	2.0%	1.0%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.9%	0.4%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of population	4.4%	6.7%	5.0%	1.2%	3.6%	7.5%	4.6%	2.8%	3.0%	2.3%	3.4%	1.6%

Table 1: Regional, Statewide and County Indicators for 2000: A side-by-side comparison (continued)

	Region	Texas	Bastrop	Blanco	Burnet	Caldwell	Fayette	Hays	Lee	Llano	Travis	Williamson
Health and Nutrition												
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of population	18.1%	19.2%	19.4%	18.2%	22.5%	21.6%	21.8%	14.6%	17.9%	26.9%	14.9%	13.3%
Children in CHIP (2001), of the population	1.6%	1.8%	1.8%	1.2%	2.1%	2.1%	2.4%	1.4%	2.1%	2.2%	1.0%	1.2%
Children without health insurance, less than 19, of children	18.1%	22.3%	18.8%	16.8%	16.4%	23.6%	18.6%	17.8%	17%	14.8%	19.3%	17.5%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of population	9.4%	12.9%	10.5%	5.8%	10.6%	15.4%	11.9%	8.0%	9.1%	8.0%	8.0%	4.7%
Persons without health insurance, less than 65 years old, of population	21.2%	22.6%	21.9%	19.1%	13.9%	27.3%	21.2%	23.3%	21.6%	14.5%	19.5%	19.0%
Births to adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births	4.8%	5.7%	5.0%	4.5%	4.5%	10.3%	1.9%	5.8%	4.5%	6.6%	4.5%	2.6%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of population)*	0.04%	0.15%	0.05%	0.00%	0.04%	0.04%	0.02%	0.06%	.03%	.08%	.09%	0.02%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of population)*	0.00%	0.02%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	.00%	.00%	.03%	0.00%
Household/Families												
Average household size	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.4	2.7	2.6	2.1	2.5	2.8
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	25.40%	28.0%	27.9%	24.1%	23.5%	27.5%	23.9%	27.3%	30.6%	13.8%	21.9%	36.6%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	8.0%	9.5%	8.3%	6.7%	7.0%	9.9%	5.2%	7.3%	6.8%	3.8%	8.0%	7.8%

Table 1: Regional, Statewide and County Indicators for 2000: A side-by-side comparison (continued)

	Region	Texas	Bastrop	Blanco	Burnet	Caldwell	Fayette	Hays	Lee	Llano	Travis	Williamson
Transportation												
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	28.9 min	25.4 min	37.1 min	31.4 min	28.8 min	31.4 min	23.3 min	28 min	30 min	27.8 min	23.6 min	28 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	2.6%	1.9%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0%	3.7%	0.3%
Early Childhood Development												
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	1:42	1:39	0	1:16	0	1:41	0	1:33	0	0	1:15	1:51
Immigration												
Foreign born population	12.2%	13.9%	8.1%	5.0%	5.4%	5.1%	5.6%	5.6%	6.1%	2.0%	15.1%	7.4%
Housing												
Owner occupied housing units	58.3%	63.8%	80.4%	78.8%	78.3%	69.7%	78.3%	64.8%	79.3%	80.9%	51.4%	74.2%
Renter occupied housing units	31.6%	36.2%	19.6%	21.2%	21.7%	30.0%	21.7%	35.2%	20.7%	19.1%	48.6%	25.8%
Vacant housing units	4.9%	9.4%	9.7%	18.1%	17.6%	9.1%	21.5%	6.3%	17.3%	33.4%	4.5%	3.9%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	0.2%	0.2%	0	78	101	100	10	130	0	0	2,180	320
Workforce												
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	60.7%	63.6%	61.1%	59.6%	56.1%	55.8%	57.5%	70.2%	61.7%	44.8%	69.1%	70.8%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	4.0%	3.8%	2.5%	1.8%	1.7%	3.2%	2.0%	4.4%	1.6%	1.3%	2.9%	2.0%
Public Safety												
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests (per 10,000 children)	15.5	20.8	19.1	10.1	15.0	13.9	N/A	38.4	13.0	0	19.5	25.7
Violent crimes reported in Uniform Crime Report (per 10,000 people)	21.1	54.5	26.5	11.2	17.0	25.3	7.1	35.2	20.6	10.1	36.6	N/A
Property Crimes reported in Uniform Crime Report (per 10,000 people)	229.1	495.2	271.0	110.6	187.5	184.7	94.8	344.4	130.5	243.6	494.5	N/A
Forcible Rape reported in Uniform Crime Report (per 10,000 people)	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.3	4.2	2.6	0	5.6	3.2	5.0	4.7	N/A

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than 4, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Issues Across the Region

Research also revealed lists of issues that had been identified by stakeholders through previous community assessment and planning efforts. Issues identified by six or more Capital Area counties as being important are encapsulated below.

In addition to issues identification, the highlights below also provide brief excerpts culled from previous regional studies, needs assessments, and focus group series on specific topics. Findings from these processes do not necessarily paint a consistent picture, because they were each undertaken independently, using different research frameworks, asking different types of questions, and involving different groups of people. Rather, they enhance the understanding of certain communities in the issue areas and provide context for the regional picture.

Health

All ten counties identified *affordable healthcare* as an issue facing their communities, several specifying health care for young children, youth, adults, elders, or across all age groups. Improving the *accessibility of care* and *providing health insurance* were also issues identified in nearly every county. Additionally, the need for *more quality healthcare professionals* was voiced by six of the ten counties.

Sources: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum; CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/Lee County 2002-2003 Community Plan; Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on African American Health Care Disparities in Central Texas; Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey; Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004; Austin Equity Commission; Indigent Care Collaboration

In addition, the Indigent Care Collaboration (ICC) also found that, "of the 20,000 eligibility screenings of uninsured patients as of October 2003, approximately 15% were eligible for a medical assistance program (e.g., Medicaid or CHIP)." (Indigent Care Collaboration, 2003) Participants in the African American Health Care Disparity Surveys identified the lack of clear information on health care options as a big problem. (Huston-Tillotson University, 2005)

The Austin Area Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment for 2005, with information from all ten counties, revealed that the number of residents in the Austin Health Service Delivery Area (HSDA) known to be living with HIV/AIDS increased by 44% between 1999 and 2003, from 2,315 to 3,325. Respondents with HIV/AIDS who had waited a year or more after diagnosis to access care explained that they had waited because they were "not sick" (40%), concerned about disclosure of HIV status (39%), or had active drug and alcohol use (28%). (HIV Planning Council, 2005)

LCRA noted that approximately 123,851 (15.2 %) of working age adults in the Capital Area had a disability. Of whom, approximately 66.3 % (or 82,122) were employed. (Lower Colorado River Authority, 2005)

Economy/Employment

All ten counties identified the *creation of job opportunities* as an issue for their communities.

Sources: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum; Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey; Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004; Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco)

CAPCOG's State of the Region 2005 address highlighted positives as well as potential challenges and disparities. While the region ranked near the top of virtually every *best of list* published in national magazines, more than 70% of the new full-time, private sector jobs in our region paid less than the region's average annual wage of \$41,280.

Approximately 30% of those new jobs paid less than 50% of the average annual wage, or \$20,640 per year. CAPCOG also noted that the effect of rising prices and stagnant income growth was most noticeable in areas with large percentages of residents on fixed incomes, such as retirees or welfare recipients. Real incomes declined for residents living in the region's top four retirement areas: Llano, Fayette, Burnet, and Lee counties. (Capital Area Council of Governments, d)

Housing

Affordable housing was an issue in eight of the ten counties.

Sources: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum; CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan, Liveable City; Community Action Network FAQ on Basic Needs, 2004; Austin Equity Commission

On the other hand, CAPCOG's State of the Region Report for 2005 noted that despite the region's upward trend in housing values, home ownership is still attainable for most residents. (Capital Area Council of Governments, d)

Education, Children and Youth

Eight of the ten counties felt that more *affordable, higher quality pre-school and childcare* was needed. *Better Healthcare for young children* was a specific issue in most counties. Nearly every county voiced concern over the *quality and equity of education available* to its students. Most counties would like to see improvements to the *vocational programs for high school students*. *Funding* is also an issue in the eyes of seven counties. All counties identified the need for *more after-school programs and recreation* for youth in their communities. Additionally, *healthcare and disease prevention* for this population were also issues raised by most counties. Nine counties identified *juvenile crime* as an issue or priority.

Sources: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum; CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan; Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey; Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004; Austin Equity Commission; CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan; CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco and Llano Counties 2005-2006 Community Plan.; Huston-Tillotson University, 2005; CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/Lee Counties 2002-2003 Community Plan; City of Austin : African American Quality of Life Survey; Liveable City;

The Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project reported decreasing percentages of accredited childcare facilities and spaces in the five-county area. (Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project, 2004)

Public Safety

The increase in *domestic violence and child abuse and neglect* were issues of concern identified in nearly every county.

Sources: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum; CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/Lee county 2002-2003 Community Plan, CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Plan; CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan; CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties 2005-2006 Community Plan

Growth, Transportation, and Quality of Life

Heavy traffic and the need for either *more or better roads* were issues raised in eight counties.

Every county identified the *quantity and quality of its water supply* as an issue. Additionally, most counties also named the *preservation of land and its natural resources* as an issue.

Sources: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum; Liveable City; Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey; Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004

LCRA cited the demographic trends in the Census projections and noted that all of the Capital Area counties, except Fayette, grew at or above the Texas rate, that ethnic/racial diversification is expected to continue, and that the Capital Area population is aging. (Lower Colorado River Authority, 2005)

The Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project showed a decline in the percentage of land classified as rural in all five of its target counties.

Through a regional growth planning process, community members indicated that the priority problems were: Traffic, 40%; Roads, 18%; Schools, 11%; Jobs, 9%; and Health Care, 9%. Findings also indicated preferences that solutions should create a balance of jobs throughout the region; maintain affordability; preserve the character of rural communities and urban neighborhoods, and other features. (Envision Central Texas, 2005)

Basic Needs

The 2-1-1 information and referral service shows that requests for assistance with basic needs already doubled from 2001 to 2004. There was a 17% increase in calls about affordable housing and a 22% increase in calls about Adult Mental Health Counseling. Top needs expressed by the callers were assistance with electric bills, rent, food, childhood immunizations, shelter for the homeless, and a variety of health care needs. The number of Spanish-speaking callers increased by 70% and there was a 37% increase in callers sixty years old, and older. The number of calls in all ten counties increased, most significantly from Williamson, Hays, and Caldwell Counties. These increases may be related to the level of need, to better awareness about 2-1-1 services, or a combination of the two. (United Way Capital Area, 2004)

Table 2: Issues Shared by the 10 Counties

General Area	Issue	Travis	Williamson	Hays	Fayette	Llano	Lee	Caldwell	Bastrop	Burnet	Blanco
Education	Quality & Equity	P	X	X		X		X	X	X	X
	Funding	X		X		X		X	X	X	X
	Improve Vocational Programs (Tech & Agriculture, etc.)	X	X				X	X		X	X
Economy/Employment	Creating Jobs/Creating Jobs with Benefits	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Health	Affordability	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	More Quality Healthcare Professionals				X	X	X	X	X		X
	Access-General		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
	Access-Children	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Access-Adults	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Access-Elderly	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Insurance-Children	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
	Insurance-Adult	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
	Insurance-Elderly	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Early Childhood	Affordable/Better Pre-School & Childcare	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
	Better Access to Healthcare	X	X	X			X	X	X		
Youth	More After-School Programs	X	X		X	P	X	X		P	P
	Recreation/Entertainment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Healthcare & Disease Prevention	X	X	X			X	X	X		
	Juvenile Crime/Graduation to Adult C.J. System	P		P	X	P	X	X	X	P	P
Housing	Affordability	P	P	X		X	X	X		X	X
Transportation	Roads	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	
	Mobility/Heavy Traffic	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
Public Safety	Domestic Violence	P			X	P	X		X	P	P
	Child Abuse/Neglect	X			X	P	X	X	X	P	P
Environment	Preservation/Protection of Resources	P		X	X			X	X	X	X
	Water Quantity	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Water Quality	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

X = Issues

P = Priority Issues as defined by identifying organization

Table 3: Regional Indicators

	Region	Texas
	(SMA or Region 7 Data)	
Education & Literacy		
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D., among those 25+ years old	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security		
Per Capita Income	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of County population	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of County population	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of County population	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition		
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of County population	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of County population	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under 19, of all children	18.1%	22.3%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of County population	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, under age 65, of all population	21.2%	22.6%
Births to Adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of County population)*	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of County population)*	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families		
Average household size	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development		
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in unaccredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	1:42	1:39
Immigration		
Foreign born population	12.2%	13.9%
Housing		
Owner occupied housing units	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	0.2%	0.2%
Workforce		
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation		
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety		
	Based on RMC calculation	
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than four, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Austin Equity Commission. 2001.
- Capital Area Council of Governments community planning documents
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. 2004. Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Annual Report.
- City of Austin. African-American Quality of Life in Austin, Texas.
- Community Action Network documents.
- Envision Central Texas. 2005.
- HIV Planning Council. 2005. Area Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment.
- Huston-Tillotson University. 2005.
- Indigent Care Collaboration. (2003) Recent Trends in the Use of and Capacity for Primary Health Care Services Among Travis County Safety Net Providers
- Liveable City. 2002.
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) LCRA Basic Data.
- Pedernales Electric Cooperative and Lower Colorado River Authority. 2005. Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1.

Bastrop County



Community Profile

Population 1990: 38,263 2000: 57,733 2010: 76,195

Area in square miles: 888.4

Three most populous cities: Bastrop, Smithville, Elgin

County Specific Highlights

The county's per capita income was much lower than that of the region, by over \$6,000, and slightly lower than the state average. Median household income was also lower than the regional median, by over \$5,000. The poverty rates for children and all persons under 65 were comparable to that of the region. The county's home ownership vastly exceeded the regional rate, by almost 22 percentage points, and that of the state as well. In comparison, Bastrop had a much lower rental occupancy rate than the region. Vacant housing units were on par with the state rate, but almost doubled that of the region. In 2000, health insurance did not cover about 19% of children under age 19 and 22.6% of all persons under age 65.

In addition to what has been captured in the Bastrop County Issues/Priorities table, research also revealed the following information about the nature of certain issues in the county.

There is a shortage of primary care physicians, with a ratio of one provider to 4,000 individuals in 2003. (Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project, 2004) The Indigent Care Collaboration (ICC) reported that patients from Bastrop, together with those in Burnet and Caldwell, travel up to forty miles to ICC safety net providers located in and around Travis, Hays, and Williamson counties, because very few independent providers exist in these counties. (Indigent Care Collaboration, 2003) A study of disparities in health care also found accessibility and availability of care a problem, together with the following key concerns: (1) Information is incorrect, unavailable, culturally inappropriate or late; (2) Affordability (e.g. no insurance, co-pay too high; yearly checkups too costly; ER too expensive); (3) HIV is kept quiet because denial and fatalistic views were coupled with lack of affordability for treatment and that women were too insecure in relationships to insist on protection (condoms). (Huston-Tillotson University, 2005)

Bastrop was the only county in the five-county region for which its toxic release inventory per capita increased since 1997. (Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project, 2004)

"The largest gap in victim services was not one of a particular lack of services in Bastrop County, but the need for better communication between all entities in the rural community." In addition, the services available cannot meet the need due to the increase in county population and lack of funding. Information and resources, educating the public on victim concerns and needs of victims is a necessity. A computerized tracking system linking the criminal justice system and social service agencies, and training for personnel were recommended to greatly enhance victim services. (Capital Area Council of Governments, a)

Commuting time is becoming a problem as more than 50% of the Bastrop population travels between Bastrop and Travis. (Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project, 2004)

Figure 5: Age Trends in Bastrop County
US Census Bureau 2000




Figure 6: Median Household Income by Race in Bastrop County, 2000
US Census Bureau 2000




Figure 7: Racial Makeup of Bastrop County, 1990
US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 8: Racial Makeup of Bastrop County, 2000
US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 4: Bastrop County Issues/Priorities

General Area	Issue	Bastrop	Notes
Education	Quality & Equity	X	A, G
	Higher Education	X	H
	Funding	X	A
	Affordability & Access	X	A
Economy/Employment	Creating Jobs with Benefits	X	G, H
	Creating Jobs	X	K
	Poverty	X	K
Health	Affordability	X	K, Q
	More Quality Healthcare Professionals	X	Q
	Disease Prevention/Care	X	Q
	Access-General	X	K, Q
	Access-Children	X	G
	Access-Adults	X	G
	Access-Elderly	X	G
	Transportation to Healthcare Center	X	Q
	Insurance- General	X	Q
	Insurance-Children	X	G,H
	Insurance-Adult	X	G,H
	Insurance-Elderly	X	G,H
	Lack of understanding about treatment, healthcare benefits, & advocacy orgs	X	Q
	Expansion of Mental Health Services	X	K
	Stigmatization of Physical or Mental Illness (ex: HIV)	X	Q
	Family Planning- Females too insecure to require condom use by partner	X	Q
	Denial of Condition due to Unaffordable Treatment	X	Q
	Self Medication/Home Remedies	X	Q
	More Public Health Info (Pamphlets sent home with kids, free screenings)	X	Q
	More Mobile Health Vans, Free Medication	X	Q
Early Childhood	Affordable/Better Pre-School & Childcare	X	A, H, K
	Better Access to Healthcare	X	G,H
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	G,H
Youth	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A, K
	Healthcare & Disease Prevention	X	G, H
	Detention	X	K
	Behavior Problems	X	K
	Job Training & Employment Opportunities	X	K
	Juvenile Crime/Graduation to Adult C.J. System	X	K
Adults	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A
	Better Access to Healthcare	P	G
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	G, H
Elderly	Better Access to Healthcare	X	H
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	H

General Area	Issue	Bastrop	Notes
Transportation	Public Transport	X	A
	Roads	X	A, G
	Mobility/Heavy Traffic	X	A,G,H
Public Safety	Substance Abuse	X	K
	Domestic Violence	X	K
	Sexual Assault	X	K
	Child Abuse/Neglect	X	K
Government	Property Taxes Too High	X	A
	Diversity in Elected Leadership	X	H
Agriculture	Tax Exemptions	X	A
	Sustainable Agriculture	X	A
Environment	Preservation/Protection of Resources	X	
	Rural Land	X	H
	Balance needs with Growth	X	A
	Water Quantity	X	A
	Water Quality	X	A
	Air Quality	X	A
Community	Controlling Urban Sprawl/Population Expansion	X	A
	Uncontrolled Growth	X	K
	Discrimination	X	K
	Creation of space for comm. Events	X	A
	Civic Participation	X	H
	Volunteers	X	K
	Cost of Living Too High	X	H
Basic Needs	Homelessness	X	K
Information & Coordination	Emergency Disaster Assistance	X	K
	Communication Between Community Members	P	K
Other	Not Enough Funding	X	K

**X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source;
Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources**

A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum	E: Liveable City	I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds	N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan
B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan	F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005	J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan	O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan
C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable	G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey	K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/ Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan	Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health
D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey	H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004	L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan	R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups
		M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan	S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco)

Table 5: Bastrop County Indicators

	Bastrop County 2000		Region	T e x a s
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7 Data)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	28,646	76.9%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	6,347	17.0%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	11,901	22.3%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	4631	8.7%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	\$18,146	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$43,578	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of County population	6,456	11.6%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	2,408	15.4%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	751	13.3%	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of County population	669	1.16%	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of County population	2,862	5.0%	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of county population	9,971	19.4%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of the county population	1055	1.7%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under age 19, of all children	3,320	18.8%	22.8%	24.6%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of County population	6,062	10.5%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, under age 65, of all population	11,350	21.9%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births	43	5.0%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of County population)*	72	0.05%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of County population)*	6	0.01%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.8	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	5597	27.9%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	1674	8.3%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	0	(x)	1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	4,673	8.1%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	16,158	80.4%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	3,939	19.6%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	2,157	9.7%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	0	(x)	2,808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	27,642	61.1%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	1088	2.5%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	37.1 min	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	47	0.2%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	14	19.1	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	145	26.5	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	1482	271.0	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	18	3.2	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than four, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) a. Bastrop, Fayette, and Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) (2005) d. State of the Region.
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. (2004) Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Annual Report.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2005) a. Community Overview November 2005.
- Real Estate Council of Austin, Inc. 2005. Envision Central Texas.
- HIV Planning Council. (2005) Area Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment.
- Huston-Tillotson University. (2005). Focus Groups Analyses: Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health Course.
- Indigent Care Collaboration. (2003) Recent Trends in the Use of and Capacity for Primary Health Care Services Among Travis County Safety Net Providers
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) LCRA Basic Data.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1.

Blanco County



Community Profile

Population 1990: 5,972 2000: 8,418 2010: 10,044

Area in square miles: 711.2

Three most populous cities: Blanco, Johnson City, Round Mountain

County Specific Highlights

The county's per capita income and median household income were almost identical to those of the state, but were much lower than the region. Poverty rates for children under 18 and for the overall population were similar to those of the region. While there is strong home ownership in the county, exceeding the region by more than twenty percentage points, vacant housing units were over three times as high as the region and twice the state rate. On health, about 17% of all children under age 19 and 19% of all people under age 65 had no health insurance in 2000.

In addition to what has been captured in the Blanco County Issues/Priorities table, research also revealed the following information about the nature of certain issues in the county. The City of Blanco developed the *Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan*, which called on quality of life issues such as safe pedestrian access, recreational amenities for all ages, and creating a city-wide network of parks and open space to increase health and community involvement. The plan also sets policies and spells out strategies to "improve the economic climate in the city" through creating local jobs and decreasing the number of Blanco City residents who currently travel outside of the community for work. The Plan "represents an important step in Blanco becoming the community of its residents' desire." (Pedernales Electric Cooperative and Lower Colorado River Authority, 2005)

Increase in population aged 5-19 has led to insufficient services, increased crimes, and juvenile delinquency. There were also more family violence, sexual assault and child abuse. Crimes had increased in both number and severity. (Capital Area Council of Governments, b)

Figure 9: Age Trends in Blanco County

US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000





Figure 10: Median Household Income by Race in Blanco County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000



24

Figure 11: Racial Makeup of Blanco County in 1990

US Census Bureau 2000





Figure 12: Racial Makeup of Blanco County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 6: Blanco County Issues/Priorities

Issues Identified by Previous Research			
General Area	Issue	Blanco	Notes
Education	Quality & Equity	X	A
	Improve Vocational Programs (Tech & Agriculture, etc.)	X	A
	Integration of morally & ethics in classroom	X	A
	Support of Existing Schools	X	A
	Funding	X	A
	Affordability & Access	X	A
Economy/Employment	Creating Jobs	X	S
	Attract New Businesses	X	S
	Support Existing Businesses	X	S
Health	Affordability	X	A
	More Quality Healthcare Professionals	X	A
	Better Facilities	X	A
	Disease Prevention/Care	X	A
	Access-Children	X	A
	Access-Adults	X	A
	Access-Elderly	X	A
	Insurance-Children	X	A
	Insurance-Adult	X	A
	Insurance-Elderly	X	A
	Eldercare - More/Better	X	A
Promotion of Healthy Lifestyle (fitness, nutrition)	X	A	
Youth	More After-School Programs	P	A, O
	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A,S
	Community Service Opportunities	P	O
	Mental Health Issues/Suicide Prevention	P	O
	Increase Success	X	A
	Increase Successful School Experiences	P	O
	Language Barriers	P	O
	Foster/Therapeutic Homes	P	O
	Legal Services	P	O
	Poor Parenting Skills Lead to Creation of Juvenile Delinquents	P	O
	Juvenile Crime/Graduation to Adult Criminal Justice System	P	O
Elderly	More Housing	X	S
Housing	Affordability	X	S
	Adequate Number	X	S
Transportation	Public Transport	X	A
	More/Better Roads	X	S
	Sidewalks & Pedestrian Access	X	S
	Mobility/Heavy Traffic	X	A
Public Safety	Adequate Number of Law Enforcement Officers	X	A
	Need for Specialized Equipment for Certain Situations	P	O
	Law Enforcement Training & Resources to Protect Vulnerable Populations (children, elderly, homeless, deaf, immigrants, etc.)	P	O
	Improve Technological Capacity of Law Enforcement	P	O
	Domestic Violence	P	O
	Domestic Violence Involving Weapons & Strangulations	P	O
	Sexual Assault	P	O
	Insufficient Prevention of and Support for Sexual Assault Victims	P	O
	Reducing Violent Crime	P	O
Child Abuse/Neglect	P	O	
Community	Controlling Urban Sprawl/Population Expansion	X	S
	Preservation of Community Heritage	X	S
	Public Service Maintenance	X	S
	Attractiveness/Appearance of Towns or Cities	X	S
	Promote Tourism	X	S
	Creation of Space for Community Events	X	S
	Quality of Life	X	S
	Create Zoning Regulations	X	S
Government	Property taxes too high	X	A
Environment	Preservation/Protection of Resources	X	A
	Balance needs with growth	X	A
	Water Quantity	X	A,S
	Water Quality	X	A

X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source; Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum | E: Liveable City | I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds | N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan | F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005 | J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan | O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable | G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey | K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/ Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan | Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health |
| D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey | H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004 | L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan | R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups |
| | | M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan | S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco) |

Table 7: Blanco County Indicators

	Blanco County 2000		Region	Texas
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7 Data)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	4,750	80.6%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	1,306	22.2%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	1,304	16.5%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	472	6.0%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	\$19,721	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$39,369	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of County population	922	11.2%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	286	14.2%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	124	9.8%	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of County population	23	.27%	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of County population	102	1.2%	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of County population	1,409	18.2%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of the county population	104	1.2%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under age 19, of all children	378	16.8%	22.8%	24.6%
Number of people eligible for Medicaid, of population	492	5.8%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, under age 65, of population	1,339	19.1%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to Adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births	5	4.5%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of County population)*	<4	0.00%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of County population)*	<4	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.5	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	797	24.1%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	222	6.7%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	1:16		1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	419	5.0%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	2,602	78.8%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	701	21.2%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	728	18.1%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	78	(x)	2,808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	4,058	59.6%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	117	1.8%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	31.4 min	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	10	0.3%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	1	10.1	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	10	11.2	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	98	110	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	3	3.3	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than four, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) b. Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' FY 2005-6 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) d. 2005 State of the Region.
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. (2004). Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Annual Report.
- HIV Planning Council. (2005) Area Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment.
- Indigent Care Collaboration. (2003) Recent Trends in the Use of and Capacity for Primary Health Care Services Among Travis County Safety Net Providers.
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) LCRA Basic Data.
- Pedernales Electric Cooperative and Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005). *Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan* Retrieved 2/13/06, from:
<http://masterplan.blancoguide.com/cmp/index.php>.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1

Burnet County



Community Profile

Population 1990:22,677 2000: 34,147 2010:42,694
Area in square miles: 996

Three most populous cities: Burnet, Marble Falls, Granite Shoals

County Specific Highlights

Burnet's per capita income and median household income were significantly lower than the region as a whole, by almost \$6,000 and \$11,000 respectively. However, Burnet fared similarly to the region in poverty levels for both children under age 18 and for all people under age 65. In health insurance coverage, the county fared much better than both the region and many other counties. Home ownership was strong, at twenty percentage points higher than the regional rate, whereas vacant housing units more than tripled that of the region.

In addition to what has been captured in the Burnet County Issues/Priorities table, research also revealed the following information about the nature of certain issues in the county. The effect of rising prices and stagnant income growth was most noticeable in areas with large percentages of residents on fixed incomes, such as retirees or welfare recipients. As one of the region's top four retirement areas—Llano, Fayette, Burnet, and Lee counties, Burnet residents saw their real incomes decline by more than 1% on average in 2005 after several years of steady gains. (Capital Area Council of Governments, d)

The Indigent Care Collaboration reported that patients from Burnet, similar to those in Bastrop and Caldwell, traveled up to 40 miles to primary health care safety net providers located in Travis, Hays and Williamson counties, because very few independent providers exist in these counties. (Indigent Care Collaboration, 2003)

Figure 13: Age Trends in Burnet County

US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000




Figure 14: Median Household Income by Race in Burnet County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000




Figure 15: Racial Makeup of Burnet County in 1990

US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 16: Racial Makeup of Burnet County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 8: Burnet County Issues/Priorities

Issues Identified by Previous Research			
General Area	Issue	Burnet	Notes
Education	Quality & Equity	X	A
	Improve Vocational Programs (Tech & Agriculture, etc.)	X	A
	Support of Existing Schools	X	A
	Funding	X	A
Economy/Employment	Creating Jobs w/benefits	X	A
	General Economic Development	X	A
	Attracting Industries	X	A
	Small Business Development	X	A
	Educated Workforce	X	A
Health	Affordability	X	A
	Access-Children	X	A
	Access-Adults	X	A
	Access-Elderly	X	A
	Insurance-Children	X	A
	Insurance-Adult	X	A
	Insurance-Elderly	X	A
	Eldercare - More/Better	X	A
Early Childhood	Affordable/Better Pre-School & Childcare	X	A
Youth	More After-School Programs	P	A, O
	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A
	Community Service Opportunities	P	O
	Mental Health Issues/Suicide Prevention	P	O
	Increase Success	X	A
	Increase Successful School Experiences	P	O
	Language Barriers	P	O
	Foster/Therapeutic Homes	P	O
	Legal Services	P	O
	Poor Parenting Skills Lead to Creation of Juvenile Delinquents	P	O
Juvenile Crime/Graduation to Adult Criminal Justice System	P	O	
Elderly	Better Access to Healthcare	X	A
	More Housing	X	A
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	A
	Disease Prevention	X	A
Housing	Affordability	X	A
Transportation	Roads	X	A
	Mobility/Heavy Traffic	X	A
Public Safety	Adequate Number of Law Enforcement Officers	X	A
	Need for Specialized Equipment for Certain Situations	P	O
	Law Enforcement Training & Resources to Protect Vulnerable Populations (children, elderly, homeless, deaf, immigrants, etc.)	P	O
	Improve Technological Capacity of Law Enforcement	P	O
	Domestic Violence	P	O
	Domestic Violence Involving Weapons & Strangulations	P	O
	Sexual Assault	P	O
	Insufficient Prevention of/Support for Sexual Assault Victims	P	O
	Reducing Violent Crime	P	O
	Child Abuse/Neglect	P	A, O
Environment	Preservation/Protection of Resources	X	A
	Water Quantity	X	A
	Water Quality	X	A
Community	Controlling Urban Sprawl/Population Expansion	X	A
	Preservation of Community Heritage	X	A
	Create Zoning Regulations	X	A

X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source; Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources

A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum

E: Liveable City

I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds

N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan

B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan

F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005

J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan

O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan

C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable

G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey

K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan

Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health

D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey

H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004

L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan

R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups

M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan

S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco)

Table 9: Burnet County Indicators

	Burnet County 2000		Region	Texas
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7 Data)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	18,234	77.8%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	4,082	17.4%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	4,297	13.5%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	1659	5.2%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	\$18,850	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$37,921	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of County population	3,614	10.9%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	1,186	14.5%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	456	7.9%	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of County population	277	.8%	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of County population	1,216	3.6%	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of County population	6,975	22.5%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of County population	720	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under age 19, of all children	1,510	16.9%	22.8%	24.6%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of county population	3,611	10.6%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, less than 65 years old, of population	5,175	13.9%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to Adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births	21	4.5%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of County population)*	14	0.04%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients – youth annual admissions (of County)*	5	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.5	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	3094	23.5%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	925	7.0%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	0		1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	1,839	5.4%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	10,286	78.3%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	2,847	21.7%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	2,800	17.6%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	101	(x)	2,808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	15,447	56.1%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	454	1.7%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	28.8 min	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	11	0.1%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	6	15.0	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	56	17.0	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	615	187.5	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	14	4.2	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than four, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) b. Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' FY 2005-6 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) d. (2005) Capital Area Council of Governments 2005 State of the Region.
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. (2004). Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Annual Report.
- HIV Planning Council. (2005) Area Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment.
- Indigent Care Collaboration. (2003) Recent Trends in the Use of and Capacity for Primary Health Care Services Among Travis County Safety Net Providers
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) LCRA Basic Data.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1

Caldwell County



Community Profile

Population 1990:26,392 2000: 32,194 2010: 40,312

Area in square miles: 545.7

Most populous cities:, Lockhart, Luling

County Specific Highlights

Caldwell County's per capita income and median household income were significantly lower than the region as a whole, by more than \$9,000 and \$13,000 respectively. Poverty rates for all individuals under age 65 (15.4%) and for children under age 18 (15.1%) were somewhat higher than the region, but lower than the state.

In Caldwell, about one out of every four individuals, both for children and for adults, did not have health insurance, and both the child and adult uninsured rates were higher than that of the region and the state.

In addition to what has been captured in the Caldwell County Issues/Priorities table, research also revealed the following information about the nature of certain issues in the county.

The Indigent Care Collaboration reported that patients from Caldwell, together with those in Bastrop and Burnet, travel up to forty miles to primary health care safety net providers located in and around Travis, Hays and Williamson counties, because very few independent providers exist in these counties. (Indigent Care Collaboration, 2003) Another group studying disparities in health care also identified accessibility as a problem. The group recommended increasing consumer education and more and better transportation services. (Huston-Tillotson University, 2005)

Participants developing a plan for coordinating criminal justice and related activities identified the population growth in the area as a cause for increasing problems in poverty, availability and affordability of housing, and services "with very limited resources", all of which in turn contributed to public safety problems. Planners noted an increase in felony referrals since the last plan and crime calls have also increased; complex problems were affecting youth and service providers working with youth. (Capital Area Council of Governments, c)

Figure 17: Age Trends in Caldwell County

US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000




Figure 18: Median Household Income by Race in Caldwell County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000




Figure 19: Racial Makeup of Caldwell County in 1990

US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 20: Racial Makeup of Caldwell County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 10: Caldwell County Issues and Priorities

Issues Identified by Previous Research			
General Area	Issue	Caldwell	Notes
Education	Quality & Equity	X	G
	Improve Vocational Programs (Tech & Agriculture, etc.)	X	A
	Integration of morally & ethics in classroom	X	A
	Reduce Overcrowding	X	A
	Higher Education	X	H
	Lack of Affordable Translation Services	X	L
	Funding	X	A
Economy/ Employment	Creating Jobs w/benefits	X	A, G, H
	General Economic Development	X	A
	Attracting Industries	X	A
	Small Business Development	X	A
Health	Affordability	X	Q
	More Quality Healthcare Professionals	X	A,Q
	Better Facilities	X	A
	Healthcare Resources Inadequate, Low Quality, and/or Unfriendly	X	Q
	Disease Prevention/Care	X	Q
	Access-General	X	Q
	Access-Children	X	G
	Access-Adults	X	G
	Access-Elderly	X	G
	Transportation to Healthcare Center	X	Q
	Insurance- General	X	Q
	Insurance-Children	X	G,H
	Insurance-Adult	X	G,H
	Insurance-Elderly	X	G,H
	Lack of understanding about treatment, healthcare benefits, & advocacy orgs	X	Q
	Promotion of Healthy Lifestyle (fitness, nutrition)	X	A, Q
	Healthy Food too Cost Prohibitive	X	Q
	Stigmatization of Physical or Mental Illness (ex: HIV)	X	Q
	Denial of Condition due to Unaffordable Treatment	X	Q
	Fear of Outcome	X	Q
More Public Health Info (Pamphlets sent home with kids, free screenings)	X	Q	
More Mobile Health Vans, Free Medication	X	Q	
Early Childhood	Affordable/Better Pre-School & Childcare	X	H
	Better Access to Healthcare	X	G, H
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	G, H
Youth	More After-School Programs	X	A, L
	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A
	Healthcare & Disease Prevention	X	G, H
	Mental Health Issues/Suicide Prevention	X	L
	Drug Abuse Prevention/Treatment	X	L

Issues Identified by Previous Research			
General Area	Issue	Caldwell	Notes
Youth (continued)	Increase Success	X	A, L
	Increase Successful School Experiences	X	L
	Teen Pregnancy	X	L
	Job Training & Employment Opportunities	X	A
	Juvenile Crime/Graduation to Adult Criminal Justice System	X	L
	Truancy	X	L
Adults	Better Access to Healthcare	P	G
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	G, H
Elderly	Better Access to Healthcare	X	H
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	H
Housing	Affordability	X	A
Transportation	Roads	X	A, G
	Mobility/Heavy Traffic	X	A,G,H
Public Safety	Adequate Number of Law Enforcement Officers	X	A
	Child Abuse/Neglect	X	L
Government	Property taxes too high	X	A
	Diversity in Elected Leadership	X	H
Agriculture	Soil Fertility in Developing Areas	X	A
	Proper Care of Animals	X	A
	Sustainable Agriculture	X	A
Environ-mint	Preservation/Protection of Resources	X	A
	Rural Land	X	H
	Balance needs with Growth	X	A
	Water Quantity	X	A
	Water Quality	X	A
	Air Quality	X	A
Community	Civic Participation	X	H
	Cost of Living Too High	X	H
	Public Service Maintenance (Sewer/Fire)	X	A
	Quality of Life	X	A

X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source;
Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources

A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum

B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan

C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable

D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey

E: Liveable City

F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005

G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey

H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004

I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds

J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan

K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/ Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan

L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan

M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan

N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan

O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan

Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health

R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups

S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco)

Table 11: Caldwell County Indicators

	Caldwell County 2000		Region	Texas
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	14,501	71.3%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	2,697	13.3%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	9,610	32.3%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	3029	10.2%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	\$15,099	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$36,573	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of County population	3,971	13.1%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	1,327	15.1%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	562	15.4%	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of County population	636	2.0%	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of County population	2,471	7.5%	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of County population	6,071	21.6%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of County population	667	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under age 19, of all children	2,348	23.6%	22.8%	24.6%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of County population	4,971	15.4%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, under age 65, of population	7,703	27.3%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births	53	10.3%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of County population)*	42	0.04%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of County population)*	8	0.02%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.8	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	2965	27.5%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	1071	9.9%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	1:41		1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	1,653	5.1%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	7,535	69.7%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	3,281	30.0%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	1,085	9.1%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	100	(x)	2,808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	14,206	55.8%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	776	3.2%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	31.4 min	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	30	0.2%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	6	13.9	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	85	25.3	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	619	184.7	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	9	2.6	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than four, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) c.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) d. 2005 State of the Region.
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. (2004).
- Envision Central Texas. (2005). *Envision Central Texas Project*.
- Huston-Tillotson University. (2005). Focus Groups Analyses: Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health Course.
- Indigent Care Collaboration. (2003) *Recent Trends in the Use of and Capacity for Primary Health Care Services Among Travis County Safety Net Providers*
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) *LCRA Basic Data*.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). *Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County*.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) *Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1*

Fayette County



Community Profile

Population 1990:20,095 2000: 21,804 2010: 23,347

Area in square miles: 950

Three most populous cities: La Grange, Schulenburg, Flatonia

County Specific Highlights

Fayette had the lowest population growth rate in the region, with the population only increasing by about 1,800 people between 1990 and 2000.

Per capita income and the median household income in Fayette County were significantly lower than regional income levels. While the poverty rate for all individuals was similar to the region, the child poverty rate was lower by two percentage points. Almost one out of every four people living in poverty was age 65 or older. Health insurance coverage for people under age 65 and children under age 19 ranged in the middle of the spectrum among the counties.

Home ownership in the county was high, at 78.3%, or twenty percentage points higher than the region and about 15 percentage points higher than the state. However, vacant housing units accounted for 21.5% of the housing market, compared to 4.9% for the region and 9.4% for the state.

In addition to what has been captured in the Fayette County Issues/Priorities table, research also revealed the following information about the nature of certain issues in the county.

The effect of rising prices and stagnant income growth during the past year was most noticeable in areas with large percentages of residents on fixed incomes, such as retirees or welfare recipients. As one of the region's top four retirement areas—Llano, Fayette, Burnet, and Lee counties, Fayette residents saw their real incomes decline by more than 1% on average in 2005 after several years of steady gains. (Capital Area Council of Governments, d)

Participants developing a plan for coordinating criminal justice and related activities noted that, "The difficulty with communication in a rural community was identified as a gap in services. Information and resources, educating the public on victim concerns so that we have community awareness sensitive to the needs of victims is a necessity; a computerized tracking system linking criminal justice system and social service agencies, and training for personnel would greatly enhance victim services." (Capital Area Council of Governments, a)

Figure 21: Age Trends in Fayette County
US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000





Figure 22: Median Household Income by Race in Fayette County, 2000
US Census Bureau 2000



42

Figure 23: Racial Makeup of Fayette County in 1990
US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 24: Racial Makeup of Fayette County, 2000
US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 12: Fayette County Issues/Priorities

Issues Identified by Prior Research			
General Area	Issue	Fayette	Notes
Education	Support of Existing Schools	X	A
Economy/Employment	Creating Jobs	X	K
	General Economic Development	X	A
	Poverty	X	K
Health	Affordability	X	A, K
	More Quality Healthcare Professionals	X	A
	Access-General	X	K
	Access-Children	X	K
	Access-Adults	X	K
	Access-Elderly	X	K
	Insurance-Children	X	A
	Insurance-Adult	X	A
	Insurance-Elderly	X	A
	Eldercare - More/Better	X	A
Expansion of Mental Health Services	X	K	
Early Childhood	Affordable/Better Pre-School & Childcare	X	K
Youth	More After-School Programs	X	A
	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A, K
	Detention	X	K
	Behavior Problems	X	K
	Job Training & Employment Opportunities	X	K
	Juvenile Crime/Graduation to Adult Criminal Justice System	X	K
Transportation	Transportation	X	K
Public Safety	Lower Recidivism Rates/Ease Transition from Incarceration to Society	X	A
	Substance Abuse	X	K
	Domestic Violence	X	K
	Sexual Assault	X	K
	Child Abuse/Neglect	X	K
Government	Adequate Staffing to Ensure Stability of Services	X	A
Environment	Preservation/Protection of Resources	X	A
	Recycling/Waste Issues	X	A
	Water Quantity	X	A
	Water Quality	X	A
	Air Quality	X	A
Community	Uncontrolled Growth	X	K
	Preservation of Community Heritage	X	A
	Discrimination	X	K
	Creation of Space for Community Events	X	A
	Volunteers	X	K
	Public Service Maintenance (Sewer/Fire)	X	A
Basic Needs	Homelessness	X	K
Information & Coordination	Emergency Disaster Assistance	X	K
	Communication Between Community Members	P	K
	Efficiency/Effectiveness/Coordination of Service Organizations	X	A
Other	Not Enough Funding	X	K

X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source; Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum | E: Liveable City | I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds | N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan | F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005 | J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan | O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable | G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey | K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan | Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health |
| D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey | H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004 | L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan | R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups |
| | | M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan | S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco) |

Table 13: Fayette County Indicators

	Fayette County 2000		Region	Texas
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	10,826	71.3%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	2,218	14.6%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	4,195	20.3%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	1809	8.7%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	\$18,888	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$34,526	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of county population	2,426	11.4%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	629	12.7%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	588	13.5%	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of the county population	213	1.0%	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of the county population	1011	4.6%	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of county population	4,403	21.8%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of the county population	529	2.4%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under age 19, of all children	1,043	18.6%	22.8%	24.6%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of county population	2,596	11.9%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, less than 65 years old, of population	3,606	21.2%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births in this county	5	1.9%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of county population)*	9	0.02%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of county population)*	<4	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.4	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	2094	23.9%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	455	5.2%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	0		1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	1,231	5.6%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	6,829	78.3%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	1,893	21.7%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	2,391	21.5%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	10	(x)	2,808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	10,391	57.5%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	350	2.0%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	23.3 min	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	7	0.1%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	0	0	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	16	7.1	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	211	94.8	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	0	0	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than 4, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) a.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) d.
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. (2004)
- Indigent Care Collaboration. (2003) *Recent Trends in the Use of and Capacity for Primary Health Care Services Among Travis County Safety Net Providers*
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) *LCRA Basic Data*.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). *Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County*.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) *Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1*

Hays County



Community Profile

Population 1990: 65,614 2000: 97,589 2010: 140,173
Area in square miles: 677.9

Three most populous cities: San Marcos, Kyle, Buda

County Specific Highlights

Hays' per capita income and median household income were both below those of the region as a whole in 2000. Compared to the region, Hays had a higher percentage of individuals of all ages below poverty level, but a lower percentage of children living in poverty. Almost a quarter of the county's population lacked health insurance. Hays ranked second in the rate of property crimes among the ten counties in the region, and had the highest rate of forcible rape. Vacant housing units accounted for 6.3% of the housing market, which was higher than the region (4.9%) but among the lowest in the region. About two-thirds of housing units were owner-occupied.

In addition to what has been captured in the Hays County Issues/Priorities table, research also revealed the following contextual information about the nature of certain issues in the county.

Community planners expressed concerns over the population growth and its strain on the capacity of social service agencies to maintain services at their current level. They identified a list of goals and issues in the community, including: having sufficient law enforcement and legal services personnel and resources; addressing family violence, including child abuse; noting problems with employment and underemployment; mental health challenges and developmental disabilities among youth offenders and adults; barriers facing former offenders trying to make a successful reentry; poverty levels and associated issues such as affordable transportation, housing, child care and employment that pays a living wage. (Capital Area Council of Governments, e)

A study on racial disparities in health care identified concerns about insufficient providers and lack of transportation (mobile vans), so people felt that they had to go to Austin for treatment. Participants acknowledged a fear of receiving negative news regarding their health, so rather than being presented with unaffordable treatment options, individuals preferred to remain unaware of their condition. There was discussion about the prevalence of people who use home remedies or rely on religion to heal. Stress factors such as trying to make ends meet and grandmothers taking care of young children were also mentioned. Participants in the process felt that Congress should lower medical costs. (Huston-Tillotson University, 2005)

Figure 25: Age Trends in Hays County
US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000





Figure 26: Median Household Income by Race in Hays County, 2000
US Census Bureau 2000



48

Figure 27: Racial Makeup of Hays County in 1990
US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 28: Racial Makeup of Hays County, 2000
US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 14: Hays County Issues/Priorities

Issues Identified by Previous Research			
General Area	Issue	Hays	Notes
Early Childhood	Affordable/Better Pre-School & Childcare	X	H
	Better Access to Healthcare	X	G,H
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	G,H
Youth	More Recreation/Entertainment	X	A
	Healthcare & Disease Prevention	X	A,G,H
Health	Affordability	X	A
	Access-Children	X	A,G
	Access-Adults	X	A,G
	Access-Elderly	X	A,G
	Insurance-Children	X	A,G,H
	Insurance-Adult	X	A,G,H
	Insurance-Elderly	X	A,G,H
	Eldercare - More/Better	X	A,G
	Promotion of Healthy Lifestyle (fitness, nutrition)	X	A
Economy/Employment	Creating Jobs with Benefits	X	A,G,H
	Attracting Industries	X	A
	Small Business Development	X	A
Government	Property taxes too high	X	A
	Diversity of Elected Leadership	X	H
	Improve Judicial System	X	A
Public Safety	Adequate Number of Law Enforcement Officers	X	A
Education	Quality & Equity	X	A,G
	Higher Education	X	H
	Funding	X	A
Environment	Preservation/Protection of Resources	X	A
	Rural Land	X	H
	Recycling/Waste Issues	X	A
	Water Quantity	X	A
	Water Quality	X	A
Transportation	Improving Public Transportation	X	A
	Improving/Constructing Roads	X	A,G
	Mobility	X	A,G,H
Community	Preservation of Community Heritage	X	A
	Promotion of Family/Spiritual Values	X	A
	Creation of space for Community Events	X	A
	Updated Technology to Improve Communication	X	A
	Civic Participation	X	H
	Cost of Living Too High	X	H
	Public Service Maintenance (Sewer/Fire)	X	A
Housing	Affordability	X	A
	Adequate Number	X	A
	Safety	X	A
Basic Needs	Food	X	A
	Emergency Shelters	X	A
	Clothing	X	A

X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source; Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum | E: Liveable City | I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds | N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan | F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005 | J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan | O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable | G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey | K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan | Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health |
| D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey | H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004 | L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan | R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups |
| | | M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan | S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco) |

Table 15: Hays County Indicators

	Hays County 2000		Region	Texas
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7 Data)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	45,423	84.7%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	16,803	31.3%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	21,201	23.1%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	6,527	7.1%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	\$19,931	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$45,006	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of county population	13,039	14.3%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	2,803	12.0%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	688	9.7%	6970	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of the county population	630	0.6%	25,402	349,803
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of the county population	2,715	2.6%	99,495	1,394,384
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of county population	13,219	14.6%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of the county population	1,402	1.3%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, below age 19, of all children	5,193	17.8%	22.8%	24.6%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of county population	7,838	7.5%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, less than 65 years old, of all population	20,957	23.3%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births in this county	85	5.8%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of county population)*	119	0.06%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of county population)*	7	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.7	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	18,141	27.3%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	7004	7.3%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	1:33	(X)	1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	5,438	5.6%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	21,664	64.8%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	11,746	35.2%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	2,233	6.3%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	130	(X)	2,808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	53,942	70.2%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	3,379	4.4%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	28 min.	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	314	0.6%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	44	38.4	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	341	35.2	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	3329	344.4	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	55	5.6	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than 4, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) e
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. (2004).
- Envision Central Texas. 2005
- HIV Planning Council. (2005) Area Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment.
- Huston-Tillotson University. (2005). Focus Groups Analyses: Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health Course.
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) *LCRA Basic Data*.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1.

Lee County



Community Profile

Population 1990: 12,845 2000: 15,657 2010: 18,114

Area in square miles: 628.5

Most populous cities: Lexington, Giddings

County Specific Highlights

Lee County's per capita income and median household income were both significantly lower than those of the region, by over \$7,000 and \$12,000 respectively. Poverty rates for children under age 18 and for all individuals across age groups were both close to regional averages, and well below the state averages. Health insurance coverage rates resemble the regional rates for adults and for children. The county had a high home ownership rate, at 79.3% in contrast to the region's 58.3%. However, the rate of vacant housing units vastly exceeded the regional rate, at 17.3% vs. 4.9%.

In addition to what has been captured in the Lee County Issues/Priorities table, research also revealed the following information about the nature of certain issues in the county. CAPCOG noted that the effect of rising prices and stagnant income growth during the past year was most noticeable in areas with large percentages of residents on fixed incomes, such as retirees or welfare recipients. As one of the region's top four retirement areas—Llano, Fayette, Burnet, and Lee counties, Lee residents saw their real incomes decline by more than 1% on average in 2005 after several years of steady gains. (Capital Area Council of Governments, d)

Participants developing a plan for coordinating criminal justice and related activities noted, "The difficulty with communication in a rural community was identified as a gap in services. Information and resources, educating the public on victim concerns so that we have community awareness sensitive to the needs of victims is a necessity; a computerized tracking system linking criminal justice system and social service agencies, and training for personnel would greatly enhance victim services." (Capital Area Council of Governments, a)

Figure 29: Age Trends in Lee County

US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000





Figure 30: Median Household Income by Race in Lee County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000



54

Figure 31: Racial Makeup of Lee County in 1990

US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 32: Racial Makeup of Lee County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 16: Lee County Issues/Priorities

Issues Identified by Previous Research			
General Area	Issue	Lee	Notes
Education	Improve Vocational Programs (Tech & Agriculture, etc.)	X	A
Economy/Employment	Creating Jobs	X	K
	Poverty	X	K
	Educated Workforce	X	A
Health	Affordability	X	K
	More Quality Healthcare Professionals	X	A
	Access-General	X	K
	Access-Children	X	A
	Access-Adults	X	A
	Access-Elderly	X	A
	Expansion of Mental Health Services	X	K
Early Childhood	Affordable/Better Pre-School & Childcare	X	K
	Provide Childcare Classes for Parents	X	A
	Better Access to Healthcare	X	A
Youth	More After-School Programs	X	A
	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A, K
	Healthcare & Disease Prevention	X	A
	Detention	X	K
	Drug Abuse Prevention/Treatment	X	A
	Behavior Problems	X	K
	Job Training & Employment Opportunities	X	A, K
	Juvenile Crime/Graduation to Adult C.J. System	X	K
Adults	Maintaining Employment	X	A
	Better Access to Healthcare	X	A
Elderly	Better Access to Healthcare	X	A
	More Housing	X	A
Housing	Affordability	X	A
	Adequate Number	X	A
Transportation	Transportation	X	K
	Roads	X	A
	Mobility/Heavy Traffic	X	A
Public Safety	Substance Abuse	X	A, K
	Domestic Violence	X	K
	Sexual Assault	X	K
	Disaster Preparedness	X	A
	Child Abuse/Neglect	X	K
Environment	Water Quantity	X	A
	Water Quality	X	A
Community	Uncontrolled Growth	X	K
	Discrimination	X	K
	Immigration Concerns (i.e. language barriers)	X	A
	Volunteers	X	K
Basic Needs	Homelessness	X	K
Information & Coordination	Emergency Disaster Assistance	X	K
	Communication Among Agencies and Community Members	P	K
Other	Not Enough Funding	X	K

X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source;
Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum | E: Liveable City | I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds | N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan | F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005 | J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan | O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable | G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey | K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/ Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan | Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health |
| D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey | H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004 | L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan | R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups |
| | | M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan | S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco) |

Table 17: Lee County Indicators

	Lee County 2000		Region	Texas
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7 Data)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	7,033	71.7%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	1,282	13.1%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	2922	20.1%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	1080	7.4%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	\$17,163	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$36,280	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of county population	1,776	11.9%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	569	13.7%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	336	16.1%	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of the county population	63	0.4%	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of the county population	463	3.0%	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of county population	2,497	17.9%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of the county population	323	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under age 19, of all children	862	17%	22.8%	24.6%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of county population	1,422	9.1%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, less than 65 years old, of all population	2,895	21.6%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births in this county	10	4.5%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of county population)*	6	.03%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of county population)*	<4	.00%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.6	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	1739	30.6%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	388	6.8%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	0		1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	960	6.1%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	4,493	79.3%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	1,170	20.7%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	1,188	17.3%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	0	(X)	2,808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	7,510	61.7%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	193	1.6%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	30.0 min	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	2	0.0%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	3	13.0	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	32	20.6	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	202	130.5	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	5	3.2	3.5	3.7

- These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than 4, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) a.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) d.
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. (2004).
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) LCRA Basic Data.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1.

Llano County



Community Profile

Population 1990: 12,854 2000: 17,044 2010: 16,608

Area in square miles: 934.8

Most populous cities: Llano, Sunrise Beach

County Specific Highlights

Llano County's per capita income was approximately \$23,500, about \$1000 below the region, and the median household income was significantly lower, by \$14,000. The county poverty rates for all individuals under age 65 and for children were close to the regional rates. Over 14% of all residents under age 65, including children, had no health insurance. More than one out of four people of age five years and older was reported to have disability status. The county had a very high home ownership rate, at more than 80%, in contrast to the region's 58.3%. Vacant units accounted for one-third of the housing market.

In addition to what has been captured in the Llano County Issues/Priorities table, research also revealed the following information about the nature of certain issues in the county. The effect of rising prices and stagnant income growth during the past year was most noticeable in areas with large percentages of residents on fixed incomes, such as retirees or welfare recipients. As one of the region's top four retirement areas—Llano, Fayette, Burnet, and Lee counties, Llano residents saw their real incomes decline by more than 1% on average in 2005 after several years of steady gains. (Capital Area Council of Governments, d)

Figure 33: Age Trends in Llano County

US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000




Figure 34: Median Household Income by Race in Llano County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000




Figure 35: Racial Makeup of Llano County in 1990

US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 36: Racial Makeup of Llano County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 18: Llano County Issues/Priorities

Issues Identified by Prior Research			
General Area	Issue	Llano	Notes
Education	Quality & Equity	X	A
	Funding	X	A
	Affordability & Access	X	A
Economy/Employment	Creating Jobs with Benefits	X	A
	General Economic Development	X	A
	Attracting Industries	X	A
	Small Business Development	X	A
Health	Affordability	X	A
	More Quality Healthcare Professionals	X	A
	Disease Prevention/Care	X	A
	Access-Children	X	A
	Access-Adults	X	A
	Access-Elderly	X	A
	Insurance-Children	X	A
	Insurance-Adult	X	A
Youth	Insurance-Elderly	X	A
	More After-School Programs	P	O
	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A
	Community Service Opportunities	P	O
	Mental Health Issues/Suicide Prevention	P	O
	Increase Successful School Experiences	P	O
	Language Barriers	P	O
	Foster/Therapeutic Homes	P	O
	Legal Services	P	O
	Poor Parenting Skills Lead to Creation of Juvenile Delinquents	P	O
Juvenile Crime/Graduation to Adult Criminal Justice System	P	O	
Adults	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A
Housing	Affordability	X	A
	Adequate Number	X	A
Public Safety	Need for Specialized Equipment for Certain Situations	P	O
	Law Enforcement Training & Resources to Protect Vulnerable Populations (children, elderly, homeless, deaf, immigrants, etc.)	P	O
	Improve Technological Capacity of Law Enforcement	P	O
	Domestic Violence	P	O
	Domestic Violence Involving Weapons & Strangulations	P	O
	Sexual Assault	P	O
	Insufficient Prevention of and Support for Sexual Assault Victims	P	O
	Reducing Violent Crime	P	O
	Child Abuse/Neglect	P	O
Environment	Recycling/Waste Issues	X	A
	Creation of a Master Gardener Program	X	A
	Cedar & Mesquite Removal Education for Water Conservation	X	A
	Water Quantity	X	A
	Water Quality	X	A
Community	Unifying the Community	X	A
	Quality of Life	X	A

X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source; Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum | E: Liveable City | I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds | N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan | F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005 | J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan | O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan |
| C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable | G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey | K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/ Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan | Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health |
| D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey | H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004 | L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan | R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups |
| | | M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan | S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco) |

Table 19: Llano county Indicators

	Llano County 2000		Region	Texas
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7 Data)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	11,338	83.5%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	2,848	21.0%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	1,105	6.7%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	428	2.6%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	23,547	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$34,830	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of county population	1,733	10.3%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	459	17.2%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	299	6.0%	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of the county population	69	0.4%	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of the county population	388	2.3%	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of county population	4,349	26.9%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of the county population	380	2.2%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under age 19, of all children	443	14.8%	22.8%	24.6%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of county population	1,369	8.0%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, less than 65 years old, of population	1,715	14.5%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births in this county	9	6.6%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of county population)*	14	.08%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of county population)*	<4	.00%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.1	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	1091	13.8%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	299	3.8%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	0	(X)	1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	348	2.0%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	6,372	80.9%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	1,507	19.1%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	3,950	33.4%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	0	(X)	2,808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	6,758	44.8%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	197	1.3%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	27.8 min	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	0	0%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	0	0	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	14	10.15	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	336	243.6	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	7	5.0	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than 4, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) b. Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' FY 2005-6 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) d. 2005 State of the Region.
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) LCRA Basic Data.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1.

Travis County



Community Profile

Population 1990: 576,407 2000: 812,280 2010: 963,814

Area in square miles: 989.3

Three most populous cities: Austin, Pflugerville, Lakeway

County Specific Highlights

Income levels in Travis were very similar to the region, both for per capita income (\$25,883) and median household income (\$46,761). Poverty rates for children and for all persons under age 65 were similar to the regional rates. Just under 20% of the county's population younger than age 65, both children and adults had no health insurance. Travis admitted adults in substance abuse treatment programs funded by TCADA at double the regional rate.

Travis County had the largest share of foreign-born individuals in the ten-county area, with fifteen out of one hundred residents born outside of the United States. Unlike other counties, only a little over half (51.4%) of housing units were occupied by owners, with the other nearly half in rental units. Housing vacancy is at par with the region, at 4.5%, and only half of the state's rate. Compared to the region as a whole, Travis had a higher rate of violent crimes (36.6 per 10,000) and of property crimes, at 494 per 10,000. The county ranked second highest in forcible rape, at 4.7 compared to the regional rate of 3.5 per 10,000 people.

In addition to what have been captured in the County Issues and Priorities table, research also revealed a large amount of information through previous community and regional planning efforts. The body of available data for Travis County is substantial, particularly compared to some of the rural counties in the Capital Area region. The following presents just a few highlights from the wealth of information.

Growth and Quality of Life

The Liveable City Survey found very different ranking of priorities among Caucasians, African-Americans and Hispanics. (Liveable City Survey, 2002)

The African American share of the total population is in decline and is now less than 10% of the total county population. African Americans in Austin have one of the lowest poverty rates in the nation and, enjoy a higher average income than in most urban areas. However, they earn only about half of what their Anglo counterparts make. Attainment of higher education degrees and unemployment rates follow this trend. Austin has a low level of African American business ownership (2.5%) compared to other urban regions. On the other hand, African Americans in Travis County account for almost 32% of the County's inmate population, while the share of total county population for African Americans is only 9%. In 1970, eight out of ten Travis County African Americans lived within east Austin; thirty years later, three of ten do. (City of Austin, 2005)

Community Action Network (CAN) reported that the unemployment rate has been declining (Community Action Network, 2005 a). The Greater Austin Area Labor Market Indicator (LMI) Survey found that most employers surveyed had not laid off anyone in the last 12 months, and most anticipated hiring during the next 12 months. More than half expect to hire degreed professionals, semiskilled or skilled staff, and administrative/support staff. Many employers said that they require a high school diploma, even for unskilled jobs, and generally viewed entry-level applicants as lacking in basic and social skills, but rated the advanced skills of their new employees as "fair" or "good." (Skillpoint Alliance, 2005)

Figure 37: Age Trends in Travis County
US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000





Figure 38: Median Household Income by Race in Travis County, 2000
US Census Bureau 2000



69

Figure 39: Racial Makeup of Travis County in 1990
US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 40: Racial Makeup of Travis County, 2000
US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Basic Needs

CAN noted that the Red Cross had received more than 10,000 applications for Hurricane Katrina and Rita evacuee households in the Austin/Travis County area, and that more than 1274 apartment units in Austin/Travis County area were rented with the help of FEMA and Red Cross vouchers as of October 2005. (Community Action Network, 2005 a) The CAN Basic Needs Coalition described an increase in requests for assistance with basic needs, including a 60% increase between FY2003 and FY2004 in food and clothing distributed by the City of Austin Health and Human Services Department. The Housing Authority of the City of Austin (HACA) reported a 98% occupancy rate for public housing units and more than 4,000 people on a waiting list. There were more than 5,000 housing choice vouchers/Section 8 participants, with more than 3,500 people on the waiting list, which was then closed. (Community Action Network, 2005 b)

Children and Youth

The Community Action Network reported a steady decline in the number of accredited childcare facilities. The capacity of accredited childcare centers had steadily declined from approximately 9,200 slots in 2001 to approximately 6,400 in 2004 — a more than 30% drop in three years. Eighty-eight percent of families with children under the age of five indicated they needed full time care, at least part of the year. Sixty-three percent of childcare center directors, 60% of teachers and 71% of assistants did not have college-level training in early childhood education or child development. (Community Action Network, 2005, c) WorkSource reported a waiting list of more than 3,500 children for childcare support. (Community Action Network, 2005 a).

Youth focus group participants voiced needs and concerns about job training and placement, having safe places to hang out, help with financial aid for college, affordable health services, to have “the rules fairly enforced,” to have opportunities to engage in community service, and for Austin to be “more affordable to youth”. The youth also said that school **did not** help them find a job, that school counselors “are always too busy,” and that there was too much standardized testing. Some youth expressed not feeling safe in school. (Ready by 21 Coalition, 2004)

CAN process also revealed that in 2002-03, 33% of staff and 37% of students surveyed reported that student safety was the most serious problem on campus. (CAN, 2004b) A community planning process for criminal justice identified concerns that a large number of youth were at risk for entering and remaining in the juvenile justice. Planners noted that these young people were also using or abusing substances, and a disproportionate number of them had developmental and/or mental health challenges and disabilities. (Capital Area Council of Governments, f)

Elders

CAN also reported several issues as a result of the aging population. Census data from 2002 estimates that 6.1% of Travis County residents age 65 and older lived at or below the poverty threshold, and food stamp participation rates for individuals age 65+ in Travis County were increasing. Those in need of subsidized senior housing faced waiting lists from three to 24 months. (Community Action Network, 2003 a)

Health Care

CAN also reported that Austin Travis County MHMR Center's Behavioral Health Services had a waiting list of 585 adults needing mental health services as of September 24, 2005. Travis County was allocated 54 beds per day for indigent or uninsured individuals, down from 78 beds. The wait time for residential substance abuse services was five to six months for the adult population (both for the general population and the offender/probation population) and one to two months for outpatient services. Youth were waiting from two to three months for residential beds. (Community Action Network, 2005 a)

Focus groups conducted by Huston-Tillotson University expressed concerns about access to health care, and individuals not seeking diagnosis or treatment for fear of finding out bad news or that they would need costly care. They recommended that the mobile vans be more available, particularly in East Austin, and that health information be presented with colorful fliers, in Spanish as well as English, and “sent home with kids.” (Huston-Tillotson University, 2005)

Table 20: Travis County Issues/Priorities

Issues Identified by Prior Research			
General Area	Issue	Travis	Notes
Education	Quality & Equity	P	A, D, E, G
	Improve Vocational Programs (Tech & Agriculture, etc.)	X	I
	Encourage High Standards/Student Achievement	X	I
	Higher Education	X	H
	Funding	X	A, I
	Affordability & Access	X	A
Economy/Employment	Creating Jobs with Benefits	X	A, G, H
	General Economic Development	P	D, E
	Management of Personal Finances	X	A, I
	Improve Labor/Management Relations	X	I
	Provide Transportation for Employees	X	I
	Fair Pay	X	A, I
Health	Affordability	X	A
	Healthcare Resources Inadequate, Low Quality, and/or Unfriendly	X	Q
	Disease Prevention/Care	X	A, I, Q
	Access-Children	X	G, I
	Access-Adults	X	G, I
	Access-Elderly	X	G, I
	Medicaid/care & MAP prohibitive due to red tape	X	Q
	Fearful of Releasing Personal Information to Obtain MAP card, etc.	X	Q
	Insurance-Children	X	G, H, I
	Insurance-Adult	X	G, H, I
	Insurance-Elderly	X	G, H, I
	Lack of Understanding about treatment, healthcare benefits, & advocacy orgs	X	Q
	Promotion of Healthy Lifestyle (fitness, nutrition)	X	I
	Expansion of Mental Health Services	X	I
	Denial of Potential Health Complications (Skeptical of Statistics)	X	Q
	Fear of Outcome	X	Q
	Fearful of Treatment Options, Skeptical of Success	X	Q
	Fearful of Voicing Concerns because of Potential Retaliation	X	Q
	More Public Health Info (Pamphlets sent home with kids, free screenings)	X	Q
	Suspicious of Available Public Health Info	X	Q
More Mobile Health Vans, Free Medication	X	Q	
Bilingualism in Healthcare	X	Q	
Early Childhood	Affordable/Better Pre-School & Childcare	X	H, I
	Encourage recruitment, development, & retention of quality child care providers	X	I
	Increase Childcare Funding	X	I
	Better Access to Healthcare	X	G, H, I
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	G, H, I
Youth	More After-School Programs	X	A
	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A
	Healthcare & Disease Prevention	X	A, G, H, I
	Drug Abuse Prevention/Treatment	P	M
	Increase Success	X	I
	Teen Pregnancy	X	I
	Job Training & Employment Opportunities	X	A
	Juvenile Crime/Graduation to Adult Criminal Justice System	P	M
	Prevalence & Development of Mental Health Issues while in Juvenile Justice System	P	M
	Exposure to or experiencing violence could lead to substance abuse, or adoption of violent behavior	P	M

Issues Identified by Prior Research			
General Area	Issue	Travis	Notes
Adults	Recreation/Entertainment	X	D
	Better Access to Healthcare	P	G, H, I
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	G, H, I
Elderly	Better Access to Healthcare	X	H, I
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	H, I
Housing	Affordability	P	A, E, F, I
	Adequate Number	X	I
	Safety	P	A, D, E
Transportation	Public Transport	X	A
	Roads	X	A, G
	Mobility/Heavy Traffic	X	A, G, H
	Air Traffic	X	A
Public Safety	Community/Law Enforcement Relations	X	A
	Law Enforcement Training & Resources to Protect Vulnerable Populations (children, elderly, homeless, deaf, immigrants, etc.)	P	M
	Lower Recidivism Rates/Ease Transition from Incarceration to Society	P	C, M
	Substance Abuse Services for Inmates	P	M
	Mental Health Services for Inmates	P	M
	Current, Cohesive, & Compassionate Victim Support Services during all C.J. phases	P	M
	Legal & Support Services for Victims to Ensure Safety, Stability, & Recovery	P	M
	Domestic Violence	P	M
	Understanding Causes & Prevalence of Violent Crime/Victimization	P	M
	Reducing Crime	P	A, E
	Increasing number of women arrested, incarcerated, & released	P	M
Insufficient immediate & short-term crisis services	P	M	
Child Abuse/Neglect	X	A	
Government	Diversity in Elected Leadership	X	H
Environment	Preservation/Protection of Resources	P	A, E
	Rural Land	X	H
	Recycling/Waste Issues	P	E
	Water Quantity	X	A
	Water Quality	P	A, E
	Air Quality	P	E
Community	Controlling Urban Sprawl/Population Expansion	X	A
	Understanding & Promoting Diversity	X	D
	Civic Participation	X	H
	Cost of Living Too High	X	H
	Unifying the Community	X	D
Basic Needs	Food	X	A, F
	Utility Assistance	X	F
	Increase Funding for Basic Needs Service Providers	X	J
	Clothing	X	
Information & Coordination	Efficiency/Effectiveness/Coordination of Service Organizations	X	J

X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source;

Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources

A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum

B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan

C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable

D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey

E: Liveable City

F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005

G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey

H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004

I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds

J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan

K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/ Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan

L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan

M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan

N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan

O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan

Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health

R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups

S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco)

Table 21: Travis County Indicators

	Travis County 2000		Region	Texas
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7 Data)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	424,575	84.7%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	203,666	40.6%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	216,164	28.7%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	94350	12.5%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	\$25,883	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$46,761	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of county population	99,388	12.5%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	26,071	13.9%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	3989	7.6%	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of the county population	7,450	0.9%	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of the county population	27,213	3.4%	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of county population	111,514	14.9%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of the county population	8368	1.0%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under age 19, of all children	42,898	19.3%	22.8%	24.6%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of county population	65,306	8.0%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, less than 65 years old, of population	147,461	19.5%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births in this county	655	4.5%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of county population)*	1973	.09%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of county population)*	299	.03%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.5	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	70293	21.9%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	25809	8.0%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	1:15	(X)	1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	122,621	15.1%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	164,975	51.4%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	155,791	48.6%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	15,115	4.5%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	2,180	(X)	2808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	460,525	69.1%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	18834	2.9%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	23.6 min	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation to work	15880	3.7%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests per 10,000 children	156	19.5	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	2817	36.6	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	38,009	494.5	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people	366	4.7	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than 4, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources


Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
<http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?lang=en>

Issues Sources

- Austin Equity Commission. (2001)
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) d. (2005). Capital Area Council of Governments 2005 State of the Region.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) f. Travis County FY 2005 – 6 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities.
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. (2004).
- City of Austin. (2005). African American Quality of Life in Austin, Texas: A Narrative Discussion of Background Issues and Data Trends.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2003) a. Frequently Asked Questions about the Aging and Elderly Population
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2004) a. Frequently Asked Questions about Alcohol and Drug Abuse.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2004) b. Frequently Asked Questions about Public Safety.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2005) a. Community Overview
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2005) b. Facts and Questions about Basic Needs-Food, Clothing, Rent and Utilities.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2005) c. Frequently Asked Questions about Early Care and Education: Child Care.
- Community Action Network (CAN). Urgent Issues Action Plan.
- Envision Central Texas. (2005). Envision Central Texas Project. Austin.
- HIV Planning Council. (2005). Austin Area Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment.
- Huston-Tillotson University. (2005). Focus Groups Analyses: Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health Course.
- Indigent Care Collaboration. (2003) Recent Trends in the Use of and Capacity for Primary Health Care Services Among Travis County Safety Net Providers.
- Liveable City. (2002). Liveable City Survey Results.
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) LCRA Basic Data.
- Ready by 21 Coalition. (2004)
- Skillpoint Alliance. (2005)
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1.

Williamson County



Community Profile

Population 1990: 139,551 2000: 249,967 2010: 344,892

Area in square miles: 1122.8

Three most populous cities: Round Rock, Cedar Park, Georgetown

County Specific Highlights

Williamson County's median household income was the highest among the ten counties, about \$11,000 higher than the region's (\$60,642). The county per capita income was almost identical to the region's average. The poverty rate for all individuals was 4.7%, the lowest among ten counties and less than half of the rate for the region as a whole, and the child poverty rate was just over one third of the rate for the region. However, higher income level and lower poverty rates do not correspond with higher health insurance. The county still had over 17% of all children under age 19 and 19% of all people under age 65 without health insurance. Home ownership was high, above seventy percent.

In addition to what has been captured in the Williamson County Issues and Priorities table, research also revealed the following information about the nature of certain issues in the county.

The number of calls reported to the Healthcare Helpline increased 30% from 2001 to 2003. As of August 2004, staff fielded 12,317 calls to the Helpline, an average of 76.1 phone calls per day. In 2004, 1,074 individuals enrolled in the primary care health care program, 1,114 enrolled in the indigent care health care program, 2,274 applied for pharmaceutical assistance and 8,620 children applied for CHIP. A survey also revealed disparities in health status and services between the east and the west parts of the county. (Williamson County & Cities Health District, c, 2004)

Focus groups on racial disparities in health care revealed that residents believed that health care accessibility was a problem, in part related to lack of public transportation in Williamson County. (Huston-Tillotson University, 2005)

Community planners developing a coordinated plan for criminal justice and related activities identified a number of needs and concerns, including waiting lists (of up to two years) for public housing, limited emergency housing within Round Rock, and an expectation that federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding cuts will continue. The plan noted that victims of domestic abuse are more likely to return to their abuser or to not leave at all if there is a lack of housing resources. (Capital Area Council of Governments, g)

Figure 41: Age Trends in Williamson County

US Census Bureau 1990 & 2000




Figure 42: Median Household Income by Race in Williamson County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000




Figure 43: Racial Makeup of Williamson County in 1990

US Census Bureau 1990





Figure 44: Racial Makeup of Williamson County, 2000

US Census Bureau 2000



AIAN=American Indian and Alaskan Native

Table 22: Williamson County Issues/Priorities

Issues Identified by Previous Research			
General Area	Issue	Williamson	Notes
Education	Quality & Equity	X	G
	Improve Vocational Programs (Tech & Agriculture, etc.)	X	A
	Higher Education	X	H
Economy/ Employment	Creating Jobs w/benefits	X	A, G, H
	Management of Personal Finances	X	A
	Educated Workforce	X	A
Health	Affordability	X	Q
	Healthcare Resources Inadequate, Low Quality, and/or Unfriendly	X	Q
	Disease Prevention/Care	X	Q
	Access-General	X	Q
	Access-Children	X	G
	Access-Adults	X	G
	Access-Elderly	X	A, G
	Transportation to Healthcare Center	X	Q
	Insurance-Children	X	G,H
	Insurance-Adult	X	G,H
	Insurance-Elderly	X	A,G,H
	Eldercare - More/Better	X	A
	Lack of Substance Abuse Treatment Facility	P	B, Q
	Lack of understanding about treatment, healthcare benefits, & advocacy orgs	X	Q
	Expansion of Mental Health Services	P	B, Q
	Stigmatization of Physical or Mental Illness (ex: HIV)	X	Q
	Family Support Services for the Infirm	X	A
	Denial of Potential Health Complications (Skeptical of Statistics)	X	Q
	Fear of Outcome	X	Q
	Self Medication/Home Remedies	X	Q
More Public Health Info (Pamphlets sent home with kids, free screenings)	X	Q	
More Mobile Health Vans, Free Medication	X	Q	
Stress Related to Balancing Illness w/ Basic Needs	X	Q	
Early Childhood	Affordable/Better Pre-School & Childcare	X	A, H
	Provide Childcare Classes for Parents	X	B
	Better Access to Healthcare	X	G,H
	More Affordable Healthcare	P	G,H

Issues Identified by Previous Research			
General Area	Issue	Williamson	Notes
Youth	More After-School Programs	X	A,B
	Recreation/Entertainment	X	A,B
	Healthcare & Disease Prevention	X	G,H
	Drug Abuse Prevention/Treatment	P	B
	Gang Prevention	P	B
Adults	Better Access to Healthcare	P	G
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	G, H
Elderly	Better Access to Healthcare	X	H
	More Affordable Healthcare	X	H
Housing	Affordability	P	B
	Adequate Number	P	B
	Safety	X	B
Transportation	Roads	X	A, G
	Mobility/Heavy Traffic	X	A,G,H
Public Safety	Prevention of ID theft & Technology Related Crimes	X	B
	Improve Technological Capacity of Law Enforcement	P	B
	Substance Abuse	X	B
	Reduce Number of Criminal Cases involving mentally/physically ill	X	B
	Rehab/Counseling for Domestic Violence Offenders	X	B
	Improve Domestic Violence Victim Support Services/Legal Aid	P	B
Government	Diversity in Elected Leadership	X	H
	More Efficient Use of Funds	X	A
Agriculture	Use of Mass Media to Promote Agricultural Awareness	X	A
	Educational Opportunities to improve Production	X	A
	Technical Assistance for Farmers	X	A
Environment	Rural Land	X	H
	Water Quantity	X	A
	Water Quality	X	A
Community	Controlling Urban Sprawl/Population Expansion	X	B
	Civic Participation	X	H
	Cost of Living Too High	X	H
Information & Coordination	Updated Technology to Improve Communication (i.e. radio)	P	B

X: Denotes Issue Identified; P: Denotes Priority Issue as defined by source;
Corresponding Bold Lettering Indicates Identifying Sources

A: Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum

B: CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan

C: Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable

D: City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey

E: Liveable City

F: Community Action Network Basic Needs FAQ 2005

G: Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey

H: Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004

I: Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds

J: Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan

K: CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/ Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan

L: CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan

M: CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan

N: CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan

O: CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan

Q: Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health

R: Ready by 21 Coalition Youth Focus Groups

S: Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco)

Table 23: Williamson County Indicators

	Williamson County 2000		Region	Texas
	#	%	(SMA or Region 7 Data)	
Education & Literacy				
High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old	138,201	88.8%	84.8%	75.70%
Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old	52,309	33.6%	36.7%	23.2%
Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old	39,404	17.2%	25.8%	31.2%
Individuals who speak English less than "very well", 5+ years old	13,312	5.8%	10.5%	13.9%
Economic Security				
Per Capita Income	\$24,547	(X)	\$24,516	\$19,617
Median Household Income	\$60,642	(X)	\$48,950	\$39,927
Individuals below poverty level, of county population	11,735	4.8%	11.1%	15.4%
Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children	3,973	5.4%	14.9%	20.2%
Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty	980	8.4%	11.0%	12.8%
Average monthly TANF recipients, of the county population	892	0.4%	1.1%	1.7%
Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of the county population	3,931	1.6%	4.4%	6.7%
Health and Nutrition				
Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of county population	29,818	13.3%	18.1%	19.2%
Children in CHIP (2001), of the county population	3064	1.1%	1.6%	1.8%
Children without health insurance, under age 19, of all children	14,216	17.5%	22.8%	24.6%
Persons eligible for Medicaid, of county population	11,742	4.7%	9.4%	12.9%
Persons without health insurance, less than 65 years old, of population	43,926	19.0%	24.2%	25.5%
Births to adolescent mothers (under age 18), of all live births in this county	114	2.6%	4.8%	5.7%
Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs (of county population)*	123	0.02%	0.04%	0.15%
Substance abuse treatment clients - youth annual admissions (of county population)*	5	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%
Household/Families				
Average household size	2.8	(x)	2.6	2.7
Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old	31829	36.6%	25.40%	28.00%
Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18	6763	7.8%	8.0%	9.5%
Early Childhood Development				
Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in unaccredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs in the county)	1:51	(X)	1:42	1:39
Immigration				
Foreign born population	18,449	7.4%	12.2%	13.9%
Housing				
Owner occupied housing units	64,380	74.2%	58.3%	63.8%
Renter occupied housing units	22,386	25.8%	31.6%	36.2%
Vacant housing units	3,559	3.9%	4.9%	9.4%
Individuals receiving Section 8 housing assistance	320	(x)	2,808	53,992
Workforce				
Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old	129,192	70.8%	60.7%	63.6%
Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old	3703	2.0%	4.0%	3.8%
Transportation				
Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old	28.0 min	(X)	28.9 min	25.4 min
Individuals who use public transportation (self-reporting for Census 2000)	420	0.3%	2.6%	1.9%
Public Safety				
	Based on RMC calculation			
Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests (per 10,000 children)	83	25.7	15.5	20.8
Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people No Precincts Reporting	N/A	N/A	21.1	54.5
Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people *No Precincts Reporting	N/A	N/A	229.1	495.2
Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report per 10,000 people *No Precincts Reporting	N/A	N/A	3.5	3.7

* These numbers may be slight underestimates. If the number of admissions for any of six substances was less than 4, the data was removed. Thus, the maximum possible number undercounted would be 18.

Data Sources

Statistical Data Sources

- Texas Dept. of State Health Services-Texas Health Facts (2000-1).
<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>
- KnowledgePlex 2005. Data Place. <http://www.dataplace.org/>
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Early Childhood Atlas (2004-5).
<http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool-statusreport>
- U.S. Census Bureau. Decennial Census (1990 and 2000)
http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

Issues Sources

- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) d. (2005). Capital Area Council of Governments 2005 State of the Region
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) g. Williamson County FY 2005 – 6 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities.
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators. (2004) Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Annual Report.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2005) a. Community Overview.
- Envision Central Texas. (2005). Envision Central Texas Project
- HIV Planning Council. (2005) Area Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment.
- Huston-Tillotson University. (2005). Focus Groups Analyses: Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health Course.
- Indigent Care Collaboration. (2003) Recent Trends in the Use of and Capacity for Primary Health Care Services Among Travis County Safety Net Providers
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005) LCRA Basic Data.
- Texas Cooperative Extension. (2004; 2004-2005). Futures Forum Prioritization of Needs by County.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004) Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1.
- Williamson County & Cities Health District (WCCHD) a. (2004). Annual Report.
- Williamson County & Cities Health District (WCCHD) b. (2004). Community Snapshot for the Taylor Area.
- Williamson County & Cities Health District (WCCHD) c. (2004). 2004 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Report Williamson County.

Next Steps for the Community Agenda Project: Phase II

This Phase I report provides key summary data and analysis of community conditions for each of the ten counties, and for the Capital Area as a region. Pointing to health and human services conditions, the data in this report indicate the economic well-being of the community, which help in identifying the gaps in critical services.

The Phase I reported also provided an initial list of issues and priorities that the Ray Marshall Center research team has identified from community surveys and community planning documents, some of which were specific to one town or county. Some of the issues and priorities were regional in nature.

Through this process of research and analysis, the researchers discovered that many of the issues documents do not indicate whether stakeholders identified any of the issues as priorities for future action, and if and how the lists were used after the issues were identified. Thus, a key difference in the Community Agenda Project process will be asking stakeholders to prioritize the key issues, to explore root causes or “drivers” behind the issues, and then to identify important strategies or opportunities to address the issues or their underlying causes.

Phase II of the project seeks to explore and understand community perspectives regarding health and human services. The Ray Marshall Center researchers will have conversations with community leaders and key community “connectors,” including elected officials, health and human services agency representatives, ministerial leaders, and corporate and civic leaders, among others. Where possible, RMC researchers will observe or participate in existing meetings where key issues and priorities are discussed.

Researchers will also conduct focus groups with health and human service providers, clients, and general community members. In some instances, community members will be specifically invited to represent key constituencies in the general population of that county. Similarly, since some health and human services clients will not be in a good position to represent themselves in focus groups. Service providers and others who work with these individuals will be invited to offer perspectives that would otherwise not be represented.

Phase II will also include the administration of online surveys geared to service providers and general community members who will not participate in a focus group, but who would like to provide their input on the project. The surveys will be developed and posted after the first rounds of focus groups, so that some standardized answer choices can be developed to facilitate a higher survey completion rate.

Each of the focus groups, conversations, and surveys will seek input from stakeholders on:

The way stakeholders define their own communities (whether they view their community as their neighborhood, their town, their county, the region, the community surrounding their place of worship or children’s school, or a community they associate with their race, ethnicity, or an activity);

Their vision for that community, or how they would like it to be;

What issues they believe are “in the way” of realizing this vision for their community;

The issues that they think are the highest priority;

Their thoughts on the possible root causes, or “drivers” behind the problem or issue;

Their ideas for possible solutions or approaches for addressing these root causes; and

Their perspectives on the highest priorities for initial action, based on the highest priority issues and the responses that would leverage results.

As issues and priorities are identified through Phase II, the researchers will be adding available statistical data items related to these issues for the final report, so that United Way Capital Area staff, volunteers, and partners will be able to compare data on community conditions to the issues and priorities that loom largest in the perspectives of the stakeholders.

As the project enters Phase II, the Ray Marshall Center researchers look forward to working with United Way Capital Area to identify and prioritize the key issues and courses of action and to expand the partnerships to address them.

Bibliography

- (2005). *Strategic Spartanburg: Community Indicators VI*. Retrieved 1/09/06.
- (2005). *Community Indicators of Colorado*. web.uccs.edu/ccps/comminicatorpage.htm.
- Austin Equity Commission. (2001). *Improving the Odds: Increasing Opportunities in Austin*. Austin. Retrieved 2/10/06, from <http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/health/downloads/Austin%20Equity%20Commission%20Final%20Report%208.23.01.pdf>.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) a. *Bastrop, Fayette, and Lee Counties' 2002-2003 Community Plan*.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) b. *Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' FY 2005-6 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities*.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) c. *Caldwell County Community 2003 Plan For Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities*.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) d. (2005). *Capital Area Council of Governments 2005 State of the Region*. Retrieved from <http://www.capcog.org/news/templates/newstemplate.asp?articleid=119&zoneid=1>.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) e. *Hays County FY 2005-6 Community Plan for Coordination of Victims Services, Criminal Justice and Related Activities*.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) f. *Travis County FY 2005 – 6 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities*.
- Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) g. *Williamson County FY 2005 – 6 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities*.
- Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project. (2004). *Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Annual Report*. Austin. Retrieved 12/19/05, from http://www.centex-indicators.org/annual_rept/ar2004.pdf.
- City of Austin. (2005). *African American Quality of Life in Austin, Texas: A Narrative Discussion of Background Issues and Data Trends*. Austin. Retrieved 12/19/05, from <http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/aascorecard/downloads/aareport.pdf>.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2005). *Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable*. Austin. Retrieved 1/04/05, from http://caction.org/IssueAreas/PublicSafety/ReEntryRoundTable/June_2005.pdf
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2003) a. *Frequently Asked Questions about the Aging and Elderly Population*. Austin. Retrieved 01/04/05, from <http://www.caction.org/IssueAreas/faqs/OlderAdults.pdf>.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2003) b. *Victims Services Assessment Survey*. Austin. Retrieved 2/10/06, from <http://www.caction.org/IssueAreas/Victims/VictimsAssmt/TOC.htm>.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2004) a. *Frequently Asked Questions about Alcohol and Drug Abuse*. Austin. Retrieved 1/05/06, from <http://www.caction.org/IssueAreas/faqs/SubstanceAbuseDec2004.pdf>.

- Community Action Network (CAN). (2004) b. *Frequently Asked Questions about Public Safety*. Austin. Retrieved 1/04/05, from http://www.caction.org/IssueAreas/faqs/PublicSafety_Aug2004.htm.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2005) a. *Community Overview November 2005*. Austin. Retrieved 01/03/06, from http://www.caction.org/community_conditions/November2005/nov_2005.htm.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2005) b. *Facts and Questions about Basic Needs- Food, Clothing, Rent and Utilities*. Austin. Retrieved 1/04/06, from http://www.caction.org/IssueAreas/faqs/BasicNeeds_2005.htm.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (2005) c. *Frequently Asked Questions about Early Care and Education: Child Care*. Austin. Retrieved 1/05/06, from http://www.caction.org/IssueAreas/faqs/EEC_Sept2005.pdf.
- Community Action Network (CAN). (undated) *Urgent Issues Action Plan – Summary of Issues*. Retrieved 1/04/06, from <http://www.caction.org/IssueAreas/UrgentIssues/Summation.htm>
- Envision Central Texas. (2005). *Envision Central Texas Project*. Austin. Retrieved 2/1/06, from <http://www.envisioncentraltexas.org/>
- HIV Planning Council. (2005). *Austin Area Comprehensive HIV Needs Assessment*. Austin. Retrieved 12/21/05, from <http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/hivcouncil/downloads/NeedsAssessment2005.pdf>.
- Huston-Tillotson University. (2005). *Focus Groups Analyses: Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health Course*. Not published. Retrieved 1/29/06.
- Indigent Care Collaboration. (2003). *Recent Trends in the Use of and Capacity for Primary Health Care Services among Travis County Safety Net Providers*. Retrieved 12/22/05, from <http://www.icc-centex.org/library/reports/2002UseCapacityReport.pdf>.
- KnowledgePlex. (2005). *Data Place*. Retrieved 1/22/06, from <http://dataplace.org>
- Last Acts. (2002). *Means to a Better End: A report on dying in America today*. Retrieved 12/22/05, from <http://www.rwjf.org/files/publications/other/meansbetterend.pdf>.
- Liveable City. (2002). *Liveable City Survey Results*. Austin, Texas. Retrieved 1/05/06, from <http://www.liveablecity.org/surveyresults.php>.
- Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005). *LCRA Basic Data*. Retrieved 1/28/06.
- National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. (2004-5). *Early Childhood Atlas*. Retrieved 1/22/06, from <http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1.AOI/countylist.asp?tool=statusreport>
- Pedernales Electric Cooperative and Lower Colorado River Authority. (2005). *Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan* Retrieved 2/13/06, from <http://masterplan.blancoguide.com/cmp/index.php>.
- Ready by 21 Coalition. (2004). *Input from Youth Focus Groups*. Retrieved 2/1/06, from www.readyby21austin.org/yv-youthsaid.php.
- Real Estate Council of Austin, Inc. Envision Central Texas. http://www.recanoline.com/topics_frame.html

- Skillpoint Alliance. (2005). *Greater Austin Area Labor Market Indicator (LMI) Survey 2005: Summary Report*. Austin. Retrieved 12/22/05, from <http://www.caction.org/reports/LMISurveyReport.pdf>.
- Surgeon General's Office. *Oral Health in America: Surgeon General's Report*. Washington D.C. Retrieved 2/10/06, from <http://www2.nidcr.nih.gov/sgr/sgrweb/execsum.htm>.
- Texas Cooperative Extension; The Texas A&M University System. (2004). *2004 Texas Community Futures Forum Priority Issues and Needs*. Retrieved from TCCF County Issues link on <http://futuresforum.tamu.edu/>
- Texas Department of State Health Services. (2000-1). *Texas Health Facts*. Retrieved 1/04/06, from <http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>.
- Texas Department of Public Safety. (2000). *2000 Crime in Texas: The Texas Crime Report*. Retrieved 2/2/06, from http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/director_staff/public_information/ucr2000.pdf.
- Texas Department of State Health Services. (April 2001). *Search for Statistical Information for Central Texas 2000: Region 7*. Retrieved 2/2/06, from <http://www.tcada.state.tx.us/research/statistics/region7.shtml>.
- United Way Capital Area. (2004). *Community Needs and Trends Report: South Central Texas 2-1-1*. Retrieved 1/09/06.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (1990). *Decennial Census*. Retrieved 1/12/06, from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *Decennial Census*. Retrieved 1/22/06, from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.
- Williamson County & Cities Health District (WCCHD) a. (2004). *Annual Report*. Retrieved 12/22/05, from <http://www.publichealthwilliamson.org/Docs/2004.pdf>.
- Williamson County & Cities Health District (WCCHD) b. (2004). *Community Snapshot for the Taylor Area*. Taylor. Retrieved 12/22/05, from <http://www.publichealthwilliamson.org/TySnap/Docs/TaylorII.pdf>.
- Williamson County & Cities Health District (WCCHD) c. (2004). *2004 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Report Williamson County*. Retrieved 12/19/05, from <http://www.publichealthwilliamson.org/BRFSS.htm>.

Appendix A:

List of Acronyms

CAN	Community Action Network
CAP	Community Agenda Project
CAPCOG	Capital Area Council of Governments
CHIP	Children's Health Insurance Program
CIC	Community Investment Cabinet
CTSIP	Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FY	Fiscal Year
GED	General Educational Development
HACA	Housing Authority of the City of Austin
HUD	Housing and Urban Development
ICC	Indigent Care Collaboration
ISD	Independent School District
LCRA	Lower Colorado River Authority
LMI	Labor Market Indicator
MHMR	Mental Health Mental Retardation Center
NAEYC	National Association for the Education of Young People
RMC	Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, University of Texas at Austin
SMA	Standard Metropolitan Area
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
TCADA	Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse
TDHS	Texas Department of Human Services
UCR	Uniform Crime Report
UWCA	United Way Capital Area
WCCHD	Williamson County & Cities Health District

Appendix B:

Description of Sources Identifying Issues & Priorities

Note: This list is presented in a non-standard order, as they were identified and received for review to generate an issues and priority issues list for each county, which was prepared on an ongoing basis. Any new documents or issues lists are simply appended to the end of the working list of sources identifying issues and priorities in the counties or the region.

A. Texas Cooperative Extension: Futures Forum

The Texas Community Futures Forum is a planning process facilitated by the Texas Cooperative Extension, bringing together partners in county government, state agencies, organizations, businesses, and other groups. It utilized a modified Nominal Group Technique to solicit issues from participants. Each county in the state held a one-day county forum between mid-January and the end of March.

B. CAPCOG: Williamson County 2005-2006 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities

This Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) document monitors trends and social service needs, and provides lists of priorities seeking solutions. Participating community representatives were: Round Rock Police Department, Georgetown ISD, Williamson County Sheriff's Office, Life Steps, United Way of Greater Williamson County, Round Rock Chamber of Commerce, Williamson County Crisis Center, City of Taylor, Williamson County and Cities Health District, Williamson County Workforce Center, Bluebonnet Trails, Taylor ISD, Williamson County Head Start.

C. Community Action Network: *Frequently Asked Questions about the Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable*

In 2004, the Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable kicked off a year-long project to develop a common vision for offender reentry into our community. The group's mission is to implement collaborative community-wide strategies for the effective reintegration of offenders, thereby reducing recidivism, supporting victims and promoting public safety in Texas.

D. City of Austin: African American Quality of Life Survey

The City of Austin convened a task force to study and make recommendations on this topic after a highly charged incident involving an African-American owned business and the Austin Police Department. The task force considered current data, research on best practices, and community perspectives in developing reports with recommendations on the quality of education for African American students in AISD.

E. Liveable City

The survey consisted of 428 door-to-door interviews in the City of Austin, and was conducted between June 3 and June 13, 2002. All respondents were shown a deck of 17 cards, each representing a quality of life issue. They were then asked to choose their five top priorities and five top problems from the deck. Survey respondents closely mirror U.S. Census data from 2000 and represent the entire City of Austin.

F. Community Action Network: Basic Needs FAQ 2005

The Basic Needs Coalition (www.basicneeds-ctx.org) is a grass-roots collaboration of 19 human service providers who seek to address core challenges for families as they move toward self-sufficiency. The BNC produced this document of frequently asked questions (FAQ) on behalf of the Community Action Network.

G. Envision Central Texas Regional Growth Survey

The survey asked citizens what life could look like with twice as many people living in Central Texas. ECT distributed more than 600,000 surveys beginning Oct. 6, 2003. The survey will be used to create a consensus vision for the region's future.

H. Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project 2004

The Sustainability Indicators Project was intended to increase regional awareness and commitment to sustainable community development. The Sustainability Indicators Project was facilitated by a diverse group of residents committed to the sustainability of the Austin Region (defined here as Hays, Travis, and Williamson Counties). The objective was to develop a limited number of indicators that reflect the values of the regional community.

I. Austin Equity Commission: Improving the Odds

The Austin Equity Commission (AEC) was created by the Austin City Council and appointed by Mayor Kirk Watson in May 2000. The Commission's mandate was to "build consensus around a strategic vision for long-range economic prosperity and social equity for all." To carry out this mandate, Commission members, who represented a broad cross section of the Austin community, examined seven highly interrelated subjects in depth: wages, education, workforce development, affordable housing, early education and care, community health, and transportation. They produced the report, *Improving the Odds: Increasing Opportunity in Austin*.

J. Community Action Network: Urgent Issues Action Plan

The Community Action Network's Urgent Issues Action Plans are provided to the community to assist in: 1) identifying urgent issues that need immediate attention, 2) investing resources where appropriate, and 3) collaborating for greater impact. This document suggests a community investment approach that deals directly with the needs of people in our community. It is not a comprehensive plan to address all of the community's social challenges faced by members of our community, but rather a description of some of the most urgent ones facing people in Travis County.

K. CAPCOG: Bastrop/Fayette/Lee County 2002-2003 Community Plan

This Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) document monitors trends and social service needs, and provides lists of priorities seeking solutions. The Community Planning meeting was held August 28, 2002 to review and revise the current Community Plan. Because of the regional aspects of many of the participants, Lee, and Fayette are also covered in the Bastrop County Plan.

L. CAPCOG: Caldwell County 2003 Community Plan For Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities

This Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) document is a summary of the activities and concerns expressed jointly by representatives of public and private agencies and serves as a modification of the plan submitted in December of 2000. The objective of this plan was to promote a more coordinated approach in addressing the problems of crime in Caldwell County. Participating community representatives were: Lockhart Community Recreation Center, Luling, Hays-Caldwell Women's Center, CASA of Central Texas, Inc., Juvenile Probation, Caldwell Co. Sheriff,

Kraftz-4-Kidsz, Connections, Caldwell, Connections, Lockhart, Texas Rural Legal Aid, Caldwell County Pop Warner Football, and the Martindale Police Department.

M. CAPCOG: Travis County 2005-2006 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities

This Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) document monitors trends and social service needs, and provides lists of priorities seeking solutions. Participating community representatives were: Any Baby Can, Austin Independent School District, LifeWorks, Pflugerville Police Department, Travis County Health and Human Services, Travis County Sheriff's Office, Travis County Criminal Justice Planning, CASA of Travis County, Travis County CSCD, Travis County Drug Court, City of Austin Health and Human Services, Travis County District Attorney's Office, Community Action Network, Capital Area Council of Governments, Travis County Underage Drinking Program, Austin Outreach, ARC of the Capital Area, Center for Child Protection, Travis County Juvenile Probation Department, WorkSource, Austin Police Department, Travis County Domestic Relations Office, Constable Precinct 5, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), Caring Family Network, Mind the Gap 4-Kids, and River City Youth.

N. CAPCOG: Hays County 2005-2006 Community Plan for Coordination of Victims Services, Criminal Justice and Related Activities

This Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) document monitors trends and social service needs, and provides lists of priorities seeking solutions. Participating community representatives were: Hays, Caldwell, Blanco Counties Community Action, Inc., Roxanne's House Children's Advocacy Center, Central Texas Medical Center, Hays-Caldwell Women's Center Family Violence Outreach Program, Hill Country MHMR, Hays-Caldwell Women's Center Sexual Assault and Abuse Program, Hays County Workforce Development Board, Hays County, PAPA, San Marcos Police Department, Texas Rural Legal Aid, Hays County Sheriff's Office, Greater San Marcos Youth Council, Hays County Criminal District Attorney's Office Criminal Investigations, Central Texas Casa, Hays County Grant Division, Casa Esperanza, Hays County Criminal District Attorney's Office Victim Assistance Team, Hays Caldwell Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Hays County Adult Probation Community Supervision and Restitution, Texas Department of Family and Protective Services Child Protective Services, Hays County Juvenile Probation Department, and the Kyle Police Department.

O. CAPCOG: Burnet, Blanco, and Llano Counties' 2005-2006 Community Plan for Coordination of Criminal Justice and Related Activities

This Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) document monitors trends and social service needs, and provides lists of priorities seeking solutions. Participating community representatives were: Hill Country Children's Advocacy Center, Burnet County Sheriff's Office, CASA for the Highland Lakes Area, Inc., Burnet County Victim Services, Boys and Girls Club of the Highland Lakes, and the Marble Falls Police Department.

P. *To avoid confusion, we did not use P to designate any sources because P was used to designate a priority issue.*

Q. Huston-Tillotson University Focus Groups on Aspects of Racial Disparities in Health

In 2005, focus groups were conducted in five counties by participants in a Huston-Tillotson University course examining bio-psycho-social aspects of racial disparity in healthcare. Participants were from Bastrop, Caldwell, Hays, Travis, and Williamson counties.

R. Ready by 21 Coalition

The Ready by 21 (RB21) Coalition of Austin/Travis County is a collaborative group of youth service providers, educators, government agency representatives, and teen advisors who are concerned about youth, especially youth who face challenges to achieving self-sufficiency. The RB21 Coalition is sponsored by WorkSource – Greater Austin Area Workforce Board, and serves as the

Youth Issues group of the Community Action Network. In Spring 2004, the Coalition sponsored a series of focus groups conducted by trained youth facilitators who obtained input from more than seventy youth participants on their perspectives on youth issues and the availability of support.

S. Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan (City of Blanco)

The Pedernales Electric Cooperative and the Lower Colorado River Authority worked with leaders and residents of the City of Blanco to develop the *Blanco Comprehensive Master Plan* on land use, growth management, quality of life, economic development, downtown revitalization and other community development issues. The initiatives recommended in the plan included safe pedestrian access, recreational amenities for all ages, and creating a city-wide network of parks and open space to increase health and community involvement. In June 2004 surveys were mailed to 3,000 property owners within the Blanco Independent School District. In addition, surveys were made available at City Hall and other locations and events in the community to allow city residents a better opportunity to complete them. A Town Hall Meeting was held to further develop the issues and opportunities identified in the mail survey. More than eighty residents participated.

Appendix C:

Term Definitions and Sources

Racial Makeup Chart: Racial categories are Anglo, African American/Black, American Indian/Alaskan Native (AIAN), Asian, and other. These categories represent those to identify as “only Anglo,” “only Asian,” etc. Individuals who identify as none of these groups are all identified in “Other.” The 2000 Census was the first to offer the category “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,” and those people could have responded in a number of different ways in previous years. Latino is identified as Latino or Hispanic of any single race. (Decennial Census 2000 and 1990)

Age Trends Chart: Age categories here are defined by the Census Bureau in smaller increments but are grouped as seen here for ease of use and comparability to other data points. (Decennial Census 2000 and 1990)

Median Household Income by Race Chart: Median household income is the income level where half of the households make more than that level and the other half of the households make less than the level. This indicator gives a better picture of a community’s income distribution than an “average” income, which is the approximation of the norm after evening out extremely high or low scores. Racial categories are defined the same as above in the “Racial Makeup Chart.” (Decennial Census 2000)

High school graduates or GED, among those 25+ years old: Individuals who have received a high school diploma or equivalent (GED) among the population in the county, region, or state who are 25 years of age or older. (Decennial Census 2000)

Bachelors, Masters or Ph. D, among those 25+ years old: People are classified according to the highest degree or level of school completed. The category “bachelors or graduate/prof. degree” includes people who have obtained one or more of the following degrees: bachelors, masters, professional school, or doctorate among the population in the county, region, or state who are 25 years of age or older. (Data Place)

Individuals who speak a language other than English at home, 5+ years old: Language currently used by respondents at home, either “English only” or a non-English language which is used in addition to English or in place of English. Individuals who primarily speak any language other than English at home who are over the age of five is compared to the population who are over 5 years old. (Decennial Census 2000)

Individuals who speak English less than “very well,” 5+ years old: A respondent who speaks a language other than English at home and refers to his/her assessment of his ability to speak English, from “very well” to “not at all.” (Decennial Census 2000)

Per Capita Income: Average obtained by dividing aggregate income by total population of an area. (Decennial Census 2000)

Individuals below poverty level, of population: Number of individuals living in poverty as defined by the federal poverty guideline, as a portion of the total county population. (Decennial Census 2000)

Children (under 18) below poverty level, of all children: Number of children living in poverty as defined by the federal poverty guideline, as a portion of all children living in the county. (Decennial Census 2000)

Elderly (65+ years old) below poverty, of all individuals in poverty: Number of elderly people living in poverty as defined by the federal poverty guideline, as a portion of all poor people in the county. (Decennial Census 2000)

2000 HHS Poverty Guidelines

Size of Family Unit 48 Contiguous States and D.C.

1	\$ 8,350
2	11,250
3	14,150
4	17,050
5	19,950
6	22,850
7	25,750
8	28,650

For each additional person, add 2,900

(Source: *Federal Register*, Vol. 65, No. 31, February 15, 2000, pp. 7555-7557.)

Average monthly TANF recipients, of population: The average monthly number of individuals, children and caregivers receiving TANF benefits in the county in 2000. (Texas County Health Facts)

Average monthly Food Stamp participants, of population: The average monthly number of individuals receiving Food stamps in the county in 2000 (Texas County Health Facts)

Individuals with disability status, 5+ years old, of population: "Disability" is a long-lasting physical, mental, or emotional condition. This condition can make it difficult for a person to do activities such as walking, climbing stairs, dressing, bathing, learning, or remembering. This condition can also impede a person from being able to go outside the home alone or to work at a job or business. (Decennial Census 2000)

Children in CHIP (2001), of the population: The number of children who are enrolled in the CHIP program as related to the entire population. (Texas County Health Facts)

Children without health insurance, less than 19, of children. The number of children is calculated using Census population by age numbers and raw numbers from Texas Health and Human Services Commission, Research and Forecasting Department numbers. (Texas County Health Facts)

Number of people eligible for Medicaid, of population: Individuals who are deemed by Texas Department of Human Services as eligible for Medicaid as a proportion of the county, regional or state population. (Texas County Health Facts)

Persons without health insurance, less than 65 years old, of uninsured population. This is calculated using Census population by age numbers and raw numbers from Texas Health and Human Services Commission, Research and Forecasting Department numbers. (Texas County Health Facts)

Births to Adolescent Mothers (under age 18), of all live births in this county (Texas County Health Facts) The Number of infants born alive to mothers 0-18 years of age as compared to the number of live births to mothers of all ages.

Substance abuse treatment clients – adult annual admissions in TCADA-funded programs: Individuals aged 18 years and older who were admitted to TACADA-funded treatment programs in 2000 as a proportion of the county, regional or state population. Numbers may be slightly under counted as a number under 4 admissions per substance is counted as 0. (Central Texas 2000: Region 7)

Substance Abuse Treatment Clients - Youth annual admissions: Individuals 17 years of age or younger who were admitted to TACADA-funded treatment programs in 2000 as a proportion of the county, regional or state population. Numbers may be slightly under counted as a number under 4 admissions per substance is counted as 0. (Central Texas 2000: Region 7)

Average household size: Average household size is obtained by dividing the total number of people living in households by the total number of households (or householders). The calculation excludes persons residing in group quarters. (Data Place)

Married-couple family w/ own children under 18 years old: A married-couple household is one in which the householder and his or her spouse are enumerated as members of the same household. People in formal marriages, as well as people in common-law marriages, are included. (Data Place)

Single-parent-headed households with own children under age 18: A household containing one or more own children of the householder, but no spouse of the householder. (Data Place)

Ratio of children ages 0-5 years served by NAEYC accredited programs, to those in non-NAEYC accredited programs (0 means no NAEYC Programs exist in the county): The ratio compares the number of children attending a program accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) to those attending non-NAEYC accredited programs in a county, the region and the state. (Early Childhood Atlas)

Foreign born population: The foreign-born population includes all people who were not U.S. citizens at birth. Foreign-born people are those who indicated on decennial Census forms that they were either a naturalized U.S. citizen or not a citizen of the United States. (Decennial Census 2000)

Owner occupied housing units: A housing unit is owner occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid for. (Decennial Census 2000)

Renter occupied housing units: All occupied units that are not owner occupied, whether they are rented for cash rent or occupied without payment of cash rent, are classified as renter-occupied. (Decennial Census)

Vacant housing units: A housing unit is vacant if no one is living in it at the time of enumeration, unless its occupants are only temporarily absent. Units temporarily occupied at the time of enumeration entirely by people who have a usual residence elsewhere are also classified as vacant. (Decennial Census 2000)

Individuals receiving Section 8 type housing assistance: This includes privately-owned units subsidized under several federal programs, including Section 8, Section 202 housing for the elderly, and Section 515 for rural rental housing that had a currently active contract at time of survey (2004). (Data Place)

Individuals in labor force, 16+ years old: The labor force includes all people classified in the civilian labor force, plus members of the U.S. Armed Forces (people on active duty with the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard). The Civilian Labor Force consists of people classified as employed or unemployed. (Decennial Census 2000)

Individuals unemployed, 16+ years old: All civilians 16 years old and over are classified as unemployed if they (1) were neither "at work" nor "with a job but not at work" during the reference week, and (2) were actively looking for work during the last 4 weeks, and (3) were available to accept a job. Also included as unemployed are civilians who did not work at all during the reference week, were waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off, and were available for work except for temporary illness. (Decennial Census 2000)

Travel time to work, workers 16+ years old: The amount of time it takes to get from individuals' home to their usual workplace. (Decennial Census 2000)

Individuals who use public transportation to work: People who use buses, streetcars or trolley cars, subways or elevated, railroad, ferryboat, taxicabs to go to work. (Decennial Census 2000)

Juvenile (ages 10-17) violent crime arrests (per 10,000 children): Number of arrests, and rate per 10,000 children aged 10 through 17, for the offenses of murder, manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery,

and aggravated assault. (Texas Kids Count) Crime rate= number of violent crimes X 10,000/
(population of children)

Violent Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report (per 10,000): This is calculated using raw data from the Texas Department of Public Safety. Violent crime includes murder, robbery, and aggravated assault. All data is provided from reporting agencies on a voluntary basis. (2000 Crime in Texas)
Crime rate= total number of property crimes X 10,000/ (population served by reporting agencies)

Property Crimes reported for Uniform Crime Report (per 10,000): This is calculated using raw data from the Texas Department of Public Safety. Property crime includes burglary, larceny, and auto theft. All data is provided from reporting agencies on a voluntary basis. (2000 Crime in Texas)
Crime rate= total number of property crimes X 10,000/ (population served by reporting agencies)

Forcible Rape reported for Uniform Crime Report (per 10,000): This is calculated using raw data from the Texas Department of Public Safety. All data is provided from reporting agencies on a voluntary basis. (2000 Crime in Texas)
Crime rate= total number of forcible rapes X 10,000/ (population served by reporting agencies)

Regional Crime Rates for juvenile, violent, property crime and forcible rape: This average was calculated by the Ray Marshall Center using the formula.
Regional crime rate=sum of each county's juvenile, violent, property, or forcible rape crime rate per 10,000/number of counties reporting data

Issues: Areas of special concern or interest as previously and independently identified by those sources in Appendix B. The RMC had no involvement in any part of the issue identification process.

Priorities: Issues previously and independently designated as priorities by sources listed in Appendix B. The RMC had no involvement in any part of the priority identification process.

Toxic Release Inventory. The inventory (TRI) is maintained by the federal Environmental Protection Agency as required by the federal law called Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act. TRI contains nearly 650 chemicals and chemical categories from industries and commercial hazardous waste treatment, among others.

* **Note:** Where SMA or Region 7 data was not available regional data was computed using information from county data tables

Sources Cited Above:

Texas Health Facts. (2000-1). Texas Department of State Health Services. Retrieved 1/04/06, from <http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/chs/cfs/>

Early Childhood Atlas. (2004-5). National Center for Rural Early Childhood Initiatives. Retrieved 1/22/06, from <http://ims.circ.rupri.org/RuralEC/step1AOI/countylist.asp?tool=statusreport>

Data Place. (2005). KnowledgePlex. Retrieved 1/22/06, from <http://dataplace.org>

Central Texas 2000: Region 7. (April 2001). Texas Department of State Health Services. Retrieved 2/2/06, from <http://www.tcada.state.tx.us/research/statistics/region7.shtml>

2000 Crime in Texas: The Texas Crime Report. (2000). Texas Department of Public Safety. Retrieved 2/2/06, from http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/director_staff/public_information/ucr2000.pdf.

Decennial Census. (1990 & 2000). U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved 1/22/06, from <http://factfinder.census.gov>